

**TOWN OF DEERFIELD
BOARD OF SELECTMEN
February 22, 2021
MINUTES**

Call to Order

5:30 pm – Chairman Robertson called the meeting to order

Present: Andrew Robertson, Chairman; Richard Pitman, Vice Chairman, Fred McGarry, and Cynthia McHugh, Selectmen.

Absent at Roll Call: Alden Dill

Chairman Robertson: As I stated a few minutes ago, Alden is not with us as I believe that he is unloading hay at the moment.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Chairman Robertson will forego the Pledge

Town Audit Contract Proposals – Decision

Chairman Robertson: We went out to bid for the town audit process. I believe that we received three bids last week. We thought that we had only received two but we had actually received a third one before the deadline. It was at the post office and John took those proposals to Rita, our financial person for her evaluation and recommendation.

I don't know if Rita is with us or she gave you her recommendation, John?

Mr. Harrington: I believe that Rita is on the line.

Ms. Donaldson: I am on the line.

Chairman Robertson: Great. If you could us your recommendation Rita and brief explanation as to why, I think that the Board would appreciate it.

Ms. Donaldson: I have been doing this for a number of years and I have worked with all three of these firms.

Melanson is currently or has been the auditor in Deerfield since I have been involved with Deerfield and I think, I think, not only for myself but the staff as to how frustrated we've become with some of the procedures or lack thereof that happens there.

In my experience, working in various towns and school districts and cities, my recommendation with be to go with Plodzic.

Chairman Robertson: Okay. And we, prior to Melanson, we had used Plodzic and Sanderson. We actually moved away from them as we had a year or two where we didn't meet deadlines for the audit but it has been a few years and we did go out to bid so questions for Rita from the Board?

Vice Chairman Pitman: I think that I would have to agree with her on that.

Chairman Robertson: Okay. All right. If there are no further questions or discussion, I would entertain a motion to accept Rita's recommendation that we move forward with Plodzic and Sanderson for our audit.

Motion: Vice Chairman Pitman and Selectman McGarry both move to accept the recommendation of the finance director subject to the three-year contract

Second: Selectwoman McHugh

Discussion: Chairman Roberson: I believe that it is a three-year contract.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Right, I just thought that we should have it in the minutes.

Mr. Harrington: It's three years with an option to renew for three years.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Right but we will be locked into three, right?

Mr. Harrington: Right.

Vice Chairman Pitman: That is how I want it to read.

Vote: Yea 4, Nay 0, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

The chairman thanked Ms. Donaldson.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Andy, jumping ships here won't have any effect on Melanson wrapping up where we are at with them.

Chairman Robertson: I don't believe so at all, no.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Rita is all good starting clean with the cut date?

Ms. Donaldson and Mr. Harrington: Yes.

Ms. Donaldson: We did get the final report from them for 2019 so we should be all set.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Thank you Rita.

Ms. Donaldson: All righty, thank you.

Chairman Robertson: Thanks Rita, have a good evening.

Matt Fisher, Chief – F/R Department – Engine 2 pump issue/ F/R Quarterly Report:

Chairman Robertson: Next we have Chief Matt Fisher and this is in regard to Engine 2 and the failed pump.

We had received information from John Harrington last week that the Engine 2 had failed and the recommendation that the fire chief had received was to replace the pump rather than rebuild it.

We have been looking at a cost slightly north of \$16,000.00 although that didn't include shipping for the new pump and it didn't include installation in the truck and I know that the Board wanted to hear from the fire chief as to the ramifications and why the decision was made to look at replacing instead of repairing and I know that the town administrator, John, had forwarded us information from Matt earlier today with photos of the pump and an explanation from the pump technician that had removed the pump and looked at it.

At this point, I guess I would look to Matt just for a general synopsis of why you want to do what you want to do and then maybe you could take questions from Board members if they have them Matt.

Chief Fisher: Thank you, Andy.

So, I think that that summary from Wayne Perkins from W.D. Perkins kind of lays out how he had been in contact with Darley, who is the pump manufacturer. He had contacted them, sent them the pictures, talked to their engineer and flat out the advice from the manufacturer was to replace the pump, not to rebuild it for a second time.

I believe some of the language spoke to the time and the money to get the parts and rebuild the pump at this point, would be, cost more than replacing the pump.

Chairman Robertson: I think one of the questions that the Board was wondering about was the expected lifetime of Engine 2 Matt, if that is something that you're looking to replace sooner rather than later or if you are expecting to get more years out of Engine 2?

