

## Official

### TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES Wednesday, December 3, 2008

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman D. Dickson called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

**PRESENT:** William "Bill" Gahara, James Gorton, Paul Loiselle, George Longfellow, Michael Pischetola, David Ross, Patricia Rueppel, Nancy VanScoy, Chairman David Dickson, Carol Granfield (Interim Town Administrator)

#### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

***P. Loiselle motioned to table the minutes of November 19, 2008.***

#### **PUBLIC INPUT**

None

#### **NOMINATIONS/APPOINTMENTS**

Available Positions:

Parks & Recreation Advisory Board, (1) Full member, exp. 6/2009 & (1) Alt. member, exp. 6/2010.

#### **SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS**

Public Hearing, re: Acceptance of Donation to the Fire Department from Wal-Mart Real Estate per RSA 31:95(b).

Open Public Hearing at 7:00 pm

M. Hoisington, Fire Department presented a grant for \$8832 received from Wal-Mart to be used for mobile radio computer equipment.

Close Public Hearing at 7:05 pm

***P. Loiselle motioned to accept the donation from Wal-Mart for \$8832. Seconded by P. Rueppel.  
Roll Call unanimously in favor***

P. Loiselle requested the Administrator send a thank you letter to Wal-Mart.

Bill Sirak, Economic Development Committee Report

re: Focus Group Meetings Update

Activities and scope of the EDC

B. Sirak: Jack Munn, SNHPC and David Preece are working on building the database presented tonight. The work is 60% complete. The business survey and business database are complete. A copy of the business database was distributed. Hooksett businesses are in two (2) clusters, retail trade and construction. The inventory has been mapped within the town. They have a map identifier. The database can be used by the town for great economic development and link to the town's website.

Three focus group meetings were held in which 22 businesses attend. There were two (2) focus group areas:

1. The development review process – the communication that has gone on between towns.
2. What relations the town has with the business. Being more proactive and know what business want and how to retain those business.

The executive summary, which was handed out, was reviewed. The major concern is there appears to be no one in charge from the point of approval through construction and issuance of CO. There were

## Minutes of 12/3/08

concerns with engineering and specification that didn't get addressed. There are different precincts for water and sewer and no one available to coordinate. The group discussed the following issues:

- A Development Review Handbook could be developed to look at a one-stop review process to make it more friendly and efficient for the property owner. To develop a development review handbook. The value to that is \$10,000. We want to work with the town officials to go come up with a flow chart to better navigate through the town's development review. This will provide an opportunity for the engineers to meet with developers and someone in charge from the town's standpoint to answer questions that arise from an engineering standpoint.
- Coordinate the planning and building departments and assign a staff person to an applicant.
- Reduce the size of the Town's Zoning Ordinance.
- In order to enhance business relations, the town's website should be redesigned to make it more friendly to developers.
- Establish a local Chamber of Commerce
- Improve traffic flow on Route 3.
- Seek quality, full service restaurants and hotels
- Continue the use of the TIF districts
- Seek affordable housing defined as workforce housing. Housing that will provide a level of affordability so people can live and work in your community.
- Identify prime development sites.

J. Duffy presented an Economic Development Website that is currently being utilized by Londonderry and development by CDM. Londonderry was the pilot town and incorporated this as their Economic Development website. This would provide a link for people looking for available land to develop in Hooksett. The cost is \$8000 for the development of the site and \$3200 per year to host the website. We now pay to host ARCH IMS that we now have.

Budget request summary:

\$10,000 – Development of Review Handbook

\$8000 – Establish an Economic Development website

\$3200 to host ED website

Total request is \$21,200.

A demonstration of the Londonderry website was given to the Council.

P. Loiselle stated that Charles Watson did a great deal of work establishing the GIS data.

P. Loiselle asked if was possible to view who had accessed the website and if information could be provided to identify industrial and commercial area which still need infrastructure.

This information is not available.

J. Duffy stated that the EDC money came out of Administration's budget last year.

P. Rueppel: We created a line item in the budget last year.

B. Sirak: The line item contained one (\$1) dollar..

J. Duffy stated there would be a workshop meeting next Monday, December 8<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 with a selectman from Pittsfield land use boards and SNHP.

B. Sirak stated that the EDC is requesting \$21,500 in next years budget. The committee would like authorization to look into options for Exit 11. Steve Korzyniowski developed a Mission Statement, which the committee would like the Council to endorse. This would give the Economic Development Committee authority to enter into discussions with prospective developers.

