

APPROVED

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING

APRIL 7, 1997

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, Marilyn W. Black. Present were: Marilyn W. Black, Chairman; Jack H. Nelson, Vice Chairman; Katherine S. Connolly; Dorothy King; Brian Walsh; Julia Griffin, Town Manager; and members of the public.

Ms. Black announced that this meeting was being taped by CATV 6 and that assistive listening devices were available for anyone who wished to use them.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Anne Morris presented a petition bearing 142 signatures asking for a warrant article for Town Meeting regarding the possible allocation of \$175,000 for the purchase of a parcel of land on King Road. She also included a map showing the approximate location of the residences of those individuals signing the petition.

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA).

Don Lyford, from the Department of Transportation, presented a brief summary of the history of the bicycle path project and displayed two plans of the proposed path. Mr. Lyford stated that the cost of construction of the path as proposed is \$294,000, the cost of designing the path and collecting ground data is \$66,000, and \$5,000 is allocated for rights of way, but with the intent that the Town will obtain easements for this path.

Mr. Lyford indicated that the requirements of the ISTEA funds call for a multi-use path with a recommended 8 to 10 feet of surface which would allow for bicycles or pedestrians to pass each other going in opposite directions. A hard surface is recommended both for ease of maintenance and to maintain control of bicycles. He added that there are some requirements relating to grades, and he believes the grades in the proposed path meet both the Americans With Disabilities Act guidelines and the requirements outlined in the Bicycle Guide. Mr. Lyford indicated that the Bicycle Guide states that 5% grades are desirable, but recognizes that steeper grades may be required, and recommends increasing the design speed. He noted that the proposed path will have a 25 mph design speed for bicycles.

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA). (Continued)

Mr. Lyford stated that applications are reviewed and approved based on their location, expected use, and how they might tie into other properties. He noted that this path ties into a path that Lebanon is planning to build from the hospital to the City of Lebanon, and the committee felt that it had a good regional chance to tie into other paths. Mr. Lyford indicated that if an applicant decides to not use the money as applied for, they have to go back to the advisory committee and ask to be allowed to revise the application. Frequently, the committee will ask the applicant to reapply.

Tom Linnell asked what percent is the super elevation of the path. Mr. Lyford answered that most of the cross elevation will be at 2%, with possibly 4% or 5% in the steeper curves.

Fred Croy asked for a discussion of the bridge and its cost, and the problems associated with obtaining a permit for the bridge.

Mr. Lyford answered that there will be a bridge required where the path crosses Mink Brook, and that a wooden structure appears to be preferred. He added that they have included a \$50,000 estimate for the bridge. Mr. Lyford stated that a wetlands permit will need to be obtained.

Mr. Nelson asked for a timetable for construction of the path. Mr. Lyford answered that the wetlands permit would take approximately six months to obtain. If approved, they would plan to run an actual survey line on the property and develop better contract plans. Mr. Lyford stated that he expected to either advertise in the fall with spring construction, or advertise in the spring for spring construction.

Roger French expressed concern that this project will require the removal of many trees, and wished to maintain the concept of a path through the woods with a canopy of trees overhead.

Dr. Ellis Roulette stated his understanding that the basic purpose of the proposed bike path is to connect Hanover with the hospital, and is to provide alternate transportation rather than recreation. He also asked what type of survey had been done to determine projected usage.

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA). (Continued)

Ms. Connolly stated that the Planning Board sent a questionnaire out a couple of years ago to 1,000 people, divided between property owner, non-property owner and age, asking if they felt there was a need for new recreational facilities in Hanover, and if so, what type. The largest number of people asked for bicycle paths and lanes. A specific question was asked stating that the State of New Hampshire had approved funding of \$210,000 with \$260,000 required to construct a bike recreational path connecting Route 10 at Brook Road with the Loop Road at DHMC, and asked if they favored its construction. Sixty and seventy-two percent favored its construction, with 600 people responding.

