

APPROVED

BOARD OF SELECTMEN / SEWER COMMISSIONERS MEETING

Wednesday January 2, 2019 – 6:00 PM – Richmond Town Hall, 1529 State Road

PRESENT: Mr. Neal Pilson, Chair; Mr. Roger Manzolini, Selectman; Mr. Alan Hanson, Selectman; Mr. Mark Pruhenski, Richmond Town Administrator; Mr. Tom Grizey, Wiring Inspector

ABSENT:

GUESTS: Mr. Marc J. Adams, Property Owner; Mr. Christopher Walsh, the builder; Mr. George F. Rufo, III, owner; Mr. Vincent Stannard, property owner; Mr. Tom Grizey, Wiring Inspector and Sewer Maintenance.

Mr. Neal Pilson called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and began with the two Special Permit Applications before it: Mr. Marc J. Adams for an accessory guest house and barn at 587 Canaan Road and Mr. George F. Rufo, III for an accessory barn/workshop/studio/office at 1455 State Road.

Mr. Pilson noted that the Chair of the Planning Board has determined that there is no need to conduct a Special Permit Application with respect to the proposed house to be erected at 587 Canaan road at this time as there is a requirement that the site plan first be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board. A site visit will be scheduled once the actual building permit application is submitted. Therefore, the purpose of the public hearing tonight is only for the application for the barn.

The public hearing was opened at 6:04 PM. Mr. Pilson asked the builder or the owner of the property to make a brief statement about the permit being sought and then invited any abutters who wished to be heard to speak to the Board. At the completion of those comments, the Board will close the Public Hearing, deliberate among themselves and vote on the application as required.

Mr. Manzolini noted he visited the site at 587 Canaan Road and, in speaking with the builder, was asked for instruction as to the process going forward and what a probable timeline might be to begin actual construction. Mr. Pruhenski said that, assuming the special permit is granted at this meeting, there will be a 20-day appeal period once it is filed with the Town Clerk. Once the 20-day appeal period lapses and there has been no appeal made, the Town Clerk will sign off on the permit, which will then go to the Building Inspector to apply for the Building Permit. As part of the Building Inspector's review before issuing the permit, it will be forwarded electronically to all the Boards and Committees that need to sign off. Mr. Pruhenski felt that it would be at that time that the Planning Board would want to schedule a site plan for the house, which would most likely be an agenda item for their February meeting.

Mr. Pilson asked if there was any way for the Board to expedite that process. There was a discussion.

Mr. Christopher Walsh, the builder, noted that he has already applied for the Building Permit and has been in contact with the Building Inspector. The process for other Boards and Committees to sign off on the application can begin at once, but the Building Permit cannot be issued until the 20-day appeal period lapses and the Planning Board conducts a site visit and review. Mr. Pruhenski advised that this lengthy process is the nature of special permits and he noted that it would be unfortunate to have the building process begun and then have a neighbor submit an appeal.

Mr. Pilson noted that the Board conducted a site visit earlier that day, at which time Mr. Manzolini said that he would recuse himself from any discussion or decision on this issue as he is an abutter of the property and he felt that would be a conflict of interest.

Mr. Adams, the applicant, explained that his family situation is complicated; he has three children in three different places, one of whom is autistic; as well as other family members for whom he needs a place to stay when they visit.

Mr. Pruhenski advised that all Boards and Committees were notified on November 21st of this Special Permit Application; all certified abutters were notified by mail on November 30, 2018; two copies were posted on the Town Boards on November 30, 2018 and a legal ad was sent to *The Berkshire Eagle* on November 30, 2018 and published in both editions of December 10th and December 17th. Notices were provided to neighboring community Planning Boards as required by law.

Mr. Pilson asked for any comments on the application. Ms. Maureen Jacoby, Foresight Land Services (the Civil Engineer on the project) wished to understand why the Planning Board is considering this a new house, rather than an accessory guest house, which is how it was considered in their application.

