

BOARD OF SELECTMEN
Minutes of March 24, 2014

CALL TO ORDER: Selectman Ross McLeod called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. Selectmen Roger Hohenberger, Al Letizio, Bruce Breton and Joel Desilets were present; as was Town Administrator David Sullivan. Mr. McLeod opened with the Pledge of Allegiance

BOARD REORGANIZATION: Mr. Breton moved and Mr. Desilets seconded to nominate Mr. McLeod as Chairman and Mr. Letizio as Vice-Chairman. After a brief discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. McLeod assumed the Chairmanship, and then formally welcomed Mr. Desilets and Mr. Breton to the Board; adding that he looked forward to working with them. He then extended thanks, again, to Mr. LoChiatto and Mrs. DiFruscia for their service.

Mr. McLeod also thanked the over 3800 voters who had come out on Election Day, and those who worked the polls throughout the day.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/LIASION REPORTS: Mr. Letizio advised that the following day, from 4P to 7P, Infinite Fitness would be holding a grand reopening of their expanded facility at 4 Cobbetts Pond Road.

Mr. Letizio announced that the Community Development Department in cooperation with the Greater Derry/Londonderry Chamber of Commerce would be hosting the 2nd in the free business seminar series on 4/17 at 5:30 PM. The subject will be Social Media and Marketing for Small Businesses, and the event will be held at Mr. Letizio's company on Indian Rock Road. Those interested in attending should RSVP to Community Development Director Laura Scott.

Mr. McLeod announced that the Planning Board will undertake discussions regarding possible implementation of Recreation Impact Fees.

CORRESPONDENCE: Mr. Sullivan advised that the State of NH has, again, offered the Town the first right of refusal on parcels 13B-102 and 196B; adding the Town had previously advised the State there was no interest in purchasing these parcels.

Mr. McLeod recused himself from the discussion, indicating that he is familiar with an individual who is interested in these properties. Mr. Letizio assumed the Chairmanship.

Discussion ensued, and Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. Breton seconded to advise the State the Town is not interested in purchasing these parcels, and that they should be returned to the tax rolls as soon as possible. Passed 4-0.

Mr. McLeod resumed the Chairmanship.

MINUTES: Mr. Letizio moved and Mr. Hohenberger seconded to approve the minutes of 2/24 and 3/20/2014 as written. Mr. Desilets indicated he believed there was a typographical error in the 2/24 minutes. This discussion was tabled to allow for Mr. Desilets to locate same.

MANIFEST/PAYROLL: Mr. Sullivan noted this was a new agenda item per Mr. Breton's request, and deferred to the latter for discussion. Mr. Breton indicated that, after reading the audit report he had concerns relative to the Library expenditures. He noted that, as the Library is governed by an autonomous Board, he would prefer to see separate checks issued for their payroll and manifests; adding that per statute the Board of Selectmen do not approve Library purchases.

Lengthy discussion ensued as to the logistics and potential difficulties of separating the Library from the regular payroll and accounts payable functions. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the manifest should not be an issue, however, he would need to look further into the payroll to ensure there would no resultant issues.

Further discussion then ensued regarding the Library's funding being part of the operating budget and, because this is the case, whether the Selectmen are in fact required to sign off on same. Mr. Sullivan will check into this and advise the Board at a future meeting.

DONATIONS: Mrs. Margaret Case approached to request that the Board accept the following, additional donations towards the Searles facility:

50.00	James & Patricia Flynn 32 N Lowell Rd
250.00	Alan & Diane Carpenter 6 Glenwood Rd
200.00	Heath & Tracey Partington 17 Galway Rd
2,500.00	Windham Endowment for Community Advancement
25.00	JMKAVA & MORE LLC 33 Indian Rock Rd
25.00	Delucia WildFlower Photography 32 Damon Ave., Nashua NH
25.00	SPRITZAN, LLC 11 Gordan Ave., Salem NH
25.00	Stephanie & Percy Daniels 15 Range Rd
25.00	Special Events of New England, LLC, Manchester NH
25.00	Wharf Industries Printing, Inc. P.O. Box 367
25.00	Fab& Faux Jewelry, LLC 23 Faith Rd
150.00	Fundraiser

Mr. Letizio moved and Mr. Hohenberger seconded to accept with gratitude the donations towards the facility; and with thanks to Mrs. Case for her efforts.

