

Select Board

8/6/18

Draft Minutes

1. Call Meeting to Order

The board members present were Anne Surman, Kathy Corson, Molly Cowan, and Don Clement. Ms. Corson acted as the chair for this meeting, filling in for Ms. Gilman, who was absent due to a family matter. Town Manager Russ Dean was also present. The meeting was called to order at 6:30PM in the Nowak Room.

2. Board Interviews - Communications Committee, Facilities Committee

The board moved downstairs to interview applicants for the communications and facilities committees. Candidates were Greg Colling, Facilities Committee; Debbie Lansdowne Kane, Communications Committee, and Lindsey Sonnett, Communications Committee. After the interviews, the Board moved upstairs for the regular business meeting.

3. Motion to Rescind – Selectwoman Surman re: motion of 7/9/18 on televising of meetings

MOTION: Ms. Surman motioned to rescind the motion made by Ms. Cowan on 7/9/18, which was to film all meetings held by non-advisory committees, and which passed the Board by a 3-2 vote. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it failed 2-2-0, with Ms. Corson and Ms. Cowan voting nay.

Ms. Surman emphasized that wanting to rescind the motion had nothing to do with not wanting to be transparent. She agrees that meetings that are of interest to all taxpayers should be televised. However, she said that others are narrower, and have already established transparency through audit trails, receipts, budget approvals, and other methods. These boards and committees don't necessarily have to be on film for them to be transparent. She felt that the motion made by Ms. Cowan was too hurried, and that the arts committee was singled out to be filmed which also wasn't given a lot of discussion. She feels that the boards should choose if they want to be filmed. In addition, televising all meetings would have to be funded because of staffing. They were not given any budget estimates. She also said that people can get all the information on spending from the finance office if they want.

Ms. Cowan said that her original motion was brought forward as an important measure for transparency and openness. She thought she had tailored it in a specific way and didn't feel it was rushed because the issue had been discussed for months. Although she understood the budget concern, she said she was elected on a message of inclusivity and open government. There was an overwhelming amount of positive feedback and no negative feedback from residents on her original motion. She did not want to feel that if motions were passed, the "losing side" would make another motion to override it.

Mr. Clement had voted against the original motion, and repeated that transparency is very important. He does not think that televising a meeting automatically creates transparency, and also did not feel it was the right of the board to demand filming of different boards and committees. He agreed with Ms. Surman that the town already has transparent meetings – they are all public and recorded through minutes. He thinks people should be more concerned about what happens outside of the meetings. The issue of enforcement was also brought up – what would happen if a board or committee doesn't comply?

Public discussion on this item did not happen until after the motion was made, due to procedural rules. Ms. Cowan said that the public had been able to talk at other times during a motion and was appalled that they were not allowed to this time.

4. Bid Award: TTHM Remediation

Jennifer Perry, DPW Director, presented the recommended bid for the Chloramination Treatment System project. DPW is recommending PRB Construction in Gilford NH, who had bid \$642,000. Aquagenics Inc. conducted a review of their work and they had good recommendations. The project could be complete by March 2019. The department wants to start public education and outreach as soon as possible – the water treatment will affect people with fish tanks and those on dialysis.

Ms. Perry further clarified that the treatment would just involve a change from free chlorine in the water to chloramine, which is more toxic to fish and can contaminate dialysis processes. It is fairly common to reduce TTHMs by this method. Mr. Clement asked if new structures in the water treatment facilities would need to be built. Ms. Perry said that as the water leaves the plant, ammonia is added in order to form chloramines, so there will need to be some storage for ammonia.

Mr. Dean said the bids were not opened at the last meeting because the select board was in between meeting dates. They were opened by Ms. Gilman and himself in a public place, and bidders were present. Mr. Clement felt that the entire board should have been present. Mr. Dean cited there is precedence for what was done, it has been done several times.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to award the surface and groundwater chloramination system treatment upgrades to PRB Construction Inc. of Gilford NH, in the amount of \$642,000. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

5. Public Comment

Nancy Belanger said that the motion she came to speak on was voted on already and was appalled at the way this was done. She expressed her support of the motion that Ms. Cowan made on July 9th. It's a good start but is not an end-all solution. She eventually wants all meetings to be recorded. Although town meetings are public, not everyone can come to the specific times of the meetings. She thinks we should televise the meetings for those who can't attend. She also stated that the board should not ask "why would we do this?" but instead "Why wouldn't we do this?"

