



**Warner Board of Selectmen
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 1, 2017
APPROVED**

Selectman Carson opened the meeting at 6:09 pm.

In attendance: Selectman Clyde Carson - Chairman, Selectman Allan N. Brown, Selectman John Dabuliewicz, Jim Bingham – Town Administrator

1. Public Hearing – Highway Equipment

A. Chairman Carson opened the Public Hearing for public input per town vote of 2012 Town Meeting directing the Selectmen to hold a noticed Public Hearing prior to consideration using the capital reserve fund for highway equipment. Chairman Carson turned the hearing over to the Director of Public Works, Tim Allen, to present his recommendation for the purchase of a loader back-hoe to replace the excavator and replacement of the 2010 F-350 plow truck.

B. Tim explained to the audience the current equipment has issues, he doesn't feel it would be best to keep putting money into them. The equipment is not dependable and no one can tell Tim what's wrong with the excavator. There is an intermittent travel issue with the excavator, the hydraulics fade away. Tim is recommending trading it in for a loader back-hoe. The loader back-hoe won't replace the excavator, but will service us better maintenance wise year round. Tim said he has tried 5 machines and has narrowed it down to two, the Caterpillar 430 and a JCB 4-wheel drive loader back-hoe. The reason he is recommending the Caterpillar is the feature's that he likes over the JCB. The JCB is a little less money, \$2K less, the warranties are the same. The difference is the trade in value, Caterpillar will give \$17K for the excavator, JCB \$25K. But, looking 10 years down the road the Caterpillar holds more value than the JCB. The price for the Caterpillar is \$143,500 minus the trade would cost \$126,500, the JCB is \$140,200.

Selectman Dabuliewicz asked Tim what his basis is for saying the Caterpillar will serve us longer. Tim said he thinks some of the feature's, the whole back-hoe structure is built different from JCB. From past experience the Caterpillar is a more comfortable machine to operate, it's smoother than the JCB. Structurally the Cat is more rugged.

Selectman Brown said he has worked with both Caterpillar and JCB. The JCB loading ability, he said there is nothing more frustrating than losing most of your load in the bucket because it can't curl enough when loading material into the trucks. Allan also said the boom structure on the JCB, if the outside tube is dented it can't go up and down.

Chairman Carson asked about availability. Tim said the Caterpillar can be here in 3 weeks. Clyde also asked do we have people that are already certified and trained enough to start using it? Tim said it basically operates the same as an excavator.

C. Chairman Carson opened the hearing up to public comments.

John Leavitt: Do you expect to use up the 7,000 hours before 7 years.

Tim: No, I think John we will probably put 700 to 800 hours on it a year.

John Leavitt: Are they both 4-wheel drive?

Tim: Yes, everything we drive is 4-wheel drive. The Case back-hoe was less money, but, I had no luck communicating with them. I tried to go to Town Line but they wouldn't sell us one because we are out of their territory.

John Leavitt: So (not audible) for the Cat really isn't an issue because 7 years for both either way, and you won't give up the hours.

Allan: Generally municipal equipment, most of the industry standards are 1,000 hours per year on a piece of equipment. But, that's not the kind of equipment you would use everyday, in the winter time it would be used to load salt/sand.

Tim: The loader back-hoe is going to help us tremendously in the winter time. The maintenance issues, it's going to make a world of difference.

Marianne Howlett: You said you were trading the excavator for this, but this wasn't truly replacing the excavator and then I heard you say later that you would probably rent an excavator in the future, is that the plan?

Tim: If we had a road job, ya.

Marianne Howlett: The plan to be to actually buy another excavator at some point?

Tim: I don't see any in the future, unless things change dramatically, I never would say never. I don't have any intention at this point in time, to buy this, and then come back a year later and ask for an excavator.

Marianne: That's a good answer.

Tim: It wouldn't be feasible for the town to own a machine big enough to do what we would do for work if we had that machine. This is going to service us year round for everything.

Marianne Howlett: My second question is what's the balance in the capital reserve fund for the Highway Equipment.