Mrs. Case noted that the next project will be outside work, which may be donated in full.

After a brief discussion, motion passed unanimously.

Mrs. Case then advised the Board of a possible grant opportunity for the facility through the Moose Plate program; and requested the Board's authorization to apply for same.

Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. Breton seconded to allow Mrs. Case to proceed to apply for the grant as described; and to allow Mr. Sullivan to execute the related documents. Passed unanimously.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the previous efforts of the Commission to obtain same, which had been unsuccessful, and that there is the possibility of receiving \$10,000 if awarded.

MINUTES, CONTINUED: Mr. Desilets inquired whether the vote as recorded on page 3 was correct, in that Mr. Letizio was shown as having seconded a motion which he then voted against. Mr. Letizio indicated that was correct, in that he had only seconded it for discussion purposes and was ultimately opposed.

The previous motion as presented by Mr. Letizio and seconded by Mr. Hohenberger passed 4-0-1, with Mr. Breton abstaining.

RECREATION COMMITTEE: Mr. Sullivan advised that the Committee was seeking the Board's guidance as to how to begin the process of determining re-use of the former skate park area; specifically whether the Board wished the Committee to gather public input and make a recommendation, or whether the Selectmen wished to hold a public meeting.

Mr. Hohenberger noted that public input was definitely needed; suggesting it be an agenda item for a future Board of Selectmen Meeting. Mr. Letizio concurred.

Mr. Breton noted that it might be more feasible to have the Recreation Committee do a series of meetings and bring back the information gathered to the Selectmen. Mr. Hohenberger noted that the Board of Selectmen meetings are better attended, and felt more input might be gained.

Community Development Director Laura Scott approached noting that, with the Master Plan process starting, there may be an opportunity to gain wider input as the Recreation Committee will have a seat on the Steering Committee.

Mr. Letizio inquired whether Recreation had given a sense of timing for when they wanted to proceed with implementation of a new use. Mr. Sullivan replied he believed they wanted to be done by summer.

Discussion ensued regarding the Board possibly having public informational meeting on an off-night, or at the beginning of a regular agenda; as well as the master plan time line.

Mr. Desilets indicated he concurred with Mr. Hohenberger, noting the importance of the property overall. He suggested that discussion be kicked off with a joint meeting between Recreation and the Selectmen.

After brief further discussion, it was the consensus of the Board that Mr. Sullivan schedule this as a future agenda item.

BID AWARD: Tax Assessor Rex Norman approached and noted that the following bids had been received for a Municipal Assessment Technician Contractor:

Company	Fixed Price	Price per Parcel	Data Entry
CCAG - Concord, NH	No bid	\$32.00	\$300/per diem
CNP - Pembroke, NH	\$78,000.00	\$26.00	\$240/per diem
Vision - Northboro, MA	\$89,000.00	\$28.00	\$2/per parcel
KRT - Haverhill, MA	No bid	\$18.00	\$275/per diem

Mr. Norman explained that the purpose of the contractor was to assist him in completing the mandatory re-valuation; adding that any contract would ultimately have to be approved by the Department of Revenue Administration. He advised that he had vetted all four (4) companies, and that any one of them could do the job; adding that all are qualified by the DRA and their references have been verified.

Mr. Letizio moved and Mr. Breton seconded to award the contract to the low bidder, KRT of Haverhill, MA. Discussion ensued, and Mr. Breton noted that he had not seen in the bid specifications that the contractor must have performance bond and insurances in place; nor was a requirement included to hold public meetings in advance.

Mr. Norman clarified that the meetings beforehand were part of his responsibility and, therefore, were not referenced in the specifications. Mr. Sullivan added that the bid specifications do require insurances, but if the Board wished to require a performance bond they would have to add same separately. Further discussion ensued in that performance bonds are generally required on contracts pertaining to construction.

Mr. Norman then noted that the approved budget for this was \$100,000; and recommended that the Board award the contract as a “not to exceed” due to the unknowns encountered in a revaluation and the need to ensure that the project can be completed. Discussion ensued, and Mr. Norman clarified that he had met with representatives of KRT who had assured him they can complete the project and that he will be spot checking same.