Paul Royal agreed with Ms. Belanger, although he did agree that the budget issues are worth talking about more. He thought that Ms. Cowan's motion was clearly not rushed, because it's an issue that has been heard for months. He also urged the board to handle disagreements more respectfully.

Darius Thompson brought up the holiday parade lock that was cut by the Memorial Day parade committee, and that he had not received a response from them or payment for the lock. During a recent meeting, a question was why the Christmas parade is not a formal committee. Mr. Thompson wanted to clarify that it is only funded in part by the town, so it's not a town committee. He thinks having a volunteer board being televised and scheduled might mean that nobody wants to volunteer. If this is implemented, maybe they should consider fully funding the parade as well as considering how it would be enforced.

He also asked for an update on the sidewalks on Drinkwater Road. Mr. Dean said that the sidewalk program is part of the Capital Improvement Program, which will go through the planning board process and then

move to the Select Board and the budget recommendation committee. Mr. Thompson asked if the bid opening should have been televised. Mr. Dean said that they don't have a problem with that, but also stated that in the majority of cases bids are opened with the entire board.

Scott Ruffner was confused that there might be budget and time issues for the IT department for the filming of meetings. The department has had more of a strong presence and are continually putting out a call for more content. They want more people involved and more information out there.

Chris Surette was very happy that they did not rescind it, because he thinks it would have looked bad for the town to change their minds suddenly. He also mentioned that the vote was very popular among people in town.

Mr. Thompson thanked Ms. Surman for bringing the issue forward to try to improve the idea and its implementation.

Debbie Kane pointed out that as part of the master plan, part of their charge was to improve communications. Televising meetings can be a good way to get messages out there as a form of communication.

Jeremiah Rubera said that the board needs to publicize their meetings more and believes that more people would want to come if they felt that they were able to have a say. Ms. Corson said that the meetings are televised, we have minutes, agendas are posted before the meeting. Would love more people to get involved and to get informed. Mr. Clement also explained that are enacting select board policies, which are internal, and that they are not laws.

Ms. Surman explained Robert's Rules of Order that the board has to follow as elected officials. She said she had reached out to Ms. Cowan after last meeting for a motion to reconsider but did not receive a response. She emphasized that she doesn't have a problem with televising meetings, but just didn't want to dictate and was unsure about what would be included.

Enna Grazier thanked the board for reaffirming the decision that was made about filming. She thinks electronic information is becoming more and more important, especially because you cannot tell body language and tone from the minutes.

Nick Gray asked for any feedback on the millennial task force he had proposed a few meetings ago. He believes it would bring solutions that would benefit a lot of people through affordable housing, job creation, and other issues. Mr. Clement thought that it would be added to a future agenda. Ms. Cowan encouraged Mr. Gray to send people who would be interested in this to the housing advisory board, the economic development commission, and other boards.

6. Proclamations/Recognitions

a. Proclamations/Recognitions

There were no proclamations or recognitions at this meeting.

7. Approval of Minutes

a. July 23rd, 2018

Ms. Corson asked that when Mr. Bisson stated that the turf was 100% organic, it be added that she questioned that statement and requested more information to be sure.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to approve the 7/23/18 minutes as amended. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

8. Appointments – EEDC, Conservation Commission

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to appoint Lindsey White as an alternate member the conservation commission, term to expire 4/30/19. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Clement to appoint Earl Murphy as a voting member to the economic development commission, term to expire 4/30/21. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

9. Discussion/Action Items

a. Public Hearing: Solid Waste Fees

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to open the public hearing on this issue. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Dean gave a brief overview of the solid waste fees as proposed by DPW. Solid waste costs have increased based on the new contract with Waste Management and other factors. DPW is recommending an increase in price of the blue trash bags for the town (which has not happened since 2009), increasing the price of appliance stickers, charging a fee or banning the dumping of brush at the transfer station from commercial businesses, and requiring a \$10 permit to the transfer station for all Exeter residents (Christmas tree/leaf bag pickup would remain free). Ms. Perry said that they recommended banning brush dumping by commercial entities at the transfer station, which would require all residents to get a sticker.