Dr. Roulette asked if those answering the survey realized the profile of the path. He stated that he is a member of a bikeway subcommittee of the Hanover 2001 project, and the members were polled to determine if they supported the project. Dr. Roulette indicated that one member of the subcommittee who currently bikes to work at the hospital stated that he would prefer to use an alternate route rather than the bike path which is proposed. He expressed concern that the proposed path is not a friendly one for cycling due to the elevation going up as well as coming down, and appears to be an accident waiting to happen.

Marcia Nagy stated that she currently does not bike to work because of the traffic and inhalation of fumes, and if this path were to be constructed she would definitely use it to either bike or jog to work.

Nancy Lamarcino asked if there are any assurances that this project will not traverse an area that the Barrett-Ransmeiers might later develop for the retirement facility. Ms. Griffin answered that the proposed route has been reviewed by engineers, and that it will not conflict.

Ms. Black added that the Barrett-Ransmeiers have been studying the plan, and have given verbal approval to provide the Town with an easement.

Cam Rankin noted that three years ago the cost estimate for the proposed bike path was \$260,000, which has now been increased to \$365,000. He stated that he had walked the proposed route with a contractor who estimated that the project would cost approximately \$350,000, without adding funds for design, pavement and a bridge.

Mr. Lyford stated that the State's estimate is based on quarterly cost amounts from other comparable projects.

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA). (Continued)

Mr. Nelson stated that if the proposed bike path is passed at Town Meeting and the figure is over that which is approved, the matter would have to go back to another Town Meeting.

Mr. Rankin indicated that access to the path via Main Street or Route 10 is considered the most dangerous section of Town for bicycling. He asked if the access to the path has to be ADA approved.

Mr. Lyford answered that only the bike path has to meet ADA requirements.

Ms. Griffin stated that the Town has no liability regarding the access to the bike path that does not exist on any other street in Town. She also added that the State required that the Town match for the project be approximately \$73,000, and she suggested that be increased to \$80,000 reflecting a 10% contingency, which is a normal practice when budgeting for construction projects.

Bob Norman stated that in earlier correspondence there had been a question regarding zoning, and the fact that this path is not one of the permitted or special uses in the SR2 zone. He asked if such a path could be built with or without a special exception.

Ms. Griffin answered that a letter exists from the former code administrator to Walter Mitchell regarding whether a special exception would be required to construct the path, and Mr. Mitchell's answer was that it would not be required. Ms. Griffin noted that she has asked for further research into that question to be sure the opinion is correct.

Mrs. Sokol stated that she understands the Upper Valley Land Trust may possibly be purchasing some of the Barrett-Ransmeier land in an effort to preserve this area that contains alot of wetlands and wildlife. She expressed concern that if the proposed path is built it will interfere with the purpose of preserving the land.

A member of the audience asked what percent of hospital employees will use the proposed path, and wondered how those employees would make use of the trail when leaving work at the end of the day in the dark if the trail is not to be lighted.

Ms. Connolly stated that the path would be located adjacent to the area which is planned for development, with the remainder designed to be in Town hands as conservation lands, and would not intrude on the wildlife areas. She added that there are no intentions to plow the path in the winter.

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA). (Continued)

Allen King stated his understanding that the path is to have a paved area 10 feet wide to satisfy national requirements for disabled people, presumably in a wheelchair. He does not feel that a wheelchair patient could negotiate the path as proposed.

Kirk Endicott voiced his opposition to the bike path. He stated that the area can be easily accessed by people on foot at the present time, and he does not believe the path will be utilized by many people. Mr. Endicott asked what alternatives were presented, and suggested that Route 120 would be an obvious alternative route.

Mr. Lyford summarized the requirements and recommendations for the path, stating that increased width is recommended in areas of sharp curves. He stated that a 10 ft. width has been shown as a concept, and that the width will be closely reviewed if the project is approved. Mr. Lyford indicated that the Bike Guide recommends grades of 5% or less, and states that anything steeper is undesirable. He noted that the 12% grade covers a relatively short distance. Mr. Lyford added that the ADA requires rest areas in areas of steeper grades.

