

FINAL

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING

March 20, 2000

7:30 P.M. - MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING - HANOVER, NH

The meeting of the Board of Selectmen was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by the Chairman, Brian Walsh. Present were: Brian Walsh, Chairman; Marilyn Black, Vice Chairman; Katherine S. Connolly; John Manchester; John Colligan; Julia Griffin, Town Manager; and members of the public.

Mr. Walsh announced that this meeting was being taped by CATV 6 and that hearing enhancement equipment was available for anyone who wished to use it.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT.

There was no public comment.

2. PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO POLE LICENSING PROCEDURES REGARDING TAXING OF RIGHT-OF-WAY LAND ENCUMBERED BY UTILITY POLES.

Ms. Griffin indicated that the recommendation to amend the pole licensing procedures, which the Board of Selectmen by statute are authorized to issue on behalf of the Town, comes as a result of the State Supreme Court decision in the late summer of 1999 overturning the Superior Court decision, and indicating that because poles occupy the right-of-way that this constitutes rental of public property. This agenda item is asking the Board to consider amending the licensing procedures in order to move forward to begin to assess the taxable value of land in the right-of-way occupied by utility poles in Hanover. Ms. Griffin noted that she has no idea how many utility poles are in the rights-of-way in Town, but she would venture to guess that some may not be licensed. A process will need to begin to obtain pole inventories, and then to determine which poles are in the right-of-way. Once the inventory of these poles is determined, the next step is to determine the taxable value for the land on which the poles reside.

Ms. Griffin noted that there will undoubtedly be legal issues involved in this matter, as taxing of utilities in New Hampshire has been controversial. What is being requested at this point is that before April 1st, which is the beginning of a new tax year, the Town be authorized to begin to assess taxes for poles that are in the right-of-way.

Jim Hearst of Granite State Electric asked Ms. Griffin what is proposed to be taxed. Ms. Griffin answered that at this point the Town is looking at establishing a value for the poles. The other issue deals with whether or not the Town has the authority to charge a license fee

separate from a tax. This is a fee that essentially reimburses a community for the costs incurred in hosting utilities in the right-of-way. She acknowledged that there is a lot of work to be done to determine what that cost might be, and plans are to begin with just looking at the pole inventory and determining the taxable value of land that is actually resided on by the utility poles themselves.

Mr. Manchester stated that he understands that the Town wants to do this to increase revenue, but the utility will then go to the PUC and request a rate increase which the consumer will eventually pay. Ms. Griffin explained that there is no guarantee whether the PUC would grant a rate increase to the utilities as a result of the proposed tax. Much depends upon the impact of the cost. Ms. Griffin added that one of Bell Atlantic's positions is that they think the potential tax revenue to a community is fairly negligible. She noted that the PUC would first have to make a ruling whether or not that cost impact is significant enough to warrant a rate increase, and it is not known how long that process would take. She noted that one of the issues is that when a municipality seeks to benefit tax revenue wise or fee wise from a utility, one of the downsides is that the utility can try to recover that additional cost from their customers. This is an issue which needs to be weighed very carefully when thinking about assessing a utility any fee.

Ms. Griffin indicated that many municipalities in many states are making a significant amount of revenue from charging some sort of license or rental fee to utilities in the telecommunication field. It is a potential major revenue source but it has its downside for the consumer.

Jack Nelson asked what other communities have done with regard to this issue. Ms. Griffin answered that in New Hampshire not much has been done because the litigation has moved forward. She explained that this was a Superior Court case taken by New England Telephone and the City of Rochester, New Hampshire. The Superior Court ruled that Rochester could not assess taxes against the telephone utility, and the Supreme Court overturned the Superior Court's decision. The Supreme Court essentially said that utility equipment poles, for example, in the right-of-way constitutes rental of public property; under New Hampshire State statutes when public property is rented to a private entity it is taxable land. Ms. Griffin explained that until this decision was rendered by the Supreme Court, very little was happening in the area of utility taxation in New Hampshire.

Mr. Nelson stated that if 99% of the communities decide to go ahead with what the Board is considering doing and it results in a tax increase, there will be no offsetting benefit to the taxpayers of Hanover because their rates will go up. If a large number of communities will be going ahead with this, Mr. Nelson feels that it would be in the best interest of Hanover to go along with them.

Ms. Griffin feels that it is safe to assume that there are a number of communities seeking this amendment to the licensing procedures and the rest will probably pursue it prior to November. The feeling is that this is a new opportunity to assess taxes in the State, and most communities simply want to go through the legal process to enable them to explore what the tax revenue would be and to move forward.

Mr. Walsh asked what the motion in front of the Board would be and what steps would take place afterwards. Ms. Griffin explained that the motion would be to amend pole licenses

pursuant to RSA 231:161 and 231:163 to add the language contained in the resolution.

Mr. Walsh asked what the affect of the amendment would be. Ms. Griffin answered that the next step would be to request an inventory of all poles from the three utilities that operate with poles in Hanover, and then to determine accurately which poles are in the right-of-way and which are not. She feels that this procedure will take several months. Once the actual inventory of poles is determined, the assessor will begin to try to place a value on the piece of land occupied by those poles. He will assess a value, which will obviously be subject to appeal just as any other tax assessment.

Mr. Manchester asked for an explanation of what would be taxed. Ms. Griffin answered that the area occupied by the pole would be taxed, and added that a lot of poles have support braces as well which would be included.

Ray Buskey asked whether underground utilities in the rights-of-way would be taxed as well. He feels that underground utilities in the street probably have a greater effect on the Town than poles. Ms. Griffin answered that there is the issue of the poles themselves and then there is the issue of overhead wires as well as underground utility work which tends to be as destructive, if not more so, in terms of street repair. She suggested that a staff working group be put together to determine the cost of hosting utilities in the rights-of-way.

Mr. Buskey asked if current property owners would start looking to charge the utility companies for poles located on private property. Ms. Griffin answered that they could, but that this typically gets negotiated when the utility receives permission to place poles on private property. It is an agreement between the utility and the property owner.