Mr. Desilets indicated he had requested additional information from Mr. Norman relative to previous jobs completed by KRT, which had included Bedford (3 times) and Rye. Mr. Desilets noted he believed this speaks to the firm’s abilities; adding, however, that he was not comfortable awarding the contract to them as a “not to exceed”. Mr. Desilets opined that any changes beyond the scope as specified should come back to the Board. Discussion ensued regarding the number of parcels specified in the scope of work (3,000) versus the number in Town.

Mr. Norman clarified that there are almost 4,600 single family homes, 66 multi-family units, and 652 condominiums; adding that commercial properties had not been bid. He noted that, if there is a possibility of getting more property seen within the approved funding, then that is a win for the Town.

Mr. Breton felt the contract should be awarded for the bid price, with a performance bond; adding that if additional properties need review after the project is complete as bid, then the appropriation can be reviewed at that time. Mr. Hohenberger inquired how a performance bond would be calculated, and discussion ensued regarding percentage of error rates and that the DRA has established an exact criteria for revaluations.

Mr. Letizio indicated he wasn't sure the Board needed to impose a performance bond, as the Town will have the ability to withhold payment if the vendor performs unsatisfactorily. Discussion ensued in that the contract must meet DRA standards, and that the vendor is only providing physical data to the Town. Mr. Norman clarified that periodic payments would be issued, and the data verified. Further discussion ensued, and Mr. Breton concurred that a performance bond was not necessary if working with a schedule of payments and the ability to terminate the contract if performance is deemed unsatisfactory.

Discussion ensued as to the scope of work bid, which Mr. Norman clarified was for residential property only, although KRT is qualified to do commercial parcels, and whether the motion on the table was to award a not to exceed price. It was clarified that the motion was to award the contract to KRT for the bid price for 3,000 parcels - totaling \$63,000 - and that anything else would come back to the Board for further discussion.

Mr. Sullivan sought clarification from Mr. Norman as to whether KRT would be able to complete additional parcels, if requested, prior to the July 2015 deadline; and Mr. Norman replied in the affirmative. Discussion ensued as to the number of parcels Mr. Norman is able to complete himself per year, on average, which he indicated was approximately 1000.

Discussion then moved to the Town's depreciation model, which Mr. Norman indicated the DRA was recommending be changed significantly. Mr. Norman advised that KRT is very familiar with the conditional depreciation protocol being recommended by the DRA. Mr. Desilets inquired what number of parcels would need to be reassessed in order to obtain an accurate model for same, and Mr. Norman replied approximately 3,500.

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding the unexpectedly low bid prices received and the opportunity it could afford to do in excess of the 3,000 as specified. Mr. Sullivan indicated that if KRT were to do 3,700 parcels, at a cost of \$77,000, then the project could be completed in full.

Mr. Desilets noted that when budgeting for the project, it must have been felt that 3,000 parcels was enough to obtain an adequate statistical model, and a brief discussion ensued. Mr. Breton indicated his support for the motion as stated; adding that a second contract could be executed with the vendor for anything beyond 3,000 parcels.

Further, brief discussion ensued; with Mr. McLeod noting that alternatives within KRT's proposal could be discussed separately in the future after this contract is complete. The motion passed unanimously.

PROPOSED FEES – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: Ms. Scott reviewed with the Board several proposed changes to the Department's fee schedule; noting some came as a result of Town Meeting. Discussion ensued regarding the proposed escrow fees, and Mr. Breton suggested the word "minimum" be added to clarify additional fees may also be required. Ms. Scott indicated a set amount was preferred, and that the Department has not run into issues obtaining additional escrow funds when necessary.

Mr. Desilets inquired whether some hourly rate was involved in calculation of these fees, and Ms. Scott replied in the negative. Mr. Desilets noted the \$1000 excavation fee as an example, seeking further clarification as to whether that amount was based upon estimated staff time and/or department costs. Ms. Scott noted that the time and complexity of applications types is considered, and that such fees offset staff/equipment costs. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hohenberger noted that, in the 1980's, the Department had been self-sufficient and inquired how close it was to being so today. Discussion ensued regarding the expansion of the Department since that time, and that there should be a rational nexus for the Department fees.