Jim: \$192K.

John Leavitt: The added work you could do with a loader, that you can't do with the excavator, do you anticipate that in the off-set the cost of renting an excavator on occasion? I won't hold you to it.

Tim: I think in some cases, John, maybe, but I don't foresee....basically the reason we would rent an excavator is if we decided to do a road job. Depending on the size of road, if it is a small piece you can do with this, if there was 2,000 feet of Burnt Hill, we would rent an excavator anyway.

John Leavitt: So it's not something you do every year.

Tim: Since I've been here, there's only been one year we did not rent an excavator.

D. Chairman Carson closed the public portion of the hearing. Jim reminded Clyde there is another piece of equipment Tim wants to purchase. The hearing continued on.

E. Tim explained the 2010 pick-up he drives has the check engine light on and needs a new turbo charger. The transmission is also acting up, this is the third tranny. To repair these two problems, it will cost between \$8 - \$9K. The trade in price is \$7K, and to Tim it doesn't make sense to dump more money into this vehicle. Tim was told if he did fix the turbo, they could give us the cost back towards the new vehicle. The cost for a new vehicle with a snow plow is \$47K. Tim recommends trading up to the new vehicle.

F. Chairman Carson called for public comments.

John Leavitt: Given the 350, which you have right now, which has been notorious for transmission problems.

Tim: Yes

John Leavitt: I don't know if they corrected that, I read somewhere they were going to the allison (?), have they done it?

Tim: Not that I know.

Allan: They were talking about it.

John Leavitt: If the Ford has transmission problems, why wouldn't you think of going over to GMC.

Tim: That crossed my mind. If it was my decision at the time, I would not have rebuilt the one that was in it. Another would have been put in instead. Roger the service guy said he's never seen anything so ruptured in his life.

John Leavitt: It's funny it's the heavy duty Ford transmissions that had been a problem. So...

Tim: The only issue with this transmission now is the shift between fourth and fifth, it's gotten a little longer all winter.

John Leavitt: I'm not questioning your decision, just curious.

Barbara Annis: Where are these items on the replacement schedule.

Tim: The loader back-hoe is scheduled for this year and the pick-up is for next year.

Jim: We moved the pick-up one or two years to accommodate the anticipated grader and back-hoe.

Clyde: Your doing the F-350 for the future or for tonight.

Tim: If I could get approval to make it happen, all the better.

Clyde: We have funds in the capital reserve to do both items?

Jim: We do.

G. Chairman Carson closed the public portion of the hearing. He called to the Selectman for any motions they want to make.

Board Action

Selectman Dabuliewicz moved to approve buying the loader back-hoe as presented. Caterpillar at \$143,500, with a \$17,000 trade for a net cost of \$126,500. Selectman Brown seconded the motion, motion passed 3-0.

Selectman Brown moved to approve buying a 2017 F-350 with a snow plow for \$47,000. Selectman Dabuliewicz seconded the motion, motion passed 3-0.

2. Road Posting

Selectman Brown moved to allow the Director of Public Works to post Class 5 road for weight limits and close Class VI roads to heavy trucking. Selectman Dabuliewicz seconded the motion, motion passed 3-0.

3. Minutes

Selectman Brown moved to approve the January 31, January 31 nonpublic, February 7, February 14 and February 14 nonpublic. Selectman Dabuliewicz seconded the motion, motion passed 3-0.

4. Manifest

Selectman Dabuliewicz moved to authorize the Selectmen to sign manifests and order the Treasurer to sign Payroll check numbers 4612-4632 in the amount of \$36,401.76 (including 23 direct deposits) and Accounts Payable check numbers 53408-53465 in the amount of \$413,570.15 (includes a check to KRSD in the amount of \$325,000). Selectman Brown seconded the motion, motion passed 3-0.

