

**ALTON BOARD OF SELECTMEN**  
**Minutes**  
**March 8, 2021**  
*(Approved - March 22, 2021)*

---

Chairman R. Wentworth convened the meeting at 6:02 PM. and V. MacDonald led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and a Moment of Silence. The following staff members were present:

Reuben Wentworth, Chairman  
Virgil MacDonald, Vice Chairman  
Philip V. Wittmann, Selectman  
Paul LaRochelle, Selectman  
Bob Holt, Selectman  
Elizabeth Dionne, Town Administrator  
Laura Parker, Finance Manager

R. Wentworth announced the following:

Until Further Notice: To keep our members and staff safe, and to comply with RSA 91-A, the State of Emergency, and Governor's Orders, restrictions on public gatherings, The Town of Alton is moving from "in-person" meetings to "remote audio participation meetings". To remotely attend the meeting (audio only) visit our website: [www.alton.nh.gov](http://www.alton.nh.gov) for telephone access and remote access instructions listed under News and Announcements on the home page or telephone the Selectmen's Office 603-875-2113 or 603-875-0229 between 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM for the Dial-in Code and Meeting ID for each Selectmen's Meeting.

**Agenda Approval**

V. MacDonald inquired about a plan for Church/School Street that was submitted to the Board that was not listed on the agenda. He was informed it would be handled under the TA Report with K. Roberts joining into the discussion. R. Wentworth informed the Board this was received late today and suggested he amend the agenda.

V. MacDonald requested to amend the agenda adding under Old Business: Plan from KV Partners for Church/School Street, allowing K. Roberts to discuss this item and P. LaRochelle seconded. Roll call vote:

B. Holt, yes	P. LaRochelle, yes	P. Wittmann, yes
V. MacDonald, yes	R. Wentworth, yes	

At this time, R. Wentworth informed the Board that the Appointment for Justin Cooper will be postponed/cancelled for tonight. This will move forward at a future meeting.

V. MacDonald made a motion to approve the agenda as amended and P. Wittmann seconded. Roll call vote:

B. Holt, yes	P. LaRochelle, yes	P. Wittmann, yes
V. MacDonald, yes	R. Wentworth, yes	

**Announcements**

- The Town Clerk/Tax Collector Office will be closed on Tuesday, March 9<sup>th</sup> for Town/School Elections which will be held at St. Katharine Drexel Church (lower level), Hidden Springs Road from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM.

**Submission of Public Comments - Questions - Concerns**

1. John Markland - Bay Hill Road Suggestion

*Board Members,*

*As I have watched your meetings and discussions relative to Bay Hill Road, I have a suggestion in which a similar situation occurred in a neighboring town.*

*In Gilford, they have a local road (Cat Path), that connects Route 11A to Route 11B, providing a shorter drive for people to connect either going towards the Weirs or wanting to go to Gunstock. This short residential road also saw an increase in traffic thanks to Google Maps, etc. This road, like Bay Hill, had a steep incline with a slight bend at the lower end.*

*Just as your fellow members described vehicles going off the road in snow storms, etc...Gilford was experiencing the same issue with vehicles constantly getting into accidents, going off the road into the ditch whenever it was hazardous.*

*After much deliberation and public hearings, the Selectmen made the decision to make Cat Path a One Way Street. Vehicles are allowed to enter Cat Path from the bottom and go up the hill, and exit off the top.*

*Similarly, if the Board should consider in this situation at Bay Hill Road the possibility of making it a One Way Street going from the Bay up to Route 28.*

*Although it will cause a disapproval probably among the residents who live on the road, in the end it did do the following:*

- *Decreased the amount of traffic using the road*
- *Decreased the amount of accidents from people sliding down the hill*
- *Decreased the amount of accidents from people trying to turn onto Cat Path from Route 11A (rear end collisions).*

*I also noticed when I traveled Bay Hill Road the other day just to experience the grade, that when I approached the stop sign at the bottom of the hill to turn left, the line of sight was limited and a very conscious effort was needed to make the decision to proceed.*

*Thank you for the opportunity to address this with the Board and I thank you for the job you do.*

*Warmest regards,*

*John E Markland, Stockbridge Corner Road*

### **Appointments**

- Justin Cooper - Request to Unmerge Map 10 Lot 6, Avery Hill Road

This appointment was postponed.