Mr. Desilets noted that, offhand, he could not ascertain whether the fees were too high/too low; adding he would like to see the data behind the numbers (eg the average number of hours involved in an application). Ms. Scott indicated she could try to compile such data. Mr. Breton concurred with Mr. Desilets, noting building permits, as well (eg. how many visits does a permit for a pool entail).

Mr. Letizio noted he did not think it was the Board's job to micro-manage in this way, and moved to post the fees as presented for Public Hearing. Mr. Breton seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Scott indicated she will post as such for May 5th.

RIGHT-OF-WAY REQUEST, 22 HAVERHILL ROAD: Ms. Scott advised that this was not a permit request, but rather the Board's input was being sought as it pertained to renovations to the property. She indicated that an application had been submitted to the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment and, as part of same, the owner was proposing to move the driveway and install a new sign. She noted the latter would then be located within the Town's right-of-way on the Old Haverhill Road. Ms. Scott indicated that variances will be required, as well as a right-of-way permit and cut for the new driveway.

Mr. Letizio noted that he would like the owner to be able to move forward without the need to return to the Board of Selectmen; reminding the Board that a similar approval was given to a governmental agency last year.

Mr. McLeod clarified that the owner would still need PB/ZBA approval; suggesting the sign could be conditionally approved by the Selectmen. Mr. Breton noted that the Highway Agent, not the Selectmen, serves as the Town's right-of-way agent. Mr. Sullivan confirmed that Mr. Breton was correct, however, the Board had retained control over the placement of structures in the right-of-way. Discussion ensued, and Mr. Sullivan suggested that a motion of support would be in order subject to the owner going through the proper process.

Mr. Letizio moved and Mr. Breton seconded to grant the placement of a sign the Town's right-of-way, and to allow a new driveway to cross same subject to Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment approvals; and submission of applications at the appropriate time.

Mr. Desilets inquired whether the property owner also wanted the Class VI right-of-way removed, and Mr. Sullivan replied in the affirmative; adding their request for same had not made it in time for this year's Town meeting. Brief, further discussion ensued before the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Breton then moved and Mr. Letizio seconded to confirm the Board's intent to submit to Town meeting the residual Class VI roadways conveyed by the State this past year including, but not limited to, in the area of 22 Haverhill Road. Discussion ensued regarding the locations of these roadways, and Mr. Desilets indicated that without all the pertinent information on hand he did not feel it was appropriate to vote as such that evening.

Mr. Breton noted that if the Board sends out notification of this intent, it makes the sign in question more conforming; adding that taking them to Town meeting also puts these areas back on the tax rolls. Mr. Letizio suggested that perhaps the Board could just state they intend to look at these areas as an agenda item; without a formal motion. Discussion ensued, and Mr. Breton amended his motion to indicate that the Board intends to look at the parcels in question.

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding Mr. Sullivan and Ms. Scott working to put the data together for the Board to review, that if the Board does not take this to Town meeting the owner would need to do so as a petition, and the review on a case by case basis of any similar, future requests.

Mr. Breton then withdrew his motion, and Mr. Letizio his second. Mr. Sullivan and Ms. Scott will work on compiling the parcel information for the Board's review.

Ms. Scott then advised the Board that ZBA/Code Enforcement Officer Nancy Pendergast has submitted her resignation; effective April 25, 2014. Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. Desilets seconded to accept with regrets.

Discussion ensued regarding Ms. Pendergast's service, the Board members noted the excellence of same and that she is always a pleasure to work with. Motion passed unanimously. Ms. Scott indicated she will move forward to advertise to fill the vacancy.

OLD BUSINESS: Mr. Sullivan advised that he had been contacted by the Scouts regarding the upcoming Jamboree, and permission was now being requested to sell food during the event as a fundraiser; adding that this would require the Board to waive the town's Vending Policy. Mr. McLeod clarified for the record that, as this was not a field issue, he would not be recusing himself from this discussion as he had when the Jamboree was approved.

Ms. Scott approached and advised that, in her capacity as Health Officer, her only concern would be the need for the Fire Department and Building staff to approve the Scout's set-up for health and safety regulation compliances. Brief discussion ensued, before Mr. Letizio moved and Mr. Breton seconded to waive the Vending Policy to allow for the Scouts to sell food subject to the conditions as outlined by the Health Officer. Passed unanimously.