Mr. Pruhenski read a letter from the Planning Board Chairman that addressed that question. "After reviewing the Plans for the proposed guest house and barn, I have concluded that the barn requires a special permit, but the guest house does not. Zoning does not permit a dwelling as an accessory use – the proposed dwelling is permitted under Section 4.8.a, permitted principal uses as a second dwelling on the lot. The lot area and frontage are more than enough for two dwellings. The dwelling will require a site plan approval by the Planning Board under section 6.10. In my opinion the Plans submitted are enough for a site plan review and I will place this on the agenda for the next Board meeting in January. A Building Permit cannot be issued for the guest house until the Planning Board approves the site plan." Mr. Pruhenski noted that the Chair of the Planning Board did not take into consideration the 20-day appeal delay in his comments.

Mr. Pilson advised that the Planning Board does not report to the Select Board; it is a separately elected body that operates on its own rules. The current Chair of the Planning Board has been in that position for 35 years and is an acknowledged expert in this area. Mr. Pilson noted that

he will support granting the application, subject to approval by the Planning Board of the site plan.

Mr. Pilson asked for any further discussion on this issue. Mr. Robert Youdelman, an abutter living on Canaan road, asked for clarification of the scope of the project. Ms. Maureen Jacoby of Foresight Land Services produced a site plan for the abutter's consideration. She explained that the property in question consists of 99 acres with an existing house. The application is for a permit to build an additional three-bedroom guest house about 200 feet north of the existing house and a smaller, 24 x 26- foot proximate barn, all of which would use the same existing driveway off Canaan Road.

Mr. Pilson pointed out that the approval of the application for the proposed barn would not include permission for living quarters or bathrooms. Mr. Pilson noted for the record that the owner and the builder and the representative from Foresight gave visual signs of agreement.

There being no further discussion or comments on the issue, Mr. Pilson moved that the public hearing be closed, Mr. Hanson seconded that motion and it was carried by unanimous vote, with the abstention of Mr. Manzolini.

The Board began its discussion. Mr. Hanson said he was comfortable with what he understands of the project and has no further comments. Mr. Pilson also indicated that he had no issue with the proposed project and, in the absence of any objections from the abutters, he proceeded to make the required findings on the proposed use:

Is it in compliance with all provisions and requirements of this bylaw and in harmony with its general intent and purpose? Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini abstaining.

It is not undesirable and does not substantially derogate from the public good or convenience at the proposed location. Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini abstaining.

It will not be detrimental to adjacent uses or to the established or future character of the neighborhood. Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini abstaining.

It will not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety. Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini abstaining.

It will not overload any public water drainage or sewer system or any other municipal facility to such an extent that the proposed use or any existing use in the immediate area or in any other area of the Town will be unduly subjected to hazards affecting public health, safety or general welfare. Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini abstaining.

The Board has approved the application for a Special Permit. Mr. Pilson noted that the special permit for the house, although the Board's opinion is that it is not required, is subject to site review by the Planning Board. Mr. Pilson noted that Mr. Manzolini usually cautions the builder with respect to awareness of the outside lighting bylaw. The application was granted.

Mr. Pruhenski will write up the Board's decision and forward it to the Town Clerk, who will stamp it as received when she comes into the office on Saturday. That starts the clock for the 20-day appeal period, at the end of which a copy of the application, signed by the Town Clerk, and noting that the application has not been appealed, will be produced. Mr. Manzolini suggested that the owner and the builder be in contact with Mr. Paul Greene, the Building Inspector to get on the fastest timeline available.

The builder asked if it would be helpful to the timeline to reapply for the house and barn separately. There was a discussion of the possibilities, which answered Mr. Walsh's question.

Mr. Pilson then moved to the second item on the agenda, which is the Public Hearing on a Special Permit application by George F. Rufo, III for an accessory structure on 1455 State Road. Mr. Pruhenski noted for the record that the permit was submitted to *The Berkshire Eagle* and was advertised in the December 10, 2018 and December 17, 2018 editions of that paper. All abutters on the Certified abutters list were notified and the special permit public hearing was posted on both Town boards and on the Town Website as well. Notices were provided to neighboring community Planning Boards as required by law.

Mr. Pruhenski advised the Board that he has comments from the Conservation Commission and the Board of Health on this permit. He then distributed packets that included an updated letter from the applicant.

