

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

The Selectmen reviewed the meeting minutes of August 23<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Hines made the motion to accept the regular minutes of August 23<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Steiner seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous and so moved.

The selectmen reviewed correspondence and/or signed:

Administration/Business

- a. Minutes - August 23<sup>rd</sup>
- b. Payroll
- c. Manifest
- d. Cemetery Lot sale - signatures required
- e. Property Tax Refund - Kathleen McKinnon (\$15.35) overpayment
- f. County nursing home data

The TA briefed the Board on the status of several ongoing issues. The EPA found that natural attenuation of volatile organic compounds (VOC's) would obviate the need for installation of on site water treatment facilities at the Coakley Landfill. This was good news because additional costs for water treatment were no longer needed.

The DOT officially recognized the request made by the Selectmen and Planning Board for a 4-way stop sign on the Lovering Road and Walnut Avenue intersection where the Winterberry subdivision will be located.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented on the road conditions on North Road. Mr. Fitzgerald asked when the Hampton Water Works would repair the road. It was noted that a portion of the road had been excavated for the purposes of installing a water line. The excavated trench had since been filled and paved. Mr. Strout (Road Agent) replied that R.H. White had said that they would be applying a skim coat over the side of the road, which had been excavated on Sept. 20<sup>th</sup>. They would then return again in the spring to apply another shim coat on that side of the road that had been excavated. Mr. Fitzgerald commented on the dangerous situation the current road conditions created along North Road. Drivers were traveling on the wrong side of the road to avoid the bumps caused by the water line installation. The Board noted that if the conditions did not improve after work done by R.H. White, then the Board would need to contact the HWW regarding the issue.

Mr. Fitzgerald next voiced his concerns regarding the intersection improvements the highway department had made on North & Post Roads. Mr. Fitzgerald commented that the intersection was too tight and ugly particularly with the angle iron stuck in the ground alongside the road. Mr. Landman mentioned that there was a loss of rural character and that the intersection looked scary. Mr. Strout replied that the reconfiguration to a "T" intersection from the previous "Y" shape intersection was for safety purposes and that a previous Board of Selectmen had approved the work. The reconfiguration of the intersection to its present "T" shape was in response to complaints from residents concerning traffic speeding through the former "Y" type intersection. The angle iron posts stuck into the ground alongside the road at the intersection were for the purposes of delineating the road until the striping (centerline / fog line) could be completed. Both Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Landman expressed concern over the ability of large trucks like those owned by John Cafarella and Walter Nordstrom to negotiate the turn in the intersection. More discussion ensued regarding the subject. Mr. Walter Nordstrom commented that he had a 33-foot trailer and that he had no

trouble negotiating the turn. The Board asked whether "T" type intersections were a requirement for new road construction. Mr. Strout replied that it was. The Board suggested that the issue be revisited after intersection work was completed.

### **Health Ordinance**

#### *Subsurface Waste Water Disposal/ Health Officer Position / Nuisances*

The Building Inspector, Paul Charron, briefed the Board on a model health ordinance concerning subsurface wastewater disposal from the perspective of a Health Officer. Mr. Charron noted that North Hampton is 100% septic and that a large portion of the industrial business zone along Route 1 sat above an aquifer, which is a source of drinking water. Because of this situation Mr. Charron felt that local ordinances should be more stringent in the areas of septic system setbacks from other wells and lot lines than current state regulations. For instance, design criteria and review of test pit data should receive more importance and would, in most cases, alleviate problems down the road. Mr. Lagassa inquired whether, in Mr. Charron's opinion, DES design standards were lower generally, or were they lower in specific areas. Mr. Charron felt they were lower generally because of the wetlands and number of wet areas that collected water and eventually flooded in some respect. Mr. Charron also explained that the position of Health Officer needed to be examined as well, both from a funding and responsibilities perspective. The Health Officer position was characterized as complaint driven and reaction oriented. Complaints drove the process and they usually were not schedule friendly and tended to interrupt other duties. Mr. Charron is responsible for the positions of Building Inspector and Health Officer. Oftentimes this leads to scheduling conflicts. It was noted that a deputy health officer would lighten the workload while providing better service in this area. The discussion moved into the area of codifying nuisances through adoption of health ordinances. It was explained that zoning ordinances are not as effective in governing nuisances, generally health ordinances are more effective in governing nuisances. Mr. Steiner supported the idea of beefed up design requirements for septic systems because of poor soil conditions. The Board agreed that design criteria and test pit results were important and that perhaps a technical review committee was in order. Mr. Roland Neves supported the idea noting that from the public health, safety and welfare perspective such ordinances made sense particularly in light of the present building boom. Mr. Steiner agreed to look into organizing a review committee to study the model health ordinance.