PROPOSED RAIL TRAIL POLICY: Mr. Mark Samsel, President of the Windham Rail Trail Alliance, approached and reviewed the attached presentation with the Board relative to a proposed policy governing/limiting running events on the Rail Trail.

Mr. Breton sought clarification as to whether a fee could legally be charged for use of the Trail, and Mr. Sullivan replied in the affirmative. Discussion ensued regarding organizations such as Baseball and Soccer who expend funds on Town fields and charge fees to recoup same, and that the Town would lose statutory immunity from liability if a fee were charged. Mr. McLeod noted that the policy, as proposed, requires the coordinating group to have liability insurance. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. McLeod suggested that the policy could simply state only three (3) authorized races per year, and that the calendar for same will be determined. Mr. Samsel indicated they could do that; adding, however, that the Alliance is essentially offering a third race out of the goodness of its heart. He noted the policy could also be worded to indicate that only two (2) races per year are permitted, and that both will be hosted by the Alliance. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hohenberger inquired why the Alliance would be different than any other group that comes before the Board as it pertained to needing liability coverage; adding that the Town also contributed much toward completion of the Trail. Discussion ensued regarding the agreement with the State for the Trail and that the Alliance is covered as it operates in conjunction with the Town. Mr. Samsel noted that, for the 10K race, ConvenientMD had provided liability coverage.

Mr. Breton sought clarification that the Town is, essentially, at risk for everything as it pertained to the Trail. Mr. Sullivan replied in the affirmative, as it is Town property. He indicated that a policy is not required, but had been drafted in response to many requests/inquiries; adding that there could simply be a policy that says no other races are permitted except the Alliance's. Mr. Sullivan also clarified that if participants are charged, then the Town assumes liability; without a charge the Town has immunity.

Discussion ensued regarding the ConvenientMD 10K race; and it was reiterated that they had provided liability insurance for the event. It was also noted that they had only sponsored the race and all proceeds had gone to the Alliance.

Mr. Breton suggested that an agreement be drafted with the Alliance to host two (2) races per year. Discussion ensued regarding the differing types of races on the Trail, and sanctioned events.

Mr. Desilets raised several concerns including walking events, the policy being specific to "Windham" registered non-profits, and the waiver clause and whether it meant each race request would be presented to the Selectmen. Mr. McLeod clarified that such waiver language is standard to all Town policies, and Mr. Samsel noted that in this case the requests would be filtered by the Alliance and their recommendation then brought to the Board.

Further discussion ensued, and Mr. McLeod clarified that the Board also has the option to leave this status quo. Mr. Desilets opined that the policy was valuable, but perhaps not in its present form; citing for example that if a race has to be reviewed by January it may not make it into the filtering process.

After further discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mr. Letizio seconded to authorize the Windham Rail Trail Alliance to run the Annual Flat & Fast 5K and the Annual ConvenientMD 10K races. Passed unanimously. Brief discussion ensued, with input from resident Bob Coole, relative to Trail parking.

FORESTRY COMMITTEE: Mr. Sullivan noted that, in accordance with passage of the Town Meeting article, the Board must now establish a Forestry Committee. He indicated that, per statute, it must be comprised of no less than three (3) and no more than five (5) members. Mr. Breton suggested a composition of two (2) Conservation Commission representatives and three (3) residents. Discussion ensued, and the Board concurred.

Mr. Desilets inquired whether it was possible to have an additional, non-voting member; and Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative as the Statute requires three (3) or five (5) voting members. Discussion ensued regarding having the Conservation Commission recommend their members, and addition of a Selectmen liaison to the new committee. Mr. Breton suggested that Mr. Desilets could serve in the latter capacity.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that staff will move forward to advertise for three (3) resident members.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS: Mr. McLeod noted that Mr. Sullivan had distributed the annual liaison assignment list to the Board, and asked that the members forward their requests on to Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. McLeod requested an update on the Campbell Farm vote. Mr. Sullivan reminded the Board that, due to the date of receipt of the petition, the Town had been unable to comply with the statutory requirement to hold a public hearing on the bond by January 21. Thus, either special town meeting or legislative action was required to ratify the Town Meeting vote. He indicated that the latter is currently in process, and that he was working with Representative McMahan, Jim Finn of the Conservation Commission, and Attorney Campbell on same; and that they will be attending a hearing on April 1 to request legislative support.

