TOWN OF NEW LONDON
BOARD OF SELECTMEN
METING MINUTES- APRIL 30, 2007

PRESENT:
Ruth I. Clough, Chairman Board of Selectmen
Mark Kaplan, Selectman
Larry Ballin, Selectman
Jessie Levine, Town Administrator

ALSO:
John Chiarella, Springfield Selectman
Ken Jacques, Commissioner New London/Springfield Village District
Debbie Cross, *InterTown Record*
Caroline Dube, *Argus Champion*
Robert Anderson, New London/Springfield Water Precinct Resident
Sue Andrews, New London Planning Board member
Pat Blanchard, New London Budget Committee
Bob Brown, President Messer Pond Protective Association
Dick Cavallaro, Resident
Dale Conley, New London Planning Board and Conservation Commission
Celeste Cook, New London Planning Board, and Welfare Director
David Cook, Resident
The Crozers, New London/Springfield Water Precinct Residents
Alan Gepfert, New London/Springfield Water Precinct Resident
Hardy Hasenfuss, Kearsarge Area Council on Aging
Bill Helm, Chairman New London Hospital Board of Trustees
Michele Holton, Resident
Jack Holton, Resident
Jack Hughes, New London/Springfield Water District Resident
Janet Kidder, Resident
Vicki Koron, New London Conservation Commission
Bob Lavoie, New London Citizens' Advisory Committee
D.J. Lavoie, Resident
Les Norman, Chairman New London Conservation Commission
Stanley Richards, New London/Springfield Water Precinct Resident
Peter Stanley, New London Zoning Administrator
Debbie Stanley, Resident
Jess Taylor, New London/Springfield Water Precinct Resident
W. Michael Todd, Resident
Lori Manor Underwood, Senior Director Planning & Projects for New London Hospital
Don Voss, New London/Springfield Water Precinct Resident
John Wilson, New London Budget Committee
Kitty Wilson, President Pleasant Lake Protective Association
Anita Wolf, New London/Springfield Water Precinct Resident
Steve Wolf, New London/Springfield Water Precinct Resident
Other New London/Springfield Water Precinct Residents

Sue Clough called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. The Selectmen addressed 12 items of business during this meeting.

1. Volunteer Appointment Process—Sue Clough said the main issue with which the Selectmen are wrestling right now is the question of term limits for appointed Board members. She informed the meeting that Town Counsel has cautioned Selectmen against establishing a firm written policy with regard to term limits. She opened the floor to comments from residents in attendance.

Dale Conly informed the meeting that he is a member of the New London Conservation Commission, and serves also as the Conservation Commission's representative to the Planning Board. He referenced the on-going debate regarding term limits for appointed board members, and said that while he appreciates the advantage in having new members with new energy and new ideas, he does not favor imposing strict term limits for the following reasons:

- The strength of the Planning Board rests on its making thoughtful decisions that are fair and consistent. In other words, members must be able to draw on history, on those issues preceding and similar to the one before them at any given time.
- The plans presented to the Planning Board require a familiarity with such complex areas as soil types, runoff and drainage issues, etc.
- It takes a great deal of time to become familiar and comfortable with the processes of the Planning Board, and particularly with the vast number of regulations and ordinances within which it must work.
- Regarding the Chairman in particular, he said it is of particular benefit to the Board to have someone with a legal background, and willingness to spend the huge amount of time required. He noted that the issues coming before the Planning Board these days are increasingly complex and with that complexity comes increased contentiousness at the hearings. Parties are often represented by lawyers who may take advantage of a weaker board. The current Chairman has been instrumental in protecting New London, and addressing those legal issues that otherwise may have required outside (and costly) consultation.
- Similarly, the Conservation Commission is composed of members with strong backgrounds in environmental fields.

In conclusion, he said that if the Selectmen feel they must impose term limits on experienced members just to make room for someone else, they would seriously weaken those Boards. He suggested that if term limits are instituted, then the length of a "term" should be longer than three years.

Regarding the selection process itself, he made the following suggestions:

- The candidate should be willing to make a substantial time commitment. The Planning Board has a minimum of two meetings a month, and in addition, members are required to serve from time to time on subcommittees. Also, a great deal of time is required to study the issues, laws, regulations.
- The experience and expertise of the candidate must be considered. What can this person add to the Board?
- The particular interests of the candidate should be considered. Are these in concert with the well-being of New London? Are they within the parameters of the Master Plan?