Kyle Taylor, who runs a commercial landscaping business, said he has dump permit stickers on both his personal and commercial truck. He primarily disposes of leaves and grass, which are used for compost. The brush at the transfer station is bulldozed up the hill. He pointed out that residents could dump just as much as some landscaping companies and suggested raising the cost of brush dumping for everybody instead of only commercial users.

Keith Whitehouse, who works at Yeti Landcare, said that the proposed fees could make a \$38,000 impact to his business. He asked how these fees would be enforced, because many businesses do not label their vehicles. He emphasized that he would not have been able to properly dispose of brush without the free available space to do so. He thought there was a better solution and suggested dividing the cost to the town by the number of commercial landscapers in Exeter.

Paul Royal said that he wants to make sure that Exeter does not become a dumping ground, but also believes this would be a shock for businesses. He suggested a different rate for businesses in Exeter and those not in Exeter. However, Mr. Clement said that only residents can bring materials to the transfer station. The issue is not where the people are coming from to dump, it is where the actual brush is coming from as many businesses cover more than just Exeter. Mr. Clement also read a town ordinance stating that brush needs to be disposed of by the Exeter residents of the property that the brush comes from.

Steve Taylor, the owner of a landscaping company too, stated that 1/3 of his business is in Exeter. He said that everybody dumping at the transfer station are asked where the brush is coming from. When he has brush from other towns, they use their transfer stations. There are other towns that don't charge for brush.

Darius Thompson asked if the town has considered using a chipper to break down the material to make the brush more compact. He would like DPW to also consider how to make the space more efficient and effective and thinks that raising fees across the board at once is too much.

Mr. Dean clarified that the town has to rent a bulldozer several times a year to push the brush away, which costs about \$7,000 a year. They are looking to offset that cost. Ms. Perry said that the costs have increased dramatically, and next year there will likely be a 10% increase. The area of the brush dump is fairly limited, so the bulldozing will only compress it so much. They've considered chipping, but they would need a much larger chipper which is more expensive, or to hire an outside contractor. That area is used for site work as well.

Mr. Clement said that a lot of that area is wetlands, and another part is the already capped landfill. There is not that much of that space left to use. They have a very extensive log of people coming in to dump brush, and the capacity is not enough. Ms. Perry said they are trying to encourage people to keep the brush on their site instead of removing it.

Steve Taylor said he felt like there was an assumption that the landfill use is being caused by landscaping. Residents also bring in a lot of brush. He asked how the town would make the call from what is coming in from other towns. Mr. Clement brought up the conflict between the ordinance and what is happening. Mr. Taylor asked the board how they are expecting landscaping companies to keep in business with the raised fees. Mr. Dean said that from the memo, it looks like other towns don't accept from commercial vendors.

Ms. Cowan would like to have a discussion about what a reasonable fee is. She does not want to have the entire fee schedule just on the backs of commercial entities. Ms. Corson requested more information about what other towns do for brush dumping.

Jeremiah Rubera said that the company he works for dumps at both Hampton and Epping. He asked what would happen if they were to take brush voluntarily and did not profit off the dumping – would they still be charged as a commercial business? He also said that generally landscapers already chip their brush, so that they can reduce their loads. He would be interested in seeing the amount of dumping from residents vs. commercial businesses.

Nick Gray said he doesn't see why there needs to be a distinction between residential and commercial dumping. It would make the most sense to have a flat fee for everybody. Landscapers are also not the only ones using it commercially, for example, landlords might use the transfer station to dump brush too. He suggested a per load fee that the owner of the property would pay. Also, the rates wouldn't have to be as high if they were applied to everybody, because more people would be paying.

Gerry Hamel thinks it would be a good idea to grind some of the material and possibly send the material someplace else. The town needs to become proactive about the space in the landfill. Enna Grazier thinks that the landscapers should have more time for public comment and that the fee should be more spread out.

Mr. Royal said that he was a bit concerned about taking a large amount of money and putting it into the General Fund. He thinks the fees should go to a fund dedicated towards improving the dumping space at the transfer station.