### **New Business**

#### **1. Medical Card Recommendation**

A recommendation was received from K. Roberts in reference to employees being required to hold a medical card. This should be for anyone driving a vehicle over 10,000 lbs. which should include all departments. B. Holt inquired if this was within the Personnel Policy. K. Roberts remotely joined the meeting stating that this has been done in the past, paid for by the Town, keeps the liability for the Town down and is a plus. Currently the Town pays for this.

R. Wentworth requested a motion to have anyone (all departments) that operates a Town vehicle over 10,000 lbs. be required to hold a medical card.

Further discussion: Both R. Wentworth and V. MacDonald felt that people should have them by May/June or 90 days. B. Holt voiced concerns that it should read that any/all employees that drive a truck should be tested and hold a medical card. A debate took place on the issue.

R. Wentworth made a motion to require anyone (all departments) who operates a Town vehicle over 10,000 lbs. be required to hold a medical card and V. MacDonald seconded. Roll call vote:

B. Holt, no	P. LaRochelle, yes	P. Wittmann, yes
V. MacDonald, yes	R. Wentworth, yes	

2. IT Equipment CRF Expenditure Request

J. Monaco joined the discussion requesting to look at a new technology solution to be put in place. He would like to purchase a mobile laptop that can be used both mobile and in the office. The current desktop computer will be repurposed in another department. The amount to be expended is \$1,935.63 from the IT Capital Reserve Fund; this would be a one-time expense and will be considered Town property.

P. Wittmann made a motion to approve the purchase of the Dell Laptop for the Public Works Director from the IT Capital Reserve Fund in the amount of \$1,935.63 and P. LaRochelle seconded. Roll call vote:

B. Holt, yes                      P. LaRochelle, yes                      P. Wittmann, yes  
V. MacDonald, yes              R. Wentworth, yes

Old Business

1. Alton Housing for the Elderly - Financials

As previously requested by the Board, the financials were provided for the Alton Housing for the Elderly (Prospect View) which contained a lot of information.

