

Select Board

July 23rd, 2018

Draft Minutes

1. Call Meeting to Order

Anne Surman, Kathy Corson, Julie Gilman, Molly Cowan, Don Clement, and Russ Dean were all present at the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 6:40PM by Ms. Gilman.

2. Board Interviews – EEDC, Conservation Commission

The board moved downstairs to interview applicants for the EEDC and the Conservation Commission. The applicants were Earl Murphy for the EEDC and Kristen White for the Conservation Commission. After the interviews, the board reconvened at 7:05PM in the Nowak Room.

3. Public Comment

The public did not have any comments at this meeting.

4. Proclamations/Recognitions

a. Proclamations/Recognitions

There were no proclamations or recognitions at this meeting.

5. Approval of Minutes

a. July 9th, 2018

On page 7, Mr. Clement wanted to remove the sentence about him and Mr. Campbell working together on a business survey. Ms. Corson also stated that she did not attend that planning board meeting. Ms. Surman clarified that on page 6, her statement was that she did not want the taxes going onto the other ratepayers.

MOTION: Ms. Corson moved to approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

6. Appointments

There were no appointments at this meeting.

7. Discussion/Action Items

a. Energy Committee re: Updates and Electric Charging Station Project

Renee Hitzrot introduced the energy committee, which she is a member of. The committee was charged with improving energy efficiency in the town, and to educate citizens. The committee is looking into LED streetlight conversion, hosting an insulation workshop, a public test drive event for electric vehicles, and also would like to obtain electric vehicle chargers for public use. They have contacted 3 vendors and done a site walk with Unitil. There are over 200 hybrids in town, and 10 fully electric vehicles. She emphasized the benefits of electric vehicles as being energy-efficient, and that demand will

increase over the next few years as more models are released. Electric vehicle chargers downtown would help Exeter to become more attractive to out-of-town visitors, too. The committee is asking for approval to install a dual-head charger.

Lew Hitzrot spoke about the cost of different electric chargers, and what the estimated maximum energy cost monthly would be for the town (about \$126). The committee is recommending that the town cover costs for two years. Charging the public would be more expensive, because it would require “smart chargers” which can connect to a network. The committee talked with the town of Amesbury, and their annual cost for one charger is about \$500. The prices for the charger options as outlined ranged from \$2,000-\$7,900. The town of Derry is also going through this analysis, and they have decided on free public charging.

Ms. Gilman mentioned how much work has gone into this proposal. She thinks Exeter should consider this sooner and not later since new electric vehicles are being rolled out quickly. Ms. Surman asked if the chargers are universal. Mr. Hitzrot answered that Tesla chargers are separate, but adapters are available. All other car models would be able to charge, and these chargers are faster than most at people’s homes. There are also some maintenance and contract costs.

Ms. Corson said that she didn’t want others to pay for people’s electric charging, and also suggested that the idea should go through the budget committee. She also doesn’t think there should be a decision about it until the parking study is done. Ms. Cowan asked if they had talked to the Exeter Inn, because they have some electric charging, and what their usage is. Ms. Hitzrot said that theirs is a Tesla charger. Ms. Corson also suggested a partnership between the town and private businesses to install a charger on a private parking space.

Mr. Clement was excited about the report by the committee, especially the LED streetlight conversion which might save the town a lot of money as well as being greener. He asked how people charge their cars usually. Ms. Hitzrot differentiated between level 1 and 2 chargers. Level 2 gives a 20 mile charge in one hour, whereas level 1 is only a 5 mile charge in one hour. Most people have level 1 chargers at home. She also talked about “range anxiety”, where people with fully electric vehicles need to find charging at the end of their mileage range. Right now, Exeter has no public chargers so they are invisible to electric users at the end of the range. Mr. Clement worried about asking taxpayers to subsidize public charging. Ms. Hitzrot talked about the incentive towards clean energy. Also, people would not be able to charge for more than 2 hours.

Mr. Clement asked where the money would be coming from for the chargers. The committee suggested the capital reserve fund, Mr. Clement said that the 2010 policy was that the fund was meant to fund projects to improve energy use and efficiency, and for carbon reduction for municipal infrastructure. He does not believe this project meets that qualification of “municipal infrastructure”. In his opinion, they would need to find another way to fund this. Mr. Dean said that if the town owned the charger he believes it would be municipal infrastructure.