***D. Ross motioned to endorse the Mission Statement. Seconded by P. Loiselle***

N. VanScoy and J. Gorton felt they didn't have enough time to review the goals and objectives presented in the Mission Statement and would prefer to act on this at the next Council meeting.

D. Dickson suggested tabling until next meeting.

D. Ross stated that is simply an endorsement and should not be postponed.

J. Gorton believes that the Charter states, "No new business will be acted upon on the night it is proposed".

D. Dickson: I would like the Council to move cautiously on all new business and the Council should do "due diligence" This is a courtesy we should extend to all Councilors to review and make a vote.

**Roll Call:**

P. Loiselle	Y	G. Longfellow	Y
J. Gorton	N	D. Ross	Y
D. Dickson	Y	P. Rueppel	Y
W. Gahara	Y	N. VanScoy	Y
M. Pischetola	N		

Vote 7:2

**John Pieroni, Budget Committee Update**

John Pieroni took the seat after the Committee Chair, Tom Keach resigned. All committee seats are now filled. There will be Budget Committee Workshop meeting Saturday, December 6<sup>th</sup> at the Cawley Middle School where the School will present their budget. The Budget Committee will meet with the Council on January 30<sup>th</sup> to review the municipal town budget. The Budget Committee is charged with creating a budget. This budget is submitted to voters at a public hearing and then again at the deliberative session. The background information is received from all departments. One issue is the concept of a "bottom line budget" and perception that the money can be spent anyway they want. That is legally true, if there is a line, it is an appropriation. The budget is a total dollar amount, however, there is a blueprint by which that was created and that is how the governing bodies propose to spend the money and how the voters understand that spending will occur. There is an expectation by both the committee and the voters that it will be spent accordingly. One issue that has come before the Budget Committee is the police budget. The Budget Committee held a meeting to review the act that created the Police Commission as well as the operation of the police department and opinions of town attorney on that creation. Concern of the budget committee relate to expenditures that fall out of line. The training (firing) range for example was never brought before the Budget Committee or reported to the committee after funds were spent. This bothers us (the Budget Committee). More importantly, the budget process is important and was not followed in the case of the sign erected at the Safety Center. I have no recollection of any discussions of this item or money being placed in the budget. Where did the money come from? Was good purchasing and accounting practices followed with regard to these items? Was the sign put out to bid? No, it was not, although the Town requires that process, the police department state they are not required to follow that procedure. If they are not required, they should however be required to follow best practices. Was there a want or a need for the sign? Having not gone through a discussion to determine if we want it or are there other options available, it is difficult to know. The sum total of \$33,000 was spent on the sign. The Budget Committee took a tour of the Safety Center a year ago, and at that time, the host tower was in disrepair and structurally impaired. The cost to repair that structure is \$34,000. Would the citizens have wanted to put the money to that repair rather than the sign? The Town did a wonderful thing by naming the Safety Center after former Chief Oliver. There is also an issue of police department reporting. The Finance Department sent an email asking departments for input on how the past budget was spent and wanted to bring that information to the Town Council and the Budget Committee. That didn't infringe on the Police Commission, it was simply a report. The commission voted not to send such a report to the finance director. That is disturbing. The Council presents the budget to the Budget Committee and they should

know about it. It is particularly disturbing when you are spending money on items, which are not coming before the committee or the voters and now will not report the expenditures. We don't want to over ride the function of the Police Department. However, they are part of the Town's budget and audited under the Town. I would expect they would provide all the information requested by the finance director for a better understanding of the expenditures. There are maintenance issues at the Safety Center and the Police Department should not be in the business of maintaining buildings and the budget should provide money for that purpose.

P. Loiselle: There is a clear definition for the Police Commission with a different set of guidelines.

J. Pieroni: Regardless of whatever independence they have, items should still be put out to bid. The citizens demand this. The finance director oversees their money. Asking how the money was spent is important to determine what is needed in the future.

D. Ross: I am troubled after the article in the paper regarding the sign. The sign was discussed in Council Chambers at a public meeting. There were a number of meetings and discussions about the sign. The appearance is that it was done in secret and it was not.

J. Pieroni: It was not included in the budget process when the budget was developed. It was not an emergency and wasn't brought forward to the people to decide if they wanted a sign or to fix the tower.