2. Bay Hill Road Signage Discussion

K. Roberts, Highway Manager and Ryan Heath, Police Chief were both remotely available for the discussion. P. LaRochelle took the liberty of speaking with several residents both on and off of Bay Hill Road and gain input from them on signage and how to remedy the situation. The general consensus was “No Thru Traffic” providing there be a temporary sign during the winter months suggesting that the hill is dangerous during those months between October 30<sup>th</sup> to April 15<sup>th</sup>. There are already quite a few signs and hopes that K. Roberts and R. Heath already visited the area to see how many signs are actually in the location. The 6-Ton limit sign, the 20% slope sign, the 25 MPH speed limit sign, the no box trucks sign with the circle around with the slash through it (indicates no trucks), the temporary 6-Ton limit sign on both ends, there is a temporary and permanent for this, the temporary one is not needed because there is a permanent one. If there was a sign closed to no thru traffic one of those signs need to be removed. The point is that as many signs that are placed and have had in the area for years is not working; we need enforcement. P. LaRochelle has asked for radar in the past and knows this is a problem. Jewett Farm Road is available to place the radar on the side or a Police Officer stationed once or twice a week. Again, this is the consensus of the people of this roadway. It wouldn’t hurt to have someone there and would be “nailing” everybody going up and down this hill going over the 25 MPH speed limit. As many time as signage is put in this area unless there is enforcement it will not work. In no uncertain terms nobody is interested in having the road be one-way. J. Markland was thanked for the suggestion. It is his opinion to place Closed No Thru Traffic on both ends, remove the circle sign and all should be on the right hand side of the road and not the left (believes this is illegal). The Town should be in favor of this signage as long as there is enforcement. B. Holt also owns property in the area and has spoken to two (2) neighbors and has the same concerns as P. LaRochelle. Bay Hill Road looks like a sign “pincushion”; there are more signs that are advisory because nobody is doing anything about it. A decision needs to be made to keep advisory signs or place legal signs that will be enforced. If there are Closed No Thru Traffic signs placed there would be no need for the other signs it would alleviate the need except for the speed limit sign but it has to be enforced. Advisory signs are not working, at all. The truck signs are there and was previously told they are State signs; they are not the State, they are on both ends of the road on Bay Hill Road. It was noted that the State has one sign but we have some on Bay Hill Road, that are not being enforced and it is unknown whether it can be. The truck traffic is great and it is not just deliveries. V. MacDonald asked if the complaint was too much traffic or accidents and if it was too much traffic you might as well put signs on every road. P. LaRochelle stated at first most of the issues were speed through the years it has been getting progressively worse and in the winter as far as accidents coming down the hill. The Chief has provided statistics on accidents that have been recorded however it is not showing those of people just going off the road who are pulled out and proceed on their way; this happens almost every week during a snow storm. In addition, speed has been getting worse over the years. When there is an accident the people have been informing that GPS has been sending them down the road which is another problem. Once you are committed on the road there is no turning around. P. Wittmann asked if with the Closed No Thru Traffic signs, would a seasonal sign be necessary or is there a need for a Slippery sign. The hope would be that the Closed No Thru Traffic would help as long as some of the other signs

are removed but feels it won't be enough in the winter; people will still use the road because of GPS. People ignore conditioning and become oblivious to the signs after time. This is not an issue for people who know the road it is people that are not familiar with the road that have the issues. A temporary sign in the winter would probably help. B. Holt stated this is a dangerous road and would never be built this way today with the way it is set up and should be addressed. P. LaRochelle stated the J. Markland had a good point when he addressed the bottom of the road which is so curved that it is difficult for line of sight vision to the right to see traffic coming around the corner from Route 28A heading towards Town. You cannot take a right hand turn you can only turn to the left; feeling that it should be wider at the bottom which is another issue. P. Wittmann wondered if there was any input from residents. R. Wentworth stated he won't stop going up the road and feels he should have a right to go up the road; a debate transpired on previous statements. R. Wentworth feels that a sign should be posted from October 30<sup>th</sup> to April 2<sup>nd</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> that conditions might enhance your driving or hazardous conditions exist and doesn't feel that any Town road should not be stopped to any vehicle going up or down except when it comes to deteriorations of a road such as large trucks; our roads are not built for them. He understands the neighbors feeling and the Google directive. Anyone should have the ability to go up the road within the limits of the 6-Ton weight. It also depends on people's common sense. He does not feel that this solution will solve the issues unless a Police Officer is there every day. Possibly an Officer should go there at least once a week during the heavier commute times. He feels there is no perfect solution; all that can be done is to educate people. P. LaRochelle feels then don't change any signage and have more enforcement. V. MacDonald believes that if the Police are there more often then people would be more aware. P. LaRochelle voiced he asked for this last year as well as Route 28A where the crosswalk is located at the Town Beach. There is a lot of activity with Officers in the Bay, Route 11 by Mt. Major parking area, traffic circle and Route 28A which are all State roads; we should be enforcing on our own Town roads that the Town owns.