The board decided they did not feel comfortable making a decision today, and they would come back to it. Ms. Gilman said that the municipality might want to lead this so that citizens follow. Ms. Corson asked about snow removal around the chargers – the chargers can be either street or wall-chargers depending on the model chosen.

Paul Royal thanked the committee for the idea and the research. He wondered if the price of the installation for chargers would decrease as the technology becomes more popular. He also said it might make more sense to install 3 chargers instead of just 1, in case that spot is taken.

b. Nitrogen Control Plan Presentation: Wright-Pierce, Horsley Witten

Jennifer Perry said that they are headed for a December 30th deadline to have the plan submitted to the EPA. This effort is leading the work to reduce nitrogen, and has so far focused on counts of nitrogen instead. These will be these best possibilities for reducing nitrogen in the town.

Edward Leonard, from Wright Pierce, talked about the 2013 administrative order which had a number of requirements from the town. The town needed to track all total nitrogen, coordinate with NHDES for total nitrogen tracking and allocation, and develop a nitrogen control plan (this step), and then implement and evaluate the plan. The plan will document baseline loading and loading goals, document what the town has already done, and develop a 5 year implementation plan leading up to evaluation in 2023.

Mr. Leonard talked about some of the effects of too much or too little nitrogen. Nitrogen is an essential nutrient for both plants and animals. Is a limiting nutrient in water environments, meaning too much nitrogen causes a loss of habitat due to algae blooms, water clarity/light penetration, and dissolved oxygen. He outlined the different methods by which nitrogen can enter the system, such as wastewater, stormwater, fertilizer, etc. The total load to the Great Bay watershed is 1,285 tons per year. 30% is wastewater, 30% stormwater, and 40% are non-point sources. The Exeter/Squamscott Rivers provide a load of 167 tons per year, or about 13% of the total load to Great Bay. Of that, about 35% of the load is from Exeter. Exeter is also in other watersheds such as the Lamprey River. Exeter's specific load to the Great Bay is about 62 tons, of which about 67% is from wastewater. This means that Exeter contributes about 5% of the total nitrogen load to Great Bay (3.5% of total load to Great Bay is from Exeter's wastewater treatment plant).

Mr. Leonard clarified the terminology used. They have been using the phrases "reduced load" and "baseline load". The baseline load for Exeter is 62 tons. The "load to be removed" is the difference between those two, which is not yet agreed upon. They will present a plan between 3% and 50% removal depending upon NHDES estimated goals. The specific point source measure is to upgrade the wastewater treatment facility to enhance its treatment of nitrogen. They want to reduce the nitrogen load from the WWTF from 5-mg/L to the permitted threshold of 3-g/L.

Renee Bourdeau of Horsley Witten discussed non-point source strategies. They looked at a variety of 9 strategies including atmospheric deposition, fertilizer management, enhanced street cleaning, stormwater management, etc. There was also a detailed estimate with the town to calculate the cost to town, staff time, etc. The cost-effectiveness of different strategies was ranked based on 20/year cost per pound of nitrogen removed. The least expensive are the WWTF upgrades. The most expensive would be street/pavement cleaning.

She also discussed the alternatives for non-point solutions, assuming the WWTF is upgraded to 5-mg/L effluent TN (which is underway). Mr. Clement asked how much nitrogen will be reduced when the WWTF is in operation. Ms. Bourdeau said that it will be reduced by about 25 tons. The alternatives are to remove the equivalent NPS load as upgrading WWTF to 3-mg/L; meet requirements of MS4; meet

MS4 plus additional \$100,000; and plan 3 plus select denitrification systems and stormwater BMPs. The most cost-effective is to upgrade WWTF from 5-mg/L to 3-mg/L. She also talked about the usefulness of the WWTF upgrade and the residential fertilizer ordinance. Ms. Corson feels that the residential fertilizer ordinance is not as effective as other measures. Mr. Clement said the suggestion is covering the entire area with the ordinance. Ms. Bourdeau went over the next steps and schedule for developing the nitrogen control plan. A draft will be submitted by September 7th to the Select Board. They are planning to submit the plan to EPA on September 28th.