Mr. Buskey asked where this proposal fits in with representation, as in "taxation without representation". Ms. Griffin answered that State law grants the Board of Selectmen a number of responsibilities. One specific responsibility granted in the RSAs is to issue licenses and amend licenses within State law anyway the Board sees fit. The Supreme Court decision last August said that the Board of Selectmen or any other elected body in the State can now amend licenses to enable a community to tax utilities for poles placed in the right-of-way.

Dale Wilkie wondered if some utilities pay taxes presently to certain towns, and whether this proposal would result in double taxation. Ms. Griffin answered that her understanding is that it would not result in double taxation. She noted that there is some equipment that is currently taxable, but she is positive that poles are not being taxed in New Hampshire.

Mr. Wilkie asked if the value that the utilities are presently paying for equipment within the right-of-way would be exempt. Ms. Griffin explained that the proposal represents an additional revenue source for communities; the Supreme Court decision essentially enabled the taxation of poles, which is seen as differentiated from some of the equipment that may be taxable.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to close the public hearing. Mr. Colligan SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen vote to approve the proposed amendment to pole licensing procedures regarding taxing of right-of-way land encumbered by utility poles.

Ms. Griffin read for the record the following language contained in the proposed amendment to pole licensing procedures: "In accordance with the requirements of RSA 72:23 IB this license is granted to the licensees subject to the condition that the licensees and any other entity using or occupying property of the state or of a city, town school district or village district pursuant to this license shall be responsible for the payment of and shall pay all properly assessed real and personal property taxes no later than the due date. Failure of the licensees to pay duly assessed personal and real estate taxes when due shall be cause to terminate this license. In accordance with the requirements of RSA 72:23 IB the licensees hereunder and any other entity using or occupying property in the State or of a city, town school district or village district pursuant to this license shall be responsible for the payment of and shall pay both current and potential real and personal property taxes when due. Furthermore, in accordance with the requirements of RSA 72:23 IB the licensees and any other entity using and/or occupying property in the State or of a city, town school district or village district pursuant to this license shall be obligated to pay real and personal property taxes on structures or improvements added by the licensees or any other entity using or occupying property of the licensor pursuant to this license. The amendment to all pole licenses set forth in the preceding two paragraphs to take effect 4/1/2000 and shall remain in effect until changed in accordance with the requirements of RSA 231:163."

Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO POLE LICENSING PROCEDURES REGARDING TAXING OF RIGHT-OF-WAY LAND ENCUMBERED BY UTILITY POLES.

3. 4TH BUDGET HEARING:

Parking Fund

Ms. Griffin stated that the report provided to the Board for the Parking Fund represents hundreds of hours of work and ties in with the proposed budget.

Ms. Connolly asked if some of the changes recommended by the Task Force were included in the budget. Ms. Griffin answered that the recommendations of the Task Force are reflected in the numbers which are proposed for the Board for FY 2000/2001. For example, the recommendations regarding rates to be charged for long-term parking spaces in the structure match to the revenue projections that have been devised for the budget. She added that the committee spent a large amount of time looking at three expenditure and revenue

related projections, which were optimistic, middle-of-the road, and pessimistic.

Other than facilities, Ms. Connolly asked if there were recommendations that have been made which are definite changes in the revenue stream and are reflected in the budget. Bill Baschnagel answered that changes in the report, outside of the facility, were rolled into the modelling which the Task Force did to come to the conclusion that the accuracy of the projections was consistent. What is included in the report are all of the recommendations that are consistent with the budget that Mike Gilbar has put together and is proposing.

Ms. Black asked if handicapped parking spaces were metered. Ms. Griffin answered that they are not; State standards do not allow meters in handicapped spaces.

Mr. Walsh asked if at some point, presumably before the first of July, Ms. Griffin would be bringing to the Board a fee schedule which would be followed by a public hearing on that fee schedule. Ms. Griffin answered that the Board needs to amend the Parking Ordinance, so it would require a public hearing.

Referring to the funding model built for the parking facility two years ago, Mr. Walsh noted that there were certain expectations and money that would be raised by tax increment financing and from the parking district. He stated that he would like to revisit those expectations in terms of the present proposals.

Mr. Colligan asked what the probability would be for each of the three scenarios which were presented to the Board - "optimistic, average, and pessimistic". Mr. Baschnagel answered that it is a combination of probabilities. The committee forecasted things both in terms of long-term and short-term revenues in and out of the facility, using different numbers for each.

Mr. Colligan noted that he is trying to better understand what the contingency would be in the pessimistic scenario, looking at the \$150,000 shortfall. Ms. Griffin explained that a number of expenditure areas have been identified that the Board would have to look at reducing if the pessimistic scenario came to pass. She noted that one of the easiest to cut simply because it is a large lump-sum item would be the Thompson Arena shuttle, as well as the two very expensive leases for parking on the Fleet deck and the HSD lot. There are a number of items that could be looked at if a troublesome situation was encountered.

Mr. Manchester asked why the items mentioned by Ms. Griffin would not be shed initially to get more demand for the parking garage. Ms. Griffin answered that if that were to happen it would be more likely than not that the two owners of the properties mentioned would turn around and lease those parking spaces for what was being charged in the parking garage.

Mr. Manchester agreed that initially that might happen, but it would not continue for the long-term. Ms. Griffin stated that originally it was felt important to hold onto those lots, particularly while the garage was under construction, because they contained critical parking

spaces. She noted that the HSD lot is on a month-to-month lease and the Fleet deck is in part related to what may happen with the Fleet building itself. If retail expansion were to happen on the front of the Fleet building it would necessitate coming up with more on-site or off-site parking spaces to comply with the expansion. Ms. Griffin pointed out that these two lots do not generate nearly the revenue that is expended on them. The Town made the decision to hold onto them because they represent convenient parking and it is felt that it is important to provide a sufficient supply of parking spaces for downtown. She agreed that it will be very important to keep a close watch on the parking garage literally week by week and make recommendations to the Board in terms of areas where expense may need to be shed.

Dave Cioffi stated that one of the key recommendations the Task Force is making is that the Town run the parking garage operation. One of the reasons for this recommendation is that the Task Force felt that rather than let someone else manage part of the parking system and be in competition with the Town, overall control by the Town was important. He stressed the importance of beginning to sell some of the leased spaces in the structure.