Mr. Letizio requested that the Board consider moving their meetings back to Town Hall; indicating he believed it was more fitting. He also noted that improvements have been made to the Town Hall area to correct previous issues, and that audio problems exist with the current room. Discussion ensued regarding the difficulties of meeting in the room as it related to the ability to hear the discussion.

Mrs. Case approached and noted that remote cameras and a new sound system have recently been installed in the Town Hall; all of which are controlled from the studio. Discussion ensued as to which facility was more cost efficient/convenient, ADA compliance of both, and possible upgrades to the microphones in the Community Development room.

Mr. Letizio indicated that he did not believe the current room was the best representation of the Town given the beauty and historic nature of the Town Hall facility. Lengthy discussion ensued, and Mrs. Case suggested the Board hold their upcoming workshop regarding the Skate Park at the Town Hall and evaluate it then. After further discussion, it was the general consensus of the Board to continue to meet at Community Development, but to hold the Skate Park meeting at the Town Hall as suggested. Mr. Breton requested that, to Mr. Letizio's point about the quality of the audio, someone be brought in to look at the Community Development set up. Discussion ensued, and Mrs. Case indicated they could do that.

Mr. Sullivan advised that staff had met with the School District Business Administrator and Superintendent regarding the potential for joint projects, and that the possibility of IT connectivity had been discussed via fiber from Center School to the Police Department. He indicated that the estimated cost for same would be \$10K-15K, and it would provide shared connectivity including telephone and security camera access. Mr. Sullivan noted that the two IT directors are working to gather more information which will then be brought to the Board. Mrs. Case approached and inquired whether Comcast had been contacted regarding this possibility, as there is a potential for substantial savings through them. Mr. Sullivan confirmed contact with Comcast is part of the plan.

Mr. Sullivan noted that, as it pertained to the need for a “plan of land” in order to complete the sale of Town property on Londonbridge Road per the 2013 Town Meeting, he has received three (3) comparable proposals for same. He recommended that the Board engage the services of KNA to complete this plan, in order to avoid any potential conflict; as the other proposals are from Herbert Associates and Dubai Associates. *Mr. Sullivan* clarified that this plan is a seller responsibility and will come out of profits from the sale. The Board concurred with *Mr. Sullivan’s* recommendation to engage the services of KNA to complete a plan of land.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION: *Mr. Hohenberger* moved and *Mr. Breton* seconded to enter into a nonpublic session in accordance with RSA 91-A:3 II a, d and e. *Mr. Letizio* indicated he would like to add a matter under contract negotiations. Roll call vote - all “yes”.

Discussion ensued regarding *Mr. Letizio’s* matter, and *Mr. Letizio* then moved and *Mr. Breton* seconded to resume the public portion of the meeting. Passed unanimously.

PUBLIC SESSION: Discussion ensued regarding the earlier bid award to KRT for Assessing Technician, and whether or not their proposal left open a potential for increased costs for additional work. *Mr. Letizio* indicated he would like the Board to reconsider their award of same, and a new motion be made to award it to KRT subject to their holding their bid price for any additional work.

Discussion ensued, and *Mr. Sullivan* clarified that a formal bid award letter will be presented to KRT, and can include an express understanding that the Town may add additional parcels at that same price. Further discussion ensued, and it was noted that *Mr. Norman* had clarified KRT’s intent to maintain that price subsequent to the bid opening. It was the consensus of the Board to include specific language regarding same in the bid award letter, and to require KRT to sign off on same.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION: *Mr. Breton* moved and *Mr. Hohenberger* seconded to enter into a nonpublic session in accordance with RSA 91-A:3 II a, d and e. Roll call vote - all “yes”.

The Board, *Mr. Sullivan*, *Mr. Norman*, and *Ms. Devlin* were in attendance in the first session.

Mr. Norman updated the Board on a legal matter relative to a property tax exemption/abatement. After lengthy discussion, *Mr. Letizio* moved and *Mr. Hohenberger* seconded to authorize *Mr. Sullivan* to proceed within the settlement parameters as established. Passed 4-1, with *Mr. Breton* opposed.

Mr. Norman advised the Board of a personnel matter. No decisions were made.