Mr. Clement clarified that upgrading the WWTF would cost 11.6 million over its 20-year lifecycle. It would be the most cost-effective solution. Mr. Dean also clarified that the figures in table 20 are annual costs. Mr. Dean asked if the plan would separate the MS4 district and the non-MS4 district. Ms. Bourdeau said it would depend on what plan the town would decide to move forward with, because some of the alternatives only involve the MS4 district. They have not done an analysis between the MS4 district and non MS4 district. Mr. Clement also mentioned that most septic system regulations are by the state. Mr. Leonard emphasized that Exeter is already doing a lot of good work, and that the town should be strategic about the plan and what will be evaluated.

c. Downtown Parking Spot Accessibility Update

Jennifer Perry included a map of accessible parking spaces in the town, as well as a memo about the issue overall. There are 17 spaces in downtown, 9 are on-street and 8 are in parking lots. One of every 8 spaces needs to be van accessible, with a wider access aisle. The spot in question right now is a car-accessible space in front of Capital Thai. The concern is the location of the aisle in relation to the sidewalk. The user right now needs to come in front of the curbed bump-out to access the ADA ramp, which is a safety issue. She presented 3 options for the board: relocate the spot to 85 Water Street (in front of Trends Gift Store, and make van-accessible from passenger side); keep the existing space and stripe a path of travel to the existing ramp; or keep the existing space and install a curb-cut/ramp in the bump-out adjacent to the access aisle.

Ms. Gilman asked if a driver could park in a handicap space when they are driving a handicapped passenger, with a placard. Ms. Perry said she believed they could. Mr. Clement asked for clarification about the relocation of option 1. Ms. Perry said that there is another space near Billingsgate that offers a driver-accessible spot, and this option would offer a passenger accessible space. There is already a ramp to the sidewalk. Also, this would be easier to maintain in the winter for ADA access. Mr. Clement also asked for an estimate of cost on option 3. Ms. Cowan thinks that option 1 makes the most sense, but asked if they could make it accessible from both sides. She was also concerned about the grade of the slope. Ms. Perry said that her understanding is that the slopes are within ADA requirements. Ms. Cowan also wanted to reach out to the residents who were here last meeting to discuss the issue. Ms. Corson asked if they have maps available for residents to view where handicap parking is.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to complete option 1, and to get a cost estimate for option 3. Ms. Cowan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

d. Proposed Solid Waste Fee Updates

Mr. Dean began the discussion that public works is reviewing fee increases. They are looking for the board's input, and then would schedule a public hearing. Also, an intern recently did an overview of

the waste program and they have seen a significant increase in solid waste costs. They also haven't had a fee increase since 2009.

Ms. Perry said the department are recommending increasing fees for pay-as-you-throw bags from \$2.00 to \$2.50 for large, and from \$1.00 to \$1.25 for small. The prices recommended would be on the high side, similar to costs in Concord. They also want to increase price of freon-appliance stickers from \$7.00 to \$10.00, which would be in alignment with nearby communities. 3rd suggestion is to require all transfer station users in town to get a \$10 annual permit. 4th is to no longer allow commercial businesses to dump brush at the transfer station, which other towns also do. Exeter is getting an excessive amount of brush from commercial businesses. They could also establish a fee schedule for commercial and residential users like Stratham does. The bag price increase would bring the most revenue, about a \$121,000 increase.

Ms. Gilman asked where the brush would go if not accepted by the transfer station. Ms. Perry said that are places in Epping and Raymond that accept material from other communities for a fee. Mr. Clement asked if there would be an increase in the 2019 budget for solid waste. Ms. Perry confirmed that there would. Mr. Clement said that he was worried that requiring all users to get a \$10 permit for leaf bags and Christmas trees too would lead to potential dumping. He thought that charging commercial users for brush dumps was a good idea, but was unsure about charging residential users. Ms. Surman agreed with Mr. Clement.