Mr. Pilson then opened the public hearing on this application at 6:30 PM. Mr. George F. Rufo, III addressed the Board with an overview of the project and how it has evolved. On his first application for the building, he had requested it be a barn with an apartment and studio, which entail some complicated legal requirements concerning the plumbing and septic system. He has, therefore, revised the application to build the barn as a structure for storage and workshop use only. He intends in the future to investigate other possibilities to convert it to a second accessory dwelling. Today's permit is for a structure with electricity that is slightly larger than the Town's limits, which is why a special permit is required from the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Pilson noted for the record that the Board of Selectmen conducted a site visit that afternoon. Mr. Pilson felt he was comfortable with the application. He then invited any discussion from the floor. Mr. Vincent Stannard, the current property owner, was present, but had no comment.

There being no comments or discussion on the permit application, Mr. Pilson closed the public hearing portion of the meeting in favor of discussion by the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Pilson noted that the location of the proposed barn was well situated on the property and that there are no residences visible from the site.

Mr. Manzolini asked if the application before the Board was for the revised request only (just the shell of the barn with electricity). He was assured that it was. Mr. Hanson had no problem

with the application as revised but suggested that it be stated for the record that this structure is not to be used as living quarters.

Mr. Pilson noted that the Board would be willing to make the findings necessary to approve the application as submitted with the understanding that Mr. Rufo is clear that he will have to begin a new application process for any further additions to the proposed structure.

Mr. Pruhenski read into the minutes the letters received from the Board of Health and the Conservation Commission:

Richmond Board of Health December 4, 2018 regarding special permit for 1455 State Road. "Since last evening, Mr. John Olander, (Board of Health Agent) has had the opportunity to review the permit application and, through his email, you are likely already aware that the Board can not approve the permit at this time until a satisfactory perc test and approved design for a septic system serving the new "barn" is received. The Board will be sending the applicant a letter stating its position in the permit." Signed Mr. Fred Schubert, Board of Health

Mr. Pruhenski then read the email from Mr. John Olander that was referred to: "To whom it may concern, I reviewed today the complete package from Mr. George Rufo, III for a special permit for a second residence located in the second story of a new barn proposed to be erected at 1455 State Road. The Plan for the project shows bedrooms, living areas, bathrooms and a kitchen in the second story of the barn. The application shows a connection to an existing septic system from the barn. There was no septic system on this property when it was inspected in 2004. The inspector found a direct discharge to the ground, with no septic tank. A new system was designed and constructed for the property sale in 2004. Because of a variance, the Title V was granted for the percolation test and a reduction and separation to ground water from 4 feet to 3 feet was also granted. No flows for new construction could be added to this system. To comply with Title V, new construction will require a new, separate septic system. If the soils on the site do not pass the percolation test no new construction will be allowed on this site. The Board advises the petitioner to investigate the suitability of the soil on the proposed construction site before proceeding."

Mr. Pruhenski then read into the record the letter from the Conservation Commission dated December 9, 2018. "The Richmond Conservation Commission has reviewed the subject application for the proposed barn and has the following comments: In accordance with Mass. GIS data map #1, the Con Com can not determine if the proposed barn is in any jurisdictional area since the plot plan has not been laid out on a topographical map or any distances specified from the barn to a known point shown on the included Google aerial picture, other than a set-back from a northern boundary line. Approval of this special permit as is, would allow location of the barn anywhere on the property east of the house and 37 feet south of the property line. There is a swamp in the northern area of the property, as well as natural heritage areas in the northeastern portion of the property. Also, there are streams on the property. A building permit should not be issued until a scale topographical plot plan is provided and reviewed by

the Conservation Commission. The proposed barn is not in any Scenic Mountain Area within the jurisdiction of the Con Com. The plot plan is not updated/detailed in the special permit to allow the exact location to be determined and a Con Com review of the final barn location will be required and possibly a request for a determination of applicability will have to be submitted to the Con Com. Also note, the Con Com's agent review of the plan indicates this is a two-bedroom, two-bath residence masquerading as a barn. This input was communicated to the Board of Health Agent. We recommend that we reserve judgement until we hear what the Board of Health has to say as we understand that the existing septic system may not be able to accommodate effluent from the barn/residence. Applicant may have to do perc tests and design a new septic system for the barn/residence. According to a letter from the applicant, the building inspector advised the applicant not to install the kitchen in order to avoid having to file for a permit as a residence. The applicant refers to the upstairs level of the structure as a loft/studio with two bedrooms and two baths.