Bill Helm said that he recalls that while he was serving as Selectmen elsewhere, he observed that the weight was given to continuity of service and experience. He noted that in that locale, a "term" was five years long, and volunteers tended to serve two terms or ten years. In his current capacity as Chairman of the New London Hospital Board of Trustees he has had opportunity to see how both the Planning and Zoning Boards have addressed the technical issues, and recognized their understanding of those and of

relative precedents. In conclusion, he suggested the Selectmen should seek a balance of both renewal and managed continuity.

Celeste Cook said she is currently in her second term as a Planning Board member, and she noted the learning curve required. She said the number of regulations and processes that a member is required to become familiar with can be overwhelming for at least the first three years. She went on to say that the current Planning Board works extremely well, and the face of the Town reflects that. She noted that as far as she knows, there have been no complaints about the Planning Board's work or decisions. She seconded Dale Conly's assertion that the Board is dealing with increasingly difficult and serous issues including new site plan regulations and, this year, updating the Master Plan. On that note, she suggested that people interested in getting involved could start out by working on one of the Master Plan subcommittees. In conclusion, she suggested that imposing term limits would take valuable experience away from the Board, and be detrimental to the town.

She asked if the process under discussion tonight applies to all appointed boards. Selectmen responded in the affirmative.

John Wilson informed the Board that he has served as a Planning Board member in the past and is currently in his second term on the Budget Committee. He, too, noted the amount of time required to learn the RSA's, regulations etc., and he observed that at every meeting, he still learns something new. Regarding the question of term limits, he said the Town is fortunate to have people who can dedicate the time required to learn the regulations and RSA's, who can apply them with little subjectivity, who can exercise due diligence in filling the position, and who are willing to continue serving. He suggested the three criteria that should be considered are

- Objectivity of the prospective member.
- Ability and willingness to give the time.
- Members who are unable to do the above, who are not performers, should not be renewed; performers should be considered assets and kept on the Boards.

David Cook referred to his past experience as a New London Selectmen, and also to the draft of the "Town of New London Board Appointment Process" being considered at this meeting, particularly section D-5, 7th bullet, regarding Conflict of Interest, and he made two suggestions:

- He urged the Selectmen to not encourage town employees to serve on Boards. He has observed problems arising from this situation in other Towns.
- He suggested that people with special agendas may not bring unbiased views to a Board.

Bill Andrews referred to his past experience as Chairman of the Planning Board, and said he would favor a limit of two terms. He said the Boards should not be allowed to evolve into elite groups. He noted two advantages to term limits: the rotation keeps the boards "user friendly, and having term limits gives the Selectmen an "excuse" to not reappoint someone who is not performing well on the Board. He said he does not feel that the material that must be learned is rocket science; it can be learned within a year. And in a small town, the Boards are working as "neighbor to neighbor."

Michele Holton also supported the idea of term limits, saying that the Town is enriched by a wealth of people willing to serve. There is a great deal of untapped skill in the community, and it is time now to draw on that.

Les Norman, Conservation Commission Chairman, said the Commission is composed of seven regular members and two alternates, noting that four are relatively new. He, too, cited the importance of having

members with long experience. It is good to know what happened to a piece of land some years ago. He said it is important to keep that kind of knowledge on the boards.

Jeff Hollinger said he is in his second year on the Planning Board and is just now beginning to feel comfortable. He opined that it takes three or four years to understand fully the Planning Board's operations. He favors continuity, not term limits. The Board should have members who know what has happened in the past. He, too, referred to the Planning Board's current Chairman and said she does not dominate or try to sway the Board. He noted that it is rare to find people willing to work as hard as she does, including all the behind the scenes work. He said the current Chairman understands the legalese, and, referring to Bill Andrews' comment that it is not rocket science, he said that like it or not, things are indeed more complicated now, despite that fact that New London is still a relatively small town. In conclusion, he said that there is already a fairly good turn over on the Planning Board, and he would favor keeping at least a few of the old members each year.