Ms. Black referred to the line item relating to parking enforcement and overtime. She asked why scheduling is not done so that employees rotate duty on Saturdays making it unnecessary to pay overtime. Patrick O'Neill answered that most of the overtime shown is related to line painting. Saturdays and Sundays there is only one person working, and Thursdays Ken Force is working to cover the other employees' time while they collect revenue from the meters.

Ms. Griffin explained that the bulk of the overtime is to monitor the line painting which takes place after hours. Mr. Manchester asked why it was necessary to monitor line painting. Peter Kulbacki answered that some of the line painting was done in-house because the contractors could not get back to paint the second time. Public works staff and parking personnel ended up doing the painting for the second time around.

Ms. Black questioned the \$54,000 allocated for meter heads, noting that it amounts to almost \$150 per meter. Patrick O'Neill answered that the mechanisms cost \$155. This would be the second phase of switching the Town to the electronic meters. He added that replacement of the meters would cost \$41,000, and there is also \$9,600 included in the \$54,000 to replace some of the housings that are grey and dingy looking. Ms. Griffin commented that this item will go down after this year.

Ms. Black asked why the \$106,000 for facility improvements was not included in the bond. Ms. Griffin answered that the decision was made not to include it in the bond and instead to try to budget for it across two budget cycles.

Mr. Manchester asked for an explanation of personnel cost, specifically parking division supervisors. He asked if it was necessary to have two supervisors for eight employees. Patrick O'Neill answered that there would be one key person at the parking facility who would supervise the equipment, become familiar with the operations and assist in training

of personnel within the facility, as well as manage the numbers. Ms. Griffin added that the job title is envisioned along the lines of something like a parking control facility technician; in addition, there will also be a parking facility cashier, with Patrick O'Neill supervising all of the staff.

Ms. Black asked if there would be bathrooms in the garage. Patrick O'Neill answered that there will be one bathroom for the use of the employees only.

Ms. Connolly asked for an explanation of the revenues in line items 331, 340 and 352. Ms. Griffin answered that these line items are related to the parking facility revenues.

Ms. Connolly asked if permit parking related to the leases that were discussed earlier, and if so, she believes the total is \$108,000 rather than \$157,000. Mr. Gilbar explained that the \$157,298 represents lease revenue from long-term parking spaces while \$36,000 represents rental revenue that Dartmouth College would pay the Town for renting their parking spaces. The figure of \$75,000 is the parking deficit fee. Mr. Gilbar further explained that part of that tax, the \$150,000, is actually divided into two parts. One part is actual tax and the other is the deficit space fee that is assessed to businesses that were grandfathered in with the zoning requirements.

Ms. Black commented that there is a recommendation that some of the metered spaces revert to leased parking. Ms. Griffin answered that this would be a very small number of meters. Ms. Black pointed out that last year the Town only made \$307,000, and asked for the reason in the requested increase in the amount of \$17,000. Ms. Griffin explained that part of the plan is to replace the other half of the mechanical meters with electronic meters while at the same time raising the rate to 50 cents an hour. This plan is what drives the \$324,000 projection.

Mr. Colligan asked if the school was paying the same rate as the Co-Op for the Thompson Arena spaces. Ms. Griffin answered that they are paying more because they have 50 spaces and the Co-Op only has 40 spaces; however, the per space rate is the same.

Ms. Black noted that with the Co-Op utilizing 40 spaces and the school utilizing 50 of the 160 spaces available, only 70 spaces are left for the Town's use, making the cost of running the system extremely expensive. Mr. Walsh suggested that this item is a legitimate question for next year's budget. He feels that the last thing the Town is in a position to do is to start to shed parking spaces. He agreed that it may be determined next year that there are parking lots that should be converted to private parking, but he would prefer to put off this discussion to next year's

budget. He thinks that data needs to be gathered through this coming year to make a knowledgeable determination of all parts of the parking system Town-wide.

Ms. Griffin indicated that it is clear that the shuttle is probably going to have to receive the most scrutiny of all as its relative value is looked at as part of the whole system. Mr. Walsh noted that the Town will have the opportunity to monitor the ridership in the fall, and if ridership is down there may be the possibility of terminating it. Ms. Griffin agreed that a careful analysis is required of the ridership, but it is impossible to predict at this time how behavior will be modified once the parking garage is open with respect to the shuttle.

Ms. Black asked if there was any way of identifying the Co-Op parkers and high school parkers who have permits to park there so that parking lot counts could be done. Patrick O'Neill answered that the tags used by the vehicles are numbered, but parking lot counts have not been done recently. Ms. Black indicated that it would be helpful to do this for next year.

Ms. Griffin discussed personnel costs at the facility. She noted that expenses have been broken out between the enforcement section and the facility section in order to be able to track the facility expenses directly. There is money budgeted for full-time enforcement and the only increase shown from the current year are step increases. Ms. Griffin noted that the full-time enforcement staff is supplemented with part-time so that the staff has time to empty the meters of revenue on a regular basis. The expense for temporary supervision is very small, but is necessary for when Sgt. O'Neill is away. At these times it is necessary to look at a supervision differential for the acting supervisor and enforcement overtime, which is largely related but not exclusively related to line painting.

Ms. Griffin noted that the committee and staff have spent a great deal of time talking about the staff that would be recommended to be hired to operate the parking garage. Two recommendations were arrived at in the full-time and part-time category. This money tracks with the job descriptions developed based on the skill levels desired and the number of hours of operation of the parking garage. Two positions are being recommended, one being a parking control facility technician and the other being a parking facility cashier position. Mr. Gilbar added that there is also a part-time fund included because the parking control technician would also be writing tickets within the Lebanon Street area. Sgt. O'Neill pointed out that there would also be part-time staff acting as cash collectors within the facility.

Ms. Black commented that she does not feel the recommended salary level is adequate for the hours of operation and six days of operation indicated. Ms. Griffin explained that they had looked at industry salary levels in arriving at their recommended salary level.