Mr. Perkins asked how they would differentiate between residential and commercial users who dump brush. Also, the sticker would only limit Christmas trees and leaf bags because everything else requires a permit. Christmas trees have a curbside program already for free. The leaves are composted and available for residents to use as compost. Only charging commercial users would be difficult to regulate. Ms. Corson asked why there isn't an increase for fees on bulk stickers. Ms. Perry said that they were thinking about increasing the cost of electronic stickers, but it was recommended to hold off for now. Also, bulk stickers are accepted curbside, and the costs for that are being covered by current revenue.

e. 2018 Paving Recommendations

Ms. Perry discussed the 2018 paving recommendations, with price increases of about \$2.00/ton. The price of pavement after August 15th would be subject to the NHDOT asphalt adjustment clause. She also included a list of streets that are scheduled to be paved, with High Street as a high priority. The budget is \$800,000. They are intending to use \$25,000 of budget for crack sealing to preserve pavement, which was last done around 2014. Mr. Clement asked what would happen to Epping Road. Mr. Vlasich said that with preliminary costs for the road and signal, they will do most of the base paving this year and come up with an overlay next year without using the public work's paving budget. There is concrete road under some of Epping Road, so those slabs will be removed, and more extensive paving would need to be done. All of the repaving work for Epping Road and those projects are coming out of the TIF fund.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to accept the pricing as proposed in the May 30th, 2018 memo to Mr. Dean from John Bell. Ms. Corson seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

f. Proposed Lease Agreement for Municipal Lot re: 23 Water Street construction

Ms. Gilman said that it was recommended by Primex for this to be a licensing vs. a lease. Mr. Clement said he thinks the board should be able to see the written opinion from any counsel. Mr. Dean said that the markup in the packet was done by Primex. Mr. Clement said he wanted to know why this would be a license vs. a lease. Mr. Dean said that licensing offers more flexibility of the town. Also, there the location would be changed to the green space behind the fence on Bow Street, instead of parking spaces. There is a revised agreement to go along with that.

Mr. Winham said that only 2 or 3 parking spaces would be used with the revised edition, instead of 8 spaces. Ms. Corson suggested adding “not to exceed 3 spaces” to the license agreement. Mr. Clement said he is still hesitant to give away public parking spaces, but thinks this is a good compromise.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to approve the revocable license agreement between the town of Exeter and Pairpoint Group LLC with the amended language above, and to authorize Julie Gilman to sign the agreement. Ms. Corson seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

g. Liberty Utilities Proposed Easement and Option Agreement

This agenda item was postponed until the next meeting.

h. Request for Use of Recreation Revolving Funds/Impact Fees

Mr. Bisson explained that this request came from an examination about pre-existing facilities. He is proposing using impact fees to renovate the two softball fields in town. They are not constructed properly, and they have seen a huge demand in use of those fields. The fields are in very poor condition, and they do not drain well. He got a quote from Sport Turf Specialties. EYSA asked them to do a field analysis of the turf which was constructed in 2004. There has been little maintenance, the fields are consistently wet because they are compacted from heavy use. There is a short window for reconstruction, because the fields are used from April to November and they need to make sure the sod will reestablish. There is only a two-week window from August 20th-30th, with no one using the fields.

Currently, the department has about \$194,000 in impact fees, with about \$116,000 in the pipeline. There is a balance of (as of Jan. 2018) \$104,000 in the revolving fund, which has increased since then from summer fees. The costs savings would be \$5,000 annually because the new turf would never need tillage. In 11 years it would pay for itself. The turf is Duraedge, which is made to bind together and shed water off of it and is made locally for NE weather. EYSA would cover half of the cost of the field analysis.

Ms. Surman asked why this isn't a budget issue because of the cost involved. Normally this would be put out through bid. She is not concerned about the cost, but is concerned about the process. Mr. Bisson said that he would recommend going with this vendor because they are the experts on creating a proper sports field. He didn't want to take a chance with this cost that it would not be constructed well. They specifically do sports fields, and the Duraedge technology has a lot of benefits.