Jack Holton pointed out that term limits would not mean that the whole board turns over at one time. The terms would alternate. That is, two would come due every three years. He referred to the comment above regarding lawyers representing people at hearings, and suggested that it is not correct to assert that just because lawyers are attending the hearings now, the Boards must have someone who can "fight" them.

Bob Lavoie said the Selectmen's concern should be the total combined experience of a Board. He referred to the comment about the benefit of having members who are familiar with the past experiences of a Board, and noted that the current members can always go back and look at minutes in order to find out what has happened in the past. And he added that a Board can always call upon prior members if history of a particular issue is needed. In conclusion, he suggested that the need to have experience available to current boards can be handled even with term limits in place.

D.J. Lavoie said that at the last Citizens' Advisory Committee meeting, suggestion was made that with a limit of two terms, there could be flexibility allowing a member who has served one of those terms as Chairman, to serve a third term. Similarly that flexibility would allow the Selectmen to waive the limit in instances when no one else is available to fill an opening. She noted that previous members can be used as back-up, and that would fill any voids in knowledge that may arise. She reminded everyone that the consensus of the CAC was that term limits could be made to work very effectively for the town.

Kitty Wilson said the bottom line is that the Committees should be highly effective. She acknowledged the difficulty with which the Selectmen are faced, and suggested the challenge is not the question of term limits, but to get as many highly effective people as they can on the Boards. She also pointed out the possibility that when a Board member is not performing well on a given board, the problem may simply be that he or she is on the wrong board.

Sue Andrews has served as Conservation Commission Chairman, as that Commission's representative to the Planning Board, and for several years now as a regular Planning Board member. She said she feels the current Planning Board members work well together, have a good working relationship, and she would like to continue to serve in that capacity. She is not aware of a perception that the Board is not "user friendly". The Planning Board works in the best interest of the Town, always, and that was demonstrated most recently during the application process for New London Hospital's renovation plans.

Vicki Koron said she has observed that on the Conservation Commission there is some amount of "natural" turn over. Beyond that, she said she does not know what the Commission would do without some of the people who have the history and knowledge of that Commission's past work. She said it

would be very difficult if new members had to go through a stack of past minutes every time they needed information about a particular parcel or issue.

Sue Clough said the Selectmen are seeking a balance of the two ideas, and she referred to Town Counsel's advice about not establishing a firm written policy regarding term limits for appointed Board members. Mark Kaplan said his objective would be to have continuity over the long term. The question is how to address this with comity. To that end, he made two suggestions:

- The Chairman's position could be made rotating, as it is on the Board of Selectmen.
- Alternates could be appointed to the Planning Board, allowing new persons to gain experience in that capacity, and giving the Board experienced people ready to move up when an older member steps off.

Certain small changes can be effective in bringing new ideas to a Board, and he said that really there are always changes being made, but the Boards have to have people who can keep the continuity going.

John Wilson said he likes the idea of rotating Chairmen, but feels it is really just window dressing. He noted that State law stipulates that the Boards choose their own chairman. Selectmen agreed, they can only make recommendations.

Peter Stanley said that appointing alternates would allow new people to attend meetings and to study the information. He agreed that it is difficult information to learn and to apply. He noted that over the long run, New London's Boards are extremely competent. He addressed the question of term limits by naming two of the Town's most valuable volunteer Board members: Esther Currier who was instrumental in getting the Conservation Commission established in New London and who served on that Commission for many years and whose precepts the Commission is still following to this day, and Syd Crook who served many years on the Planning Board, and brought to that Board a wealth of engineering expertise which the Board now has to contract outside for, at additional cost to the Town. Peter Stanley suggested it would be a huge mistake to impose term limits on such long term valuable members. He made the following suggestions for the appointment process:

- The position should be regarded as a *job.*
- Minimum training requirements, attendance at seminars etc., should be required
- A minimum attendance requirement should be established.
- The policy of appointing alternates would allow new people to work into regular positions, and would allow the Board and the Selectmen to get a sense of how they would perform on that Board.

Michele Holton said that Attorney Mayer's letter to the Selectmen indicates that the Supreme Court has not had opportunity to address this issue (of term limits for appointed members). She said she disagrees that it is difficult to find individuals who are willing to make the commitment described above. The Selectmen have received responses to the call for volunteers. She asked about the possibility of drafting a policy for this, and submitting that to Town Meeting for approval.