Ms. Griffin indicated that the project will initially be looking for a 50 ft. easement to allow the contractors to work within the natural topography, and that once the path is constructed to fit those natural features, it will ultimately end up with a 20 ft. wide easement. Mr. Lyford stated that there is likely to be a 25 ft. to 30 ft. area of impact.

A member of the audience indicated he was an avid cyclist, and was still undecided about the proposed bike path. He stated if this project represents the first step in improving the area for bicyclists, then he would be in favor of the project.

Ms. Black stated that one reason the project was approved is that it connects with the proposed Lebanon bike path, as well as a path going across Ledyard Bridge. She added that there is a proposal for funding for a bike path from Wilder to Norwich that this path would also connect with.

Anne Morris asked if the bike path meets standards for rollerbladers and skateboarders. Mr. Lyford answered that he is not aware of any standards for rollerbladers or skateboarders.

Tom Linell stated that the proposed path exceeds the ADA maximum super elevation of 2%. He added that although the proposal purports to be for everyone, the path is too steep to serve the wide variety of recreational users for which it is intended. Mr. Linell stated that the New Hampshire Department of Transportation has not examined an alternative location for the path. He added the proposal will call for parking somewhere

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA). (Continued)

in Hanover in the Brook Road location, as well as paving of the path behind Hanover High School. Mr. Linell indicated that Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center is not an appropriate destination for children using the path, and noted that most of Hanover's future growth will occur north and east of the present growth centers.

Fred Crory noted that because parts of the path will be located in Lebanon, there would be a problem with Hanover police patrolling the entire path. He also stated that it is his understanding that the Town has a sewer easement through part of the path, and that the present owners also have a right-of-way or easement along that same sewer line for access to their property, whether for logging or for any other purpose. Mr. Crory noted that these should be honored even if the bike path is constructed, which would mean the possibility of heavy equipment going over the path. He stated that he feels a portion of the path would have to be designed to highway standards to honor the easements.

Mrs. Griffin stated that any damage done to Town property has to be repaired by the user. She added that the Town would not give permission for a logging truck to use the bicycle path; they would need to find an alternate route. Ms. Griffin noted that the developers as well as the current property owners have reviewed the plans with respect to the realigned path to be sure the path would not conflict with the proposed use of the property, either by these developers or any other potential developer. She stated that representatives from both the current property owners and the developers have stated that a conflict does not exist, and that this path would not conflict with any access issues they are viewing as part of their design. Ms. Griffin added that the path will be built to accommodate a pickup truck for maintenance uses of the path only, and will not be built for heavy vehicles. She stated that the Town has alternative access to repair the sewer line.

David Vincelette stated that Ms. Connolly appeared at state hearings and spoke on the Barrett-Ransmeier's behalf, had apologized for access to the property being from Brook Road, but stated that it represented a type of trade-off in that the Town would get the bike path as a result. He indicated that the Barrett-Ransmeiers have located another access to their property, and he does not understand why the project is still on the drawing board.

Ms. Connolly stated that she did not recall apologizing, but repeated at the wetlands hearing the findings of the Conservation Commission that this was the best and least negative way to access the property. She noted that there is a wetlands permit granted which would allow the developers, if they wished, to construct a road through the

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA). (Continued)

property which would necessitate moving Mink Brook slightly. Ms. Connolly indicated that her involvement with the project is a result of her wish to have at least half of the land fall into Town hands for conservation.

Mary Anne Rankin expressed her concern that the bike path would not actually be used as an alternative form of transportation, but more for recreational uses, and asked if that conforms with the requirements for ISTEA funds.

Mr. Lyford responded that a small number of people will use the path as alternate transportation, and that those numbers may increase.

Ms. Rankin stated that she had done an informal survey of doctors who commuted to the hospital, and they had indicated they would not use the path because it is not a direct route to the hospital. She questioned whether Route 120 could be used as it is already paved and poses less problems in terms of environmental consequences.