D. Ross: The concept of the commission is not to micromanage. We trust the committees to make decisions and the police generally return money to the Town.

P. Loiselle: The previous Administrator had the charge to address the sign and the chief offered to manage the sign with his budget.

J. Pieroni: I'm not saying the Council didn't know. The money wasn't in the budget and was not discussed in front of the voters. The people didn't decide what items they want. It is better to bring it up in the budget process.

G. Longfellow: I sat on that committee, but we were supposed to get donations. We had \$5000 in donations and \$15,000 in commitments. Once they put the name, Oliver Safety Center on the building, the committee was dropped.

M. Miville: I am a new member on the Budget Committee and we had a productive meeting with the Police Commission. The Statute, which grants the Police Commission authority states, "they are only allowed to do safety and police matters within the limits of funds appropriated." The firing range and the sign were not appropriated. They took funds from an unhired police officer and reassigned it. We stress transparency and accountability. How do we move on from here? Appropriation of more than a \$7500 are supposed to go out for bids.

D. Dickson thanked the Budget Committee for their work.

Planning Board, re: Beachesne Development Drainage Study

J. Gryval: The Planning Board got involved in the water problem on Beachesne. There are two (2) proposed projects on Route 3. On November 3<sup>rd</sup> at a public hearing for Brookview, the people from Beachesne said they had a lot of water from this project. We scheduled a public hearing at the library and had Bruce Cox, a Hydrologist, and the engineer from Stantec there. We talked with the engineer and they said they could do a survey of the hill not to exceed \$10,000. The developer's of the two (2) project said they would each put up one third (1/3) of the cost. That leaves one third (1/3) to be paid by the town. At the Monday night meeting, it was decided that it wasn't fair to the people in the development to simply look at storm water. The engineer stated they could study the ground water for an additional \$2000 dollars. We felt the extra \$2000 could be picked up from the planning budget to give these people an answer to where the waters is coming from.

P. Loiselle: Will this give you a definitive answer?

Rene LaBranche, Stantec: We want to provide an indication of where the water is going. We will use available aquifer and monitoring well information that will be pulled together. We would need monitoring wells and micro wells and something up grade and down to get an idea of where the water is coming from. The price tag on that is unknown. There are two parts; there are ground water and surface water issues. The \$10,000 is to do a drainage analysis and how it is affecting the existing infrastructure. To do a specific groundwater analysis, which is under ground, requires subsurface investigation. I have a company in Epping putting together the costs to do that. You definitely want both pieces of this puzzle.

D. Ross: Isn't it up to the developer to verify that when they are done developing; no more water leaves that site than prior to the development?

J. Duffy: They have confirmed that is the case for Brookview. J. McCourt, engineer for Brookview, is here. The fact is there were flooding problems, which could be coming from Granite Hills land, and running through their site and across into Beaufort. If you look at the system in Beaufort, it is old and no longer working. The culverts in the street during the storm don't go toward the culverts any longer. It is a problem and the Planning Board doesn't want to add to the problem. The developers said they would pay one-third (1/3) of the cost to move forward.

D. Ross: My concern is with who is responsible for the drainage after these systems are installed. Who is in charge of maintaining these drains? It isn't the taxpayer's responsibility. Where is the follow-up on the drainage system?

J. McHugh: The Planning Board has done some things. Dale Hemeon went to the Beaufort development and looked at the drain pipes and we, as a Planning Board, don't want to perpetuate this problem. We also want to make sure that what we do doesn't cause a problem for someone else.

R. LaBranche: Part of the mapping we are doing will include the drainage systems and will obtain existing infrastructure information for the Beaufort development. Funds that were already approved will be used here first.

J. Gorton: I heard residents from Beaufort state that until recently, they never had water problems. These problems didn't begin until 2005. In the scope of services, it says it is not the goal to look at models before the development was done. That information is available through USDA and they have that type of historical information. If it's coming down hill, and the Beaufort is higher than the river and lower than the hill, it was adequate but now it is not. Maybe the historical information is imperative.

R. LaBranche: The intent of the study is to look at the existing condition now in Beaufort. The thought process was let's look at the problem now and determine the deficiencies.

J. Duffy: Part of the development on the hill was Granite Heights and Granite Hill and they did not have site compliance at the time. We don't know if they were built as designed. There has been a lot of blasting as well. The groundwater is rising all over the state. What you are asking for is great but at what cost? I encumbered \$5000 last year for engineering review. I would strongly recommend that in the future, the Town look for budgeting for engineering. We are growing and we don't have an in house engineer and can't rely on the developer to pay it all. I requested another \$5000 for next year's budget as well.