At this time, R. Heath, Police Chief remotely joined the meeting for discussion. The first thing to address is to contact the State for clarification of the signage; after speaking with the road agent he believes all the signs on the left hand side of the road behind the guardrail belong to the State. K. Roberts told him he has not placed any signs on Bay Hill Road for No Trucking and there is no authorization for enforcing those; this needs clarification. The next thing is there have been several requests for Route 28A and Bay Hill area last year and has a lot of documentation regarding enforcement for the location. The department has done the best they can in this area; Bay Hill Road is not conducive of getting off the side of the road with the ditch lines which makes some of the preventive measures that would be utilized in other areas hard, difficult, unless the radar trailer is left in the travel portion of the roadway and can be dangerous in itself. He agrees enforcement is the key and do their best to set those directives to try and curb it. He would be happy to get the Officers out there to try and make a difference. As far as the signage is concerned he feels there is a misconception. Signs are usually not on the left side of the road. When coming up the hill, his observation of those signs that are there were not placed by K. Roberts. This does need to be clarified and hopes that the Board understands what is enforceable and what is not enforceable in that area.

At this time, K. Robert, Highway Manager remotely joined the meeting for discussion. He visited the roadway and is unsure where the Box Truck sign came from and is nothing he has ever purchased or installed so he is not sure where it came from. The 20% grade and the 6-Ton load limit signs were left up after all the others were pulled down. Those were left up and are a good thing for tractor trailer trucks. He feels there is a need for a 6-Ton limit and there should not be large trucks or tractor and trailer trucks running up and down this road. The discussion about signs for No Thru Traffic or temporary signs or a permanent sign post and changing signs out at certain times of the year but does not know how enforceable that would be; it may not and would be advisory. The Chief would need to make that call. Chief Heath reiterated that advisory signs are not enforceable under the fine schedule but are enforceable if someone uses gross negligence with an accident resulting. The same with No Thru Traffic signs which is enforceable but a difficult one for proving in Court if stationary; you must be able to actually see the vehicle enter one end of the road and leave the other end of the road, making no reasonable stop in between. Even if someone doesn't reside on the road they have the right to travel on it; there is a lot of proof with that type of signage. The department does its best with enforcement but there are many difficulties that factor in with this signage. Currently there is signage for No Thru Trucks and that is believed to be a State sign and if that's the case it is not enforceable because it is only enforceable for the road it was meant for. If local signage is placed on a Town road then there has to be a mechanism such as an ordinance to enforce it; the 6-Ton Weight Limit is not enforceable due to the Public Hearing that was held years ago the Board decided to lift all weight limits on residential roads regardless of signage. The Ordinance would have to be put back in place even if it is just for Bay Hill Road. R. Wentworth asked if a No Commercial Thru Traffic sign could be used which would eliminate certain

vehicles and might cut down on the traffic; would that be enforceable. The Chief responded that it might not take care of some of the mentioned vehicle because you won't know whether it is commercial or a resident with lumber on a rack etc. that that would be determined by a vehicle being stopped for a traffic stop for speeding or another violation. Upon a crash with reasonable cursory questions asked and answered, citations could be issued as a result if signage was ignored. B. Holt stated the thru trucking is an issue but the regular vehicle is another. He has pulled two (2) regular vehicles this winter who were on the road and it was slippery. This is not just this year. A somewhat heated discussion transpired amongst the Board members. P. LaRochelle stated there are multiple issues on the road and feel for the people coming down the hill and have asked the people why did you use the road; GPS sent us this way, so there is that issue, the issue of the trucks and heavy trucks, speed and the snow. Whether the signs are working or not, the residents are asking if something can be done to make it better.

K. Roberts would like to make a couple of suggestions: No Commercial Vehicles which would be an enforcement sign year round and a secondary sign post for seasonal signage which would be placed possibly the beginning of October through the end of March; Danger when Snow Covered. This could be tried for now to see how it works. The Chief stated that enforcement can be stepped up to try and curb issues and recommended the sign read Danger in Inclement Weather which would cover not only snow it would cover rain and other weather issues. The Chief's concern for temporary signage would be someone would have to physically put the signs up before or in the middle of a storm. There are other tasks that would take precedent to placing temporary signs for each event and would be problematic. Seasonable signage for a duration would be best. B. Holt stated that he doesn't have a problem with the road but there are two (2) residents that do and there could be a serious problem and P. LaRochelle agrees, it is not the residents in the area, it is the people that are not familiar with the road.