Sue Clough said she would not be averse to that, but they need to address the issue now, for this year. She reminded everyone that three years ago, voters at Town Meeting voted against having Planning and Zoning Board positions be elected, and the proposed elimination of the Zoning Administrator and the zoning ordinance was withdrawn during the course of that Town meeting.

Larry Ballin said that Town Counsel's letter makes clear that elected officials cannot be subjected to term limits. The question tonight is whether or not to apply term limits to appointed board members. Regarding the question of alternates, he suggested that a member can serve as an alternate not only at the beginning of his or her service to a board, but also at the end, when his term as a regular member expires. Often the Zoning Board calls upon alternates, former regular members, to make up a quorum.

Jeff Hollinger said if the Town goes to term limits, he would like them to at least keep some options open. Perhaps they can just use term limits as an "out.' Otherwise, he suggested that term limits would tie their hands, and possibly hurt the Town and the Board. The goal and responsibility of the Selectmen should be to assure that the best people are on the Board.

Jack Holton pointed out that implicit in the idea of term limits, is that a previous member can always be reappointed.

Pat Blanchard suggested that the process as described in the draft may be a bit intimidating. It includes an interview and questions about history of volunteerism, etc. She suggested that Selectmen should really be more pro-active in encouraging new volunteers. If someone expresses an interest in serving the Town, the Selectmen should really work hard at finding him or her a place.

John Wilson added that the CAC is also a great place to get one's feet wet.

D.J. Lavoie asked what the future would be for alternates. Would they have to serve as alternates for years before becoming a regular member? She noted that the list of interested volunteers contains 48 names, and she suggested that if people keep getting turned away, eventually they will stop bothering. She suggested that rather than have a black and white term limit, that they have a flexible policy.

David Cook asked how many members will be needed for the Master Plan Committees. Sue Clough said she thinks there will be as many as 12 Master Plan subcommittees. Peter Stanley said that during the 1998 Master Plan process, they had 250 attend the first visioning session, 100 attend the second, but only about 10 or 12 who followed the process all the way through and who attended every single meeting. Larry Ballin agreed that attendance is very important, but added that now days, a lot can be done electronically.

Bob Lavoie suggested the Selectmen not encourage so many people to apply for only a few slots. Jessie Levine clarified that of the 48 on the list, 19 applied this year, and many are seeking positions on brand new committees such as the Energy Committee, the Solid Waste Committee, and the Master Plan subcommittees. So there are enough places to be filled. Of the thirty applicants this past year, 21 were placed on Boards. This is not a case of 48 people applying for just a couple of slots.

Sue Clough thanked attendees for their input, and said the Selectmen will be working through this and beginning meeting with volunteers next week.

2. <u>Public Hearing on Petition to Redefine boundaries of New London/Springfield Water Precinct</u>

Sue Clough opened this public hearing at 7 p.m., and read the Notice of Hearing as posted. Specifically the petition is to redraw the boundary of the water district to except seventeen properties that do not receive public water supply.

Jack Hughes said that in March 2006, the Commissioners were asked to change the rate structure. Commissioner Ken Jacques said the Commissioners did look at the rate structure, but he pointed out that has no bearing on tonight's hearing.

Jack Hughes went on to say that the seventeen petitioners pay a total of $6600 per year in water district taxes, although they are not hooked up to the public water supply, and there is no intention to hook them

up. He said that in conversation with former Selectman Doug Lyon, the latter agreed that an inequity exists, that the problem will not go away on its own, and it should be addressed either by letting those seventeen out of the precinct or by some type of abatement. At this meeting, Jack Hughes also referred to an earlier comment by Mark Kaplan that $6600 represents 1.3% of the precinct's revenue, and is not so large that it cannot be solved.

He also referred to comments made at earlier meetings comparing this tax on people who do not receive public water supply to childless property owners paying the school tax, and a similar comment relative to fire protection, and he pointed out how the entire community benefits from good schools, and from having fire protection. He said at stake tonight is the principle of availability. He said that if the water mains passed in front of their homes, all seventeen of the petitioners would be delighted to hook up. As it is, they are being taxed for a service they cannot have. He asked about precedents, and said they have asked the Commissioners to look at what other Towns are doing.