D. Dickson: What is the time frame for completion of this study?

R. LaBranche: Approximately 2-3 weeks.

D. Ross: I stand by my statement, I don't see it's the taxpayer's problem to facilitate someone's business venture. It's not the Town's responsibility to do engineering for their project. I feel there is a need for follow-up of these drainage systems.

J. Gryval: It isn't fair to have these developers pay for a study on water coming off of Granite Hill because there was no monitoring when that was built.

P. Rueppel: We don't live in an ideal world and it is the Town's responsibility to help the Beauchesne development and protect them.

P. Loiselle: I'm concerned that we get a complete picture and we don't have a price on that complete study. If this Council is going to pick up a third of the cost, I would prefer to have the cost of the total study and the developers would pick up two-thirds (2/3) of that number.

N. VanScoy: When the Beauchesne was built, there were minimal regulations and Dale Hemeon said there are pipes that are different sizes. That is important piece of information. We do the study, and we find it is water coming off the hill, which is affecting Beauchesne. Granite Hill and Heights were grandfathered and if that is the problem, the new developers will have to evaluate that and Granite Heights continues to develop. Will the study give us any right to step in?

J. Duffy: If you can prove they didn't build it to the original design, the approval could be revoked but that is no good for those that live there. The ones that are not built don't care.

N. VanScoy: What is the value of the study to the Town? I understand the value to the new developers coming in. It seems two thirds (2/3) of the payers want one outcome, and one third (1/3) another outcome. What is the next step? Jennifer said as this soil soaks up water over the years, it soaks up more water. What is the outcome?

J. Gryval: We intend to research the old Granite Hill plans and if there are retention ponds that should have been built and were not, we will try and have them built.

B. Gahara: We should go back and look at the plans that were there before, and second, I understand what Nancy was saying with the outcome. I think it is important to do both studies to get an outcome and find out what is going on. We need to help these people. Once we know the issues, we can look at the options, or do we fund the corrective action. I highly recommend the Council support that, so at the end, we make a decision with the engineers and the Hydraulic people to act quickly.

G. Longfellow: We have already decided to do a Hydrology study. Lets wait until we get the answers to the study to decide what to do.

R. LaBranche: I suggest going forward with the storm water evaluation and then get a number to JoAnn within a few days for the groundwater evaluation.

D. Dickson: \$3300 is the cost for the storm water study. The Administrator has authority to go forward under \$7500.

The Consensus of the Council is to go forward.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **Renewable Energy Property Tax Exemption**

***B. Gahara motioned to table until a report is obtained from Assessing. Seconded by P. Rueppel. Roll call vote unanimously in favor.***

#### **Route 3 Update**

This will remain on the agenda for information only.

D. Dickson will contacting Senator Gatsas and whoever is appropriate to address this issue.

#### **Mr. Jutton with MRI wanted us to sign a contract for 24 hours per week.**

D. Dickson recommended the Council review the contract (since it was just received tonight) and act on this at the next Council meeting. Mr. Jutan should have no problem waiting a few weeks for action.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Proposed Development at Exit 10**

J. Gorton: Hard Rock Development has come before the Zoning for approval to build new homes off of Kimball Drive. At the time the Exit 10 TIF district was created, there was an agreement with the developer to hammer some things out. My understanding is they will come before the Zoning Board to present their proposal and get the ZBA to give them relief against their contractual agreement to provide the Town with two (2) acres of land or some amount of land for a future fire station. According to the plans that were presented originally at Exit 10, that land is a piece where he wants to put houses. I don't think it is up to the ZBA to address the potential piece of town property. The developer signed that contract. There has been discussion on what piece we were going to get. I understand the final agreement was a piece that was considered undevelopable and was not agreed upon. Now, he is looking for a Special Exceptions. I think it should be up to the Town Council to take a stand and take that one off the ZBA.

D. Ross: I agree with Jim and know this has been an issue with many people. This was part of the initial sell.

Harold Murray, Fire Department: You are talking about two (2) different locations. One is a swamp on the hill that isn't a buildable property. I called the architect and asked him to pen a letter saying it was not a buildable site. The contract says either party can opt out of that piece. We picked two (2) pieces and he said no. He said, there was a piece at Exit 10 that the Town could buy with his money and he will deed it to the Town. The Town can't be part of buying property with someone else's money. He showed us another piece behind Home Depot, into the woods. We walked it and had an engineer look at it and it is not wet. He wants to develop behind that where he cleared the trees by the river. I have all the documentation associated with that.

