

**This set of minutes was approved at the April 19, 2010 Town Council meeting**

**Durham Town Council  
Monday March 1, 2010  
Durham Town Hall - Council Chambers  
7:00 P.M.  
MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Neil Niman; Councilor Jerry Needell; Councilor Julian Smith; Councilor Doug Clark; Councilor Mike Sievert; Councilor Diana Carroll; Councilor Robin Mower

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Councilor Karl Van Asselt; Councilor Peter Stanhope

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Town Administrator Todd Selig

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Niman called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

**II. Approval of Agenda**

*Councilor Julian Smith MOVED to approve the Agenda. Councilor Mower SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.*

**III. Special Announcements**

Chair Niman first recognized Councilor Stanhope and Councilor Van Asselt, who were not present, for their service on the Town Council. He then presented a certificate of appreciation to Councilor Needell for his years of service on the Council.

**IV. Approval of Minutes**

None

**V. Councilor and Town Administrator Roundtable**

Councilor Smith thanked the Police Department, the Fire Department and the Department of Public Works for all of their efforts in connection with the recent power outages.

He then updated the Council briefly on the Planning Board's recent quarterly planning session, where he said there was extensive discussion on proposed amendments to the site plan review regulations and subdivision regulations concerning storm water management, and possible changes concerning the Shoreland Protection Overlay District of the Zoning Ordinance.

Councilor Carroll noted that the Integrated Waste Management Advisory Committee along with the DPW was selling compost bins and rain barrels to residents at a reduced price.

She also said she wanted to thank the Fire Department for their help during the power outage with installing a generator at her house. She also thanked the Durham Library, which had graciously opened its doors on Sunday from 11am -3 pm, and all day Monday. She noted that it was usually closed on these days. She said the Library had heat, light, and Internet access, and said many people had been making use of it. She said it had become a great community center, and she thanked the Library for pitching in this way.

Councilor Mower thanked Administrator Selig for keeping everyone so well informed. She noted that he had been on NHPR that morning in regard to this.

Councilor Clark said the Economic Development Committee had recently met. He said member Chris Mueller was handed the reigns of chair over to Tom Elliot. He said there were big plans for how the Committee could be more effective.

Administrator Selig told Councilors that about 40% of the Town was still without power, and he provided details on this. He spoke about ongoing communications between Public Service of NH and DPW, noting that Doug Bullen of DPW had showed Public Service staff where the problem areas were. He said trucks would be working through the night to restore power.

He also said Governor Lynch had visited the Fire Department, and had toured the Sunnyside and Pine Crest neighborhoods, which had been really devastated by the storm. He said it looked like a tornado had come through that area. He also said the Director of the NH Office of Emergency Management had called. He said there should be additional progress on restoring power based on this show of support.

He said there would be an update on whether the Oyster River School District schools would be open the following day. He also noted that there was a warming center at the “Hamel Hilton” and that it was open all night for residents. He said over 200 residents had gone there, and noted that regional shelter had closed. He spoke about the fact that a champion Norway Spruce on the Dubois property near the Oyster River had fallen, and also said a Memorial Park tree had fallen down.

Administrator Selig referred to recent negotiations with Neuro-Rehab Center concerning possible locating at the Durham Business Park. He said unfortunately the company was moving forward with plans to locate at the Pease Tradeport, noting that the company had already put a lot of money into that location. But he said a communication had been received on how user friendly the negotiations and preliminary review of their proposal to locate at the Business Park had been.

Administrator Selig said he would speak that evening about recent Fire Department contract negotiations. He also noted that in March, Town Department heads would be

going to Augusta, Maine to gain more skill sets to enhance recent Kaizen continuous improvement efforts.

Administrator Selig said there was an invitation from the Oyster River Superintendent and the Chair of the School Board to have a subset of the Council meet with them, in order to see about improving the dialogue between the School District and the Town. He suggested that he, Chair Niman, and Councilor Clark should participate, but said he wanted to check with the full Council to see if they were comfortable with this.

Councilors indicated they were agreeable to this approach.

Councilor Carroll said several residents had approached her to ask why their electric utility wires couldn't be buried underground. She noted that cost was an obvious reason, but asked if research had showed that underground electric utilities had fewer problems than above ground wiring. She said this issue was on the mind of residents, and said the Council might want to deal with it in some way.

Administrator Selig said cost was of course a factor, and he also noted that with newer subdivisions, underground utilities could be included as part of the planning process. He said they were a great solution in terms of avoiding power outages, except during earthquakes.

Councilor Needell noted that new subdivisions were required to have underground utilities.

Councilor Mower also pointed out that a portion of the electrical utilities for the development on the former Houghton Hardware site were underground.

## **VI. Public Comments**

**Roger Speidel, Nobel K. Petersen Drive**, said the cost of the Oyster River School system must be checked. He said it cost \$15,574 per student per year in Durham, while the cost in Bow was \$12,791, and the cost in Exeter was \$12,552. He asked why that was, stating that Durham was not the premier school district in the State. He said if the costs could get down to the \$12,700 range, that would save \$5.6 million per year. He noted that these cost figures were from the State Department of Education.

Mr. Speidel said the School Board didn't care about the taxpayers. He noted that the Superintendent had recently made a statement at a meeting that the Board couldn't speak candidly because there were members of the public present. He said the Superintendent was a public servant, and said Oyster River was a public school system. He noted that at another School Board meeting, he had asked the Board to check with other school systems, and was told by the Superintendent that Oyster River didn't compare itself with other school systems. Mr. Speidel asked why not.

He said at a School Board forum, senior Board member David Taylor was asked about

the issue of declining enrollment, and he stated that he didn't believe the projections, and believed that enrollment would be going up. Mr. Speidel asked if Mr. Taylor was qualified to run a School District that was losing students, and he provided details on this.

He said these were examples of two School District leaders who seemed to be blind to the facts. He said the taxpayers needed help, and said Durham should band together with Lee and Madbury to open things up. He said the issues must be audited and brought to the attention of the citizens of the School District. Mr. Speidel said education had been his profession for 30 years.

**Bill Hall, Smith Park Lane**, said he had watched a recent School Board meeting, and said that Board has no idea what it was doing. He said Mr. Taylor's comment that enrollment would be going up was wrong, and said it instead would go down, and by more than what was projected.