### **Review of Performance Evaluation Policy**

The TA introduced a draft of a performance review policy noting that Board members had previously reviewed the material. No additional copies were available nor had the public reviewed the draft. The TA explained that the performance review policy sought to manage compensation costs within a legal, equitable and competitive framework. The policy seeks to establish a base salary rate paid employees for their service to the Town, which can be determined by competitive wages in the market place, the responsibilities of the position, and the performance of the responsibilities over time. The performance review process would utilize performance elements necessary for the consistent delivery of high quality services to the citizens of North Hampton. Those performance elements are *Service Professionalism, Teamwork & Cooperation, Resource & Risk Management, Work Effectiveness, and Staff Management & Development*. The performance evaluation process consisted of an overall ratings guide, goals and development—both planning and review sections, employee comments, and an overall narrative. Mr. Hines commented that he had given a copy of the draft to a human resource professional at Pan Am for review. He noted that the policy was probably better for a company the size of General Motors. Lengthy discussion ensued. Mr. Lagassa noted that there was no formal performance evaluation process in place for department heads and that he did not see where the policy was overly complex. Mr. Steiner noted that it was a thorough document that provided employee feedback and participation and served to better inform Board members on overall employee development. He noted that as a Board member on RCA they had used a similar process to help set employee and organizational goals. Ms. Shirley Fuller asked who would be performing the evaluations. Mr. Lagassa replied that it would be the Town Administrator, but that the

Board would be part of the process as well. Ms. Fuller commented that it was too much power for one person to have and that the performance evaluation process would wind up rewarding people who wrote the most reports. Mr. Hines did not think that a formal process was necessary to determine who got a raise. Mr. Lagassa noted that the Board had approved COLA increases of 2% for department heads this year and that the Board had also mentioned merit raises for department heads, too. There was now some question from both Board members and department heads about what criteria would be used to determine merit raises. The performance evaluation process provided the basis for such criteria to be defined. Mr. Steiner agreed that some criteria needed to be established. Mr. Lagassa commented that the TA developed the policy in response to concerns raised by the Board and department heads. If the TA thought that the policy would be beneficial in the administration of the office the Board should support the policy. The TA reminded those present that the policy was still in draft form and that the department heads would review the policy and provide their input as well. The Board agreed to table to issue pending review by department heads.

**Selectmen's Issues** 8:00pm

*Education Funding Update*

Mr. Lagassa chronicled the education lawsuit to date adding that he and the TA had attended a coalition communities meeting in Portsmouth that was sponsored by the Town of Rye. He noted that there were several speakers who talked about the funding gap in the current education plan. During his talk Senator Fred King from District 1 estimated that education costs would increase 9% annually forcing more Towns into the donor category. It was further noted that a one-time reimbursement from the State to the Town for \$21,000 to cover the costs associated with collecting and administering the statewide property tax was in the works. The TA mentioned that he had asked the staff to track their time on issues dealing with the statewide property tax. The NH constitution prohibited the legislature from enacting legislation that resulted in unfunded mandates to municipalities. Municipal collection and administration costs associated with the statewide property tax were unfunded mandates.

*Stairwell & Records Room Bid*

Mr. Steiner noted that the Town had received only one bid for construction of a stairwell and records room above the police station. He thought that the Town might do better to act as its own contractor and pay for construction costs on an hourly basis. Mr. Steiner agreed to work on the final details and get back to the Board.

**Questions & Comments**

Lucille Ellingwood asked whether or not the Town clock could be fixed. Mr. Strout replied that money was available for such purposes in the Hobbs Fund. There had been some complaints about the bell ringing during the evening hours by residents living in close proximity to the Town Hall. Mr. Strout believed that there was a way to get the clock working without having the bells ring.

There being no further business to come before the Board the public meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00pm.

Mr. Hines made the motion to convene in non-public session under RSA 91-A:3 II (a) to discuss personnel issues. Mr. Steiner seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous and so moved.

Respectfully,

Russell McAllister  
Town Administrator