Ms. Griffin indicated a couple of areas where the Town may wish to think about shedding expenses if it becomes necessary. She referred particularly to Lot Rentals which goes down slightly from the current budget of \$62,300 to \$60,003. This is due to the recommendation that the leases for miscellaneous parking spaces behind the Lou's block not be continued. These spaces are very difficult to enforce and are typically full of meter feeders who are employed by the businesses from whom the Town leases the parking spaces. Ms. Griffin feels that it makes no sense to continue those leases as not much revenue is realized from

them. It is planned to continue to operate the spaces on the east side of the parking lot behind the Lou's block but not on the west side.

Ms. Griffin added that lot rentals and the shuttle are two key areas that will need to be looked at very carefully, and it will be necessary to keep a very close eye on the parking facility over the first few months of the parking garage's life.

Mr. Colligan requested that staffing recommendations for the parking facility be put on the list for further discussion.

Ms. Griffin indicated that no reserve purchases are recommended for the coming year. The parking reserve has essentially been maintained in the past for the parking enforcement vehicle. She noted that in terms of the parking facility area she will be coming to the Board every year to recommend that a reserve be maintained each year for the parking garage itself; this was included in the proforma when the original projections for the bond issue were completed.

Bill Baschnagel suggested to the Board that one item to be put on the list for discussion would be the ticket fine level. The current fine is \$5 per ticket, which has not been raised for some time. It is the consensus of the Parking and Transportation Board that the fine be increased to at least \$7.50. This increase is not included in the proposed budget, but he would suggest that the Board consider it as another way to add a buffer against some of the uncertainties with the parking facility without cutting services that are provided.

Mr. Walsh stated that a discussion of the fines will be put on the list for further discussion.

Regarding parking facility rates, Ms. Connolly stated that she would question the wisdom of having the rates in the facility any different than the rates on the street. She suggested that consideration be given to keeping the rates in the facility the same as the rates for the two-hour meters on the street, with some elevation in fees later.

Mr. Baschnagle indicated that there was concern about discouraging employees from using the facility as a surrogate meter feeding facility. The thought was that escalating the rates beyond the third or fourth hour fairly steeply would not have an adverse impact for legitimate users. It would act as a significant deterrent for an employee leaving their car there for five to six hours. The attempt is to provide an alternative to employees and to keep them out of the facility so that it can be available for short-term parkers. Ms. Connolly answered that she was simply suggesting that the rates in the facility be made equal to what is on the street for the first two hours, then begin to elevate.

Mr. Baschnagel explained that the average stay as indicated by the profile used to project the revenues is on the order of two hours. To the extent that the front-end part of the rates are reduced, revenue generation is decreased considerably. Mr. Baschnagel feels that parkers will have high confidence in finding a parking place in the parking garage immediately and also will have confidence that they will not be threatened with a parking

ticket.

Ms. Griffin agreed that parkers in the facility would have the convenience of being able to shop without worrying about putting enough money in a meter. The assumption is that some people would rather pay a little more to be able to leave their car for as long as they wish and not have to worry about getting a ticket.

Mr. Walsh asked what would happen to the revenue and deficit if the facility opens on September 1st rather than the date proposed. Mr. Gilbar explained that the expenses would go down as well because there would be no operating costs. Mr. Walsh indicated that he would like to see what date the facility is projected to open and what the sensitivity is if it opens two months later than projected.

Clint Bean from the Chamber of Commerce noted that one of the points made in the report is that this is all a starting point, and the Chamber and downtown businesses all feel that the proposal is a fair and balanced approach as a starting point.

Mr. Walsh stated that the point he is trying to make is that the parking system will be successful or will fail based on what the downtown interests do with it. It will work because the downtown businesses validate tickets and deal appropriately with their employees; it will work because the storeowners or landowners downtown make it work. He thanked the group of people who have worked so hard on this proposal, adding that they have done an outstanding job and put the Town in a place where there is a good chance of success with the parking facility.

Ms. Black commented that the hourly count for Advance Transit has been received and it shows that the largest number of ridership has been 14 people. She asked if new, smaller buses could be used rather than the large ones that are never full. She noted that smaller buses would be less polluting and less noisy than the larger ones.

Van Chestnut of Advance Transit explained that the new buses that are coming will have a 25 passenger capacity.

Water Company Staff Consolidation Proposal

Ms. Griffin indicated that the better part of the last five months has been spent looking at the potential for a recommendation to consolidate the current staff of the Water Company with the staff of the Public Works Department. At the current time the Town of Hanover manages the Water Company on behalf of the Water Company. Peter Kulbacki, the Public Works Director and two staff members from the Wastewater Treatment Plant spend a considerable amount of time overseeing the day-to-day operations of the Water Company as well as their own operating department. Ms. Griffin noted that in addition Mr. Kulbacki has spent an even more significant amount of time overseeing the capital improvement related program aspects of the Water Company. When it was first proposed to the Town and the Water Company board that the Town take over the contract management of the Water

Company, an additional position in the Wastewater Fund was budgeted for to oversee the two facilities. However, the position was not filled because Mr. Kulbacki wanted to take some time to see what was required of the Town managing the utility in terms of staff impact.

Ms. Griffin noted that the criteria which was established was to be sure that a proposal could be developed that was in the best interests of all three funds involved and interacting together on water issues. It was hoped to come up with a proposal that would enhance all three operations but not cost any fund any more money than what is currently budgeted for the day-to-day work they are engaged in. These were essentially the criteria that were established realizing that this was not a year to be incurring additional expenditures, particularly in the General Fund.

Ms. Griffin explained that the proposal would be pending final approval of the Water Company board and being able to arrange an attractive alternative for the current Water Company staff. Essentially, the Water Company would contract from the Town for their entire operation rather than just the management as is done currently. In the process, three positions are gained through funds that are available that would aid all three utilities.

Ms. Griffin stated that one position recommended would be the addition of a utility engineer's position. This person would oversee both wastewater and water, more heavily focused on the water side because there is so much work to be done on capital improvement for the Water Company. Also proposed is to allocate a small portion of the utility engineer's salary to the Wastewater Treatment Plant Fund in the amount of \$7,300, with \$4,200 allocated to the General Fund. This individual would be working with Mr. Kulbacki and with the Wastewater Treatment Plant staff, and would be involved in some of the industrial pre-treatment ordinance monitoring as well as doing a fairly extensive plan review as part of the Planning and Zoning process. The individual would also spend a considerable amount of time both in reviewing plans and in on-site inspection during construction.