Mr. Lyford stated it is possible, but the Town would have to go back to the enhancement advisory committee. He added that the City of Lebanon attempted to do a similar thing, and were told they would have to reapply for the funds.

Mr. Rankin stated that it is recorded in minutes that Ms. Connolly would talk to abutters on Route 120 to obtain permission to widen areas of Route 120, but the abutters were never contacted. He added that in the master plan section regarding bicycles, it states that the Town should develop additional bikeways, pedestrian walkways and other space to encourage commuter non-automobile transportation whenever possible. Additionally, it should be undertaken to make these changes in the highway system necessary to protect the safety of people using these routes, and states that it is recognized that in carrying out these objectives, certain highways may need to be widened.

Mr. Rankin stated that included in the warrant article should be a dollar amount attributed to annual maintenance of the path.

Ms. Griffin answered that the Town does not do that with any other warrant articles for appropriation of funds for capital improvements. She noted that incorporated in the Town's budget is maintenance for Town facilities, including town roads and sidewalks. Ms. Griffin added that in talking with managers in communities where similar bike paths exist, it appears that maintenance costs are minimal.

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA). (Continued)

Bob Norman presented a sketch of an alternate route for the bike path. He stated that a hearing should be held on the issues of whether or not there is a public transportation demand for the bike path as proposed, how many people would actually use the path, and whether those numbers are adequate to justify the cost. Mr. Norman stated that he feels many more people would use his alternate route, although the path as proposed is certainly more scenic. He indicated that the alternative he suggested would accomplish the purposes of ISTEA by providing alternative transportation, decreasing the number of cars on the road, decreasing fuel consumption, reducing exhaust and reducing highway construction. Mr. Norman added that the State Highway Department encourages the placement of bicycle paths along state highways, and the alternative he proposed is a state highway.

An audience member asked how long the construction phase of the project would take. Mr. Lyford answered that it should not take more than six to eight weeks.

Jamie Gouth supported the idea of the quality of the bike path, stating that it is nicer to have it go through woodlands than along busy Route 120. She asked if there was any way to minimize the steep grade. Mr. Lyford answered that they tried to minimize the grade to the best of their ability.

Dr. Roulette asked if the project could be downscaled so that it would be a footpath only for walking and jogging, and still fit within the guidelines of the project.

Mr. Lyford answered that pedestrian traffic would qualify, but if the path were not paved, it would require much more maintenance.

Ken Viera asked if the path could be used as a pedestrian path and paved only four or five feet.

Ms. Black noted that the requirement is that the path has to be paved to be wheelchair accessible.

Nan King asked if it is possible to withdraw the warrant to allow time to pursue the issue further and look at alternative sites. Ms. Black answered that anyone at Town Meeting can make a motion to pass over an article.

Mr. Nelson added that if the item is passed over at Town Meeting, the Town's application would be pulled and it would be necessary to reapply for the funds.

2. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ALLOCATION OF \$80,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND TO PAY FOR 20% OF COST TO CONSTRUCT BICYCLE PATH FROM BROOK ROAD TO MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE, TO BE MATCHED BY 80% FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-MODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA). (Continued)

David Vincelette asked if a temporary heavy-duty bridge would have to be constructed in order to accommodate the large equipment necessary for the project. Mr. Lyford answered that a temporary bridge would have to be constructed, the specifications of which would be left up to the contractor.

Mr. Vincelette asked if the wetlands permit already issued is for a bridge in another location than the one shown on the proposed map. Ms. Connolly answered that it is for another location.

Ms. Griffin stated that the bridge designed for this project is for bike path traffic only, allowing a pickup truck for maintenance purposes only. Regarding the current development for the continued care retirement community, the developers are negotiating with the hospital for access off Medical Center Drive, not off Brook Road.

Mary Anne Rankin asked if it was possible to determine the environmental impact of the project to the wetlands and surrounding area, and if an environmental study had been undertaken. Mr. Lyford responded that there is an ongoing environmental document being prepared, and if the project is approved, there are plans to better delineate the wetlands areas.