Steve Wolf provided some statistics compiled from data provided by the NH Department of Revenue. There are 104 village districts in the State. Of those, 28 including New London/Springfield are for water only. Twenty-three charge only user fees, no taxes. Of those which do charge both user fees and taxes, 12 are multi-use districts (that is, include one or all of the following: fire, sewer, ambulance, lighting, impoundment, recreation, roads, ornamental trees, parks, electric). He observed that in New London, fire protection is covered by the general taxation. There are 150 hydrants in Town and he observed that the cost to the Town was increased last year to $250; that is an increase from $11,000 to $37,000 for fire hydrant maintenance. He suggested that this is at least going in the right direction.

He said that the petitioners are proposing three potential solutions to their dilemma:

- That the district tax only those who are hooked up to the water. The water is a utility, and he suggested that the tax should not be imposed on the non-users.
- That the district operate on fees only.
- That the district boundaries be adjusted to except the seventeen petitioners. He reminded the hearing that there are some precedents for changing the boundary, going back to 1985 and those pertained to Camp Sunapee Road and Lake Sunapee Country Club.

Sue Clough reminded everyone that tonight's hearing is <u>only</u> regarding the petition to change the boundaries. That was what was posted in the notices, and they cannot engage in discussion of other proposals.

Anita Wolf said the petitioners have been frustrated in their efforts to generate discussion and resolution of this among the precinct commissioners. Jack Hughes agreed that the water commissioners have an obligation to respond to the petitioners. The minutes of the water precinct meeting do not reflect any discussion of this issue. He said that the petitioners have waited thirteen months for a response, but feel that they have just been "blown off." Ken Jacques said that the Commissioners did look at the rate structure as well as at other communities. He reiterated that a discussion of rates has no bearing on tonight's hearing.

Sue Clough agreed that the Selectmen do not have the authority to change the water precinct tax structure. Tonight, the Selectmen have been asked to consider the petition to change the boundary. Larry Ballin asked the petitioners if they could provide a map of how the boundary will appear once the proposed change is put in—or are they proposing to strictly remove just the seventeen houses. Jack Wolf provided a map of the current precinct, and Steve Wolf said he could draw in the proposed new boundary. The seventeen petitioners are located in three specific areas.

Jack Hughes went on to say that it would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars for those seventeen residents to hook up to the water (they would be required to bring the water main to their properties). He reiterated his concern that it has been so difficult to get information, and to get people willing to agree that this is a problem that needs solving. Sue Clough expressed concern that there are others within the water precinct who also are not hooked up. Jack Hughes and Steve Wolf agreed, but pointed out that some of those do have the water main going right by the front of their property (thus it would be less expensive and easier for them to hook up if they wished to).

Ken Jacques said the Water Precinct Commissioners are opposed to changing the boundary. He noted that nothing has changed since 2003 when this petition was last presented to the two boards of Selectmen and denied. He said there are 100 properties within the precinct that are not hooked up to the water. Of those, some do have the main running by their property. Some have chosen to dig wells. He disagreed with the description of the water precinct as a utility. He said it is a non-profit water service company.

He went on to say that the current boundaries were established in 1945, and were based on property lines at that time. Those included in the precinct at that time, elected to be so. In the 50's, the mains were built to where homes were at that time. Afterwards, individual subdivision developers had the option of bringing water into their subdivisions.

He said the Water Precinct Commissioners do not see the current structure as being inequitable, or that it is a big problem. There are some property owners who pay very high taxes, and who will never be hooked up to the water. He said the Commissioners see this petition by seventeen owners as "cherry picking." He noted that all they have to do is bring the main to their properties to be hooked up. He observed also that they have all had the opportunity to do that. He cited Woodland trace as an example. However, he pointed out, it is not the Water Precinct's obligation to do that (pay to bring the main to these locations).

He said the Commissioners collect taxes to cover anticipated revenues. He reminded everyone that since 1994-95, the Water Precinct has incurred some large capital improvements projects including the Colby Point well field, the 100 gallon tank in the woods (Morgan Hill?), and now the project at the College. This year, they are looking at a $350,000 cost to improve the mains on Newport Road as it is going to be more efficient to do that during the construction work relevant to the round-about. All of that debt is carried by people in the water precinct. If owners choose to tie in, that is an additional benefit. They have the option to do that.