In addition, Ms. Griffin explained that it is proposed to merge funds that were available in the Water Company budget and the unfilled part-time position in the Water Company, plus money that was budgeted in the Fleet Maintenance Division in Public Works for a stock room clerk. This particular position was filled with a temporary person for a number of months and is now vacant. Those two pools of money that are currently available in the budget would be combined to create the stockroom administrative position which would be filled by someone who would deal both with the Water Company in administrative work and also with related clerical work in the Public Works Department Fleet Maintenance Division.

Ms. Griffin stated that the Water Company has in its budget sufficient funds to hire up to three seasonal workers to beef up the line staff in the Water Company for summer work. The recommendation would be that rather than hire three seasonal workers, the line capability be increased to four individuals from the current three full-time individuals. It is recommended to use that money which is sufficient to hire the additional line person for

Water, but also look to access that person for highway work during the winter, providing additional support for the highway division.

Ms. Black asked how one full-time person could do the work in the summer that it currently takes three seasonal people to accomplish. Ms. Griffin explained that one of the difficulties is that the three seasonal workers hired are not necessarily skilled workers. The Water Company has essentially hired college students in the past. It is felt that having one trained individual will result in as much work as was accomplished by the three seasonal workers.

Mr. Kulbacki stated that one of the biggest problems with the Water Works is maintenance of the pipes. This is the number one priority and needs to continue to be this for the next twenty years; however, without adequate staffing it will not happen. He noted that tracking from this point on will be fairly difficult. As more distribution related problems are discovered, they will require more and more attention. This is where the focus of the work will have to be.

Ms. Griffin indicated that it is felt that there should be some efficiencies that are gained when the two utilities are coordinated. She noted that this proposal is about as close as a Town can come to municipalizing a utility without converting that utility from a private company to a publicly-owned utility. It is ultimately a guess on whether the proposed number of staff will be sufficient, but it is based on experience over the last 18 months.

Mr. Kulbacki explained that it is also difficult now to do a lot of work for the Water Company because they are a taxable entity, and it is necessary to bill for the Town's time. This would not be necessary in the future if the merge were to occur. In addition, staff would be available to assist in emergencies and some scheduled repairs.

Mr. Colligan stated that the conclusion is that this proposal is basically a defacto move toward municipalization. He noted that there are some longer term issues which need to be identified, which include land use as well as trying to value not only capital costs but operating costs to the two partners, Dartmouth College being the majority shareholder. He asked what the appropriate burden sharing would be in terms of formalizing this municipalization.

Ms. Griffin explained that a process is underway of accumulating the names of consultants that specialize in valuing utility assets such as the Water Company so that the College, which is the majority owner, and the Town, which is just shy of being the majority owner, are going to be in a position in the future to ascertain what the value of the asset is and if it is in the best interests of the Town to seek a municipalization. In addition, it needs to be determined what would be the expenditures incurred in turning the utility over to the Town. She feels that in many ways it makes sense to municipalize the utility because it would no longer be necessary to deal with the administrative bureaucracy of the Public Utilities Commission; however, it may be costly enough to the Town that this route may not be desirable. The Town and the College have both agreed to hire an independent objective source to take a look at the state of the Water Company, the state of capital assets, and the

future of water treatment and distribution to determine an objective analysis as to how this type of transaction could most effectively occur.

Mr. Colligan stated that he appreciated the work involved in developing this proposal, and wants to be sure that included in the analysis is the operating piece. He indicated that one of the things he has heard from people on the street that are uneducated about the issues involved with this merger is a question why municipalization should be considered when there is 100 years worth of catch-up on the plant and equipment. He asked that the operating piece of this proposal be folded into the analysis so that the Board can make an informed decision.

Mr. Walsh stated that the question he has is what the Public Utilities Commission is going to do with this proposal relative to rates. The theory of what is being attempted with this proposal is to come up with some economic efficiencies on the personnel side but to keep the costs on the Water Company users rather than on the Town. Ms. Griffin agreed, but stated that the proposal would indicate that the goal is that there would be no increased costs to any of the three utilities, including the General Fund, over and above what they are currently budgeted for in operations. From the PUC's perspective, they will not see an increased bottom line operating expense for the Water Company coming out of this proposal.

Jack Nelson, President of the Water Company, explained that right now the PUC is adjusting the rates; in doing so, it looks at all budget line items to see their appropriateness. In the future, this will involve only one line item. There is a good chance that the PUC will not be satisfied to only look at this one line item and may want to go deeper into how that line item was made up and whether the contract with the Town was a viable contract that they can accept.

Mr. Kulbacki noted that the PUC had reviewed the contracts and felt they were appropriate. The reporting requirements as far as the resources that were used have to still apply to the PUC's accounting system. One of the big burdens in the proposed transition is the time spent in doing the recordkeeping.

Mr. Nelson reported the opinion of the Board of Directors of the Water Company was to enthusiastically support the proposal. One reason is that it is a step closer to municipalization, and the second reason is that with the proposed management contract the Water Company customers will be getting a level of professionalism that they have never before seen in the history of the Water Company. The Board of Directors of the Water Company does not know how else to bring this quality to the customers without attaching to the Town of Hanover.

Mr. Walsh asked what the next step would be for the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Griffin answered that the Board needs to direct the Town to begin to pursue this proposal in more detail pending Town Meeting approval of the entire Town budget. Specifically, the Board

would then be presented with job titles with labor grades attached. Job descriptions have been drafted but need to be brought before the Board formally. In addition, Ms. Griffin indicated that there are many discussions needed with the staff of the Water Company who have to feel comfortable with this consolidation. It is necessary to go back to the Water Company Board to get their ultimate authorization to deal with this matter. Then it will also be necessary to look on the legal side in terms of the contract that will satisfy the PUC requirements as well as the Town in overseeing contract operations of the Company. It was the Selectboard's concurrence that this proposal makes sense from a budgetary perspective.