D. Dickson: Is that land suitable?

H. Murray: Yes, but we would have to modify the building. Arleigh Greene said that was ok and then when we said ok. However he said the people he is in business with would not agree (this is two years ago).

N. VanScoy: Is this a situation our legal counsel should look at?

H. Murray: Legal has been involved.

M. Sorel: I attended a meeting at the Fire Department a few months back when this came before the ZBA. Harold Murray, the chief and I reviewed the process and D. Jodoin agreed to contact the town attorney to review. The chief looked at his records and provided his file notes. Harold agreed to contact Stantec and make sure a fire station would fit on the property. I gave J. Gorton all correspondence with B. Mayer and myself. This is a Town Council responsibility, not a ZBA responsibility.

***B. Gahara motioned to have the developer come to Council to present information relative to the commitment for a fire station property at Exit 10, so we can make a proper decision if needed. D. Ross seconded.  
Roll call vote unanimously in favor.***

**Automated Trash Collection**

G. Longfellow mentioned the information provided to the Council regarding the automated trash pickup. He recommended moving cautiously regarding joining the coop in Concord. He stated that you couldn't buy one piece without buying the whole package. D. Boyce plans to go to the CIP to request two vehicles. These figures need to be reviewed and it isn't a worthwhile venture.

D. Dickson: I plan to sit down and talk to Diane Boyce about this and everyone is invited to sit in. We will also go to Goffstown and look at their process.

G. Longfellow: I believe it can work but it will be expensive.

### **TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

C. Granfield: The tax rate has been set at \$20.82, which was a reduction. The rate was confirmed and tax bills have been sent. With the rate going down and assessments going up, it is stated that 1/3 go down, 1/3 stay the same, and 1/3 go up. We have received a number of calls from the public.

Malloy will be submitting a quote for a sound system.

New panels will be added to the new Council Chamber tables for privacy.

There were two fires in the town in two days, which displaced residents, Dale Road and Scott Avenue.

A Management Team/Department Head meeting was held this week.

Future meetings will be held twice a month on the day following the regularly scheduled Council Meeting to inform the department heads of the issues and decisions of the Council. Minutes of those meetings will be provided to the Council. A suggestion was made that there be semi-annual department head workshops with the Council to give an overview of the departments and their needs. I suggested a quarterly project summary be utilized to triggers what is going on.

N. VanScoy: There has been an outcry about the Resource Officer at the School. The newspaper reported at the last Police Commission meeting that M. Ouellette said there are students coming to school with knives and guns. Rumor is there has been no report of guns or knives coming to the school. I have questions relative to that statement, as well as an understanding of the resource of officers. When was the SRO removed and what was the intent in that removal. If we do have kids coming to school with knives and guns, why are they not being reported.

Chief Agrafiotis: The SRO (School Resource Officer) was first proposed seven (7) or eight (8) years ago and because of budget failings, it was not implemented until four (4) years ago. Recently, hours were cut due to budget concerns. I called my operation officers regarding the statement of guns and knives in the schools. We looked at all reports this year and I couldn't substantiate those allegations. I called the School Board Chair and asked if we should look into that. Since we couldn't get an answer, we will put the officer back and would look into it further. Since that time, I have directed my staff to see what is occurring. We have our side saying we have no record. Today, the detective supervisor met with all three (3) school principals and plan on reporting that discussion to the police commission. They claim they have always reported issues. I don't know why she (The School Board Chair) is saying this. Do parents know of issues and aren't telling anyone? If they are happening, we need to know about it. We have not been able to substantiate her claims. The SRO claims he didn't tell her those claims.

J. Gorton: Taxes - I received a phone call where individuals received tax bills with "INV" charges for inventory forms of \$50.00. In one case they were late 28 days. I was asked to present this and ask if anything can be done short of filing an abatement request?

D. Dickson: The consensus of this Council was to support the RSA and the inventory form.

G. Longfellow: The penalty is one percent (1%) of the tax bill up to \$50.00

### **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS**

P. Rueppel, Planning Board - There is a Workshop scheduled for Monday, December 8<sup>th</sup>.

G. Longfellow, Sewer Commission - Did not attend Sewer meeting  
Recycle meeting – Discussed the automated trash collection proposal.

B. Gahara: Park and Rec – We have met the minimum recreation needs for the Town and will need a letter from HYAA sent to the Town so that the Impact Fees can move forward.



Minutes of 12/3/08

Budget Committee – There is a meeting scheduled for Saturday, December 6<sup>th</sup> at the Cawley School to present the School District budget.

D. Dickson, High School Study Committee – A meeting is scheduled for December 15<sup>th</sup>.

P. Loiselle, Police Commission - There was dialogue with the Budget Committee regarding the old sign made by the Scouts. Dale will look into placing the old sign at Campbell Hill so it can be viewed from the South.

EDC – Issues were presented earlier in the meeting.

N. VanScoy: Of the \$20,000 given for Economic Development, what has been spent on work completed?

C. Granfield: We received a bill for \$1700 today; the balance of the \$22,000 remains available.

P. Loiselle: The meetings themselves are held at no cost to the town. They are held at Merchants Motors.

***N. VanScoy motioned to extend the meeting 30 minutes. Seconded by P. Rueppel.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

**PUBLIC INPUT**

Harold Murray: If it has not already been done, a thank you letter should be sent to Lowes for the \$8000 received for equipment.

Surface water report: The last 100 year rains flooded Gold Fish Pond at Exit 9 and Manchester. It is a Hooksett pond and it was Hooksett water that flooded Manchester. I did research on who owns the water and determined it is DOT. They have surface water reports that show the quarry and what caused the floods. You may be able to get something from DOT on surface water reports.

M. Sorel: I expected, but never received a written response to the informal review process I participated in with the Assessing Department regarding my assessment. I was told I would get a response. I got a tax bill but no written response. I pass that on to you. I don't know who made the decision to not send a written response to the re-evaluation process whether it is positive or negative. Should I make an inquiry through the department or inquiry through the Council?

The Council feels this should be brought up to Assessing Department directly.

Chief Agrafiotis: In response to statements made by the Budget Committee, with regard to the email from Christine requesting a budget update, it didn't say it was for any board and the commission decided to wait until a board made the request.

The range has existed for 20 years and is on land owned by the sewer department. For years, the range was a certain size. When we upgraded our patrol, the range was not big enough. David Jodoin arranged to have the Highway expand the range out of the maintenance budget and they did a great job. Shortly after that was done (which was to build burms), ATV's began running up the burms and destroy the range. In discussions with the Administrator, the only way to preserve the range from damage was to put up a fence. There was no money available, so the police put up police budget funds to pay for the fence. The building is a 3-sided lean-to. We feel that if you look at our budget, we have had a line for the range. We are responsible for providing training. We have upgraded shooting targets and this is unlike the type at the State site. For our officers to be safe it is within our purview to provide that and we didn't think we needed to come to the budget committee for it.

The sign, to remind the Councilors that were here and new Councilors, Chief Oliver passed away and the widow and Budget Committee chair at the time took a tour with family of the Safety Center. The budget committee was disappointed at the condition of the building. We renamed the building and then offered to do the project. Originally, there was supposed to be a lit sign on Route 3. We made the offer and Paul Loiselle took the offer for the police to pay to the Council and the Council voted unanimously to accept. We only did it when given permission by the Council. We are only tenants in the building. The commission didn't go off and do that. The sign company said that was an average cost for the sign. The Council requested we pay because they didn't have the money in their budget.

Minutes of 12/3/08

There was transparency, the Council voted in public session and the commission had public meetings on the design of that sign. We had to wire in the Right of Way and worked this out with PSNH. The range was discussed in public. It is unfair if someone comes in a few weeks later and says because they weren't here and weren't talked to personally, that something was done behind anyone's back. The commission said we wouldn't offer to help the town Council anymore. The Budget Committee will step up to the plate and deal with building issues or leaks and bug infestation and we will not pay for that any more. If people don't go to meetings, they are unaware. If there are any questions now or in the future, please ask.

**NON-PUBLIC SESSION**

Per RSA 91-A:3,II.(d) *"Consideration of the acquisition, sale or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community."*

***G. Longfellow motioned to enter into non-public session Per RSA 91-A:3,II.(d) at 9:55 pm.***

***Seconded by B. Gahara.***

***Vote unanimously in favor***

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan

Nancy VanScoy  
Town Council Secretary