Mr. Thompson asked the board to look into longer term solutions, including the next 10 or 20 years, to consider what will happen after that space runs out.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to approve increasing the price of pay-as-you-throw bags from \$2.00 to \$2.50 for large, and \$1.00 to \$1.25 for small, effective 10/1/18. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to increase the price of freon appliance stickers from \$7.00 to \$10.00 effective 10/1/18. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to table items 3 & 4 of the July 20th, 2018 memo from Ms. Perry to Mr. Dean until the August 20th meeting. Ms. Cowan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

The board wanted to get a log of the users of the transfer station, more information about what other towns are doing, and more information about the budgetary aspect that the fees would bring.

b. Parks/Recreation Field Proposal and Use of Impact Fees

Greg Bisson found an alternative fertilizer that is 100% organic as requested by Ms. Corson. He has talked to the softball teams about the problems with the field, which doesn't drain well because the field has very uneven terrain. Also, the wrong infield mix can generate weeds. The organic weed killer lasts for about 3 weeks. They have also included various letters of support. The proposal is to use a state-of-the-art infield mix called Duraedge, which is 100% organic. Sportsturf Specialists are the only certified Duraedge installer in New England, which is why they are recommended.

Robert Ficara said that other towns around Exeter have better fields, lights, etc. The softball league is very strong and has put a lot of effort into the fields. He also emphasized the importance of adult recreation. To continue to support the programs, there needs to be more effort put into the fields from professionals.

Mr. Bisson said there are \$198,552 in impact fees. \$15,161 of those are expiring at the end of 2018. The recreation revolving fund had \$160,781 at the end of 2017. Currently there are \$296,216 in the revolving fund, not accounting for staffing costs. The Sportsturf specialists will give them a handbook for maintenance, and they can hire out contractors.

Ms. Surman asked why this isn't part of the budget process. Mr. Bisson said that they would like to do this before the next season because they could be held liable for any injuries due to the field's condition.

Mr. Clement clarified that one request is to do the softball fields for \$60,091 and the second is the greenspace improvements which would be \$16,921.60, EYSA will cover \$8,460 of the greenspace improvements. They are asking for \$4,230.40 this budget year 2018.

Ms. Corson asked about the 4-million-dollar project in the CIP request which is for the renovation of ballfields. Mr. Bisson said that that project is for the construction of new ballfields, not renovation for existing facilities. Ms. Corson asked about what they plan to use impact fees for. Mr. Bisson said that the parks do not meet the current demand. He wants to also create a better playscape so that walkability is improved, and to improve underutilized parks.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved that they authorize \$4,230.40 from the recreation revolving fund for field drainage improvements. Surman seconded motion. Unanimous.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to authorize the \$61,091 from the recreation impact fees be awarded to Sportsturf Specialties Inc. for the work at the parks and rec department. Ms. Cowan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to use up to \$2,000 from the recreation impact fees for irrigation adjustments. Ms. Surman seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Bisson introduced the new assistant rec. director, Melissa Roy, who joined the department on July 9th.

c. Liberty Utilities Proposed Easement and Option Agreement

Mr. Dean said that DPW and DED were approached by Liberty Utilities to negotiate an easement for a meter station, for which they are proposing to pay \$30,000 up front, and \$75,000 for the easement. The property they are proposing is one that DPW does not have a use for, and the assessed value was \$9,600. The size of the entire property is about 40 acres. Ms. Perry said that the parcel is to the left of the lagoons towards Route 101, abutting the edge of the right of way.

Michael Licata from Liberty Utilities explained that the meter station is a part of the Granite Bridge project, which is being proposed along Route 101. The meter station would be an interconnecting point measuring the amount and pressure of gas. There will be a 16" line along Route 101 which connects to infrastructure in Manchester. There would be a few small buildings to house the metering and telecommunications equipment, as well as a station to clean out the line. They would be paying the town \$30,000 up front and would pay \$75,000 if they chose to buy the easement. They would also be paying property taxes on the facility itself, about \$68,000 in property tax payments. Over the life of the facility (52 years), they would be paying 1.5 million dollars for residual value.

He said that the goal of the Granite Bridge project is to minimize impacts and maximize community benefits. They have received bipartisan support from government, businesses, chambers of commerce, and other entities. Shifting the meter station to this location would avoid an additional river crossing, and shorten the amount of pipeline. The approval process for Granite Bridge would be subject to site evaluation, and they have not made that filing. They are anticipating early next year for that approval. If Granite Bridge does not go forward, the \$30,000 paid to Exeter is not refundable.