Chief Fisher: I am very hopeful to have that truck around for another fifteen years or so. That would put it around 34 years.

The next ones that are due for replacement are Engine 3 which is the 1980 and Tank 2 which is a 1987. So, Engine 2 being a 2002, has quite a ways to go for us.

Chairman Robertson: Great, thank you.

Other questions for the chief?

Selectwoman McHugh: Do we know of any other pump companies that we could get an estimate from, I mean, I think we need to get estimates for what these pumps costs.

I mean, you can't just go with one company and say this is what they can do it for.

Chief Fisher: So, the pump has to be purchased through Darley, which is the pump manufacturer.

Vice Chairman Pitman: So, that's their price Matt, \$16,000.00 from Darley or is that from Perkins?

Chief Fisher: That is the price from Perkins.

Vice Chairman Pitman: So, Perkins is buying from Darley and we are buying it from Perkins?

Chief Fisher: Yes. Perkins has been doing the pump work for the town of Deerfield for as long as I have been around.

Vice Chairman Pitman: How did this pump happen to go like that? Was this from shenanigans out back from the help, or what brought this on?

Chief Fisher: Not that I am aware of. This is our truck that goes to a water hole as a source so it is going to have the most abuse of the suction being put into the lake, a pond, a stream where it could be apt to suck up any range of things.

This truck failed during a very routine truck check, if you will.

Every year the truck is pump tested. It has not, except for its previous failure, when the truck, when the pump had to be rebuilt in the past, I am not aware of any time that this truck has had an issue passing a pump test.

Vice Chairman Pitman: So, did this truck go to Country Berries?

Chief Fisher: It did not. It was out of service.

Vice Chairman Pitman: It was out for that one?

Chief Fisher: Correct.

Vice Chairman Pitman: I kind of agree with Cindy, I didn't know that Perkins had the monopoly on it as far as we put stuff out to bid for the tax payers benefit and if we can't, I guess we can't.

Chief Fisher: I think that this would be the same as, I guess, an automotive repair in sorts. If we brought a truck somewhere to get worked on and let's say that the motor blew, and it was at Liberty, I would assume in the past, it's at that place and that's who does the work for us.

Perkins came out to the fire station, took the pump off the truck, brought it to their shop, diagnosed it and this is where we are.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Where is that, Matt?

Chief Fisher: Where is that? Their shop is in Merrimack.

Selectman Dill: Matt, this isn't anything that we had any warning about, right? This was just a, you didn't know the pump was going or anything like that?

Chief Fisher: No, it had just passed its pump test a few months ago.

Selectman Dill: So, what failed on it? Was it a bearing failure or ...

Chief Fisher: So, the truck is a little unique being a front-end pump instead, the pump if you envision all of our other fire trucks, is mounted right behind the cab. This is actually in front of the cab.

So, there was a drive shaft that broke as well as a few other internal parts.

Selectman Dill: Okay.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Where was it when this happened, Matt?

Chief Fisher: I believe, if I look at the email, so Perkins came out on the 22nd and it had to be the 21st that it had its failure, of January.

Vice Chairman Pitman: So, it's already been a month.

Chief Fisher: Correct.

Chairman Robertson: And, we are looking at six to eight weeks probably to get this put back together.

Chief Fisher: I was a little hopeful, it might be sooner. Darley is able to take stance when they can to prioritize replacing a pump for a truck that is in service opposed to one that is on an assembly line being manufactured.

They realize that this is a fire truck that we are down and missing.

Chairman Robertson: Other questions or discussion?

Vice Chairman Pitman: Where will the funds come from, Matt?

Chief Fisher: I would plan on using the Fire Apparatus and Equipment Fund and I believe that the fund has about \$53,000.00 in it currently.

Vice Chairman Pitman: That is set up for when we have crisis's like this?

Chief Fisher: Yes, we have been putting money, except for this year, have had every year, out of surplus, have been putting \$10,000.00 to \$20,000.00 away for this exact purpose.

Chairman Robertson: Yup.

Motion: Selectman Dill moves to go ahead and get this pump replaced out of the surplus fund, I mean out of the existing trust fund.

Second: Selectman McGarry

Discussion: Chairman Robertson: Further discussion? Hearing none.

Vote: Yea 3, Nay 1, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

Mr. Harrington: Cindy, you are muted. Did you vote?

Selectwoman McHugh: No. I guess I just don't understand the whole getting a quote for getting these kind of large purchases.

I know that the pump is gone and I know that it needs to be replaced, but just going through one person all the time, it just doesn't make sense, so I say no, then.