Mr. Nelson stated that he came to the meeting specifically to recommend the inclusion of a warrant item for Town Meeting. He explained that the Water Company currently pays taxes to the Town. The Water Company Board has been discussing the lack of money in the Water Company budget, essentially in the capital reserve. Over the years the Town and the College have received dividends in the vicinity of \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year. This revenue was put into miscellaneous revenue and not anticipated otherwise. Ms. Griffin noted that a memo was received from Mr. Nelson wondering if it made sense to begin discussions about a way in which the Town could take a portion of the taxes that the Water Company pays the Town and set that aside in a Water Company reserve for future improvements to the water infrastructure. Mr. Nelson had suggested that \$120,000 be set aside from the General Fund revenues into a Water Company reserve contribution. As a compromise, Ms. Griffin put the sum of \$40,000 on the wish list as the beginning of the Town considering setting aside a portion of the tax revenue that comes to the Town from the Water Company into a capital reserve for future reinvestment in the water distribution system infrastructure.

Ms. Griffin indicated that Mr. Nelson had considered whether it made sense for the Town to put on as a separate Warrant Article some language that would set aside some portion or all of the Water Company tax revenue that is paid to the Town in a future reserve for water distribution system improvements. This is under the assumption that the rate increases that have been or will be approved by the PUC are enough to fund the principal and interest payments on the low interest loan that is allowing the Town to do the water distribution system and water tank improvements which are currently underway and some additional money for operating expenses, but not enough to set aside a substantial capital reserve for the Water Company.

Mr. Nelson stressed that the Water Company is in very big trouble. He suggested that people should not be surprised if they should lose their water at any time for significant periods of time. He noted that the infrastructure is rotten and at any moment the Town could lose its total water supply and total fire protection. Mr. Nelson added that for whatever reason, over 100 years ago the Water Company was set up as a private company, meaning it declares dividends. The Water Company has paid \$200,000 in dividends to the Town of Hanover that have gone into the General Fund to reduce taxes. It pays \$120,000 a year in property taxes that are added to the Water Company customers' bills that subsidize the taxes of all those that do not get water from the Water Company. Mr. Nelson's suggestion is that some of this unfairness should be adjusted.

Mr. Nelson stated that he realizes the Town's budget is tight this year, but he feels the public

and the customer base of the Water Company needs to know the very poor condition of the Water Company's infrastructure. He recommended to the Board that a Warrant item be put on separate from the budget stating that the taxes received from the Water Company would go into a reserve to be used solely for capital infusion into the Water Company for capital improvements. Taking into consideration the condition of the infrastructure, he would vote for a 3% increase in taxes because so much is at risk. He noted that he would be glad to get up at Town Meeting and represent the Warrant Article, if that were appropriate.

Mr. Nelson commented that Dartmouth College has recognized the poor condition of the infrastructure and has said that they would contribute the same amount as the Town may put in as capital infusion to use for emergency infrastructure problems, based on their percentage of ownership. Mr. Nelson feels that this is a way to start funding emergency capital improvements at a rate of one-quarter million dollars a year. The first quarter million dollars would give the water system the first aid it needs in order to assure that the townspeople have water. This assurance cannot be given at the present time.

Mr. Walsh stated that he is very concerned about Town Meeting this year, particularly if the Warrant Article suggested by Mr. Nelson were put on as well as the issue of the dissolution of the Sidewalk District. He is not sure whether it is wise to put these kinds in questions in front of Town Meeting this year considering the potential stresses already facing the taxpayers of Hanover. He has no question that it would be good to have an emergency fund, but he is troubled about making it a Warrant Article this year.

Mr. Colligan stated that this is a huge topic that needs a lot of consideration, which he is not prepared to do at this time. He added that he was shocked that Moody's and S & P, which had just rated Dartmouth College AAA, would have missed the water infrastructure problems.

Ms. Connolly stated that she feels if the taxpayers are approached on this issue they should be approached as a separate Warrant Article. It should be fully explained and dealt with by a majority of the taxpayers. She feels that this is a decision that the taxpayers should make.

Discussion of Proposed Increase in Planning and Zoning Fees

Mr. Walsh noted that his recollection is that \$23,000 positive is to be put on the wish list as a result of the proposed increase in Planning and Zoning fees.

Ms. Connolly pointed out under the section dealing with permits for the Zoning Board that a Zoning Board rehearing is scheduled to increase from

zero to \$50. She explained that if a re-hearing takes place it is because the Board itself accepts that it has made a mistake. She sees no reason why the taxpayers should pay for a mistake of the Town of Hanover.

Mr. Walsh commented that there will be a public hearing scheduled on this issue in May or June. On the other hand, he noted that having adopted the budget the Board does not want to get into a place where the public hearing is a complete sham. He stated that there is an amount of conversation that the Board should have relative to this issue.

Ms. Black asked if all of the proposed increases were built into the budget. Ms. Griffin answered that they were not. She suggested that the Board could make some assumptions about their comfort level with the relative range of fees that are being recommended, and add \$23,852 to the revenue projections which would either allow the Board to reduce the tax rate by that amount or fund some items from the wish list, or a combination thereof.

In order to leave some room for conversation on this subject, Mr. Walsh recommended that \$18,000 be put on the wish list.

Ms. Black stated that before she agrees with Mr. Walsh's recommendation she would like to see some figures comparing the proposed increases as well as the increases included in the last budget in order to determine the added costs for construction.

Jonathan Edwards explained that the difference being discussed is \$125 extra for subdivision review per lot. In the case of PRDs, currently the PRD fee is higher than the proposed subdivision fee. This proposal involves lowering the PRD application fees to some extent. In that respect, Mr. Edwards stated that he felt it was somewhat disingenuous to say that the Town wished to promote PRDs while continuing to charge higher rates for their plan reviews. He stated that the average cost for a normal single-family house by the action taken last year to raise the building fees and by the action now proposed would add approximately \$250 to the cost.

Ms. Black indicated that she would like to see what the total impact of all fees would be for major projects before this proposal is approved. Ms. Griffin stated that she would get that information to the Board in their Friday mailing.

Ms. Black suggested that \$15,000 be put on the wish list relative to a positive impact in terms of revenue from increased Planning and Zoning fees. The Board concurred with this suggestion.

Mr. Edwards indicated that the effect of the building fees voted on last year would have been to add \$76,000 to the building permit fee for the Baker Berry Library, and the proposal now in front of the Board would add another \$5,750, for a total of approximately \$82,000 for a 40 1/2 million dollar project.

