



*Town of Plaistow ♦ Board of Selectmen*  
*145 Main Street ♦ Plaistow ♦ NH ♦ 03865*

**PLAISTOW BOARD OF SELECTMEN MINUTES:**

**DATE:** December 30, 2019

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** 5:31 p.m.

**SELECTMEN:**

Selectwoman, Francine Hart, Chairman  
Selectman, Steve Ranlett - Excused  
Selectman, Greg Taillon

Selectman, Julian Kiszka, Vice Chairman  
Selectman, John A. Blinn, Sr.  
Mark Pearson, Town Manager

**MINUTES**

*G. Taillon motions to approve the minutes of December 16, 2019. Seconded by J. Kiszka.*

*Discussion: F. Hart points out a typo on page 6 under Article P-20-XD. The amount of \$500.00 should be \$5000.00.*

*J. Kiszka points out an error on page 3, on the seventh line down, "She checked with Attorney Steven Buckley" should be changed to "According to Attorney Steven Buckley"*

*Vote: 4-0-0 as amended.*

*Motion carries*

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Sam Cafiso, Kingston Road states he read the draft voters' guide and he recommends more consistency when stating if a warrant article raises new taxes or not.

F. Hart agrees and this will be discussed at the next Board meeting.

**LANDFILL CLOSURE**

M. Pearson states the Plaistow landfill was closed about thirty (30) years ago. Settling has occurred and we are required to address it. It will require permitting for engineering and design with State oversight. Normandeau has contracted with Sanborn, Head & Associates, Inc. to provide this information for us. M. Pearson introduces E. Steinhauser from Sanborn Head.

E. Steinhauser states he is the Senior Vice President of Sanborn Head located in Concord, NH. He will be the engineering consultant for the project. They specialize in landfill closure and post landfill closure. He has been to the site of Plaistow's landfill and has started research. The landfill was closed in the 1980's. Back then regulations for landfill came under the Health Department.

The Department of Environmental Services did not exist until 1987. The regulations have changed over the years. As the landfill has settled it has caused ponding, the weight of the water makes the ponding worse. E. Steinhauser states they will come up an appropriate way to fix it.

G. Taillon asks if the project will include a process for drainage in the long term.

E. Steinhauser replies, yes.

G. Taillon asks as regulations for landfill change are, they grandfathered, or will we always have to make changes to keep up with new regulations.

E. Steinhauser states that will part of the negotiations with the state. He does not have the original permit documents. It is a tough question to answer. He is more concerned with the stormwater rules than the solid waste.

F. Hart states she was going to ask the same question. Aldo how will this dovetail with the MS-4, stormwater regulations.

M. Pearson replies as he understands it is just one (1) component of the MS-4. The water coming off that site doesn't have a place to go. They will have to look at the management and quality of that water. He asks E. Steinhauser if some type of swale/drainage will be created and the water treated before draining off the site.

E. Steinhauser replies, yes. The area is well vegetated which is helpful.

F. Hart asks if it is known what is in the landfill and will it be tested for toxic substances.

E. Steinhauser replies, we do not know what is in the landfill. Some of the maps indicate there are tire piles in and around the landfill. Normandeau currently monitors the water and if there were toxic substance in the landfill it would show up in the water. Sanborn Head will not be specifically testing for toxic substances.

J. Kiszka states it is probably good that the water does not drain into a pond.

E. Steinhauser states the State might make us contain the water therefore it is not necessarily beneficial that there is not a pond to drain to. The permitting process will be done through DES under current regulations including stormwater management. There is a limited amount of information on the landfill. The type of closure is unknown. Sanborn Head has proposed a phased approach to prepare the design, permit applications and construction documents necessary to remediate the settlement issues of the landfill.

F. Hart states a suggested long-term idea is to have a solar field on the landfill. She asks if the remediation will last for thirty (30) or more years.

E. Steinhauser replies, solar panels are a possibility along with a long-term fix. He states they are currently working on Phase 1, Data Collection and Project Strategy and Phase 2 Conceptual Design. They should be completed by the end of January 2020. Then Sanborn Head will be able to provide a greater understanding of site conditions and possible paths forward to improve the landfill cover. DES will be involved soon, and it will be at least a year before construction begins. The process is not inexpensive. The pre-construction phase may be around \$200,000.00.