5. Consent Agenda

Selectman Brown moved to approve the Consent Agenda for March 1, 2017:

1. Sign Permit for Map 32 Lot 27
2. Abatement for Map 16 Lot 81 (motion needed)
3. Solar Exemption for Map 14 Lot 49
4. Elderly Exemption for Map 25 Lot 25
5. Building Permit for Map 31 Lot 20
6. Support letter to Fiver Rivers Conservation Trust

Selectman Dabuliewicz seconded the motion, motion passed 3-0.

6. Abatement

Selectman Brown moved to abate taxes on Map 16 Lot 81 per Assessor's advisement. Selectman Dabuliewicz seconded the motion, motion passed 3-0.

7. Town Administrator's Report

Old Graded School: All the work on the weatherization grant project for the OGS has been completed and the grant is closing. The Building received insulation in the attic to R50 level, all the windows and doors were air sealed with foam insulation. The new double boilers were reconfigured to run alternately to achieve higher efficiency and the heating zones were modulated for better heat distribution. The town received about \$20K worth of work and the net cost to the town was \$859.29. Marinanne Howlett asked the grant was \$20K? Jim said the grant was originally for \$20K, we spent \$4,100 of the grant money and we spent about \$5,000 of our own but we received \$4,575 as a rebate from Eversource for doing the weatherization, the net cost to the town was \$859.29.

Barbara Annis said she asked the auditor's about this, and asked if they audited the weatherization of the Old Grade School, the auditor said she never heard of the grant. Jim said probably work was still being done, the grant was closed out in January 2017 which will be reported in the next Town Report.

Clyde asked if Jim, on a different subject, if the CAP Agency has completed their move downstairs.

Jim said all the material and furnishing have been removed from the Warner Cooperative Preschool room on the ground floor. The Merrimack Belknap Community Action (CAP) Program is repainting the preschool classroom and installing new flooring. The Cap offices will be moving into the room when the renovations are complete. The food pantry inventory and operations move to the ground floor near the preschool room last month. This change of office space will make it easier for CAP program to meet with clients and run the food pantry along with a saving in heating because there will be one floor with minimum heating requirements. Clyde would like to schedule a walk-through after all the renovations are complete.

Town Report: 2016 Town Reports are being printed and will be in the mail by this weekend. Copies will be available at the Town Hall by Monday, March 6th. The most recent town newsletter will be mailed on March 7th.

Town Hall: Fire Chief Ed Raymond, Facilities Supervisor, Mel Furbush and I walked through the town hall this week reviewing fire and safety issues raised by the Primex risk manager during an inspection in November, 2016. Issues during the inspection ranged from the need for lit Exit signs and elimination of "permanent" extension cords to possibly replacing stage and auditorium curtains with ones made of flame retardant fabric. Chief Raymond is contacting the State Fire Marshall's Office to schedule a safety inspection of the Town Hall by this office. The report from this inspection will be a guideline in addressing these safety issues in the coming months.

8. Public Hearing – Sale of Odd Fellows Building

- A. Chairman Carson opened the public hearing per RSA 41:14-a at 7:02 pm for the purpose of obtaining public comment regarding the proposed sale of land and building located at 10 Church St. known as the Odd Fellows Building owned by the Town of Warner. It's been the goal of the Selectmen to save the building and put it back on the tax roll. There is a contractor interested in doing that, Nate Burrington, and the Board is working with Nate on a couple of items the town would like to achieve, for example making the building safe and secure and esthetically pleasing. The Board is still working towards an agreement at this time. If we achieve that, the Board has tentatively reserved time for next Thursday evening at 6:00 pm to hold an information meeting to go over the agreement. Point of order by John, who said I thought we discussed having that meeting to make the decision potentially as to whether to buy it and if we have the agreement completed at that point. Clyde stands corrected.
- B. Chairman Carson turned it over to Selectman Brown. Allan said he wants to correct a statement he made at the last public hearing. The question was how many square feet of land the town obtained from the school to dedicate to the Odd Fellows Building. Allan said we got from the school .275 acres, 12,000 square feet which was broken up between the building and the Town Hall. When I said last week it was 1,400 square feet it was actually 4,400 square feet. The building lot for the Odd Fellows Building is now 10,805 square feet which enlarges the area around the building by about 55' to the back and it gives the town ownership of the driveway plus there will be an easement for the building to drive over it. There is now about 8 to 10 parking spaces for the building.
- C. Chairman Carson opened the hearing up for public comments:

Martha Bodnarik: When the town has conveyed property to outside buyers in the past, has it been a habit to put a reversion clause into it saying that if you don't meet certain deadlines we will take the property back.