In summary, R. Wentworth stated that there a couple of recommendations before the Board post signage at the bottom of Bay Hill Road, left turn only or no right turn; it was noted that that is already in place. R. Wentworth feels it should be in broader letters because not everybody is seeing that. The other is No Commercial Thru Traffic with an Ordinance that would need to be set up and voted on by the Selectmen. P. Wittmann feels that K. Roberts earlier suggestion would work. R. Wentworth asked for a motion on the issue.

P. Wittmann made a motion for a No Commercial Thru Traffic sign and V. MacDonald seconded.

Further Discussion: P. LaRochelle provided a photo of a sign to the Board and is the sign that is in question by the Chief as to who put it there. R. Wentworth stated that No Thru Trucking and No Commercial Thru Traffic signs are completely different; examples given. Debate transpired on the difference of the vehicles, thru traveling etc. L. Dionne likes the idea/suggestion that K. Roberts came up with, give it a year, see if it works then tweak it if necessary. P. LaRochelle has been saying these things for over a year, nobody seems to be listening. L. Dionne again stated she feels the motion on the table should continue to move forward and evaluate and tweak as necessary. P. Wittmann stated he did not include the temporary signage that K. Roberts suggested and it should include that.

The motion on the table was withdrawn.

V. MacDonald would like to allow K. Roberts permission to place the signs, see if it works and if they need to be changed then allow them to be changed.

P. Wittmann withdrew his motion stating that maybe we need to try something and if it doesn't work then try something else. P. LaRochelle reiterated that we don't know who put the sign up on the left hand side for the No Thru Trucking Circle. So if we do a No Thru Trucking temporary sign then the one that is there will need to be removed or ask the State to remove so that there is no violation by the State that shouldn't be there. That needs to be investigated before we do any signage. K. Roberts interjected that if you put No Commercial Vehicle, 6-Ton Load Limit or any signage all other signs except for the 20% grade, he believes the can all be taken down. More signage, more confusion, make it simple and see if it works and if it doesn't then make it something different. If the State is missing a sign they can come find me. Sidebar conversation was transpiring.

P. Wittmann again withdrew his motion and was ready to precisely propose what Ken said but with conversation continuing ...I don't live on the road, to him you kind of have to listen to the two residents that live on the road. We need to learn what is enforceable. The Chief has said that we probably should check with the State on a couple of these things. Winter is almost over maybe we need the Chief to check with the State and revisit this issue; this is a suggestion. P. LaRochelle stated this is kind of what he was thinking, if the Chief could look into the signs that

are up that could be State signs and have those removed so then we can decide on whether or not or how we put proper signage and temporary signage in the winter and see what works. He doesn't know the proper answer. R. Wentworth stated now he has two that want to hold off on the sign and have the Chief and Road Agent look into the signs to find out if they are State signs. P. LaRochelle stated this was brought up tonight. V. MacDonald stated let K. Roberts go up, remove them and put signage up and see if it works and if not change them. R. Wentworth stated it won't because in six months to a year he (Ken) won't be here. R. Wentworth asked if this would be tabled again or are we going to have a motion made.

P. LaRochelle made a motion that we have Mr. Roberts go up and remove the signs on the left hand side going up Bay Hill Road that are/could be State signs with the Circle No Truck sign at the top of Bay Hill and the bottom of Bay Hill. Remove any unnecessary signs and put a new sign on the right which would be next to the sign that has 20% grade truck sign and the speed limit sign 25 MPH having the sign saying No Thru Trucking that would now replace the sign that we are removing. P. Wittmann asked if he wanted No Thru Trucking opposed to No Thru Commercial Trucking. P. LaRochelle confirmed No Thru Trucking; this is his motion No Thru Trucking and also entertain any idea in the winter months with temporary signage October to April of suggesting an advisory sign Do Not Use Bay Hill Road during Snow Storms or something to that affect, this would be his motion and V. MacDonald seconded.