F. Hart asks if we are looking at \$300,000 - \$350,000 total.

M. Pearson replies yes.

J. Kiszka wants to know why Phase 5 is so expensive.

E. Steinhauser replies permitting is expensive and we may need to include a wetland permit and/or alteration of terrain. Every rule needs to be addressed in the application. We are trying to mitigate an existing problem which is already on the landfill site.

F. Hart asks if this will dovetail with the Con Coms mapping of wetlands.

M. Pearson replies it is not a conflict. He does suggest creating a warrant article for 2020 and funding it with money from the unassigned fund balance to start planning for some of these expenses. The work needs to be done. You cannot kick the can down the road forever. If we are proactive the State will work with us.

F. Hart states the Board is proactive and prudent.

J. Kiszka asks what the cost is to get rid of the landfill completely.

E. Steinhauser replies it is complicated to remove it however it can be done. The monitoring costs will go away if the landfill is removed.

G. Taillon is willing to make a motion however he would prefer to do it at the next meeting to get the verbiage correct.

The Board agrees to add this to the next agenda.

F. Hart thanks Eric for his presentation.

### **ENCUMBRANCES**

M. Pearson states we know we will always have to encumber some items at year end however the list this year is substantially less than in past years. The total amount is \$106,424.47. In the future we will try to get it even lower.

F. Hart asks if the Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) should be added to the list. The Board agrees. We need to add \$42,400.00 making the grand total \$148,824.47. Since we can pay for the SCBA in the 2019 budget we will not need a warrant article in 2020 to support it.

***J. Kiszka motions to encumber \$148,824.47 as presented from the 2019 budget to be utilized in 2020. Seconded by J. Blinn.***

***Vote: 4-0-0***

***Motion carries.***

### **RECONSIDER DEPARTMENT BUDGET'S**

F. Hart states at the last Budget Committee Meeting some departmental budgets were changed. The Board may want to reconsider these.

G. Taillon states the Budget Committee voted to lower the Recreation Budget by \$10,000.00. They made changes to the Highway Budget. They lowered they paving line by \$34,000.00 and lowered the salt/sand line by \$15,000.00. They voted to increase the Human Services line for the Vic Geary Center by \$168.00 to match 2019. He would like the Board to have the opportunity to be in sync with the Budget Committee.

***G. Taillon motions to reconsider the Recreation Budget. Seconded by F. Hart.***

***Discussion: Bill Coxe, Recreation Commission Chair is in the audience and asks to speak. F. Hart agrees.***

***B. Coxe states he was under the impression the Recreation Budget previously voted on by the Board was agreed upon. It included adding \$6,000.00 to fully staff the Summer Recreation Program.***

***G. Taillon replies, the first budget is the Town Manager's Budget. Then the Board of Selectmen make changes to come up with the Board Budget then it goes to the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee wanted to lower the Recreation Budget to use \$10,000.00 in funding from the Revolving Fund.***

***B. Coxe asks what it can be used for.***

***G. Taillon states the Budget Committee did not discuss what funds would pay for what. They just considered the bottom line.***

***B. Coxe would like a better understanding of the Revolving fund. There seems to be an issue with the creation language and the intent of the creation language.***

***According to DRA a revolving fund has to be used for recreations activities that people pay for.***

*There are two (2) criterion:*

- 1. It cannot be used for the Summer Recreation Program.*
- 2. Must be for a program that people pay for.*

*Recreation programs will not be impacted, and fees will not be increased. A revolving fund should be self-funding.*

*B. Coye asks if the fees for Baseball Registration will be put in the General Fund or the Revolving Fund.*

*It should be put in the revolving fund. We will have to check with G. Colby, Finance Director to be sure.*

*F. Hart states in the current financial climate with high property tax bills she thinks using \$10,000.00 for the Revolving Fund is a good idea.*

*Maxann Dobson, Budget Committee Chair is in the audience. She comes to the podium to speak. She has figures for the dollar amount of the Revolving fund for several years. The fund had been building. It is not a bank account. You have to use the money.*

*She believes the fees should be going into the Revolving Fund. She will check with Greg Colby, Finance Director.*