Clyde: I'm not aware of that.

Martha Bodnarik: Then why would you do it this time. A property that we took originally with the idea that hopefully we would find somebody who would be willing and able to restore it. At this point, you notice he is not hear tonight, he is ready to walk away from this deal, this deal that also talks about not finishing the environmental (not audible) in the basement. This deal that was run by an incumbent in the idea of what would your take be on it when you are a Selectman. I have heard things....

John: Your sharing things that we have in the agreement on advise from counsel for very good reasons.

Martha Bodnarik: Not audible, to much background noise.

John: Hold on Martha, since the agreement has not been finalized, no one should be sharing the contents with anyone, other than the two parties involved.

Martha Bodnarik: I'm trying to say, this deal is about to fall right through, there will be no more negotiations from the other side, and you are not acting in the towns best interest if you let this go because for some reason your going to put a reversion clause on it. The whole idea is if he can't it, you'll get it back for taxes anyway. This is a person that has a wonderful track record for integrity in this town. A kid who walked by that school every day as he went from elementary to high school, who understands the value of it, somebody who chose to come back and be a part of this town and try to make it a better place. I am very disillusioned with the job you guys have been doing.

Clyde: I'm gonna jump in here because I did say we don't have an agreement yet...

Martha Bodnarik: And your not going to...

Clyde: And the Selectmen have not reached agreement on what we want to do, we are still negotiating, so to say that's the case...

Martha Bodnarik: He has been offered a purchase and sales agreement with a reversion clause in it. That is not acceptable, that you have been told multiple times he cannot accept such a thing, yet you continued and offered it.

Clyde: I think we should leave it there, it's not decided in that direction and it's not definite.

Richard Senior: I would like to throw a little something from a perspective. How much would it cost to mitigate, that property, asbestos, lead, if you kept the building, how much would it cost to mitigate it. Just out of curiosity, I know you guys have talked about it. I hear a couple hundred thousand dollars.

Jim: I don't think it's that high. We removed the contaminated soil in the basement. The Department of Environmental Services has reviewed the mitigation action plan, it looks like it is complete, that ran us about \$14K - \$15K. We have an estimate to remove some asbestos and tile floors on two floors and some asbestos insulation. The last quote we had on that was about \$20K. The big issue is the lead, the testing on the building, and multiple samples were completed internally and externally. The lead contamination is over the bench mark that prevents us from calling it clean fill. Under that situation, that's going to be the major cost, because each piece of timber, each piece of wall board, because of that will have to be specially treated, then wrapped and taken to a facility authorized and willing to accept. Once that's done as Allan has pointed out, now we'll have a big hole with a lot big field stones that have to be taken out and leveled out. Your probably looking on the upside of \$300K.

Richard Senior: How about demolishing the building.

Jim: That includes the demolition.

Richard Senior: OK, here we have a building that someone is willing to restore. If I was a Selectman I would ask for \$1, if he's willing to put in the time and money, give it to him for \$1. Make a deal he can't refuse, and your getting back in taxes, your getting something people can come into town and say "What a nice building, look at that clock tower". That was one of the things when I came....and you know the newspaper I was fighting you guys about the building, so obviously I have a little personal stake as part of the town.

Andy Bodnarik: How many square feet of material has to be removed from that building, lead covered. Any body give you a report on the square feet of material lead painted that you have to remove, including (not audible).

Jim: My understanding with the sampling and testing that Western Solutions did is they basically said that they were hoping to find areas that would not need that type of mitigation, but they went through the whole building and every aspect of that building, so terms of square footage I can't give you, but essentially said it's the complete building.