He said there are 1200 properties within the present water precinct boundary. Would changing the boundary be for the general benefit of those, or just for the seventeen? If the seventeen petitioners are granted their petition, it would set precedent, force everyone else to pay higher taxes, and, as others may also wish to get out then, it would put the precinct in a state of flux. He referred to Twin Lake Villa as an example of a property that must pay the water precinct tax, but does not have public water supply. Where 114 meets Little Sunapee Road is the end of the water main. The owners did not pay up front to have it extended further, and the water precinct is not expected to do that, yet the owners are expected to pay their share of the debt reduction. In conclusion, he said the water precinct tax is collected to reduce the debt. The Commissioners feel the structure is equitable.

Stanley Richards said that he feels that by charging those who are not hooked up, the Commissioners are asking some to subsidize others. Jess Taylor agreed that they are being charged for a product they do not get. Don Voss also said that he lives on Morgan Hill Road and is paying a tax for water they can't get.

Ken Jacques countered by pointing out that they are not being charged for water; but for the precinct's debt reduction. Steve Wolf disagreed, saying that according to DRA, 65% of the operating budget is covered by the tax. The tax is not all going for debt reduction. Ken Jacques questioned that figure—65%.

Bob Anderson pointed out that if the Selectmen approve the petition, it will then go on the warrant for the water precinct's annual meeting. He suggested they do that, and let the voters decide.

Peter Stanley pointed out that sewer users as for example, Job Seamans residents, have extended the sewer line at their own expense. Once the line was extended, residents had the opportunity to tie in, but were not required to do it. Regarding the water main, he suggested that eventually, there may be some state or federal grant funds available to extend that. Regarding the proposed boundary change, he said this is like a town boundary, and that owners bought their properties knowing what the tax bill is. Anita Wolf countered by spaying that in the first year of their ownership, the fact that they were paying water precinct taxes was not spelled out on the tax bill. Jack Hughes agreed that it was not until 2004, that the line on the tax bill stating "precinct" was changed to "water precinct." He suggested that the tax structure is similar to a welfare type system. He went on to say that when he asked about getting hooked up to the water, he was told his cost would be $300,000, and he would have to get easements from his neighbors. He said if at some point, the main is extended to go in front of these properties, then they would have the opportunity to hook up, and then they should be charged the tax (whether they opt to hook up or not).

Pat Blanchard suggested that in the future, the Town should be more pro-active in communicating with developers.

Alan Gepfert asked how residents can generate a discussion about the rate structure specifically. How can that be brought up? Jessie Levine said the Board of Water Commissioners is a separate, elected, independent Board. The water precinct rate structure is outside the purview of the Selectmen. Precinct boundary changes must come before the Selectmen of the two Towns, because it was their vote which originally established the precinct. Ken Jacques said that the Commissioners did look at the rate structure. This was discussed at the annual meeting. Sue Clough suggested that if residents want to discuss the method of billing, they can make an appointment to be put on the agenda for the Water Commissioners' monthly meetings. Alan Gepfert said, but the tax bills are routed through the Town. Jessie Levine said that the Town does the billing, only because the precinct does not have its own billing office.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Mark Kaplan moved to close the public hearing. Larry Ballin seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously approved.

As a quorum of Springfield Selectmen was not present, the New London Board of Selectmen agreed to postpone its own deliberations on this matter as well, until next Monday, or until further instructions are obtained on how to proceed.

3. Mark Kaplan moved to accept the Minutes of April 23 as drafted. Larry Ballin seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously approved. Sue Clough reported that she has had a conversation with Peg Birch regarding use of the side entry for the Flower Show in June, and the latter understands the safety issue that is involved there.

4. Update on Joint Meeting with Sunapee Sewer Commission—Sue Clough and Mark Kaplan reported that some question had been raised about whether or not the New London Selectmen should attend that meeting. Jessie Levine said as it was the Commissioners of the two towns who signed the contract, there

has been a question raised about the validity of that contract now that oversight of the sewer system in New London has been returned to the New London Selectmen and the New London Board of Sewer Commissioners has been dissolved. New London's Town Counsel has said that everything including the contract and agreements can continue as usual, but it is a good idea for Sunapee to check with its own attorney on this matter. Sue Clough said that there have been several proposals to redo the contract. Jessie Levine agreed that the contract should be updated, but not for this particular reason. This is a non-issue. Sue Clough said everyone agrees that the contract should be updated, but it has not yet been resolved exactly who will do it—a special subcommittee, the two Boards (New London Selectmen and Sunapee Sewer Commissioners), the lawyers, or a combination of those.