Kim Christiansen expressed concern regarding access of the path to emergency vehicles. He also questioned how needed the path is, and if any extensive studies had been made in this regard, and felt that the matter should be passed over at Town Meeting to allow time for prudent research and decisions.

Bob Norman stated that he would like to see the Town compare alternatives, with the proposed bike path being one of the alternatives. He agreed with a pedestrian access through Brook Road area, and suggested that projections be developed for usage of a bike path for the purposes for which ISTEA was designed.

Mr. French asked if the warrant article could be revised to cover an alternate location. Ms. Black answered that if it were to involve another location, the matter would have to go back through committee.

Nan King asked whether the Selectmen have any plans to implement suggestions for an alternate location if the Town decides to lay the plan aside. Ms. Black answered that if the proposed path is defeated, the process will start over.

Mr. King noted that no-one in Town is against having bikeways; it is simply a matter of where, who will use it, and how much money it will cost.

3. REVIEW OF DRAFT WARRANT ARTICLES FOR 1997 TOWN MEETING AND SETTING OF PRE-TOWN MEETING PUBLIC HEARING FOR APRIL 14, 1997

Ms. Black recommended moving Article 10 and Article 11 to immediately precede Article 15 to allow for as many people in attendance at Town Meeting as possible to be present.

The Selectmen were assigned articles to present at Town Meeting. Ms. Griffin is to prepare resolutions for retirees to be presented at Town Meeting.

Regarding Article 14, Mr. Nelson stated that the petitioners are responsible for that Article's presentation at Town Meeting.

Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION to approve Article 9 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Ms. King SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ARTICLE 9 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.

Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION to approve Article 12 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Nelson SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ARTICLE 12 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.

Ms. Connolly MADE THE MOTION to approve Article 13 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Ms. King SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Nelson AMENDED THE MOTION to approve Article 13 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting to add the option of abstaining. Mr. Walsh SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED THREE (3) IN FAVOR, ZERO (0) AGAINST, AND TWO (2) ABSTAINING TO APPROVE ARTICLE 13 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING TO ADD THE OPTION OF ABSTAINING.

Mr. Nelson stated that his abstention on Article 13 was because he felt the voters should decide this warrant article.

Mr. Walsh stated his position on Article 14 regarding the purchase of property on King Road. He indicated that he felt it would be appropriate for the Town to spend 10% to 15% of the funds saved since 1989 to preserve the site in question, if the voters were to approve the article. He questioned whether the voters might be able to have a chance to vote on a smaller amount of money.

Ms. Black stated that she feels that without a plan for the Town as a whole as to what scenic areas the Town wants to preserve, she finds this to be a terrible precedent to set if funds were taken to preserve the view of one neighborhood.

3. REVIEW OF DRAFT WARRANT ARTICLES FOR 1997 TOWN MEETING AND SETTING OF PRE-TOWN MEETING PUBLIC HEARING FOR APRIL 14, 1997 (Continued)

Mr. Nelson stated that although the purchase of the land would be a benefit to the community as a whole, it would be mostly a benefit to the neighborhood. He supported the idea of giving seed money so that the neighborhood is able to purchase the land.

Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen vote on Article 14 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Ms. King SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED NONE (-0-) IN FAVOR AND FIVE (5) AGAINST ARTICLE 14 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.

Nan King stated that the master plan encourages the Town to save scenic views. She indicated that the Town meets only once a year, thus providing a small window of opportunity.

Ms. Black indicated that a Town-wide plan is required as to what areas of Town should be saved.

Mr. Walsh stated that he would like both the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board to make a statement at Town Meeting stating their position relative to this matter. He added that he had suggested on behalf of the Selectmen at the last Conservation Commission meeting that a joint effort be started by the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board to plan those areas of Town that would be strategic for the Town to consider acquiring.

Ms. Griffin stated that the actual expenditure of these funds, assuming the matter passed at Town Meeting will be contingent upon (1) subdivision approval of the acreage including the parcel in question by the planning board, and (2) a willing seller. She explained that this is not a condemnation power that the Town would have to take the land by eminent domain, but rather simply an issue of expending funds.