Andy Bodnarik: Are they going to have to cocoon the building in order to do the removal or are they going to do an interior type removal.

Jim: We haven't gotten that far yet. We're at a point where we know what we have to do, I feel like a second test is always, a second opinion is always important to get and so I would recommend to the Board that we get a second opinion on the toxicity characterization leaching test and see what happens on that. Also, if the building is taken down, I've had one demolisher give me a quote for about half of the \$300K because he feels if it's taken down and ground up and then they took a sampling it may change the percentage of lead. We're not even at that point yet.

Allan: There is a hazard in doing that, because if you decide to demolish that building with an excavator and run the material through a grinder, maybe you could have removed a certain amount of tonnage by hand, but if you contaminate the entire structure by grinding it, now you have thousands of tons of stuff that has to be handled. Nate Burrington is lead certified so he can do it himself.

Andy Bodnarik: What your telling me is the old radiation joke, you started out with a little bit of high level radiation and you create a hole bunch of low level radiation that you have to ultimately dispose of. What's the current assessed value of that property.

Jim: For insurance purposes we have it insured for about \$250K.

Allan: I think the land and the building came in at about \$164K, but don't...

Marianne Howlett: Would you like me to get the property card?

Allan: Yes.

Clyde: I will just point out, under an RSA that the town adopted several years ago, the Selectmen are able to set the assessed value of the building at a rate in which it can be developed, so we can go for a special rate for ten years to encourage development.

Andy Bodnarik: What's the liability insurance carried on that building right now?

Jim: A minimum of \$2million as part of the town buildings.

Jim McLaughlin: I'm on the Odd Fellows Building Advisory Committee, we haven't really been a part of this discussion for at least a year. Before you would ask us our opinion or not, seems to me it would behoove them to at least involve us in some way in the process of finalizing this agreement.

Clyde: How many of the members are here tonight, rise your hands, Allan?

Allan: It looks like the building is assessed for \$164K, the land for \$76,330 and building for \$88K.

Marianne Howlett: This being tax exempt, it's looked at differently.

Andy Bodnarik: Do you know off hand what the difference would be?

Marianne Howlett: I'm not an assessor so.... I would like to make a response to a comment that was made earlier about how you sell property. I would like to say this is very different than any other properties the town might have deeded back to someone else. It certainly behooves the Board of Selectmen to be protective of for the town.

Clyde: My personal perspective on this is we would like to preserve the building but we also need to do so in a way that makes sure the building gets back and is in good shape for the town.

Richard Senor: Jim, can I ask you to sort of spill the beans and tell us what you guys think about the building.

Jim McLaughlin: We have done our darndest in the last 12 or so years I have been involved trying to find a developer or somebody who can develop it and all of the parties that have looked at it and some years of looking at it carefully, all concluded they couldn't do it within the economic constraints without a huge grant or by some outside money. None of which have been able to be found so that's the reality we had. With Nate you have a different situation all together, he's willing to put a lot of sweat equity into this, it will take longer than somebody else who would approach it in a different way. It's gonna take some time and I think putting conditions on it is a reasonable step. I would encourage the Selectmen not to make those hurdles so onerous that it can't be done.

Rebecca Courser: I would just like some clarification on something that was said because you have been holding your meetings with Nate in nonpublic session and I think I heard tonight the person running for Selectmen was asked her opinion about this proposal you are trying to work out with Nate Burrington and I want to know if that's true because that's a little troubling to me, after the (?) has been privy to some of this information that the public (too much background noise).

Clyde: If she has that information, it didn't come from the Board.

Rebecca Courser: That's what I wanted to know.

Allan: I feel the people on the street sometimes feel they know more about it than we do.

Marianne Howlett: At the last meeting I asked Nate what projects he had done and I would like to ask the Board of Selectmen, have you visited any of the...other than the coffee shop next to the Town Hall.

Clyde: I've been to his house and what he's done there is absolutely fabulous.

Allan: It's just gorgeous.

Marianne Howlett: It's good to hear you visited.