Ms. Surman asked why the agreement says that the owner can't terminate the agreement. Mr. Licata explained that it grants Liberty Utilities some certainty, so that they know that the town is in and they wouldn't have to waste engineering and design on the project. They need to present a fully designed project to the site committee.

Mr. Clement asked how the meter station compares to the already existing meter stations on Newfields and Epping road. Mr. Licata said that operation is pretty much identical. The pressure of the existing line is a bit lower and he is also not sure what type of equipment there is. Usually meter stations are about 100x100 feet, this is 300x100 feet. There are both the joint facilities and the Granite State pipeline running through the area. The existing maximum pressure is 1,140psi, Granite Bridge will be a max of 950 psi, and they will test to 150% higher than that. This will be operating typically at 750psi to match the maximum pressure on the Concord Lateral which is what they tie into.

Mr. Clement asked for pictures and layouts of the meter station in Pelham, which would be similar. He also clarified that if they can't come to an agreement, they would construct in Stratham which would be in the DOT right-of-way. Mr. Clement said that he wants to negotiate a higher price for the easement and suggested \$100,000 instead of \$30,000.

Ms. Corson said that the space with the structures on it is $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre. She would like to see more about the parcel, and how they are going to access the space. She is hesitant to give up town-owned land, and also wants to know how the plan is going to look like in a schematic form.

Ms. Cowan wants to understand the environmental impact and asked what other towns are doing to reduce impact. She questioned if the proximity to the WWTF lagoons causes any issues in construction or other problems. Mr. Licata said that a meter station is an interconnection point between two pipes. Natural gas is primarily made up of methane. The facility will be secured and would be monitored 24/7 from the Londonderry station. They would be able to shut it down remotely if any issues were noted.

He also said that in discussions with DPW about parcel selection, they talked about limiting wetland and other impacts. The fenced in area would be about 100x100', so the impacts on the site would be minimal. Meter stations are a common infrastructure for gas businesses to serve customers. Ms. Surman clarified that if Granite Bridge is approved, it will be going through no matter what, but the meter station would be located on state land if Exeter were to not accept this agreement. Mr. Clement confirmed with Ms. Perry that the lagoons would be eventually discontinued because of the new WWTF.

Enna Grazier expressed her concerns about the project. She feels like there is a lack of public information on the project. She also said that there is no guarantee on the tax benefits to town. For example, Eversource pitched the same idea to Bow, and they had to pay back millions of dollars this year. She also stated that Liberty Utilities has been fined a lot of money in safety violations in recent years.

Mr. Thompson said that since the Select Board has the power to negotiate leases and other property, he suggested looking at a lease instead of increasing the cost. That way they would continue to own the land. Mr. Dean said that any lease more than 5 years has to go to town meeting.

Mr. Licata replied that they've had over 150 meetings with stakeholders and have had a public information session where people could ask questions of the scientists and engineers designing the project. They have also put information on their website and other channels for public information. Are doing everything to be as open and transparent as possible. They are required by statute to conduct public outreach as part of their site evaluation process. They have been very upfront about the analysis they did for the property taxes. The issue in Bow was a fully depreciated property, and it was a different set of circumstances due to issues if an environmental scrubber was taxable or not. They have also done outreach with the first responders in town and other communities. He emphasized that the town's decision on this is not going to be taken as an endorsement on the project or not.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to table the proposal until the next meeting. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

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

The energy committee is going to present these updates at a later meeting.

e. Conflict Of Interest/Ethics Ordinance

Ms. Corson suggested looking at this when Selectwoman Gilman is present, and the rest of the board agreed to hold off on this topic.

Ms. Surman talked about in Swasey trustee meeting, there was a unanimous vote to have the Select Board to take over their permitting process. Most of their permits are for the roadway, which the Select Board already has control over. Mr. Dean said they have had a conversation with the charitable trust division in the attorney general's office about the operating income in the Swasey trust account. The expectation is for those funds to be moved under the care of the Trustees of Trust Funds. He was also told that the Select Board can be named the agents of those funds, or the Swasey trustees can be. There is a distinction between fee-based income and interest-income from the trust itself.