Ms. Griffin commented that the final public hearing on the budget is scheduled for March 27, 2000 at 7:30 p.m.

4. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RECOMMENDATION TO SET PROPOSED PUBLIC HEARING ON

PROPOSED PLAN FOR APRIL 3, 2000.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to set a public hearing on the proposed Housing and Community Development Plan for April 3, 2000. Mr. Colligan SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR APRIL 3, 2000.

5. RECOMMENDATION TO ACCEPT EASEMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DROP-OFF AREA TO SERVE OUTREACH HOUSE.

Ms. Griffin distributed an illustration of what is contemplated for a drop-off area to serve Outreach House. She explained that the proposal deals with assisting Outreach House on Valley Road with utilizing money they have already given the Town in the amount of \$3,000 to construct a drop-off area at their expense to make it easier for their residents to get in and out of vehicles safely. It involves a transitional location from the right-of-way onto private property, and as a result they need to give the Town an easement on their property abutting the right-of-way to affect the construction. They have also proposed to grant to the Town a sidewalk easement in the event that the Town were to build a sidewalk on that side of Valley Road. There has been some discussion in the Planning Board about constructing a sidewalk on the other side of Valley Road as part of the Dartmouth project that is being contemplated; Outreach House simply wants the Town to know that if it becomes possible to build a sidewalk in the location of the drop-off they would be in agreement. They have drafted an easement for this sidewalk, but if it is not needed it reverts back to them within a three-year time period.

Mr. Colligan asked how the proposal would impact with what is happening on the other side of the street. He stated that the real question in his mind is in terms of intensification across the street to the extent there is any safety issue. He noted that there would probably be a significant bottleneck at this location in terms of traffic.

Mr. Manchester stated that this drop-off location should expedite traffic. Ms. Griffin agreed that it should ease traffic flow. It does not mitigate the traffic that may result from the residential development, but it makes it safer to unload and load residents of Outreach House.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to accept the easement for construction of drop-off area to serve Outreach House. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ACCEPT THE EASEMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DROP-OFF AREA TO SERVE OUTREACH HOUSE.

6. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT RESTRICTION AGREEMENT WITH DARTMOUTH COLLEGE ON A PARCEL OF LAND ABUTTING THE HANOVER COUNTRY CLUB, FLETCHER CIRCLE, AND CHANDLER DRIVE.

Ms. Griffin stated that Paul Olsen from Dartmouth College and Jonathan Edwards would be willing to address any specific questions the Board might have relative to this building restriction easement deed. She noted that this is something that has been discussed before the Planning Board as part of site plan review, but it is now before the Board of Selectmen because they have the authority to accept easements.

Mr. Walsh commented that there are two questions; one is whether this easement meets the needs of the Planning Board and whether it has been approved by the Town attorney. Ms. Connolly answered that the Planning Board seems comfortable with the concept; Mr. Manchester added that the Conservation Commission is comfortable with the concept as well.

Ms. Griffin stated that this easement has been reviewed by the Town attorney. Before it is executed, the Town attorney would have the final draft to edit and review.

Mr. Colligan stated that one of the questions during the Conservation Commission discussion was whether anything would happen to the cemetery piece. The plan for the golf course renovation was displayed. It was stated that basically there are three reasons for renovation; one is to make a safer course and a little longer course to qualify as a championship college course. Another is to bring the greens and tees up to par as far as quality so that they can handle more traffic and result in a higher quality course.

As far as the entire renovation is concerned, all tee boxes and greens of existing holes will be renovated. To increase the length of the course, four of the existing holds will be eliminated and four new holes will be added. Two of those new holes occur at the north end of the property in the area that is presently zoned residential, which would be rezoned institutional under the proposed plan. This would allow the addition of two new holes and length to the golf course. The two other new holes would go in at the south end of the course. The cemetery will remain undisturbed.

Ms. Black asked if it would be necessary for this issue to go before Town Meeting. Ms. Griffin answered that no Town Meeting approval is needed; Town Meeting granted the Board of Selectmen the right to accept easements.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to approve the proposed development restriction agreement with Dartmouth College on a parcel of land abutting the Hanover Country Club, Fletcher Circle, and Chandler Drive. Mr. Manchester SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT RESTRICTION AGREEMENT WITH DARTMOUTH COLLEGE ON A PARCEL OF LAND ABUTTING THE

HANOVER COUNTRY CLUB, FLETCHER CIRCLE, AND CHANDLER DRIVE.

7. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS: PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DRAFT WARRANT FOR TOWN MEETING.

Ms. Griffin wished to draw the Board's attention to one Warrant Article which she drafted regarding the expenditure of funds for the property at 48 Lebanon Street. This is the home and tenant building owned by HIC that the Town had contemplated purchasing last year for \$135,000. There is over \$155,000 in the Land and Capital Improvement Fund so there is sufficient money in the fund for the purchase of the property. The reason this was not included on last year's warrant is that the time frame had passed for the public hearing on the budget that would have allowed appropriate notification of the voters of the intention to appropriate money from this reserve for the purchase of the property. The final budget document that would be published in the Town Report and sent to the voters would include the appropriation from this reserve should the Board decide it wants to pursue this Warrant Article. Appropriate public notification for expenditure of the funds in addition to the separate Warrant Article would be required.

Ms. Griffin reported that a request has been received from The Haven which is a shelter in White River Jct., Vermont. They are looking for a \$5,000 donation from the Town. Ms. Griffin suggested that this is an issue where the Board may opt to put it on as a separate Warrant Article just as it does with other miscellaneous requests. Traditionally with outside funding requests such as this they are placed on the Warrant for three years as a separate Warrant Article.

Ms. Griffin stated that she also assumes there will be a Warrant Article on the statewide property tax issue.

Ms. Griffin indicated that Mr. Gilbar is working with Tim Bates on the issue of how to abolish the Sidewalk District should the Board choose to tackle that issue this year. Her recollection is that something official needs to be done related to taking the revenue that has accumulated from the Land Use Change Tax, and the Town Meeting has to actually segregate those two funds. Also, the Bike Path Committee may want to resurrect the motor vehicle registration fee surcharge. They would like the Board to repeat last year's Warrant Article. It is her understanding that the Bike Path Committee will be happy to speak to this Article at Town Meeting.