Regarding the recent power outages, Mr. Hall said every outage was the result of downed trees, and said it was important for Durham to be far more aggressive about tree cutting. He said the power company didn't like dealing with Durham because of the tree situation, and said this had to change. He also said Portsmouth had dropped its ordinance requiring police details for utility work, which he said was put in some years ago so police officers could get overtime. He suggested that Durham scratch this as well, and said if it did so, it could support more tree cutting.

**Ann Wright, Lee, NH**, said she was running for the School Board. She said she had two kids, and said she hoped that communications between the School Board, the School Administration and the three towns in the School District would improve. She said the schools in the District were excellent and improving, and said this would continue to be the case because there were bright kids, supportive parents, teachers who went the extra mile, and a community that valued education.

Ms. Wright said they were all in tough economic times, but said even if they weren't, she would advocate fiscal discipline. She said every line item should be looked at carefully.

She noted that she volunteered in the community, and said she loved the fact that it felt like a community. She said she thought the schools and the community were intertwined, and said she couldn't imagine what the community would have otherwise. She said they all could do better if they kept pushing and kept caring, and stayed involved.

## **VII. Unanimous Consent Agenda**

- A. Resolution #2010-03 recognizing outgoing elected officials for their dedicated services to the Town of Durham
- B. Shall the Town Council approve the Special Event Permit application submitted by the Oyster River High School Friends of the Oyster River Track to close certain sections of Town roads for its annual "Todd's Trot" 5K road race on Saturday, April 10, 2010 ?
- C. Shall the Town Council, upon recommendation of the Town Administrator, abate the amount of the 2009 tax bills for properties owned by Smithfield Construction which no

longer exist in Town records ?

- D. Shall the Town Council, upon recommendation of the Town Administrator, approve the reduction of appraisals for property owned by David. R. Lemieux at 571 Bay Road, grant property tax abatements for tax years 2007, 2008, and 2009, and authorize the Town Administrator to sign two Assessment Settlement Agreements between David R. Lemieux and the Town of Durham ?
- E. Shall the Town Council, upon recommendation of the Town Administrator, reduce the appraisal of property owned by Heather A. Cloitre Trust at 23 Deer Meadow Road, grant property tax abatements for tax years 2008 and 2009, and authorize the Town Administrator to sign two Settlement Agreements between the Heather A. Cloitre Trust and the Town of Durham ?
- F. Shall the Town Council ratify the collective bargaining agreement between the Town of Durham and the Durham Professional Firefighters Association for the period 1/1/10 - 12/31/12 upon the recommendation of the Town Administrator ?

Councilor Smith asked that Items B and F be pulled off the Unanimous Consent Agenda.

***Councilor Mower MOVED to approve Unanimous Consent Agenda Items A, C, D, and E. Councilor Smith SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

Councilor Smith said he would vote in favor of Item B, but said he had asked Administrator Selig why six officers were needed for traffic control during the race, and if they would get overtime for this. He noted that this was supposed to be a fundraiser, and asked how much the six officers would cost.

Administrator Selig said this race involved a large number of people, and he provided details on why these officers were needed. He said probably 2-4 officers would receive overtime. He said no specific dollar amount was attached to that.

Councilor Smith said he would like Administrator Selig to give some thought to the need to put police officers in some of the locations.

Administrator Selig said the event was organized in a way that caused minimal disruption of the neighborhoods. He also said there had been no complaints from the organizers about the cost.

Councilor Smith asked if any police officers ever volunteered their time for a charity event, and Administrator Selig said a salaried person might view things in this way, an hourly person would typically be paid.

***Councilor Clark MOVED to approve the Special Event Permit application submitted by the Oyster River High School Friends of the Oyster River Track to close certain sections of Town roads for its annual "Todd's Trot" 5K road race on Saturday, April 10, 2010. Councilor Sievert SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

Concerning Item F, Administrator Selig said the Town had had fruitful negotiations with

the firefighters. He said it was realized going into the talks that this was going to be a difficult year economically. He said the discussions had led to an end result that mitigated Durham's exposure in terms of the cost in the first year of the contract, and that provided predictable increases for 2011 and 2012. He said there would be a 0% wage increase in 2010, a 2% increase in 2011, and a 2% increase in 2012.

He noted that the paramedics in the Department were in need of a market-based adjustment. He said they were excellent employees and the Town wanted to maintain them, and he said he also wanted to encourage others to move forward with paramedic training. He said there would therefore a wage increase to accomplish these things.

Administrator Selig also explained the existing arrangement concerning ambulance transport had been studied further. He noted that currently the Fire Department was the first responder, followed shortly after by McGregor Ambulance Corps, which then provided transport to the hospital. He said an evaluation had been done of whether it would make sense for the Fire Department to provide ambulance transport as well. He said if Durham chose to do this, instead of a 2% wage increase for Fire Department employees in 2012, it would be 3%. He said no determination had been made on this yet.

He said the fiscal impact from these wage increases as a result of the new agreement was as follows: 2010 - \$3,600; 2011 - \$15,577; 2012 \$16,348. He said the fiscal impact as of 2012, if ambulance transport was included in the agreement, would be \$24,522. Administrator Selig said he believed this was a good contract, based on fruitful conversations.

He said these had been the most amicable negotiations that had occurred with the Fire Department over the last 10 years, and he complemented the Department for seeing the big picture, and taking an active interest in the fiscal challenges the Town was facing. He said the employees deserved a lot of credit, and said Chief Landry did as well, because he set the tone for the Department's interest in the community and seeing the big picture.

Councilor Mower noted wording on page 32, and asked what was intended by this. There was discussion, and the matter was clarified.

***Councilor Smith MOVED to ratify the collective bargaining agreement between the Town of Durham and the Durham Professional Firefighters Association for the period 1/1/10 - 12/31/12 upon the recommendation of the Town Administrator. Councilor Mower SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

#### **VIII. Committee Appointments**

None

#### **IX. Presentation Items**

Administrator Selig noted that the draft plan from the B. Dennis Design team had been completed. He said Bill Dennis would walk the Council through it, and said in a few days

there would be a Planning Board work session that would also involve members of the Council and the EDC. He said this would provide the opportunity to provide real time feedback to Mr. Dennis and his team, with the goal of firming up the document.

Mr. Dennis said one of the things the design team had done was to look at the existing codes in the downtown area and whether they prohibited development, or if the Town was getting the right kind of development with them. He also said the plan being developed for the downtown core had begun to point out things the Town could do as it headed toward the future.