MOTION: Ms. Surman moved to authorize the Select Board to approve all permits/applications for the Swasey Parkway, and all associated fees to go to the Swasey Trustees Fund. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

10. Regular Business

a. Tax, Water/Sewer Abatements & Exemptions

MOTION: Ms. Cowan to approve the abatement for map 64, lot 105, unit 101 for \$1,160.35 from 2011. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan to approve the abatement for map 64, lot 105, unit 101 for \$1,354.75 from 2012. Mr. Clement seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan to approve the abatement for map 64, lot 105, unit 101 for \$1,225.38 from 2013. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan to approve the abatement for map 64, lot 105, unit 101 for \$675.04 from 2014. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan to approve the abatement for map 64, lot 105, unit 101 for \$428.77 from 2015. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan to approve the abatement for map 64, lot 105, unit 101 for \$379.49 from 2016. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan to approve the abatement for map 64, lot 105, unit 101 for \$319.15 from 2017. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to table the abatement for Nancy Cyr on 21st Street. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

There was an abatement for Hartman Oil, where the owner found an underground leak in the bathroom. They are looking for an abatement of \$575.73. Mr. Clement reminded the board that the property owner is responsible for their own property, but they also have a once in 10-year abatement. Ms. Cowan asked why the language in the document does not match that it's a business.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to deny the abatement for Hartman Oil. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it failed 2-2-0, with Ms. Corson and Ms. Cowan voting nay.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to table the abatement for next meeting. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to approve the abatement in amount of \$149.67 at 187B Front Street. Mr. Clement seconded. The motion failed 2-2-0, with Mr. Clement and Ms. Surman voting nay.

The board decided to table the above property abatement as well.

b. Permits & Approvals

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to approve the use of the town hall by the Exeter Area Chamber of Commerce on 9/17/18 for their travel meeting. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Cowan moved to approve the fee waiver for the above application. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

c. Town Manager's Report

Mr. Dean was able to attend a health trust retreat, which was very informative. They will be budgeting about 5% on reserve, based on the January pool trends. He thanked the highway department and DPW for cleaning up the train station recently and coordinating with Lincoln Street School for parking. The town clerk has completed the vault project, which looks very clean and efficient.

James Murray, Exeter's health officer, said that he has received complaints about rats in Exeter. He is going to come to another meeting in future for recommendations, but also suggested that residents should not leave their trash out overnight. The tax deed listing is completed, and they will be scheduling a board review. The Comcast contract is still on one-year track, so they need to start thinking about that.

There are seven committee meetings this upcoming week. They will be hosting representatives from Durham regarding the Mill Pond Dam soon about dam removal. Judy Churchill is moving away from Exeter, and so she is resigning from the Robinson Fund as the chair. They will likely appoint a new chair themselves. Finally, he let the board know that Dave Sharples received \$20,000 from the MTAG grant. PLAN NH did suggest reducing the scope of the project.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to accept the \$20,000 MTAG grant award, and to authorize Mr. Dean to make agreements on the town's behalf. Ms. Surman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

d. Select Board Committee Reports

Mr. Clement attended a conservation commission meeting. They talked about wetland and shoreland CUPs for the Rose Farm development and voted to recommend denial of both to the planning board. They also reviewed wetlands application for the Continental Drive project, which was recommended for approval by DES with some conditions.

Ms. Surman had a Swasey parkway trustees meeting. They talked about some trees that need pruning and was also asked to bring back the issue on the fallen tree limb in the river. Ms. Corson has a planning board meeting Thursday for a lot line adjustment and CIP discussion.

e. Correspondence

The board received an annual notification of the highway block grant aid from the state, which they get every year. This year there is about a \$5,000 increase, and it is delineated based on when it will be paid out. There was also a Comcast letter about sports programming, and a letter from the Exeter Farms HOA about a change in board of directors.

Mr. Clement asked about the Code Red system in Exeter because of the recent tornado and flooding warnings. Mr. Dean said he would find out if it was working properly.

11. Review Board Calendar

The next meeting is August 20th (a work session), and the next regular meeting is on the 27th.

12. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted by recording secretary Samantha Cave.