Jessie Levine reported that at the meeting, they heard Sunapee Superintendent Dave Bailey's report on current operation of the plant, recent events, and the on-going need for the inflow studies. She said that he confirmed that they want to go forward and work with New London on rebuilding the system. She said that Superintendent Bailey and New London Public Works Director Richard Lee and their respective staffs are working well together, so the actual management of the system is functioning. She said it is important for New London to be kept in the loop regarding improvements to the plant, as the Town will pay approximately 65% of the cost of those. On the other hand, they must recognize that it is Sunapee's plant, and Sunapee officials are the decision makers.

Sue Clough reported also that the Commissioners voted at that meeting to go forward with a phosphorus study.

Also, she reminded Jessie that meetings that include any discussion of the sewer system or the Sunapee plant should be sent to the Sunapee Board of Sewer Commissioners.

Jessie Levine reported receipt of the contract from Underwood Engineers for the inflow study. She said the State has reviewed and approved these terms. Specifically, the testers will conduct smoke testing within the entire system, and the testing will be divided into segments (one segment of the system will be tested at a time). Engineers will also do some door to door testing and some dye testing. The total cost will be $60,000 and is part of the mitigation with the Attorney General to reduce the fines relative to the Georges Mills spill. She confirmed that that will be paid by sewer uses. Mark Kaplan moved to authorize Sue Clough to sign the contract with Underwood Engineers on behalf of the New London Board of Selectmen. Larry Ballin seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously approved.

Jessie Levine reported that she is applying to the State for some reimbursement for the costs of upgrading the Georges Mills pump station. Mark Kaplan moved to authorize Jessie Levine to sign that grant application. Larry Ballin seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously approved.

5. Planning Board Update—Larry Ballin reported that the Planning Board has approved the final site plan for the New London Hospital improvements, after full review of issues such as how runoff will be addressed, and the requirement for silt fencing for snow confinement areas. Also at Tuesday's meeting, the Planning Board addressed a boundary line change for the Moores, a request from the Crozers for a green house on their property in the ARR zone (will require site plan review), and some parking issues relevant to the former Jesseman, now Dailey property on Little Sunapee Road.

He said the Master Plan work is now front and center for the Planning Board. Sue Clough asked him if they have set dates to begin. Not yet.

Jessie Levine reported that New London Hospital has asked if the sidewalks could be extended to in front of their building on County Road while that work is being done during the round-about project. She has told them that she will see if the grant will cover that. New London Hospital would pay the 20% for their share of the sidewalk. It would require removal of some centuries old pine trees there.

6. Hazardous Waste Day—Jessie Levine said they have received only one response to their call for bids. That is from Clean Ventures Inc. The estimate includes a set up fee plus running fees depending on the amount collected, but she said based on previous experience the cost should not exceed the $6000 the Town has budgeted for this purpose. They will receive $584 reimbursement from a State grant. Mark Kaplan moved to accept this bid. Larry Ballin seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously approved.

7. Special Person Retirement Party—Details were discussed.

8. Round About Update—Jessie Levine said she has received an email from Kimco indicating that they will grant the easement, so pending some further discussion with the Faccones, they are ready to put out the call for bids now.

9. Volunteer Appointment Process—Sue Clough said she feels that Selectmen should meet with both the incumbent members who are seeking reappointment as well as new persons interested in appointment. Mark Kaplan asked if the Board Chairmen should be present. Referring to discussion at the April 23 Selectmen's meeting, it was agreed that these meetings will be open to the public, but the decision has to be the Selectmen's. Chairs will be encouraged to attend.

Larry Ballin suggested some changes to the list of questions, and suggested that the list be given to applicants a few minutes prior to the meeting. Sue Clough referred to Karen Ebel's letter to the Selectmen. She asked if new volunteers should be asked different questions than those who are seeking reappointment. Larry Ballin recommended keeping the same matrix for everyone.