Andy Bodnarik: Let me ask a different question, we know we are on the books for \$2million in liability insurance for the town right now. How much does that cost us.

Jim: I don't know off-hand, but it's not an exorbitant amount of money. I can get that information for you.

Andy Bodnarik: How much would it cost the town to take out a liability insurance policy and keep it in effect until the building is refurbished, let's say 6 years from now.

Clyde: I don't know, the way the liability insurance works Andy, we take a policy that covers everything in town, they don't break out each individual building.

John: For us to insure the building we have to be the owner.

Andy Bodnarik: If you have a reversion clause in the contract and purchase and sales agreement aren't you maintaining co-ownership of the building.

Clyde: No, we wouldn't have insurance on it. Nate would be the person carrying the insurance on it.

Andy Bodnarik: So, if you have a reversion clause with multiple dates in it, at what point do you become the owner of the building, when you exercise the clause or when there's a default on it.

John: Those are some of the things under negotiation as we speak which is the reason we shouldn't be discussing it, especially without the other party present.

Andy Bodnarik: John I'm not asking

John: Your asking what the reversion clause says.

Andy Bodnarik: I'm asking hypothetical, if there's a reversion clause in the contract doesn't that make you a co-owner and I'm hearing no.

Clyde: That's my perspective and the attorney's.

Audience member: I'm just kind of concerned, Nate at some point in my mind, I don't know his financial situation is, but it seems like he will need a partner. My fear is he will get to a point where he is financially saturated. I think there is potential for anybody who takes on this project solely, they will hit a point where they can't afford to go on any further.

Allan: But, that's why Nate stated last time he was here that he intends to (not audible)

Clyde: The town isn't in the business of making sure the thing gets completely done, we just want to make sure it gets to a certain status.

Audience member: I would like to see the outside

Richard Senor: If nothing else, if you do take it back, at least there will be some good changes in there.

Martha Bodnarik: And that would be the point, for a guy who is financially strapped, is going to put everything into it, make him work his tale off for two and half years and all of that goes back to the town and he gets nothing out of it. I wouldn't buy into a deal like that.

Clyde: The deal is not on the table to talk about.

Martha Bodnarik: The deal should be restructured.

Clyde: Appreciate it.

Allan: I will say this, I did go out to get a cost, it's \$150K to clean the cellar hole up, change the grade, just site work no paving.

Richard Senor: That would be on top of the cost to demolish it.

Clyde: The value of the building is like about minus \$450K to the town right now.

David Hartman: I would like to encourage the Selectmen to continue along the lines of developing a purchase and sales agreement as I understand what this hearing is about to afford Nate Burrington the chance to do what he says he can do. We've had the building on the non-tax roll since the town bought it. There's been an effort over a dozen years now or more to preserve that building. We have had efforts to keep the water out looking at some point in the future someone is going to come up with a solution. There have been past efforts, I've been part of them as a Selectman, to try and figure out how to follow the vote of Town Meeting. Town Meeting decided to keep the building and the Selectmen were in charge trying to do that, and we tried. If the town doesn't go with Nate the town will be tearing it down and replacing it. From my memory the town will have to cough up big bucks to tear down and redevelop the site. I feel it's worth throwing in with a local guy who says he can do it. In the Selectman's opinion if there is something not able to be guaranteed, make the goals achievable.

John: We entered into this negotiation all agreeing we want the building to be preserved and we want to see him succeed. In doing that we don't just say, OK, because of that, here you go it's your building. We have to protect the towns interest as well in this building which is contaminated and next to a school. In part of doing that is seeking the advise of counsel on what is the appropriate thing to do and what is in the best interest of the town. We have done that. I have asked the other party if he has a lawyer, I think he told me he did, but I don't know who he has advising him and I also don't understand why it is that we should be negotiating here in public if he's not even present. And I don't think it's appropriate for you to be representing for him whatever it is he has told you. And I'm offended by that, and I don't think it's the proper way to conduct a negotiation. We all have the same goal, yes we want the building to be preserved. I'd like to see him succeed, but trust is an important thing here, very important thing. You have to have some way to say this is what we are going to achieve from this end, if we don't, here's what we are going to do. And that's what this is about right now.