Ms. Corson asked if all the materials for the new turf would be organic. Mr. Bisson said that this would be 100% organic. Mr. Dean pointed out that impact fees have to spent within 6 years of being received. There have also been many improvements in turf management in recent years. Mr. Bisson said that it is a proper mix of clay, sand, and loam. Mr. Clement said he would like a document to review to

make sure the town is protected. Ms. Surman asked for more information on what other projects the suggested company has done prior.

i. DHR Grant Acceptance: Park Street Area Survey

This is a grant of \$20,000 from DHR for the Exeter heritage commission to do a Park Street area survey. They need a formal grant acceptance agreement and a certificate for municipalities. It was recommended that Dave Sharples be the acting person for this grant because he has prior experience.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved that they accept the agreement between DHR and the town of Exeter for the Park Street area survey in the amount of \$20,000, and to designate Dave Sharples to sign as grantee. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

8. Regular Business

a. Tax, Water/Sewer Abatements & Exemptions

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to approve the 2018 excavation tax of \$104.48 for map 83, lot 1. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to approve the 2017 excavation tax of \$668.20 for map 83, lot 1. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to approve the abatement of \$3162.22 for map 94, lot 21. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Edward Anderson, 4 Hayes Park, said that his son discovered that his toilet was running after he received an unusually high bill. Mr. Anderson is elderly and has difficulty hearing, so he did not hear the toilet running. Mr. Dean explained to the board how the abatement was calculated. Mr. Clement reminded them that the individual is responsible for bill if the issue is on their property, according to current ordinances.

MOTION: Ms. Surman moved to grant Edward Anderson the once in 10-year abatement for \$162.92. Ms. Cowan seconded the motion, and it passed 4-1-0, with Mr. Clement voting nay.

Peter Helfer, 2 Grandview Terrace, went abroad from February to July because of a family accident/illness. When he returned, they did not find any leaks on the property even though they had received a bill for about \$1,600. The bill shows that from April 8th-14th, a continuous leak occurred and then re-occurred between May 14th-19th. The indoor plants were watered with a maximum of a couple gallons. His son checked the house as well as neighbors, and found nothing wrong. He thinks that perhaps the meter malfunctioned.

Mr. Clement read the policy on meter malfunctions, which is that the town will test the meter at the resident's request. Mr. Helfer said that DPW came to measure the meter, had trouble getting information from it, and another person came back and got the information. Ms. Cowan said testing the meter is a good idea to make sure it doesn't happen again. Mr. Dean clarified that if the meter is tested and found to be accurate, the customer is responsible for the entire bill as well as the cost of the meter testing. Board recommending that Mr. Helfer gets his meter tested, which he will do with the water department.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to postpone the other abatements. Ms. Corson seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

b. Permits & Approvals

MOTION: Ms. Corson moved to approve the use of the town hall by Cathy Lewis of McInnis Auctioneers for an auction from 8/19/18-8/27/18. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Corson moved to approve the use of the town hall by Betsy Kelly of Heronfield Academy for the 6th grade arts night from 2/27/19-2/28/19. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Corson moved to approve the use of the town hall by Betsy Kelly of Heronfield Academy for the 6th grade arts night (snow date) on 3/6/19. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Corson moved to approve the use of the town hall by the NH Children's Trust for a concert from 4/12/19-4/13/19. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Corson moved to approve the disposal of broken monitors and old PCs by the IT department. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

c. Town Manager's Report

Mr. Dean had a PSA about recyclables in bins, and suggested that residents try to loosen up anything left in bin because a machine is used to dump them into the truck. He will also be following up for a request about the sign at Henderson Swasey forest that needs a replacement. There is a budget committee meeting Wednesday night as well.

Mr. Clement felt that the board should have been made aware of the budget committee meeting. They are the ones to present to voters the information. On the budget committee agenda is select board comments and goals presented by Ms. Gilman. Mr. Dean will also be giving a report on major budget components and issues. Mr. Clement said that last year they decided that board members can attend meetings but not speak. He wants the board to be kept up to date on municipal actions and issues. Ms. Gilman suggested having reports from department head meetings with the budget subcommittees.

d. Select Board Committee Reports

The board decided to hold off on committee reports until the next meeting.

e. Correspondence

Correspondence consisted of thank you letters from CASA, Rockingham County Meals on Wheels, and Seacoast Family Promise for the town's contribution to their causes.

9. Review Board Calendar

The next regular meeting will be August 6th, 2018. There will be a work session on August 20th.

10. Non-Public Session

There was no non-public session at this meeting.

11. Adjournment

MOTION: Ms. Corson moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:00PM. Ms. Cowan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted by recording secretary Samantha Cave.