It was agreed that the Selectmen can appoint alternates to the Planning Board, and that alternates will function to serve on subcommittees, to serve in the position of regular member when that is necessary to make a quorum, will sit at the table with the regular Planning Board members and can participate in discussions (but will not vote except when they are filling in for a regular member to make the quorum).

Jessie Levine said that the open positions include two regulars and one alternate on the Conservation Commission (all incumbents are seeking reappointment), two regular and the possibility of two alternates on the Planning Board (the incumbent members are seeking reappointment for the two current seats), two regular and unlimited alternates for the Zoning Board, four positions on the Recreation Commission (Chad Denning has recruited two interested parties), two positions on the Firewards (incumbents are seeking reappointment), and Archives. She will schedule as many meetings as possible on Monday May 7, in morning, afternoon and evening sessions.

10. New London Inn—Jessie Levine reported that Clayton Platt has completed the survey for this property. The acquired piece is approximately one-half acre, and the new Town parcel will be 1.29 acres. She said that Bart Mayer has drafted the deed. Mark Kaplan asked for the exact square footage of what the Town is acquiring.

11. Per RSA 91-A:3 II, the Selectmen entered non-public session to discuss personnel matters.

12. Bond Bids: Selectmen reentered public session, at which time Jessie Levine reported receipt of seven bond bids. Selectmen noted that the lowest bid is guaranteed for only five years, and the Town's bonds will extend for ten years. After brief review and discussion, Larry Ballin moved to accept the lowest bid that would extend for the full life of the bonds—ten years.

The Selectmen then signed the following items:

Building Permits:

- Robert and Jill Carr, 29 Boulder Point (Map 115, Lot 002), permit to repair and replace existing stone and masonry retaining wall with similar construction materials – Approved (Permit 07-118)
- James and Lynn Gilbert, 82 Old Coach Road (Map 123, Lot 022), permit to add two dormers to the front of the house to enlarge bath and bedroom, other work to included kitchen remodel and two bath remodels with no structural changes – Approved (Permit 07-019)
- George and Phyllis Wolford, 100 Page Road (Map 117, Lot 026), permit to add 10' 7" x 10' 7" screened porch – Approved (Permit 07-020)
- Eric and Sue Schultz, 148 Old Main Street (Map 107, Lot 017), permit to add 11' 7" x 6' 3" shed – Approved (Permit 07-021)
- Jennifer and Jonathan Paul, 149 Sunset Shores Road (Map 091, Lots 007, 008, 014), erosion control permit for realignment of private roadway – Approved (Permit 07-022)
- Julius and Barbara Federici, 55 Queenswood Road (Map 118, Lot 003-003), permit to add 12' x 16' screen houses on two alternate sites – Approved (Permit 07-023)

Sign Permit Applications:

- Temporary Sign Permit Application for Kearsarge Community Presbyterian Church for two sandwich board signs indicating "Yard Sale May 26, 2007 from 8 AM – 2 PM" and "Yard Sale Here" which will be placed at the Information Booth and Kearsarge Community Presbyterian Church driveway – Approved
- Temporary Sign Permit Application for John W. Jones fundraiser for the American Cancer Society to be placed at the Information Booth for a 2 ½ x 1' sign indicating "Roast Beef Diner at the Baptist Church, North Sutton on May 12, 2007 from 5:00 – 7:30 PM - Approved
- Permanent Sign Permit Application for Distinctive Floral Designs, LLC, 255 Newport Road, for two 14' square foot signs attached directly to Colonial building indicating "Distinctive Floral Designs" one sign to be placed over large window on Route 11 and the second to be placed over windows on the parking lot side - Approved

Other Items for Signature:

- Disbursement & Payroll Vouchers for the week of April 30, 2007 – Approved
- Three copies of Inflow Evaluation Program Report Phase Engineering Contract by Underwood Engineers, Inc. - Approved
- Inter-municipal Agreement for Assessing Services between the Towns of Newbury, New London, and Sunapee - Approved
- Sewer Betterment - Job Seamans Acres Property Tax 1st Half Levy for State of New Hampshire – Approved

- Sewer Betterment - Edmunds Road Property Tax 1st Half Levy for State of New Hampshire – Approved

There being no further business, the Board of Selectmen adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah A. Denz
Recording Secretary