He said the charrette process had involved as many people as possible, and he spoke in detail on it. He said the plan that came out of this process was not about what was going to happen, but what could happen, so was a road map to make better use of the downtown corridor.

Mr. Dennis next reviewed the key issues that had come out of the charrette. He said overall, transportation issues were really big, and said some key ideas were to look at changing the one way streets in the downtown, and changing the intersection of Main Street and Newmarket Road.

He also said a key planning idea was to consider using form-based codes to encourage the right kind of development. In addition, he said a key issue expressed at the charrette was the need for effective policies to address the conflicts between student housing and the neighborhoods in Town.

Mr. Dennis spoke in detail about how underutilized the center of Town currently was, and said this represented lost tax dollars. He said some ideas the design team had heard about how to develop the downtown included maxing things out by doing six story buildings, while others residents had said that would be too big. He said other ideas were to provide civic greens, mixes of uses and mixes of housing.

He spoke in detail about ideas for providing more choices for walking around in the downtown, and discussed how this would contribute to economic activity there. He also spoke about potential locations for civic uses, and the potential for a hotel where the fraternity house was currently located.

Mr. Dennis spoke in some detail about the design ideas to put a roundabout and a green at the Quad intersection, which he said would create a special entrance to the downtown that would have some character, and would also provide a clear delineation between UNH and the Town.

He showed possible site design and building design ideas for filling in the area around the Court house building, in ways that could keep the flow going but would also encourage a lot more street life.

Councilor Carroll asked how the Town could get a business like CVS to fit in with

something like this.

Mr. Dennis said a tradeoff could be offered that the developer could get an approval quickly if what was proposed reflected what the Town wanted to see. He said companies like CVS could do this kind of development.

Councilor Mower said there was nothing specific about design standards in the report. She noted that there had been examples shown during the charrette that followed the form-based code, and said one had used design standards and one had not. She said to a certain extent then, the Town would need to have design standards in addition to a form-based code.

Mr. Dennis said that was true if they wanted to ensure the kind of building design they wanted. He said design standards could be a lightning rod, but said such standards could be written in a way that wasn't onerous, and that guaranteed that at least a bad building wouldn't be built. He said people would have to look at whether politically, having design standards would slow down everything else.

Councilor Mower said design standards could help the process if developers knew what the Town wanted up front.

Mr. Dennis said there were a lot of Towns that put in a design review board, but he said generally one didn't want to do that because it was another layer, and things became subjective. He said design standards, if included, needed to be objective, a list of items that was very clear, and something that could be administratively approved. He said developers didn't want to spend a lot of time guessing about what people wanted.

Mr. Dennis next described in some detail possible design ideas for commercial and civic uses in the Coes Corner area. He noted the possible idea of putting in a new access way for a possible new library in the area. He also said this area was a front door off the highway, and said there was the possibility of having a few commercial uses there such as a farm-like roadhouse that looked nice, and which could be a place for people to stop before continuing into Town. He also spoke about the idea of putting a restaurant in the landing area, and making it and the surrounding area more walkable, from the high school, etc.

Mr. Dennis next spoke in some detail about the form-based code approach. He said it had been found that the places that were really vital over time had the ability to mix uses. He said use was still a part of what was considered with a form-based code, but said what was also considered was what a development would look like on a lot in terms of where it sat, where the parking went, etc. He said the code could be as simple or as complicated as people wanted to make it. He said there should be a lot of images in it, and not a lot of words, and said it should be able to explain simply what a Town wanted people to do in terms of development.

Beth Della Valle, the land use planner on the design team, said she first wanted to talk a



bit about the Town's Ordinances and regulations. She first said the Town had tried hard to manage the development that had come into the community, and said the Zoning Ordinance indicated that a lot of work had been done to make a fine distinction between uses. She also said she expected that every conditional use in the Table of Uses had a story attached to it, which had led to further distinctions between uses.

She said even though the Town had tried to make these finer distinctions and apply conditions to development proposals, it had also tried hard to recognize the principles that were coming through in the charrette drawings, like requiring shallow setbacks, retail on the first floor, and only certain interruptions of sidewalks for driveways.

But she said what was heard during the charrette was that they were still not getting the things they wanted, such as mixed uses, walkable areas, and attractive and safe pedestrian environments, even though a lot of work was being done in reviewing development proposals. She said the design team was therefore recommending that a form-based code would be a more effective way to help get to these kinds of end results.

She spoke in detail on what the benefits of a form-based code would be for Durham, for both the Town and developers. (See B. Dennis report on the Town web site for details on this.)

She said something that sometimes made communities nervous about a form-based code was a speedier review process. She said there was a balance between the time needed to get really specific about a design and providing a speedier review process, and said it was the Town that would decide where it fell along that continuum.

She said right now, there was some level of delegated review with a Technical Review Committee. She said it could perhaps be tasked with administering the code, and the Planning Board could be used for the appeals process. She said another approach would be to have the Zoning Administrator work through the administrative review and make a recommendation to the Planning Board, which would then do the final approval.

She said whatever approach was taken, it would be important to recognize that they had to think about how to frame the code so it didn't look extremely different from what already existed. She said they would also need to build some flexibility into the code to account for changes in real estate.

She said a third thing to keep in mind was that whatever was done, the Town should adopt language that would be clearer about what it specifically wanted, and that would leave less room for interpretation and thus help streamline the process.

She noted that the report included a number of issues raised in the charrette that there was no time to come to conclusion on. She said she recognized that the Town would be updating its Master Plan, and said these issues were a short list of those to consider as the plan was updated.

She said the issues included such things as student housing, workforce housing, finalizing decisions on civic uses and possible mixes of those uses, proposals on transportation and parking, a parking authority; creating incentives for public/private partnerships to build some of the new street connections that had been discussed, pinning down what could be done about the building code to create a renovation code option, increasing the connections and collaborations with the University, etc.

Councilor Mower asked if during the upcoming work session at the Planning Board meeting, they could talk about the application of a form-based code in Durham, including the various ways this could be pursued.

Mr. Dennis said some of that detail work, to really get into the "nitty gritty" of putting together a form-based code, would be addressed during the next phase of work, and said perhaps consensus could be reached on the direction the Town wanted to go concerning it.