Chairman Robertson: The vote was three to one, then, John.

Thank you for joining us Matt. Appreciate your time, Chief.

Rick Pelletier – Highway Salt Shed Addition:

Chairman Robertson: This is in regard to the highway salt shed addition and essentially, questions the Board had.

We had a report from Mr. Farwell from Farwell Engineering Services over in Lee, NH. He indicated at the end of his report, that there was no cost-effective way to bring the existing or proposed foundation wall, into compliance.

It also said that he considered this a “low risk” category building in the paragraph before that and the Board was a little confused as to whether he thought we should basically, rip up the concrete that had been poured, whether he thought that it was okay to go ahead and do what we could, understanding that there were some structural integrity and since you were actually with Mr. Farwell when he did his inspection, Rick, we were hoping that you might be able to maybe give us some inferences that he hadn’t put writing, in black and white in his report.

Mr. Pelletier: Basically, we looked at the existing building. Looked for any potential failures there which there didn’t seem to be any. It’s our understanding that the current foundation was built and poured in a similar fashion.

Based on that, as he said, they characterize buildings in importance whether they’re related to health, life and so forth or whether they’re just basically, dry storage-type buildings or warehousing and they are both under the lowest risk category.

As an engineer, he can’t approve the work that was done. He is not willing to say that it meets the structural requirements for such a thing but as an opinion, he doesn’t feel that it would be a major issue, given that the current period of time that the existing shed has been in existence and the fact that the new wall was built in a similar fashion as well as the new wall is being backed up by a considerable amount of earth to stop the wall from potentially moving.

As a building inspector, knowing that it is structurally incorrect, I can’t, I can’t bless it and say that it’s all right to go ahead knowing that it has the potential for a structural failure. Probably won’t happen given what we saw there and given what has been done in the past, it probably is not going to fail and it’s a low-risk facility.

So, there is only two options, either you tear it down and start over or we move forward with what we have.

Chairman Robertson: Okay. Thank you for your input.

What’s the Board’s feeling on this? I know we had discussed just moving ahead with what we had last week.

Selectman McGarry: So, based on what Tobin had said, I would agree that we just go ahead with what we got although next time we do any construction like this, I think that we are going to have to need have far more detailed plans provided to us and my understanding is that Rick didn’t even have an opportunity to take and review these and I certainly think that the building inspector should have that opportunity prior to starting work.

Chairman Robertson: Yeah, I would agree and actually, you know, I will bear some of the responsibility. This Board probably should have brought Rick in. It’s the highway shed and the highway agent had given us the original specs for what he wanted to do but it was really up to us and I clearly should have stepped in and gotten Rick involved from the get go. I will put that out there on the public record as well.

Selectwoman McHugh: I wanted to say too, I tried to stop this before it got backfilled and nobody thought that it was important not to look at it before they backfilled the foundation and I agree, Rick should have been on this with us from the get go.

Selectman Dill: Rick, is there any remedial anything we can do to the existing wall that was moving before we build more onto it?

Mr. Pelletier: Not really. I mean, there is no way to reinforce it. The only way that you can reinforce it would be to add buttresses to the side of it but those buttresses are going to end up in the additional space we just created, so those are pointless.

Other than that, there are two cracks in the wall but the cracks are minor and there is no misalignment in the wall so even though the wall was cracked, there is no evidence that any movement has occurred and the existing wall is roughly twenty years old and it is a free-standing wall.

The new wall is of similar construction. It is thicker. It is not quite as tall and approximately two-thirds of the wall is going to be backed up with fill and sloped off so the likelihood that the old wall will continue moving before the new wall would probably move.

Selectman Dill: I guess what I meant, was not so much for the cement wall but when I was reading that report, it looked like the wooden wall was moving on top of the cement wall.

Mr. Pelletier: Well, we looked at that. Now, the building was built so crooked because that was the only way that they could make it work.

The concrete wall was poured leaning out. The trusses were ordered to a specific length and if you measure from the bottom to the top, you will find that the wall is leaning out, hence when they built the wall on top of it, they ended up tipping it in to meet the length of the trusses.

Selectman Dill: I guess what I meant was is there anything that we could put up against that cement wall to take some of the roof load off; throw in some telephone poles or something in there because we are tying in that roof to the next roof, correct?

Mr. Pelletier: We are going to set the roof on that wall, correct.

Vice Chairman Pitman: You won't be on the other roof, just on the wall the way that he drew it out.