Mr. Pruhenski asked Mr. Rufo whether he had addressed the Con Com's concerns about the exact location of the barn. Mr. Rufo noted that the revised submission is much more exact than the original and it includes maps that show that all the areas under question by the Con Com are far from the proposed building site. Mr. Manzolini asked if the new plan was seen by the Con Com and Mr. Pruhenski said he believed Mr. Shep Evans, the Con Com Agent has seen it. Mr. Rufo added that he had contacted Mr. Evans to determine if there were any problems with the site in relation to wetlands, protected wildlife, brooks, streams and so on. Mr. Evans examined the property with the resources at his disposal and indicated that everything was satisfactory as far as he was concerned. Mr. Manzolini noted that the letter quoted above was written by the Chair of the Con Com, not the agent. It was noted that the letter predates the revised application.

Mr. Pruhenski suggested that if the Board were to approve the permit at this meeting, the Conservation Commission is going to have another opportunity to voice any objections during the permitting process. Mr. Manzolini voiced his concern that the Board might approve the special permit and the potential buyer would make his commitment based on that approval and then the Con Com could later deny the permit. He asked what could be done to prevent that from happening. After some discussion, it was noted that the Board's approval would be conditional upon approval by the Con Com who has indicated that there might be a problem with the Northeast section of the property. Mr. Pruhenski advised Mr. Rufo to obtain his approval from the Board of Selectmen at this meeting and then go directly to the Conservation Commission to discuss their concerns. Mr. Pilson, upon reviewing the map, noted that the proposed location for the barn is more towards the center of the property and closer to the Northwest corner than it is to the Northeast corner.

Mr. Pilson noted that it appears to be the view of the Select Board that the proposed barn is not located anywhere near the Northeast corner of the property and closed the public hearing.

Findings:

Is the application in compliance with all provisions and requirements of this bylaw and in harmony with its general intent and purpose? Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini yes.

The property is not undesirable and does not substantially derogate from the public good or convenience at the proposed location. Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini yes.

It will not be detrimental to adjacent uses or to the established or future character of the neighborhood. Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini yes.

It will not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety. Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini yes.

It will not overload any public water drainage or sewer system or any other municipal facility to such an extent that the proposed use or any existing use in the immediate area or in any other area of the Town will be unduly subjected to hazards affecting public health, safety or general welfare. Mr. Pilson, yes, Mr. Hanson, yes, Mr. Manzolini yes.

The Board has approved the application for a special permit. Given the history of Mr. Rufo's application; that the Board of Selectmen's approval is limited to a barn for storage and a workshop with electricity. Mr. Pilson advised Mr. Rufo that if he wishes to go forward with additions in the future, he will need to submit a new permit request. Mr. Manzolini added the usual cautionary note to the builder to be sure to follow the bylaws with respect to outdoor lighting.

Approval of the Minutes of December 10, 2018 (joint meeting with Richmond School) and December 12, 2018: Mr. Pilson moved that the minutes of December 10th and December 12th be approved. Mr. Manzolini seconded the motion.

Mr. Hanson noted a correction required in the December 12th minutes in the list of Guests; the correct name should be Mary Stodden. Mr. Pruhenski will make that correction.

The Board voted to approve the minutes with the noted correction.

Cone Hill Landfill Inspections for 2019: Mr. Pruhenski reminded the Board that in 2017, Richmond agreed to take part in the STEP program of inspections of the Town's municipal-owned properties. As part of that inspection, it was noted that the 1994 and 1998 permits for a landfill required that we get quarterly inspections of the landfill, which have never been done. The DEP, which was the issuer of the permits, brought up the fact of those inspections not being done during their investigation and they also advised the Town that State Law has changed since 1994 and 1998 and they no longer require quarterly inspection. They will allow the frequency to be reduced to every two years. Mr. Pruhenski applied to the DEP, requesting that the frequency of inspections be reduced. He received a response approving that request and is in the process of working with Mr. Peter Beckwith, the Richmond Highway

Superintendent, to secure a third-party inspector. That will happen in 2019, which will get the Town back on track.