Councilor Sievert asked what the steps were to finalize this first piece of the process and to get a final plan. He also asked what the final plan would mean.

Mr. Dennis spoke in some detail on this, stating that the report shows the potential of what could be done, and said the question was then how to make that legal. He said another phase would be required to work this out, and spoke in some detail on this.

Councilor Clark said the charrette process had been an eye opening experience for him. He asked if the design team had recommended some of the best form-based codes that were out there.

Mr. Dennis said there were a number of resources available on how form-based codes were being adopted and used around the country. He noted that the towns and cities in the Northeast had been slower to adopt them, but he said Dover and Lowell, MA were regional municipalities that had adopted them.

Councilor Clark said it would be important to know not just where form-based codes had been adopted, but where they had actually worked. He said he assumed that writing the code wasn't enough, and also noted there was the issue of how much public investment in infrastructure would be necessary in order to get things going.

Mr. Dennis said it was all incremental, and said things like changing roads and adding other infrastructure would follow the normal process of being a town, and would reflect the resources available. He said the town would also need to develop a strategy of the order in which things needed to happen.

Councilor Needell asked if a regulating plan was essentially the Master Plan, and Mr. Dennis said yes, and provided details on this.

Councilor Mower asked if anything else the Council would like to see beyond the

charrette and the report would need to be negotiated in a separate contract.

There was discussion.

Councilor Needell said it seemed that the intent here was to focus on a small part of the downtown, and to use a form-based code to address a targeted area, as an experiment and something that was doable.

Mr. Dennis agreed, and said the focus was on the commercial core. He said people might decide to wait to use the form-based code on other areas of Town.

Councilor Needell asked if a form-based code overlay would be an addendum to the existing Ordinance.

Mr. Dennis said yes, and provided details on this. He said it should be clear that the application of the form-based code was what the Town wanted to happen for specific areas it had identified. He said for those developers who didn't want to follow the form-based code in developing a property in those specific areas, the out would be to have to follow the existing review process.

Councilor Smith said in other words, the Town could leave the existing regulations in place, and have a form-based code overlay.

Mr. Dennis said that was correct.

Councilor Mower noted that this was a choice suggested on the last page of the report.

Ms. Della Valle said there were a range of options, and she spoke in detail on this. She also said there were a range of options as to how to administer the code.

Mr. Dennis said if both were left in place and the form-based code was an option, it would be important to make it really appealing. He said hopefully over time, the other code would then wither away.

There was discussion that the charrette had identified some areas that made sense for civic uses for one reason or another in particular locations of Town. Mr. Dennis said a building in such a location didn't have to be a civic use, but said if it was a private use, the building should have some kind of dignity to it.

Councilor Carroll noted that some of the things talked about during the charrette as possibilities for civic uses were no longer so. She also said there were, and would be some new possibilities for locating civic uses.

Mr. Dennis said this was a living plan, so some of these things had been put in as a placeholder. He said they could certainly be changed, but did give people something to look at.

Councilor Carroll asked if there was an agenda for the March 10<sup>th</sup> Planning Board workshop..

Administrator Selig said there would be discussion on the plan that had been developed, and whether there were aspects that had missed the boat or that people were uncomfortable with. He said there should also be discussion on the form-based code. He said in addition, there should be some discussion on next steps. He said he envisioned having the B. Dennis team help with updating some of the Master Plan chapters. He also said if there was comfort around the form-based code, work could be done with the team in fleshing that out.

He said this was all part of developing a long term vision for the community. He said they would first look specifically at finalizing the vision for the commercial core and modifying the regulations to encourage the kind of development they wanted there. He said they could then work outward to the rest of the community in a way so that there was rhyme and reason and synchronization between what happened in the core of Town and what happened beyond that core. He said B. Dennis was the right firm to help the Town do this, and he also said there were funds available to do this. He noted that some good consensus had been developed around this approach.

Mr. Dennis asked if the EDC was a good representation of developers and other segments of the community.

Administrator Selig said members of the Planning Board, Town Council and the EDC would be at March 10<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting. There was discussion that members of the Historic District Commission could be included as well. Administrator Selig noted that the Master Plan was a Planning Board document, and also said there would need to be discussion with the Planning Board about how to involve the public as the process went forward.

Mr. Dennis said perhaps there would need to be an ad hoc committee to hash things out informally. He said there was usually a lot of that kind of back and forth.

Councilor Needell said he hoped provision would be made so that the new Councilors could be a part of the Planning Board meeting, and Administrator Selig said that was a good point.

There was discussion that that the March 10<sup>th</sup> meeting would be a scheduled meeting of the Planning Board, to which members of the Council and the EDC were invited.

Mr. Campbell said this had been discussed at the most recent Planning Board meeting.

Councilor Mower said as she read through the report, what she was most impressed with concerning the form-based code was not so much the building placement, but the intent to create the kind of public space and place that people really wanted.

Mr. Dennis said a designer his team had worked with a lot was someone who worked on shopping malls. He said if the Town wanted its downtown to act as an economic engine, they needed to make it a vibrant place that people wanted to go to. He said the Town was in a very fortunate place because of the University, stating that developers were interested in building in places like Durham, even today. He said he didn't think the Town would have a problem getting development, but said the question was what kind of development it would be.

The Council stood in recess from 9:00 - 9:12 PM.

**IX. Kaizen initiative update relative to the Fire Department permit process - Jerry Gottsacker and Jason Cleary**

Mr. Gottsacker first complemented Town departments for their recent efforts during the storm, and said those were very impressive.

He then described the essentials of the Kaizen process of continuous improvement:

- Problems are everywhere and are just waiting to be solved
- The biggest problem is the thinking that there are no problems, and that the status quo is just fine
- All work is a process that can be documented
- Processes must focus on the customer, not employees
- Stagnant processes decay, and get worse over time
- Process defects/errors increase as process steps increase
- The municipal problem - no competitors and the impact of this on service provided

Mr. Gottsacker noted that it was decided to apply the Kaizen continuous improvement process to the Town's payroll process and its permitting processes. He said it was found to be relatively easy to improve the payroll process. He first explained that in mapping the process, it was found that about 2/3 of it was rework, and he then provided details about how eliminating the rework eliminated waste, reduced costs, and improved quality. He said the work on improving the payroll process took about 2-3 months.

Administrator Selig said that prior to this, the Business Office had requested an additional person to manage all the work, and said this process had now eliminated the need for this. He also said the process improvement allowed the department to manage the workload much more effectively.