Mr. Pelletier: The new roof will just be sitting on the wall. You probably could add steel strong backs to the inside of the existing salt shed since the wall is pushing out. You'd probably want to put strong backs on the inside but the problem is, it's a salt shed and the only thing I can think of for strong backs would be steel. Well, the salt will have a field day with that over the course of a few years.

Telephone poles, you are driving a loader in there and it is not going to take very long to chip away at the edges of telephone poles. Look at them on the side of the road where the plows go by.

Selectman Dill: What about cabling across the top?

Vice Chairman Pitman: It's not that bad yet.

Mr. Pelletier: Across the very top, the tresses are holding that from going anywhere. The place where it would probably move is where the wooden wall joins the concrete wall but if you cable that, you effectively cut the height of that building down almost fifty percent. The loader won't go in there anymore.

Chairman Robertson: I think looking at this with your comments, Rick, we've got enough money into this that I guess it is my feeling that we should probably proceed as planned, understanding that we have a flawed building but it is a salt and sand shed. We might get a few less years out of it then we hoped or we will have to do some remediation somewhere down the line but it doesn't make sense to me at this point to take that new concrete out of there and start over.

Mr. Pelletier: And, a new concrete wall, engineered, will probably cost you two to three times what that one cost on top of that.

Vice Chairman Pitman: I just want to make sure Rick has say over the design and bidding of the balance of the work that needs to be done.

Chairman Robertson: Yes, we definitely want Rick's recommendation on whatever is going on top of this concrete.

Selectwoman McHugh: I am kind of concerned that I know that it is kind of low risk but you have an engineer and a building inspector that won't officially okay it but it is low risk. I, it's a problem.

Chairman Robertson: Understood.

Other comments or concerns?

Vice Chairman Pitman: I think the biggest concern, Andy, is on the original one. The wooden walls weren't to have salt go up against them. There were just there to give headroom for the loaders so we need to talk to the crews about stopping the loading at the top of the concrete and it will help on this new one too, if we vote to leave it.

Chairman Robertson: Okay. Good recommendation.

So, what is the pleasure of the Board at this point?

Selectman McGarry: I feel that we should just proceed with what we've got and put the roof on and whatever other amenities that need to be but whether we actually have a plan drawn up for that, I would defer to Rick to what his thoughts are.

Mr. Pelletier: As far as I know, there is nothing in place other than the size of the roof rafters but I haven't even seen what they were proposing other than they are going to use 2 x 8-foot roof rafters which are totally inadequate.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Right. The whole thing was inadequate.

Chairman Robertson: Okay, so probably what we need to do is get a specific proposal with more information about the superstructure on this and get that to Rick before we go out to bid or proceed.

(Multiple members of the Board stated that they agreed)

Mr. Pelletier: They need to put something together specifically, to specify exactly what we are looking for and probably how we want it done and then get it priced out.

Chairman Robertson: Okay. Is the Board in general agreement that that's the way that we will move forward?

Selectman McGarry: Yes.

Vice Chairman Pitman: I would like to see that get done before we make a decision on the concrete so we can see what the rest of it is going to cost us where we know that it is out of square and plumb. It is not going to be an easy fix so if it is going to be a ridiculous amount for the wood and the roof, maybe it is time to regroup now instead of after we agree to it.

Chairman Robertson: Okay, so, at this stage of the game then, the Board wants to see exactly what it going to cost to put an appropriate superstructure on that concrete before we move forward?

Vice Chairman Pitman: To finish the job. We already paid for the concrete so we have nothing to go back on there anyway.

Selectman Dill: I am really going on Dick and Rick's recommendation here. Dick has built more buildings than I will ever think about so I am going to sit back on this one.

Motion: Vice Chairman Pitman moves to proceed with the wood and roof part of it that Rick will request and get a current, out to bid price before we go any further on the project

Second: Selectman McGarry

Discussion:

Vote: Yea 3, Nay 1, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

So, John, we have three in favor and one opposed so that is the way that we are going to move forward at this point.

Thank you for your time, Rick. Appreciate your input.

Mr. Pelletier: Okay. Very good. Have a good night.