Further Discussion within the motion: The Chief was brought back for the discussion and asked what he considered as No Thru Trucking. His response was with this motion was we can take the 20% grade sign out too because that is a cautionary sign for trucks if we are going to do No Thru Trucking. There is no need to have cautionary signs up, that would be one more that we can get off the road. We can put the No Thru Trucking on the speed limit sign below it so it is right there with the posted speed limit and the No Thru Trucking right on the same sign. That would help too with visibility and identification and we can take out both the other unnecessary signs so that we don't have so much sign clutter and confusion. For us it would be any thru trucks that come through that can't produce either a delivery slip or some legitimate purpose for being on that road. R. Wentworth stated so it could be any pickup truck or little Datsun truck. R. Heath responds no, I am sorry, No Thru Trucking is any commercial truck, it would have to be a commercial truck and that would be based on weight by definition. R. Wentworth responded so any commercial van is can still go up and down it. R. Heath responded if it was a medical delivery van or a normal passenger vehicle weight by State statute a Commercial vehicle is defined by weight not by occupation at that point. R. Wentworth stated there really aren't many 8-Ton/10-Ton truck going up and down that road. Most people that know the area or smaller commercial vehicles going up and down that road. P. LaRochelle stated there has been an increase of larger vehicles and trucks over 10,000 lbs.; not in the winter. B. Holt states it is GPS sending the people down the road. L. Dionne was asked if she got that whole motion and stated the transcriptionist will. R. Wentworth cannot read that motion back which was lengthy from Mr. LaRochelle. L. Dionne stated to remove the signs on the left at the top and bottom and the unnecessary signs and install one on the right hand side 20% grade and No Thru Trucking, Temporary Sign October thru April don't use Bay Hill Road. P. LaRochelle added during snow storms or something to the affect seconded by V. MacDonald. B. Holt stated as long as it contains the winter section within, he can live with it. Roll call vote:

B. Holt, yes	P. LaRochelle, yes	P. Wittmann, yes
V. MacDonald, yes	R. Wentworth, no	

Note: R. Wentworth voiced the reason he voted against this is because he feels it is not clear enough.

Further Discussion: R. Heath does not want to discuss this any further but wanted to put this out there: he believes that L. Dionne needs to reach out to Town Counsel to find out whether or not this requires a Public Hearing. He thinks if you take a residential road and you post it to No Thru Trucking or restrict the traffic flow at all, he believes it requires a Public Hearing by law and is not positive but that is why the suggestion and touch base with Town Counsel to make sure that everything, last thing he wants to do is find out it is not enforceable or is illegal once we get to court. L. Dionne acknowledged. P. LaRochelle was glad this was brought up.

### 3. Heidke Caregiver Wage Discussion

V. MacDonald questioned the hours of service and the rate of pay for a Heidke Caregiver. He feels that the \$12.00 rate is too low. R. Wentworth feels it should be \$15.00 per hour for all Heidke Caregivers; V. MacDonald agrees. The Guidelines of the Trust need to be followed. This position receives COLA and would be reviewed periodically for increases.

V. MacDonald made a motion to bring the Heidke Caregivers position hourly wage to \$15.00 and B. Holt seconded.  
Roll call vote:

B. Holt, yes                      P. LaRochelle, yes                      P. Wittmann, yes  
V. MacDonald, yes              R. Wentworth, yes

4. Discipline and Complaint Policy

L. Parker revised the verbiage as previously requested by the Board.

B. Holt made a motion to approve the Discipline and Complaint Policy as presented 3/8/2021 with the appropriate changes made and P. LaRochelle seconded.