In the DEP's recent inspection two minor issues were discovered, which are being addressed. Once the third-party inspection is completed, sometime in the 2019 calendar year, and the report submitted, Mr. Pruhenski will provide copies to the Board. Mr. Beckwith will be responsible for complying with the required scheduling of inspections every two years. Mr. Pruhenski will add that to the Operations Calendar at Mr. Manzolini's request.

Mr. Hanson asked whether Mr. Beckwith is familiar with the requirements of a landfill. Mr. Pruhenski noted that Mr. Beckwith is very much aware of those regulations and was here for the last inspection done by the DEP.

Noise Bylaw Proposal – Continued Discussion: Mr. Pruhenski had distributed copies of a very early draft of a proposed bylaw at the last meeting. He asked whether the Board had any feedback on it. The draft will be continued to be worked on until the Town Meeting Warrant is drafted. Mr. Pruhenski will work with the Town's attorney to make sure it is in final format in time for the Annual Town Meeting.

Mr. Pilson noted that he found the word "unreasonable" used in two different contexts: "Unreasonable noise" is noise with unreasonably disturbs residents – he felt that was not a satisfactory standard. He had no objection to the general tenor of Section 1 but wondered how well that could be enforced and who determines what is "unreasonable." The bylaw should reflect the community's standard and its tolerance for a certain degree of noise, but which limits excessive noise.

Mr. Pilson noted that he would like to see more input from other sources in Town such as other Boards and Committees. Mr. Manzolini asked how the draft was created. Mr. Pruhenski explained that he did the research to obtain copies of noise bylaws from other towns in Berkshire County. The only towns that have such a bylaw are the larger towns such as Great Barrington, Pittsfield, Williamstown and they vary from one sentence to multiple pages and each of those towns have police departments and noise meters which provides ways to enforce a noise bylaw which Richmond does not have.

The final draft of the noise bylaw would be presented to the Town at the Annual Town Meeting as a General Bylaw. Mr. Pilson felt inclined that if in Section 1 the word "unreasonable" was replaced by "excessive noise, which is defined as noise generated which unreasonably disturbs residents," it would be workable.

Mr. Pilson offered to work on the draft and advise Mr. Pruhenski of any changes he felt would make the bylaw stronger. Once that revised draft is received by Mr. Pruhenski, he will distribute it to Mr. Manzolini and Mr. Hanson for their input. Once that process is complete, the bylaw can be sent to other Boards for their comments.

CEMP/ Emergency Management Plan: Mr. Pilson commended Mr. Pruhenski, Mr. Steve Traver, the Fire Chief, and Mr. Chris Porter for their work on the Plan, which he felt was extraordinarily well prepared. He did see one issue he felt needed to be discussed. The Plan provides for participation by the Chief of Police and Richmond's Chief regularly spends six months of the year in Florida. Mr. Pilson felt that the Town needs to discuss how the role of Police Chief is going to be handled in the absence of our current Police Chief. Mr. Pilson suggested that a Deputy Police Chief be appointed in his absence. Mr. Pilson also requested that a reference to the Chief Executive be incorporated early in the Plan as he has the ultimate responsibility for the Emergency Management Plan.

Mr. Pruhenski asked that the Board approve the Plan as written and edited and that the Board members sign the Plan. Once that is accomplished, Mr. Pruhenski will ask the Emergency Management Director, Assistant Emergency Management Director, the Highway Superintendent, the Board of Health and the Superintendent of Schools to read and sign a copy of the Plan. Once a master copy has been signed by all appropriate parties, copies will be provided for each of them.

In response to a question by Mr. Manzolini of how to address the issue of the need for a Deputy Police Chief, Mr. Pruhenski noted that he has included that issue on the agenda for the next meeting. There was a discussion of the training background that would be required for a Deputy Police Chief and Mr. Pruhenski advised that as the position is strictly administrative, it would not require anything special. Mr. Manzolini suggested that the responsibilities of that position, as outlined in the CEMP, be considered when looking for a candidate. Mr. Pruhenski noted that any real emergency in Town would be deferred to the State Police and the biggest part of the Richmond Chief of Police's role would be coordinating with the State Police.