Mr. Gottsacker next spoke about the Town's permitting processes, and explained that they were quite complex, for a number of reasons.

- Excessive number of permits (over 62)
- Spread across many departments
- Confusing and complicated
- Not user-friendly
- Not current

He said it was determined that the priority in improving the Town's permitting processes was to tackle Fire Department permits, then the Building permits and then any other remaining permits. He reviewed the Findings concerning permitting in Durham:

- Several Unnecessary permits
- Several duplicate permits required
- Fees were not current, so didn't come close to covering the manpower needed, which meant taxpayers were subsidizing the actual cost of services
- Permit software was not shared between departments
- Communication was a problem as to who was handling what permit, etc.
- Duplicate inspections
- Conflicting inspection results
- No additional fees for a required re-inspection

He also reviewed constraints on the existing permitting:

- Fire and safety code mandates
- Expertise

Mr. Gottsacker then reviewed the results of applying the Kaizen process to Fire Department permitting:

- Significant reduction in permits, with some eliminated and many consolidated
- Far less complexity
- Revision of fees to reduce taxpayer subsidy
- Code office and Fire Department use same permit software so can access each others' permits
- Recommended charge for re-inspections that need to be done
- New phones at a cost savings

Mr. Cleary next spoke before the Council. He first thanked Mr. Gottsacker for introducing the department to the Kaizen process, and also thanked Fire Department staff and others for helping to bring this all together.

He first outlined some of the problems that were found in the Fire Department's permitting, as a result of going through the Kaizen process.

- Too many permits
- Many permits were on paper only, and were never actually issued
- Duplication of permits with the code enforcement office
- Public confusion about permit requirements
- Fees not based on actual costs (time, paperwork, salary/hourly wage)

He said the goals were as follows:

- Eliminate any unused/unnecessary permits, to streamline the process
- Eliminate duplication of permits between Fire Department and Code Enforcement
- Provide for combined tracking of permits through Code Enforcement Office, based on the property involved
- Establish fees commensurate with costs, thus placing the burden on the permittee

utilizing the services, not the taxpayers

He then spoke in detail about the review done of the existing fee structure, during which the real cost of a particular service was determined and evaluated. He said as a result of this analysis, it was determined that the Town's Fire Prevention Code needed to be updated as well, because of out-dated code language, reference materials, and the decision to move any fees into the Town's Master Fee schedule so all the fees would be in one place.

Mr. Cleary said the results of applying the Kaizen process were the following:

- Reduction in the number of Fire Department permits from 34 down to 17
- Establishment of new oil burner/gas burner/woodstove installation permits and safety check off lists
- Consolidation of 6 permits (some within the Fire Department and some with Code Enforcement)
- Establishment of a fair and equitable fee schedule
- Combination of permit tracking within the existing code enforcement data base

He spoke further about the existing fee schedule, and reviewed the changes proposed to the permit fees:

- Assembly permit fee increased from \$50 to \$100
- Blasting fee increased from \$50 to \$100
- Confined space fee increased from \$25 to \$100; also potential equipment fund
- Fire systems installation fee increased from \$25 to \$30
- Fire systems maintenance fee increased from \$50 to \$55
- Pyrotechnical fee increased from \$50 to \$200
- Permissible fireworks fee increased from \$50 to \$200
- Halloween haunted house fee (for advertised events), to make sure safety measures are in place increased from \$10 to \$50
- LP tank installation fee increased from \$25 to \$50 per tank
- Furnace installation fee increased from \$25 to \$50
- Open flame fee increased from \$10 to \$50, or \$100, depending on the duration (\$100 covers for the year, for a specific setup)
- Fire or EMS Report fee increased from \$10 to 25
- Fire Investigation Report fee increased from \$15 to 25
- Plans Review fee changed from projects less than \$1 million to all projects
- Photos fee on CD - \$50 (new)
- Day Care/Lodging and Rooming House inspection fee - \$100 (new); no charge for those people needing State inspection for an adoption
- Woodstove Inspection fee - \$25 (new)
- Failure to obtain permit fee - \$50, in addition to the specific permit fee
- Fee for failure of inspection and one re-inspection - \$200, each time the FD has to come back after the initial inspection and re-inspection (new)

Mr. Cleary next reviewed the new process by which the Fire Department would review plans and impose the appropriate fees. He then noted that the revised fees had been

enumerated on the Master Fee Schedule.

Councilor Mower noted that Mr. Gottsacker had suggested that a key reason for the changes was to make things more user-friendly. She said she wondered if some of the residents and others looking at them would be able to understand some of the fees, and she suggested that a line of explanation where needed would be helpful.

Mr. Cleary said that could certainly be done. He then spoke in some detail about the importance of homeowners speaking up front with trades people about permits that were needed.

Mr. Gottsacker noted that there had been discussion about some things that could be done to the Town website regarding all of these things, which could make things more user-friendly.

Councilor Needell asked for more details on how this information could get out to potential users.

Mr. Cleary said an informational campaign was definitely important. He said the website could help with this, and also said there was a great working relationship with Mr. Johnson, who would be an informational outlet on this. He said the Fire Department could also put information out on DCAT, and could also make brochures available. He said another great outlet for the information was the NH Building Code Officials group, which met in Durham once a month.

Councilor Mower noted that she had spoken with Mr. Johnson about these issues.

Mr. Gottsacker said the Town website was now much more helpful now in terms of providing information on the various permits.

## **X. Unfinished Business**

- A. Public Hearing and Action on Ordinance #2010-02 amending certain sections of Chapter 68 “Fire Prevention” of the Durham Town Code as recommended by the Town Administrator and amending the fees associated with this section with the Town-wide “Master Fee Schedule”

Mr. Cleary spoke in some detail on the proposed updates to the Fire Prevention Code:

- Change in the language so the most current State-adopted version of the NFPA Codes would be utilized
- Insertion of language to allow the Town Council and the Planning Board to designate fire lanes, with the Fire Chief’s input and review
- Update of the sprinkler ordinance to cover/include lodging and rooming houses and apartment buildings, and any new business and/or mercantile occupancy (within the CBD and LBD), all types of property ownership arrangements (single entity, partnership, corporation, student organization, etc.)