Further Discussion: P. Wittmann referred to Step 2 which was previously discussed. R. Wentworth reminded him that the original contained Steps 1 through 4 and was modified. He personally believes and has full confidence and respect for the department heads and does not want them to think they would not be able to discipline without repercussions.

The motion on the table was called. Roll Call vote:

B. Holt, yes                      P. LaRochelle, yes                      P. Wittmann, yes  
V. MacDonald, yes              R. Wentworth, yes

5. KV Partners Plan for School/Church Street

K. Roberts, Highway Manager remotely joined the meeting. R. Wentworth asked K. Roberts about additional sheets that were not provided; they were specification sheets which he did not feel were needed for this discussion. K. Roberts explained the plans to the Board. It begins with sidewalk on the right hand side of the road and there will be a flashing light (need to check with the State as it is so close to the State road). It would be flashing 25 MPH during school times similar to the High School. The sidewalk will come up mid-range then it crosses to the left side due to the terrain and the lay out of the roadway; this allow good sight distance in both directions. Crosswalks were discussed and the realignment of School Street were mentioned as well as curbing and parking. Additional catch basins were added. These are preliminary designs. R. Wentworth questioned near the Veterinary Clinic on sheet 5 the possibly of moving the road over to accommodate the sidewalk. Parking could be added across the street on the right and would like to see some off street parking. The consensus is, the more parking the better especially in the area of the Vet Clinic, Funeral Home and Post office. The least amount of impact was considered for the sidewalk crossing over from one side to the other and felt it was best to handle this way. Angle parking and the bus loop will remain the same. C. Mitchell, Water Superintendent remotely joined the meeting. The water lines are fairly simple; they will try and stay 5 feet from the existing ones and abandon as they are. It should be a straight forward project and has no concerns as to how the Engineer prepared this. V. MacDonald questioned why the line was not being run all the way down School Street. C. Mitchell responded that this currently is an 8 inch existing line; it decreases in size in the Pine Street area to 6 inch and it tapers to a 4 inch somewhere at Church Street, repairs have been done in the past, been viewed and doesn't seem to have any issues that can be seen at this time. The majority of the issues are with the cast iron, between the age, material and the size. This is what is working against the department. This area can be looked at if desired. The overview is to look at the off street parking on the right hand side and to look at the water line cost for continuing a new water main all the way down the road through to Main Street. B. Holt questioned the size and age of the existing main which is 8 inch to Pine Street; the age is unknown as there is no data on it and is 4 inch cast and has exceed its life expectancy. K. Roberts asked for a consensus of the Board on the parking and he will have as much parking drawn into the final plan so this can go to a Public Hearing; the Board agreed. V. MacDonald inquired about Lily Pond Road which has been surveyed but has not moved forward. This will need to be addressed in the future. K. Roberts informed the Board he has surveys for both Lily Pond Road and Roberts Cove Road neither have been presented because he does not know if there will be enough money to do the ones we are facing; this has all been explained to the new person who will be stepping into his position. The decision will be faced in the future.

**Selectmen Reports**

B. Holt had nothing to report.

P. LaRochelle had nothing to report.

P. Wittmann had nothing to report.

V. MacDonald had nothing to report.

R. Wentworth wanted to commend the NH Electric Coop and the crews that were brought in for all of the work they have been faced with during the last wind storm. Temporary power was installed and they worked during horrible conditions which was not required but they choose to continue with their work. We are very fortunate and thankful to them.

**Town Administrator Report** by L. Dionne

Atlantic Broadband Offer from Gilford

L. Dionne asked the Board if they had given any thought to the offer from Gilford in reference to Atlantic Broadband. R. Wentworth asked what benefit this would have or if it would enhance or offer anything more to Alton and its residents. B. Holt doesn't see why this can't be handled by Alton itself. The contract is coming due and cost the Town \$6,500 for the last negotiations in 2016. It would be the decision of the Board as to how to proceed. L. Dionne recommends joining the group offer and recommends using the same specialized attorney. There currently is no financial information at this time; it is unknown. Other Towns have committed but costs are still unknown. All will be dependent on how many Towns join into the group. The Board would like to obtain an estimate of the costs if joining Gilford verses proceeding alone. L. Dionne will reach out to the attorney who handled this previously and will have the Finance Office look into the costs of the previous negotiations.