Clyde: One quick comment but keep it friendly.

Martha Bodnarik: First off, is your lawyer a member of this town and what do you and he see as the interest of this town that you are protecting. The interest of this town is to have that building restored and that's what we want protected.

John: And if it isn't? How do we assure that's what happens.

Martha Bodnarik: You can't assure anything.

John: Understanding, but you don't have to take unreasonable risk's.

Martha Bodnarik: He didn't finish the job and it still 100% better than what we did with it. I don't see what there is to preserve, if he gets a job and he ends up taking 7 years instead of 6, did he hurt the town? I don't see how.

John: I understand....

Martha Bodnarik: The town appears to put us on the hook for \$300K to \$500K to take something down that most of us would like to see preserved. Maybe you should reexamine what you think the towns best interests are.

Clyde: I'm going to stop this right here because we are having hypothetical debate about something that hasn't happened yet.

Martha Bodnarik: No, we're having a debate about terms Clyde. What do you consider the town's best interest, in this matter. You have all brought it out there, and I would really like it defined.

Clyde: My thing is we want to keep, and we may have differences in opinions. My thing is, we want to make sure the building is safe, not a hazard to the community and that it's not an eyesore in the middle of town.

Richard Senor: From where I sit you guys are for the building. What happens when you guys finish negotiations, will you bring it to the town this what we have what do you think, or (not audible) to sell.

Clyde: The Selectmen have the authority to sell the building at this point in time. I wish we could have brought something a little more concrete tonight, we don't have it, we will continue to work on it and if we have something by next Thursday, we will have a contingent meeting set up to let everyone know what it is.

Marianne Howlett: I wasn't in the room when you talked about the statute you were buying this building under, but one of the things you need is a letter from the Planning Board and I know at the last hearing you did not have one, do you, that's definitely mentioned in the statute that your operating under.

Clyde: It was presented to the Planning Board. The Planning Board couldn't reach agreement whether to make a recommendation or not. It may go back to the Planning Board this month, it would be up to the Planning Board to decide whether they want to make a comment or not. If they did or did not it's not binding on the Selectmen.

John: The statute says we need a recommendation from the Planning Board it doesn't say anything about a letter.

Richard Senor: Has DES looked over the site?

Jim: DES has been contacted, they have gotten all the reports on the testing and environmental assessments and I'm actually waiting back to hear from Mike McKluskey about that because I told them that we are moving quickly to see if we can convey this property to a developer.

Kendra West Senor: What I heard from the last meeting and what I'm hearing tonight, this is a golden opportunity for our community and I sincerely hope that we don't put up so many road blocks for Nate that he walks away from this. This is only a good thing, from everything I have heard, this is a great opportunity for this community and most of us here, and most of the citizens of this town will be greatly disappointed if this cannot happen.

D. Chairman Carson closed the Public Hearing for tonight. If there is more to talk about, we will have a special session on March 9 beginning at 6:00 pm. The audience was thanked for their attendance.

9. Old Business

- A. Fire Department – Allan said we are ready for Town Meeting. The Fire Station Building Review Committee is talking about creating a video (not for Town Meeting) to show the deficiencies.
- B. Solar Array – First warrant for Town Meeting. Clyde and Darren Blood will meet with the Fire Department to see what questions they have about the solar array. We have our financing secured at 2% for 12 years. We are finishing our application for a grant which is considered part of the financing right now so if we get the grant that makes it even more attractive. Clyde said there's an independent group in town that has taken on a website and pulling together information from all around the state of other town's doing the exact same thing and they are spreading information to younger groups of people.
- C. The town is still waiting to hear back from the Village District about Map 29 Lot 001.

10. Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn at 7:55 pm.

Board of Selectmen
Clyde Carson
Allan N. Brown
John Dabuliewicz

Recorder of the minutes: Mary Whalen