*B. Coye just wants to make sure we do what is right. If a local business sponsors a team does that go into the Revolving Fund?*

*M. Pearson replies, no. Donations are kept separate.*

*G. Taillon's understanding is that all fees go into the Revolving Fund except the fees for Summer Recreation. The intent is to run the programs. At a prior Board meeting S. Ranlett had made a motion to level fund the Recreation Budget from the current year (2019).*

*B. Coye believes another \$6000.00 would still be required to fully fund the Summer Recreation Program.*

*F. Hart states her understanding is the Recreation budget was at \$187,712.00 from the Board.*

*G. Taillon states what is important is that we are all in agreement. He would like to be in sync with the Budget Committee.*

*G. Taillon motions to amend and lower the Recreation Budget by \$10,000.00. Seconded by J. Blinn.*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Motion Carries*

*F. Hart calls for a vote in favor of the amendment.*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Motion Carries*

*G. Taillon states to be in sync with the Budget Committee's changes in the Highway Budget he motions to reconsider our approval of the Highway Budget. Seconded by J. Blinn.*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Motion carries*

*G. Taillon motions to amend and lower the budget line for paving by \$34,000.00 and to lower the salt and sand line by \$15,000.00. Seconded by J. Blinn.*

*Discussion: J. Kiszka wants a summary of the reasons for the changes of the line items.*

*G. Taillon states in his understanding the amount of salt spent by Plaistow exceeds any other town in our area. Plaistow's paving costs per mile is the highest of any other in our area. If you want specific reason for \$34,000.00 you would have to ask Sam Cafiso.*

*J. Kiszka states he knows some of the paving line comes from the State and some comes from raising taxes. How much is left after taxpayer money is removed.*

*M. Pearson states the intent is not to cut the line item beyond what the State gives us. It is just to lower the Town portion to zero (0).*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Motion carries*

*Vote in favor of the amendment.*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Motion carries*

*G. Taillon motions to reconsider the Human Services Budget to be in sync with the Budget Committee. Seconded by F. Hart.*

*Discussion: J. Kiszka states this will increase the Vic Geary line item of the budget to equal 2019.*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Motion carries*

*Vote in favor of the amendment*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Motion carries*

M. Pearson states the Water Meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather. He will check with Underwood and try to reschedule the meeting to January 27, 2020. He would like to recognize Tim Moore. He has done a lot of work for the Water Project.

M. Pearson states Underwood did a comprehensive analysis of what Plaistow's potential water rates should be. The information will be presented at the next meeting.

They held a meeting with Pennichuck Water Company. There is some interest in Twin Ridge and Partridge Lane joining the water system. We know there is interest from Greenfield Estates and possibly Timberlane Middle and High Schools.

Underwood currently has the equivalent of 200 uses. Adding users increases reserves and capital. Rates should be reviewed yearly. Once the water rates are set it will help with other decisions that need to be made. The water budget will consist of two parts, the operational and capital budgets.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

At the January 6, 2020 meeting warrant articles for the elderly/disabled tax relief and SoRock will be discussed in addition to all other warrant articles.

F. Hart states G. Taillon did a lot of work on the voter's guide and thanks him.

### **TOWN MANAGERS REPORT**

M. Pearson states there is no formal report tonight however he wishes all citizens a Happy New Year. In 2019 many projects were worked on and a lot was accomplished. Work will continue in 2020 especially the water project, the landfill post closure and the Pollard Road Culvert.

Completed projects include the Westville Road Bridge and the new Public Works Garage. It was the right decision to move the building off the old site. The Salt Shed with solar panels will be done in 2020.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

Reviewed.

### **OTHER FOLDERS**

The Accounts Payable, and FYI Folders are being passed around.

### **SELECTMEN'S REPORTS**

None

F. Hart states the Request for Proposals (RFP's) for Assessing will be opened. A decision will be made at the January 6, 2020 meeting. She wishes everyone a Happy, Healthy, New Year and she expects the Board to hit the ground running in 2020.

The two (2) Assessing bids were opened on December 30, 2019 at 7:05 p.m. during the Board of Selectmen's meeting. The proposals are as follows:

Corcoran Consulting	136,000.00
Visions	141,600.00

F. Hart adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Hossack,  
Recording Secretary