This conversation will be continued at the next meeting. Mr. Pilson signed the CEMP Emergency Management Plan.

Tree Contract/ Phase 2 for Signatures: The Town received four bids for the second phase of the tree project. The low bidder (\$21,500) was Butternut Tree and Lawn Care out of New Marlborough. There is adequate funding in the account to cover that amount. Mr. Pruhenski has written the contract, which requires the Board's approval before Mr. Pruhenski signs it on their behalf.

Butternut Tree is planning to start work immediately – the contract will state that the deadline will be February 15th to have all the trees cut, cleaned up and removed from the Town. That contract includes the vendor taking the resulting firewood and selling it. They are aware that they will need to take the wood as they cut the trees.

Mr. Pilson raised an issue with the company contracted to take the trees down for EverSource, which is not contracted for by the Town or regulated by the Town. He noted that on East Road, several large trees were taken down and the procedure did not seem to be the same as that contracted for between the Town and Butternut Tree; that is, that all of the wood appears to

have been left behind in very large pieces, which makes it impossible for residents to take advantage of the wood and creates an unsightly situation. Some of the stumps left are three to six feet high not the Town's mandated six inches from grade. Is there any way the Town can regulate that process so that the company in question will conform to our expectations?

Mr. Pruhenski noted that his experience has been that the Town is not notified of their arrival either to do the survey work, when the tree crew arrives or when the crane is brought in later to pick up the remainder of the wood after the residents have had an opportunity to pick up the firewood. Mr. Pruhenski felt that EverSource and their arborist have been very responsive in the past to requests to correct a tall stump and to come back to clean up a pile of unwanted wood.

Mr. Hanson explained why the arborist will sometimes leave a stump very tall. It is usually because there is barbed wire grown into the tree and cutting through it would ruin the saw blade, so they cut above that level.

A suggestion from Mr. Manzolini to ask the Electric Company to work with their arborist to address some of the issues that have arisen in Town was accepted and Mr. Pruhenski will follow up.

Massachusetts Farm Bureau – 2019 Renewal: Mr. Pruhenski reminded the Board that he was instructed last year to apply for membership in the Bureau, which he did. He has now received the renewal notice and was asking the Board for approval to sign and pay for it.

Mr. Hanson, who is the appointed Chair of the Farm Bureau Committee advised the Board that, although there are no issues requiring that the Committee hold meetings, it remains a good idea for the Town to remain a member of the Bureau so that the Town will be aware of laws that are passed that may affect our farms. Mr. Manzolini thought that if a Committee exists, it should be held to holding at least one meeting a year and suggested that it might be helpful to the farmers in town for that Committee to publish an updated version of the brochure they created many years ago, identifying the various products available from local farmers. Mr. Hanson said he would set a meeting date and put that item on the agenda.

The decision was made to renew the Town's membership in the Massachusetts Farm Bureau.

Sewer I/I Evaluation – Updates: The report has been completed and submitted to the DEP by Tighe and Bond. Mr. Pruhenski distributed copies of the report for the Board's review and to Mr. Tom Grizey, Wiring Inspector and Sewer Maintenance. Mr. Pruhenski noted that Mr. Grizey had been able to locate all the information requested by the DEP and that he was very pleased with the report, which met with the DEP's approval.

Mr. Grizey raised the issue of excessive water runoff during heavy rains, which he felt should be addressed. Mr. Pilson noted that in Table VII it says that in 2011 and 2014 the Town had 30,000 gallons going through on one day and 38,700 going through on another date, but the recommendation on the following page says that, "since low infiltration inflow rates were

observed, further inflow and infiltration investigations are not warranted or recommended. This seems to refer to a storm that is comparable to the numbers Mr. Grizey had mentioned. Mr. Grizey noted that the overflow from the storm Mr. Pilson had referenced was handled by the two pumps at the station. He said, however, that if we get more than that volume that could be a problem. He would like to figure out where the water is coming from and stop it.

Mr. Pilson asked how the source of the excess water can be determined. Mr. Grizey said the next time there is a heavy downpour of rain, several manhole covers should be opened to see what the flow is like. Mr. Grizey noted that he would need the aid of the Highway crew to clear off the debris from the manhole covers so that they can be opened. Mr. Manzolini offered to have the Board authorize whatever help Mr. Grizey would need to get that inspection accomplished.