**Approval of Minutes**

February 1, 2021 - Non Public

P. Wittmann made a motion to approve the minutes of the Non-Public Meeting, February 1, 2021 as presented divulging none and P. LaRochelle seconded. Roll call vote:

B. Holt, yes                      P. LaRochelle, yes                      P. Wittmann, yes  
V. MacDonald, abstain      R. Wentworth, yes

February 22, 2021 - Regular

V. MacDonald made a motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting, February 22, 2021 as presented and P. Wittamnn seconded. Roll call vote:

B. Holt, yes                      P. LaRochelle, abstain                      P. Wittmann, yes  
V. MacDonald, yes              R. Wentworth, yes

**Consent Agenda Approval**

R. Wentworth noted that on the Consent Agenda item #2 will be postponed until the next meeting.

R. Wentworth made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda #1 only Assessing Department recommendations as submitted on March 8, 2021 and V. MacDonald seconded. Roll call vote:

B. Holt, yes                      P. LaRochelle, yes                      P. Wittmann, yes  
V. MacDonald, yes              R. Wentworth, yes



1. **Assessing Department:**

**Land Use Change Taxes**

Seeblick LLC; Black Point Road; Map 18 Lot 7; \$100  
Goyette; Dudley Road; Map 2 Lot 5-2; \$7,800  
Peebles; Brynn Lane; Map 15 Lot 60-8; \$7,970  
Jeddrey Real Estate Trust; Brynn Lane; Map 15 Lot 60-7; \$7,790  
Jeddrey Real Estate Trust; MacDuffy Road; Map 15 Lot 56-4; \$7,280  
Lot 6 Brynn Lane LLC; Brynn Lane; Map 15 Lot 60-6; \$7,800  
Lot 5 Brynn Lane LLC; Brynn Lane; Map 15 Lot 60-5; \$7,550  
Pearson; Meaderboro Road; Map 1 Lot 17-1-1; \$6,260

**Administrative Abatement**

Marchand; 27 Barnes Avenue; Map 27 Lot 3-2-1; \$2,100

**Current Use Application**

DJ Real Estate LLC; Brad Circle; Map 8 Lot 37; 58.00 Acres

**Discretionary Action on Requests for Appointments** (No discussion, majority vote required to allow/not allow appointment)

None

**Non-Public Session**

R. Holt moved at 8:05pm to enter into nonpublic session under RSA 91-A:3,II,d,e. P. Wittmann seconded. Roll call vote:

P. Wittmann - yes	V. MacDonald - yes	P. LaRochelle - yes
R. Wentworth - yes	R. Holt - yes	<u>Roll call vote carried unanimously</u>

P. LaRochelle moved at 8:15pm to exit nonpublic session. P. Wittmann seconded. Roll call vote:

P. Wittmann - yes	V. MacDonald - yes	P. LaRochelle - yes
R. Wentworth - yes	R. Holt - yes	<u>Roll call vote carried unanimously</u>

V. MacDonald moved to "not divulge" the minutes because divulgence of the information likely would render the proposed action of the board ineffective. P. Wittmann seconded. Roll call vote:

P. Wittmann - yes	V. MacDonald - yes	P. LaRochelle - yes
R. Wentworth - yes	R. Holt - yes	<u>Roll call vote carried unanimously</u>

**Adjournment**

R. Wentworth moved at 8:21pm to adjourn. V. MacDonald seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Mary K. Jarvis*

Mary K. Jarvis  
Recording Secretary