The Board, *Mr. Sullivan* and *Ms. Devlin* were in attendance in the remaining sessions.

Mr. Sullivan updated the Board on a land acquisition matter. It was the consensus of the Board that *Mr. Sullivan* proceed as discussed to gather more information and a legal opinion for the Board’s review.

Mr. Sullivan updated the Board on a union unit modification request. It was the consensus of the Board that *Mr. Sullivan* proceed to file an argument regarding same.

Mr. Sullivan reviewed with the Board a request for a union side bar. *Mr. Letizio* moved and *Mr. Breton* seconded to support the request as presented. Passed 4-1, with *Mr. Hohenberger* opposed.

Mr. Letizio moved and *Mr. Desilets* seconded to adjourn. Passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendi Devlin, Administrative Assistant

Note: These minutes are in draft form and have not been submitted to the Board for approval.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

Bill Oldenburg, Bureau of Highway Design
Michelle Marshall, Highway Safety Engineer



HSIP Purpose

The Purpose of the HSIP is to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on public roads.

HSIP Consists of Three Programs

1. Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)
2. High Risk Rural Road Program
3. Railway-Highway Grade Crossing Program

High Risk Rural Roads (HRRR)

- New Hampshire (\$900,000/Year - 2014)
- Eligible on any roadway functionally classified as:
 - Rural major collector (functional class 7)
 - Rural minor collector (functional class 8)
 - Rural local road (functional class 9)
- Accident rate for fatalities and incapacitating injuries > statewide average
- Construction and operational safety improvements

Project Scope

- Highway Safety – Reduce Fatal and Unjury Crashes
- Improvement of Signing and Delineation on HRRR Eligible Roads to Decrease Lane Departure Crashes
- 6 Towns included in Project
 - Highest number of crashes on HRRR eligible roads
 - Selected Regionally

Project Scope

BASIC SIGNING TREATMENTS FOR HORIZONTAL CURVES

1. Horizontal Alignment signs: Turn (W1-1), Curve (W1-2), Reverse Turn (W1-3), Reverse Curve (W1-4), Winding Road (W1-5), Hairpin Curve (W1-11), or Loop (W1-15) as an advance warning sign depending on the geometry of the curve(s)
2. Advisory Speed Plaque (W13-1) (with any of the Horizontal Alignment signs)
3. One-Direction Large Arrow (W1-6) sign
4. Combination Horizontal Alignment/Advisory Speed (W1-1a or W1-2a) sign
5. Curve Speed (W13-5) sign
6. Chevron Alignment (W1-8) sign
7. Delineators

Project Scope

- Retroreflectivity:
 - Reflecting light back to the source
- Makes signs visible in dark conditions
- Critical for nighttime driving



Project Scope



Standardization

- Reduces accidents by reducing confusion
 - Provide consistency for the driver
- Use standard signing (MUTCD)
- Measured – not estimated
 - Ball bank indicator for advisory speeds
 - Hand level for down grades

Project Scope



Project Scope



Engineering Prep

- Identify towns in each region with highest number of crashes on HRRR eligible roads.
- Consult with state and town representatives to identify roads to include in evaluation.
- For each review all accident reports from the subject area for the preceding three years.

Engineering Fieldwork

- Focus determined by types and patterns of accidents revealed by the accident reports
- Concentrate on:
 - Curve and turn signing
 - Signing standardization

Project Tasks

1. Identify roads for evaluation
 - Crashes
 - State and town recommendations
2. Field evaluation to determine improvements
 - Geographic Location
 - Type of Traffic Control Device
3. Field engineering to determine specific improvement and location
 - Ball Bank Indicator, Distance Measurements, Level...
4. Installation
 - Contracted
 - State Specifications
5. Field review of installations
 - Acceptance
 - Inventory

Costs

- Project Costs –
 - Est. \$250,000 – 300,000 (all 5 Towns)
 - 100% State and Federal Funds
 - No Town Funds needed
- Town will receive old signs (recycle or reuse)
- Once in place New signs become Town maintenance responsibility.

Next Steps

- Town Support for project (letter)
- Town review of roads to see if any should be eliminated from project.
- Project Development – 2014
- Municipal Work Zone Agreement (letter)
- Construction - 2015