Regular Business:

Review of Outstanding Minutes of February 16, 2021

Motion: Selectman Dill moves to approve the minutes of February 16, 2021

Second: Selectwoman McHugh

Discussion:

Vote: Yea 4, Nay 0, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

Vouchers/Payroll Manifest/Accounts Payable Manifest:

Accounts Payable – February 23, 2021 - \$240,557.44

Motion: Vice Chairman Pitman move to approve the Accounts Payable in the amount of \$240,557.44

Second: Selectman McGarry

Discussion:

Vote: Yea 4, Nay 0, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

Payroll Manifest week ending February 17, 2021 - \$67,463.70 (gross) - \$42,679.52 (net)

Motion: Vice Chairman Pitman moves to approve the Accounts Payable as presented

Second: Selectman Dill

Discussion:

Vote: Yea 4, Nay 0, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

Chairman Robertson: We had some information from the consortium of towns that contract with Atlantic Broadband for cable and internet access.

You may recall we received a letter a few meetings ago from Atlantic Broadband saying that they were working towards reupping our contract with them.

I don't believe our contract expires for another couple of years but they have to legally notify us well in advance and John had sent around an email, a letter from the town administrator from Gilford who the last time we reupped with Atlantic Broadband, which was in 2014, we formed a consortium with a number of other towns, primarily Lakes Region towns that deal with Atlantic Broadband and dealt with them as the entire group giving us a little more purchase power with Atlantic Broadband then if we were just an individual town.

We have had a request, not a request, just a letter asking us if we want to join that consortium as we head into reupping again and I think that probably it is in our best interest and I would note that the last time this consortium was formed and did their ground work, they looked to see if there were alternatives to Atlantic Broadband willing to work with either individual towns or the consortium.

I doubt that we will find anyone else other than Atlantic Broadband willing to work with us but if we are part of a consortium of fifteen or twenty towns, we probably stand a better chance of getting a look from someone else than if we were just Deerfield.

I don't know how the rest of the Board feels, if we once again want to join this consortium as we look what our options are for cable and broadband.

Selectman Dill: There were fourteen other towns so I don't see any reason not to.

Selectman McGarry: Right.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Agreed.

Selectman Dill: They have already got eight towns back, well, six and they are waiting on commitment from Laconia and Franklin which I am sure have a lot more subscribers than we do.

Chairman Robertson: If there is no opposition, I think that we should let the town administrator in Gilford know that we are interested in being part of the consortium as we move forward to see what we might have for options with regard to cable and broadband.

If there is no objection, I would have John notify them that we are interested again.

(All members of the Board agreed.)

Chairman Robertson: Okay. Next up is a revisit to the Sklenear cemetery deed. There was some question about the cost of the lots.

At last meeting, we were deeding three lots to Mr. Sklenear for \$600.00 and John, I believe that you were going to look into whether that was correctly priced or not.

Mr. Harrington: Yes, I did talk to Pete, Peter Lemay and confirmed what I thought but I wanted to make sure before I shared it with the Board last week.

The old plots on Meetinghouse Hill Cemetery were sold in groups of four. They were head-to-head and you could bury quite a few folks in that plot. It was \$800.00 at the time.

These plots that are being sold now are the newly surveyed plots at the back of the cemetery and they were designed side-by-side for one person or two cremains. So, it's one-quarter of the price that we used to sell the units of four in, if you think about it that way so that's why it's \$200.00.

The Cemetery Trustees had thought about renewing or reviewing price and possibly increasing it but they never got around to it last year so that is where the price sits at the time.

Vice Chairman Pitman: The problem that we had last week; it was three lots for \$200.00 but it should have been three lots for \$600.00 at \$200.00 a-piece and that is what it is written up as well according to the paper you sent out, \$600.00.

I looked into it. It is 4' x 11', like you said, at \$200.00 per so the paperwork that you sent out looked right for \$600.00.

According to Rick, I can't think of the last name...

Mr. Harrington: Druckenmiller?

Vice Chairman Pitman: Yes.

Mr. Harrington: So, it is for three plots.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Yes.

Mr. Harrington: For \$200.00 each.

Chairman Robertson: H-1, H-2 and H-3 for a total of \$600.00.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Correct. Last week all three were for \$200.00.

Mr. Harrington: That is correct.

Chairman Robertson: So, is the Board in general agreement that we can deed Mr. Sklenear the three lots, that being H-1, H-2 and H-3 for the \$600.00.

Motion: Vice Chairman Pitman moves to approve selling cemetery lots H-1, H-2 and H-3 in the Old Center Cemetery to Mr. Sklenear for \$600.00

Second: Selectman Dill

Discussion: Selectman McGarry: On discussion, I would essentially ask the Cemetery Trustees as to whether or not they are under valuing these and whether the price should be increased. They had looked at it last year but didn't come back with a recommendation. I think that we should pass it off to them to look at it again.

Selectman Dill: The Cemetery Trustees have told us again and again that they are chronically under assetted and need some money to build more cemeteries. I think that it is time to raise the fee.