- Update language for post-incident service fees, to include negligent forest and brush fires, as well as hazardous materials incidents (this information is very specific in the State RSA's, but needed to be spelled out clearly in the Code)

Councilor Stanhope asked if there would still be situations where the Fire Department and Code Enforcement would make concurrent inspections. He noted an experience he had where the two entities didn't agree.

Mr. Cleary said while things would improve, there still might be some overlap, depending on the situation. He spoke in detail on this.

Councilor Stanhope asked if there would be language developed to address who had the authority if there was a conflict.

Mr. Gottsacker said this issue had come up with the inspection of the Seacoast Repertory Theatre property, while the Kaizen process was being worked with. He said it was recognized that when there was a conflict, it had to be resolved by Town staff and not by the property owner.

Mr. Cleary said he couldn't guarantee that there wouldn't be any more conflicts like this, but said he thought they would happen a lot less than they were happening now. He said there had been a lot more discussion on the issue, and said his hope was that there would be more dialogue ahead of time, so property owners would know what they were looking at.

Councilor Stanhope asked if there would be a policy decision on this developed by the Town..

Mr. Cleary said he didn't think that one entity could have blanket authority over the other.

Councilor Stanhope said it then became a matter of interpreting which was the most restrictive.

Mr. Cleary said in most cases this could be determined, and he provided details on this.

Councilor Stanhope said it would be helpful to people in the community if when there was a disagreement between the Fire Department and Code Enforcement, there could be a determination from the Town.

Mr. Cleary agreed that a unified front was the best way to go. He also said the precedent set meant that the wheel didn't have to be reinvented every time.

Councilor Smith asked what "Apparatus Response" on page 7 of the Master Fee Schedule meant, and Mr. Cleary said it referred to a situation where there was a negligent act such as a burning a brush pile burning down a neighbor's house, in which case the

Town could recoup the money.

There was discussion between Councilor Smith and Mr. Cleary about whether the Town charged a fee when it responded to an auto accident resulting from the carelessness of a driver. Mr. Cleary said no, stating that the Fire Department responded to it as an emergency, and the situation was then handled at the law enforcement end in terms of fees. He said such fees were used in some other towns, but said the Town hadn't chosen to do this.

Councilor Smith said in other words, the Town was subsidizing careless drivers, and Mr. Cleary said the Fire Department was just looking to take care of the person and mitigate the emergency. He said the situations listed under "Apparatus Response" involved some extreme negligence by a professional, because a higher standard was violated. He noted that the fees were set by the State, but said the community could recoup the funds coming from this.

Administrator Selig said it was found in doing the Kaizen process that permitting fees was too broad a topic, so it had to be broken out into two components. He said this was the first, and said it was not an easy one. He noted among other things how solving the software problem had helped streamline communications. He also said there was an issue with trying to create one form that would meet the needs of both the Fire Department and the Code Enforcement office. He provided details on this, and said after working with the State Fire Marshall, it was determined that it could be done. He said in this instance and others, when it was at first said that something couldn't be done, the Kaizen team had asked why not, and had found a way around the existing way of doing things.

He said a goal of working with the Kaizen approach was to create a culture of continuous improvement, and noted that they had seen some positive offshoots from this. He spoke about how the permitting process in general had now been streamlined, and said the recent work with Neuro-Rehab Associates exemplified this.

He also spoke about the fact that the Bryant student housing project had experienced some hang-ups with getting sewer out to that location. He provided details on how instead of requiring the developer to post the bond, hire the contractor, and bring in a third party review person, it was decided that the Town could do the work, and the developer would then pay for it. He said in this way, no bond was needed, and the Town could ensure that the work was done to its standards. He said it was a new way to approach things that had allowed this project to go forward, and said it was the Kaizen process that had allowed this kind of thinking to occur.

He said another example was the choice of Verizon as a new vendor for Town staff cell phones, so there would be a better signal strength. He spoke in detail on this, and said among other things that the Town had gotten a great deal on this.

Chair Niman thanked Mr. Cleary, and he also thanked Mr. Gottsacker for all of his work

in bringing the Kaizen process to Town departments.

***Councilor Smith MOVED to open the Public Hearing on Ordinance #2010-02 amending certain sections of Chapter 68 “Fire Prevention” of the Durham Town Code as recommended by the Town Administrator and amending the fees associated with this section with the Town-wide “Master Fee Schedule”. Councilor Mower SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

**Bill Hall** said there were some omissions in the Ordinance concerning fire lanes, and he provided details on where and why additional lanes were needed, noting among other things that many of these reflected incidents that had actually happened

- Madbury Court was listed as fire lane, but the signs didn’t say that. He said they had to say it in order to enforce this
- Durham Town Landing, should say fire lane, no parking down the right side of the road. He said it was important to keep that right hand side a fire lane all the way down to the landing, and he provided details on the need for this
- The Churchill Rink
- Wagon Hill
- Davis Ave, both sides from Edgewood Road up to Adams Circle because of the hill (Mr. Hall noted the evacuation from the Whittemore Center because of an ammonia incident)
- Mill Plaza
- Durham House of Pizza
- 19 Main Street
- Whittemore Center, considering among other things the fact that there could be 7,000 people there during a particular venue, and the number of people in the Fire Department. Mr. Hall said a reason he had gotten interested in fire lanes in the first place was because he had seen fire lanes at the Whittemore Center not being used properly.
- Fire lane problems at the Field House indicated the University didn’t understand fire lanes, didn’t enforce them, and should be taken to court over this.

Councilor Smith said the purpose of the hearing was to get responses on the proposed changes, and noted that no new fire lanes had been added to the proposed Ordinance update.

Mr. Hall said the Fire Department was remiss in not doing that, and said the locations he had described were only some of the examples of where they were needed. He said he could find more, and spoke about 3 Madbury Road, which needed a fire lane the entire length of the building. He said in general the fire lanes hadn’t been adequately identified, signed and enforced.

Chair Niman asked Mr. Hall if he could make a list of these locations he was concerned about.

Mr. Hall spoke about the fact that better access was needed for the elderly housing

building near him. He then said the Fire Department had almost totally ignored him on the fire lane issue, and said that was why he was present that evening. He said the enforcement at places like the Field House was still bad after talking to the Fire Chief numerous times about this.

Chair Niman asked again that Mr. Hall provide the Council with a list, and it could then communicate with the Fire Department in it.