Ms. Griffin also stated that she had taken the liberty of putting on the last page a Warrant Article related to the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program which Bob Norman had asked the Board to consider.

Regarding land conservation, Ms. Black pointed out that funding for that this year will be a bond issue. She stated that at NHMA she voted against it because of the deficit in educational funding. She noted that she does not feel the State should be entering into a \$6 million bonded deficit for a new program when they are unable to fund the programs they

have. She feels that it is a great fund, but it should be coming out of State funds rather than being borrowed.

Ms. Griffin indicated that \$12 million was apparently recommended in annual funding; the Senate bill is seeking \$6 million in bonds for initial project funding and a \$200,000 General Fund line item for ongoing staffing of the program.

Mr. Walsh recommended that language such as "to be paid for by operating funds annually raised" should be included.

Ms. Griffin will work on the language and will look for the Board's feedback at the next Selectmen's meeting.

8. SELECTMEN'S REPORTS.

Ms. Griffin

Ms. Griffin reported that March 21, 2000 will be the second and last hearing for the Zoning Amendments at the Planning Board meeting. Also, the Board will be hearing the new modular portion of the Dresden School District site plan review. The Planning Board at its previous meeting worked on visioning and heard an update on sprawl by Bernie Waugh. On March 22, 2000 the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Council will have a hearing on telecommunication towers, Senate Bill 401 and other related issues.

Ms. Black

Ms. Black reported that there was a very successful senior trip to Massachusetts to hear the Three Irish Tenors. It was attended by 25 seniors from Hanover.

Mr. Manchester

Mr. Manchester reported that he had taken a tour of the library seeing some of the old records, as well as taking a tour of the cellar in Town Hall. He commented that the cellar is not in too bad shape, but some money will have to be spent in order to update and protect the files. Ms. Griffin noted that some realistic funding is starting to move into the capital improvement program for upgrading the storage area for records in the cellar.

Mr. Colligan

Mr. Colligan had nothing to report.

Mr. Walsh

Mr. Walsh reported that a Rec Board meeting was held recently. There will be fireworks on

July 15, 2000 at 9:00 p.m. at the Reservoir Road site in conjunction with the end of Streetfest. The Rec Board also received an anonymous gift of \$3,000 which has funded uniforms for the soccer, basketball and baseball teams. The Board also expressed very strong frustration about the demise of the Community Facilities Task Force. The request was to bring the Rec Board and Community Facilities Task Force

together to review where things stand. He feels that this meeting should be held, perhaps in April. The Board had no objection to this meeting.

Mr. Walsh feels that the meeting could be delayed until after Town Meeting, but that legitimate conversation which has been on hold for a long time be started up again.

Mr. Walsh commented that the perception during the recent Pond Party was that the police were ticketing cars. Ms. Griffin stated that one area was ticketed which is located across from the Outing Club at the mouth of the roadway that goes up to Occum Ridge. The road is so narrow that emergency vehicles could not get through, and several calls were received from neighbors who live up on the Ridge who were very angry and concerned.

Mr. Walsh requested that locations like that next year be marked by barricades or signs. Ms. Griffin explained that this has been incorporated into the procedures for the Pond Party next year so that there will not be any question about where people can park safely and legally. She did note that there are no parking signs there, but obviously people assumed that parking was available everywhere because of the well-attended event.

Ms. Black suggested that a shuttle bus may want to be utilized next year.

9. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: FEBRUARY 28, 2000; MARCH 1, 2000; MARCH 6, 2000.

Mr. Colligan MADE THE MOTION to approve the minutes of February 28, 2000, as amended. Mr. Manchester SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 28, 2000, AS AMENDED.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to approve the minutes of March 1, 2000, as amended. Mr. Colligan SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 2000, AS AMENDED.

Ms. Connolly MADE THE MOTION to approve the minutes of March 6, 2000, as amended. Mr. Colligan SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 2000, AS AMENDED.

10. OTHER BUSINESS.

There was no other business to come before the meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to go to nonpublic session to discuss a matter which may affect the reputation of an individual. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO GO TO NONPUBLIC SESSION TO DISCUSS A MATTER WHICH MAY AFFECT THE REPUTATION OF AN INDIVIDUAL.

SUMMARY

- 1. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to close the public hearing. Mr. Colligan SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.**
- 2. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen vote to approve the proposed amendment to pole licensing procedures regarding taxing of right-of-way land encumbered by utility poles.**
- 3. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO POLE LICENSING PROCEDURES REGARDING TAXING OF RIGHT-OF-WAY LAND ENCUMBERED BY UTILITY POLES.**
- 4. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to set a public hearing on the proposed Housing and Community Development Plan for April 3, 2000. Mr. Colligan SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR APRIL 3, 2000.**
- 5. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to accept the easement for construction of drop-off area to serve Outreach House. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ACCEPT THE EASEMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DROP-OFF AREA TO SERVE OUTREACH HOUSE.**
- 6. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to approve the proposed development restriction agreement with Dartmouth College on a parcel of land abutting the Hanover Country**

Club, Fletcher Circle, and Chandler Drive. Mr. Manchester SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT RESTRICTION AGREEMENT WITH DARTMOUTH COLLEGE ON A PARCEL OF LAND ABUTTING THE HANOVER COUNTRY CLUB, FLETCHER CIRCLE, AND CHANDLER DRIVE.

- 7. Mr. Colligan MADE THE MOTION to approve the minutes of February 28, 2000, as amended. Mr. Manchester SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 28, 2000, AS AMENDED.**
- 8. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to approve the minutes of March 1, 2000, as amended. Mr. Colligan SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 2000, AS AMENDED.**
- 9. Ms. Connolly MADE THE MOTION to approve the minutes of March 6, 2000, as amended. Mr. Colligan SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 2000, AS AMENDED.**
- 10. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**
- 11. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to go to nonpublic session to discuss a matter which may affect the reputation of an individual. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO GO TO NONPUBLIC SESSION TO DISCUSS A MATTER WHICH MAY AFFECT THE REPUTATION OF AN INDIVIDUAL.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John Colligan, Secretary

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Nancy Richards.