Chairman Robertson: Yes, we can certainly make that recommendation to the Cemetery Commission. My understanding is that Mr. Sklenear has applied in good faith for the plots at the current price that we currently have on the books.

Selectman Dill: Oh, agreed, we can't change the price we currently have. I think Fred's saying the same thing going forward, we probably should take a look at this.

Selectman McGarry: Yes. Exactly.

Chairman Robertson: Other discussion?

Selectwoman McHugh: Each lot is one plot now? I know before when bought, you had to buy two or four, four, so now ...

Chairman Robertson: are individual is my understanding.

Mr. Harrington: So, each lot, because they were actually set up side-by-side, instead of head-to-head, you can fit one person, or two cremains in each plot.

Selectwoman McHugh: So, that is one plot. Okay.

Mr. Harrington: Correct.

Vice Chairman Pitman: Cindy, it is 4 foot by 11 foot, Cindy.

Selectwoman McHugh: Right, that's one lot. Okay.

Vice Chairman Pitman: One casket or two cremains as John calls it.

Selectwoman McHugh: I just know somebody that purchase some a couple of years back and they had to buy four but they could buy two, but they couldn't buy three because that was odd. I was just, in my mind, trying to figure it out.

Chairman Robertson: And as John mentioned earlier, I believe these are the new plots that they have laid out and they laid them out in a fashion such as you could purchase one or two or three.

Mr. Harrington: But they are all side-by-side as opposed to a family grouping where you would be head-to-head in the same area, so to speak.

Selectwoman McHugh: Okay.

Chairman Robertson: If there is no further discussion.

Vote: Yea 4, Nay 0, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

Chairman Robertson: We have a request from the Conservation Commission to reappoint Serita Frey to the Deerfield Conservation Commission which I think is an excellent idea.

I don't know how the rest of the Board feels but we would need a motion to reappoint.

Motion: Selectman Dill moves to reappoint Serita Frey to the Deerfield Conservation Commission

Second: Selectman McGarry

Discussion:

Vote: Yea 4, Nay 0, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

Selectman Dill: Thank you for doing that Serita.

Chairman Robertson: We have three, Intents to Cut. These don't require actual motions for Intents to Cut but I will read them for the record.

The first is the O'Connell's at Lot 408-011. That's on Perry Road.
The second is from the Schooks at 414-149 on Thurston Pond Road.
And, the third is the Boutwell's and that is 408-052 on Cate Road.

That doesn't require a vote John. You can just put those in the signature list unless somebody wants to speak up and have objection to signing.

Selectman Dill: I don't object to signing but I just wanted to point out that I am starting to see road postings in other towns so John, you might want to just remind Steve. I know that Steve is probably thinking of it but we have some warm weather coming up.

Chairman Robertson: Yup, starting tomorrow.

Town Administrator's Report:

Mr. Harrington: I have one item this evening for the Board just to bring your attention to the plowing analysis that I was asked to put together for everyone. I sent that out last week and I just wanted to know if anyone had questions on what I sent you or if it was the information that you were looking for or something different.

Chairman Robertson: I thought that it was useful and interesting to look at and didn't have any questions. I don't know if anyone else had any concerns about it or ...

Vice Chairman Pitman: It was exactly what I was looking for.

Selectman McGarry: Right.

Mr. Harrington: That's all I had for this evening.

Unfinished Business:

None

New Business:

None

Other Business:

Selectwoman McHugh: I would like to get a policy or procedure, whatever we have, for purchasing large items.

Chairman Robertson: Okay. I don't know off the top of my head, what the limits are exactly. At the Board's discretion. Typically, we have a policy.

Do you have the limits John or recall the limits that we typically go out to bid on?

Mr. Harrington: I can send that out to the Board. I would rather send the policy out than to try to recall the exact amounts.

Chairman Robertson: Do you think you could do that?

Mr. Harrington: I can.

Chairman Robertson: Other, other business?

Hearing none, I would note that we have no need for a non-public session this evening and would move to Citizen's Comments.

Citizen's Comments:

None

Motion: Vice Chairman Pitman moves to adjourn at 6:08 pm

Second: Selectman McGarry

Discussion:

Vote: Yea 4, Nay 0, Abstained 0 – Motion Carries

Next Meeting: Monday, March 1, 2021 at 5:30 pm

*The Minutes were transcribed and respectfully submitted by Dianne L. Kimball, Recording Secretary
Pending approval by the Board of Selectmen*