Mr. Hall said he would be glad to provide a list of locations he was personally aware of. He said there wasn't another person in the Town besides the firefighters who understood fire lanes the way he did. He said this would be a good starting point.

**Bill Cote, Little Hale Road**, said page 5 of the Ordinance indicated that the Fire Chief's authority to designate fire lanes at the University had been taken out. He said for the reasons stated by the previous speaker, he thought the Council should look at this.

Mr. Cote also noted that section 3-5.6 on page 5 said that fire lanes could be designated by the Town Council and Planning Board in conjunction with the recommendation of the Fire Chief. He said this seemed vague, and asked who the authority would actually be to designate fire lanes. He said he thought it should be the Fire Chief, in concert with the Town Council and the Planning Board, and said there should be definitive language on this.

Mr. Cleary said the reason for removing the language on page 5 was that 3-5.4.4 was that it was not up to the Fire Department to enforce fire lanes after they were designated. He also said people on private property could designate their own fire lanes, and were then charged with enforcing this. He provided details on this. He said he didn't disagree that there could be more places designated as fire lanes.

But he said there was a cost associated with painting them, putting signs up, maintaining them and enforcing them, and said they were similar to locks in terms of enforcement. He said there was only so much the Fire Department's scope and authority could encompass. He spoke in detail on this, and said there was a human nature element to this.

He said the Fire Department didn't have the authority to call Smitty's every time someone was in a fire lane, and said it was University law enforcement and the Police Department that had to address violations at the University and in the Town respectively, as well as private property owners when there were fire lane violations on private property. He said the change to the Ordinance wasn't trying to take the authority away from the Fire Chief, but he said there was a lot more than just designating a fire lane.

Councilor Smith said that section 3-5.4.4 said it was the responsibility of the local law enforcement agency and/or the property owner to enforce State and local regulations regarding obstruction of fire lanes. He noted the Mill Plaza fire lane, and said he had never seen a vehicle towed there although people were routinely parked there. He also said he had never seen a business owner come out and try to enforce this, and he asked if

it was then the responsibility of the local law enforcement agency, under the and/or language.

Mr. Cleary said to the best of his knowledge, the Police Department wouldn't do the enforcement. There was discussion.

Councilor Smith asked if the Fire Department might recommend simply removing the requirement for fire lanes at Mill Plaza, and Mr. Cleary said he would talk to the Chief on this. He said the Fire Department appreciated having the fire lanes there, so taking them away might mean access for the Department would be affected.

Councilor Smith said there might be more parking available at Mill Plaza if the fire lanes weren't there.

Mr. Cleary said there were strict rules in the Department that unless they were there in an emergency, staff wouldn't park in a fire lane. He also said the idea of designating a fire lane was to allow the Fire Department access to the building, and not necessarily to provide a parking area for fire trucks.

Councilor Needell said the designation was very important, and said the enforcement issues were secondary. He said he presumed that a private owner could call the police if someone was parked in a fire lane. He also said he assumed if he parked in a fire lane, his car could be pushed out of the way.

He also said the deletion of the designation on University property did concern him, and said if the Durham Fire Chief wasn't doing it, the question was who was doing it. He said this was important for people who would like to know where they should and shouldn't be parking.

Mr. Cleary said the wording in the Ordinance was perhaps misleading. He said the Fire Prevention Division was heavily involved in discussions on any project in town, including at the University, and said this was when these kinds of access and other issues were addressed. He noted that the University planned to redo the whole entrance to the Field House, which would take away the problem and provide better access. He spoke in detail on this.

Councilor Needell said the new Ordinance looked like the Town was taking a hands off approach, and said he was uncomfortable with this.

***Councilor Mower MOVED to extend the meeting past 10:30 pm. Councilor Smith SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

Administrator Selig said Councilor Needell had raised a good point, and recommended that before the Council moved forward, this issue be revisited. He said historically the reason the Fire Chief was the authority to designate lanes on campus was that he was the local designee of the State Fire Marshall. He noted that the Town couldn't designate fire

lanes on State property on the UNH campus. He said that was why historically this designation was in the Ordinance.

He noted that there had been concerns expressed by Mr. Hall about fire lanes for many years, which had prompted a past review. He also said the University had administrative procedures that created rules and some authority for its officers to ticket those in fire lanes.

Mr. Cleary said this was a Town Ordinance primarily to govern the streets, roadways and property in the Town. He said they did deal with the University in their arena for the same items, but said just as Mr. Johnson didn't do code enforcement on University property, the Fire Department didn't do fire lane enforcement on University property. He spoke further on this.

Administrator Selig said another issue was that even if the Fire Chief designated a fire lane, the only way to ticket this was to put it into an Ordinance. He said it could also be addressed as part of the site plan regulations.

Mr. Cleary provided details on this. He also said 3-5.6 gave the Council authority in its planning to designate fire lanes in order to maintain space out front of new buildings that would allow the Fire Department access. He spoke further on this.

Councilor Stanhope said this Ordinance spoke about public property, and said the Town really had no authority over private property other than during the planning process. He said existing properties were excluded if there were currently no fire lanes.

Administrator Selig said the issue of fire lanes on private property had been an area of concern, and said if the Town was involved in designating them, it would have to take responsibility for creating the fire lanes and maintaining them on private property, and would need permission from the landowner to do this. He said it would be complicated to do this unless it was as part of the site plan review process.

Councilor Stanhope asked if the Town had the authority, when it recognized the need for a fire lane on a University property or other private property, to advise that entity of that need. He said he assumed they would then take on the liability if there was an emergency and there was no fire lane. He said he understood why the UNH language was deleted, but said he would like to see something in the Ordinance to have allowed the Town to advise a private property owner, including the University, to have a fire lane.

Mr. Cleary said the fire lanes could be designated, but said he didn't see that the Town could enforce this.

Councilor Stanhope said the Town could make the private property owner aware of the need for a fire lane. He said if the owner then chose not to do this, they would take on the liability that would result. He spoke further on this.

Mr. Cleary said he would have to defer to legal counsel on what the RSA allowed, and spoke further on the legal aspects of this.

Councilor Smith said if the language concerning University fire lanes was removed, he wanted to know if the University could remove fire lanes from in front of the Whittemore Center, etc.

Mr. Cleary said it would depend on whether it was a life safety issue. He said there was a great working relationship with the University, and said the University understood public safety very well.