Mail/Sign Warrants: Mail was distributed, and warrants signed as appropriate.

Town Administrator Updates: Town Hall repairs and repaving was done on December 13th, which should complete the project.

Complete Streets: The Town received notification last week that our Policy has been approved by the State. He was able to set up an online sign-in on their website, which he was able to upload, and we can now move forward. The Town scored 96 out of 100 points for our policy so the next step is to develop a Project Plan. Mr. Pruhenski will work with the Board of selectmen and Mr. Peter Beckwith, the Highway Superintendent, to identify roughly 15 projects.

Budget Planning: The FY20 requests have gone out to Department Heads on December 28th and are due back on February 1st with all Capital and Operating Requests. Town Reports are also due on that day.

Mr. Pruhenski distributed the proposed FY20 meeting calendar and asked that the members of the Board advise him of any significant conflicts. Mr. Manzolini noted that his plans to be away this winter have not been finalized, but he expects to leave here sometime in mid-February and be away for at least three or four weeks, culminating in Denver on or around April 10th. All the proposed meeting dates conflict with his expected absence.

Mr. Pilson's only conflict was on Wednesday, March 20th, when he will be in Florida. That will mean that both Mr. Manzolini and Mr. Pilson will be away for the School Department Budget meeting. Mr. Pilson will be able to attend on April 3rd. Mr. Manzolini noted that he will be available to work if budgets and updates are emailed to him.

Mr. Hanson did not anticipate any conflict with the meeting dates.

Mr. Pruhenski noted that as long as he has a quorum of the Finance Committee for that meeting, it will be able to proceed.

Selectmen's Matters: Mr. Manzolini voiced a general concern about the performance of one of the Board's appointees. Mr. Pruhenski advised him that such an issue must be done in

Executive Session with the person in question invited to attend and to have representation present.

Mr. Pilson suggested that Mr. Manzolini and Mr. Pruhenski discuss the matter and decide how they want to proceed.

Next Meeting Dates: January 23, 2019 (joint meeting with Planning Board – Regular Board of Selectmen session to follow)

Mr. Manzolini will not be here on January 23rd. Mr. Pilson and Mr. Hanson will attend on January 23rd.

February 13, 2019 – Mr. Pilson will be here. Mr. Hanson noted that there is a budget date on February 20th

February 27, 2019 – Mr. Manzolini will likely be away for the 20th and the 27th of February. Mr. Pilson will also be away on February 27th – which eliminates that date for a meeting.

Mr. Pruhenski suggested that they just skip February 27th as there is nothing important for that agenda at this point.

The next meeting normally scheduled after that would be March 13th. Mr. Pilson will be available for that and Mr. Hanson will as well. Mr. Manzolini may still be away, but there will be a quorum.

The next regular meeting date would be Wednesday March 27th. Mr. Pilson will be here, Mr. Hanson will be here. Mr. Manzolini will clarify his away time more definitively this week.

Topics Not Anticipated: Mr. Pruhenski brought forth the issue of the Animal Control Officer who has indicated several times that he will likely be retiring soon. Mr. Pruhenski noted that one of the new hires for the Highway Department has expressed an interest in being Certified to become an Animal Control Officer. The question was raised as to whether that person has an adequate holding pen for the animals. Mr. Pruhenski noted that towns will often contract with an animal shelter. The only time the Town would have to pay the bill would be if the animal turned over to the Shelter was never reunited with its owner, who is responsible for the bill.

The Board expressed its approval of having the Animal Control Officer as part of the Highway Department crew, which is here 40 hours a week. There would be a fee for the course to certify an Animal Control Officer. Mr. Hanson asked if it would be possible to make the new man an Alternate if the current Officer is not sure whether he will continue in the position. That would be possible.

Mr. Pilson asked Mr. Pruhenski to find out what the cost of the certification is. The Animal Control Department has an expense account that has never been used, so there is funding available.

Mr. Pilson moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Manzolini seconded that motion, which was passed by unanimous consent.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 PM

Signed:

Mr. Neal Pilson, Chair