Ms. Connolly MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen approve Article 15 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Nelson SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ARTICLE 15 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.

Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen approve Article 16 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ARTICLE 16 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.

4. COMMUNICATION FROM TCI TWIN STATE CABLE TV REGARDING PROPOSED RATE STRUCTURE TO TAKE EFFECT JUNE, 1997.

Ms. Griffin stated that the franchise agreement requires that TCI give the Town 60 days notice prior to changing their fees, and provided the Board with the communication received from TCI relative to those changes.

5. DISCUSSION OF TOWN POLICY REGARDING RENTAL PARKING

Ms. Griffin stated that she has questions relating to people on the waiting list to lease parking spaces from the Town. She noted that the letter that has been sent in the past states that the Town will not lease spaces to people who require them in order to come into compliance with zoning which says they must have a certain number of off-site parking spaces. Ms. Griffin indicated that the Town currently leases approximately 26 parking spaces to individuals who require them to comply, and she wanted to be sure that in the future the practice is not continued.

6. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Ms. Griffin brought Senate Bill 73, which is the utility taxation bill, to the Board's attention. She stated that the Senate Ways and Means Committee, on which Senator Rubens sits, has recommended killing the bill. Ms. Griffin noted that many municipalities rely on tax revenue from the electric utilities now and stand to lose a fair amount of potential tax revenue. Senate Bill 73 has raised so much discussion in the Senate that they have voted to delay debate and decision on the bill, which is likely to push the bill into next year. Ms. Griffin stated that it is important for the Selectboard to talk with our Senator and Representatives.

Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen direct a resolution to Senator Rubens in support of Senate Bill 73. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO DIRECT A RESOLUTION TO SENATOR RUBENS IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 73.

Ms. Griffin asked if the Board wished to draft a letter in support of Governor Shaheen's proposal for funding kindergarten through an increased cigarette tax. Ms. Black stated that she felt it would be more appropriate for the Selectmen make individual calls in support of the proposal.

7. SELECTMEN'S REPORTS

Mr. Walsh

Mr. Walsh announced that the substance abuse workshop originally scheduled for March 31 has been rescheduled to 7:30 p.m. on April 10th at the Ray School.

7. SELECTMEN'S REPORTS (Continued)

Ms. King

Ms. King suggested that people view the new fire engines and the new rescue vehicle. Mr. Walsh recommended having the new equipment on hand at Town Meeting for the public to view.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to come before the meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION to adjourn the meeting of the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

SUMMARY

- 1. Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION to approve Article 9 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Ms. King SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ARTICLE 9 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.**
- 2. Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION to approve Article 12 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Nelson SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ARTICLE 12 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.**
- 3. Ms. Connolly MADE THE MOTION to approve Article 13 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Ms. King SECONDED THE MOTION.**
- 4. Mr. Nelson AMENDED THE MOTION to approve Article 13 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting to add the option of abstaining. Mr. Walsh SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED THREE (3) IN FAVOR, ZERO (0) AGAINST AND TWO (2) ABSTAINING TO APPROVE ARTICLE 13 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING TO ADD THE OPTION OF ABSTAINING.**
- 5. Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen vote on Article 14 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Ms. King SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED NONE (-0-) IN FAVOR AND FIVE (5) AGAINST ARTICLE 14 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.**

SUMMARY (Continued)

6. **Ms. Connolly MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen approve Article 15 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Nelson SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ARTICLE 15 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.**
7. **Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen approve Article 16 on the Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ARTICLE 16 ON THE WARRANT FOR THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING.**
8. **Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen direct a resolution to Senator Rubens in support of Senate Bill 73. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO DIRECT A RESOLUTION TO SENATOR RUBENS IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 73.**
9. **Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION to adjourn the meeting of the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN.**

Respectfully submitted,



Brian Walsh, Secretary

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Nancy A. Richards.