Administrator Selig explained that the Fire Chief still had the authority to designate fire lanes on University property. He said if someone didn't like this, this could be appealed to the State Fire Marshall.

Mr. Cleary said he hadn't run into that kind of situation because the University usually erred on the side of caution.

Mr. Cote said the Fire Chief was tasked with life safety and also had authority over the University. But he said he wanted it to be clearly stated in the Ordinance that this authority was given to the Fire Chief by State law. He noted that the Police Department had State authority on campus as well. He said the University was not private property, and was public State property. He said the Fire Chief had full authority over the University.

He said the Council had to task the Fire Chief with taking a careful look at the fire lanes Mr. Hall had spoken about with some very legitimate arguments. He said he didn't want to see a situation where there was a tragedy because people couldn't get out of a building, and said this was a life safety issue. He said he wanted the language to be clear that the Fire Chief still had authority over the University.

Councilor Needell said based on what he had heard, he was ok with removing the language if it was absolutely clear that it didn't matter. He then noted that the first fire lane listed in the Ordinance was on private property, but said he realized that this had nothing to do with enforcement.

Administrator Selig said it did, because the Police Department could write a ticket without the property owner's impetus. There was discussion.

Mr. Cleary said he agreed regarding what Mr. Cote had said about RSA authority, but said what was in the Ordinance were things that would not necessarily be found in the RSA, in order to streamline the process. He also said a lot of the fire lanes in there were designated before he worked at the Fire Department.

Councilor Needell said one part of this was a liability issue, and the other was being proactive and being preventive, and said fire lane prevented most people from using an

area. He also said it was important that fire lanes be in the list in the Ordinance so the Police Department would have some authority, in addition to the private property owners. He said it was important to maintain the list and follow up on it.

Councilor Smith said he was glad to hear that the Police Department could enforce the fire lanes on private property.

**Jay Gooze, Meadow Road**, suggested that the language in 3-5.4.4 could say: “The Durham Fire Chief may, by State authority, designate fire lanes on University of New Hampshire property located within the boundaries of the Town of Durham.”

Councilor Stanhope said that was a good point, noting that if the State ever removed that authority, the Town wouldn’t be allowed to do this.

Bill Hall said the Fire Chief was responsible for the life safety code, and said that applied to private property. He spoke in detail on this, and the need for fire lanes, which if not available endangered fire personnel and those in the buildings. He also said the Fire Chief could require fire lanes where he had suggested at the Whittemore Center, the Field House and Johnson Theatre because they all required an occupancy permit. He said the Chief could say they couldn’t open for business without them.

He spoke about the importance of fire lanes in front of the high rise dormitories on campus, so fire trucks could get in. He said all of this represented a life safety issue, and said there was poor leadership.

Mr. Cleary said access was very important to the Department, but said it wasn’t in the habit of being a bully, and also said functioning with 5 people on shift was very difficult. He also said people followed what the code said regarding assembly permits.

***Councilor Mower MOVED to close the Public Hearing. Councilor Stanhope SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

Councilor Mower suggested a motion to return the Ordinance to the Fire Department for amendments.

There was discussion on whether there should be a motion to adopt Ordinance 2010-02 or instead it should be sent back to the Fire Department for further amendments, to the list of fire lanes, etc.

Administrator Selig said it shouldn’t be assumed that the list of fire lanes hadn’t been gone through before by two past Fire Department administrations, based on suggestions, from Mr. Hall. He said it was possible they hadn’t agreed with Mr. Hall. He recommended that Mr. Hall provide his list, and said if items on it made sense, the current administration could make amendments to the list.

Chair Niman suggested that the Council should amend the Master Fee list and make



progress on that.

Councilor Carroll agreed, and also asked whether the Council wanted to do something regarding the wording change recommended by Mr. Gooze, or should send this idea back to the Fire Department to see if it wanted to make change.

Administrator Selig said he didn't think the Fire Department would have an issue with it, because it was non-substantive.

***Councilor Stanhope MOVED to adopt Ordinance #2010-02 amending certain sections of Chapter 68 "Fire Prevention" of the Durham Town Code as recommended by the Town Administrator and amending the fees associated with this section with the Town-wide "Master Fee Schedule". Councilor Sievert SECONDED the motion.***

Councilor Needell said he wanted to be clear on whether Administrator Selig's concerns about the Ordinance had been allayed.

Administrator Selig said they had, and also said he liked Mr. Gooze's suggestion.

***Councilor Stanhope MOVED to amend Ordinance 2010-02 to change the language in Section 3-5.4.5 by retaining the heading "University of New Hampshire Fire Lanes", and under it including the following: "The Durham Fire Chief shall, by State statute, designate fire lanes on University of New Hampshire property located within the boundaries of the Town of Durham." Councilor Needell SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

***Councilor Smith MOVED to amend section 3-5.6 of Ordinance 2010-02 to read "Fire lanes may be designated by the Town Council and Planning Board upon the recommendation of the Fire Chief". Councilor Mower SECONDED the motion.***

Councilor Mower said she had seconded the motion in order to get clarification. After further discussion, she withdrew her second.

Councilor Stanhope said he assumed that this Ordinance could only be amended by the Town Council, and suggested the following wording: "On the recommendation of the Fire Chief or the Planning Board, the Council may designate Fire Lanes"

There was further detailed discussion on the roles of the Town Council and the Planning Board regarding fire lanes.

Councilor Smith suggested postponing making a decision until the next meeting.

***Councilor Smith MOVED to table the original motion. There was no second.***

***The original motion as amended PASSED 6-1, with Councilor Smith voting against it.***

- B. Continued discussion regarding the results of the Town Administrator's annual performance evaluation.

There was discussion that Administrator Selig had been provided with his evaluation. He asked him if he would like further discussion on it.

Administrator Selig said the written feedback he had received from Councilors was adequate. He also noted that the Council had acted to extend his employment contract for another 3 years, and said he appreciated it. He said he was therefore comfortable waiving the discussion on his evaluation.

- C. Discussion relative to residency requirements for membership on Town non-statutory boards, committees, and commissions

This item was postponed.

**XI. New Business - None**

**XII. Nonpublic Session - None**

**XIII. Extended Councilor and Town Administrator Roundtable - None**

**XIV. Adjournment**

*Councilor Stanhope MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Councilor Sievert SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 6-1, with Councilor Smith voting against it.*

Adjournment at 11:06 pm

Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker