

Selectmen's Meeting  
2 November 1998  
7:00pm

The regularly scheduled Selectmen's meeting was called to order by the Chair, Allen Hines, at 7:00pm. Those present included George Lagassa & Jack Steiner (Selectmen), and Russell McAllister (Town Administrator).

The Selectmen reviewed the regular meeting minutes of November 2<sup>nd</sup>. Mr. Lagassa made the motion accept the minutes as written. Mr. Steiner seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous and so moved.

The selectmen reviewed correspondence and/or signed:

1. Oaths of Office – Planning Board (Bill Carlson / full member)
2. OSP - Coastal Zone Grant Application
3. DOT Excavation Permit - Lessard & Sons (Water Repair)
4. Mike Hirtle Resignation (Call Fireman)

#### **Town Administrator's Report**

The Board briefly reviewed the new tax rate outlined below.

	<b>Town</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>LBH</b>
<b>Last Year</b>	4.24	1.21	12.25	0
<b>New Rate</b>	4.10	1.16	12.59	.15

#### **Library Budget Review**

Mr. Lagassa reviewed the proposed Library budget for the upcoming year. It was noted that there was an overall increase of 9.6% from the previous year's budget. Increases in salaries for the Library Director and the Children's Librarian accounted for the largest share of the overall requested increase in appropriations. Richard Geoselt, library Trustee, explained that the library had received a large bequest, of which \$30,000 was used, for upgrading the Library's computer systems. Mr. Geoselt explained that the library had entered into a contract with a consultant for the purpose of coordinating and implementing the upgrade to the library computer systems. It was explained that under SB-2 a default budget was the same as the previous year's budget with adjustments to items like negotiated contracts, increases in insurance and health benefits. Mr. Hines noted that there was a lack of clarity within the statute of exactly how to calculate the default budget. Mr. Steiner noted that increases in salaries and the costs of contracted services not previously approved may not qualify as default items under SB-2. Mr. Geoselt believed that the increases in salaries were justified, but admitted that the Director and Children's Librarian were not under contract. The Board agreed that the increases may be justified but, should the proposed budget not meet with voter approval, then the trustees would need to document how they arrived at their default budget which, under extreme circumstances, could face a court challenge. The Board agreed to delay recommendation until after review of the total budget.

#### **Dan Hansen / Eagle Scout Project**

##### *Welcome to NHHH Signs*

Dan Hansen addressed the Board concerning his Eagle Scout project. Mr. Hansen noted that Gail Walter had suggested that he approach the Board concerning his project. Mr. Hansen explained that erecting "Welcome to NHHH" signs dovetailed nicely with the efforts of Ms. Walter's ongoing North Hampton Beautification Awards for NHHH businesses. The Board agreed that the project was a welcome one. Mr. Hines suggested that the landscaped signage capture the dignity and savoir faire characteristic of NHHH. Mr. Steiner agreed and suggested that Mr. Hansen submit several designs for review. The TA also suggested that Mr. Hansen confer with the Building Inspector regarding Town ordinances regulating the size and placement of signage. The TA explained that the project would be fruitful, because Mr. Hansen would also have to deal with the NHDOT because the placement of the signs would be on state roads. It

Selectmen's Meeting  
2 November 1998  
7:00pm

was an excellent opportunity to better understand intergovernmental relationships. Mr. Hansen agreed to undertake further research and report back to the Board.

#### **Rob Parsons / NexTel Telecommunications Tower**

Mr. Parsons addressed the Board concerning NexTel's desire of citing a digital cellular on municipal property within the municipal complex area. Mr. Parson explained that some terrain modeling had been done to determine the best placement for the tower. Mr. Parsons noted that he had looked at the school property located out by North Road by the Chip & Putt, but that there were significant construction costs associated with the site. He further explained that to access the site involved crossing a stream and that brought with it wetland issues that he would rather avoid because of the potential expense involved. Also, the site was in a depression and even the height of the tower would not bring the tower any higher than Route 1. Because the purpose of citing the tower was to expand service to the area in and around Route 1, any tower that barely got the facility above Route 1 did not make business sense. Mr. Parsons also indicated that life Police and Fire dispatch antennae would be placed on top of the tower at no expense. The added height would provide better transmission and help eliminate the dead pockets within the reception area. Mr. Steiner suggested that safety and visual esthetics would be the most common complaints among residents. Mr. Parsons agreed explaining that safety had been addressed. He described the tower itself as a monopole that was designed to collapse upon itself rather than falling over like a tree. The monopole itself was designed to collapse upon itself under force 5 hurricane winds. Mr. Lagassa asked what stick did the telecommunications act of 1996 provide NexTel. Mr. Parsons commented that the act compelled wireless operators to site their facilities in locations proscribed by local governing bodies. However, wireless carriers were exempt from local zoning ordinances insofar as localities could not prohibit citing of wireless facilities because a tower broke the tree line. Nor could public safety be a cause for prohibition because federal law had determined that such facilities did not pose health hazards. Under conditions where wireless facilities were excluded because of local zoning ordinances, their recourse was immediate appeal in federal court. Federal rulings exempted local and state courts from determining whether or not the dispute was a case of effective prohibition. Mr. Hines stated that he would like to improve the high tech infrastructure in Town to help attract higher tech businesses. Mr. Hines believed that such businesses were low impact and would not detract from the rural character of the Town. He noted that wireless providers were part of that infrastructure. Mr. Parsons agreed to return to the Board at a later date with more information.

#### **Selectmen's Issues**

##### *Little River Watershed*

The TA reminded those in attendance that the public participation meeting for the project would be Saturday November 7<sup>th</sup> at the Elementary School from 9:00am until Noon.

Mr. Steiner asked about the status of the DES report concerning the Peck property. Mr. Charron explained that the report was due that week, but that preliminary findings indicated that the Peck's property was not located within an inland tidal zone and was therefore exempt from cutting trees on their property. The TA agreed to forward a copy of the DES findings to the Brosseau's when it became available. Mr. Steiner asked about holding this year's deliberative session in the school cafeteria so that the gym could be utilized. The Board agreed.

#### **Questions & Comments**

Gail Walter expressed her disappointment with the dropping of the New Century Committee name from the grant. The TA commented that they could still call themselves the New Century Steering Committee so long as steering committee was part of it because the work plan submitted in the federal grant application specifically mentioned a steering committee. The Board complimented the members of the steering committee for their efforts at getting the word out, placing posters around town, and organizing the

Selectmen's Meeting  
2 November 1998  
7:00pm

meetings that led up to the first public meeting. The TA praised Gail and Claire Walter's efforts to move the project ahead.

The septic system condition on 62 Lafayette Road was discussed. Mr. Charron reported that the DES had ordered that an approved replacement system be fully reviewed by December 2<sup>nd</sup>. He also noted that while there were odors, which could be used as an indication of failure, hard evidence such as the results of a dye test, were needed for court. While Mr. Charron had performed a dye test, no trace of the dye was found around the leach field. He also indicated that the Gabrielli Plaza could be the culprit insofar as water leaching out of that system may well be pooling on the leach field of 62 Lafayette and causing it to fail. The problem for the Town was that if an order to replace the system on 62 Lafayette Road was given and the owner at his expense replaced the system and later it was discovered that the problem was still unresolved. Then the Town would probably be held liable for the costs of replacement. Mr. Charron indicated that he would continue to work to resolve the problem.

Mr. Lagassa noted that he had polled a number of citizens and business owners on the issue of sewer on Route 1. He expressed surprise that a majority of those polled thought the idea a good one.

There being no further questions to come before the Board a motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:15.

Respectfully,

Russell McAllister  
Town Administrator