

**TOWN OF ENFIELD  
ENFIELD SELECT BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES March 18, 2024**

**TIME:** 6:00 PM

**LOCATION:** Public Works Facility & Teams videoconference  
74 Lockehaven Road, Enfield

**PRESENT**

**Select Board:** Erik Russell, Kate P. Stewart, John Kluge, Alice Kennedy, Tracy Young

**Administrative Staff:** Ed Morris, Town Manager; Alisa Bonnette, Assistant Town Manager; Whitney Banker, Recording Secretary

**Members of the Public:** Jean Patten, Steve Patten, Brad Rich, Dan Kiley, Kurt Gotthardt, Harrison Drinkwater, Dan Regan, Dave Beaufait, Sharon Beaufait, Nate Miller, Paul Vianco,

**Via Teams:** Barbara Jones, Jean Balgrosky, Shirley Green, Barbara Ruel, Bridget Labrie

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Morris called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD**

Ms. Stewart made a motion to nominate Mr. Russell for Chair of the Select Board. Ms. Kennedy seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Ms. Stewart made a motion to nominate Mr. Kluge for Vice Chair of the Select Board. Ms. Kennedy seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Board members discussed committee assignments.

**Required:**

**Select Board Chair** – Eric Russell

**Select Board Vice Chair** – John Kluge

**Budget Committee** – John Kluge with Tracy Young as an alternate

**Capital Improvement Program Committee** – Tracy Young

**Heritage Commission** – Alice Kennedy (due to a conflict, Ms. Kennedy will discuss meeting with the commission at a different time than last year.)

**Planning Board** – Eric Russell with John Kluge as an alternate

**Not Required:**

**Community Nursing Committee** – Alice Kennedy

**Conservation Commission** – Kate Stewart

**Energy Committee** – Tracy Young

~~**Johnston Property Use Committee**~~ – Ended – not needed

**Mascoma Lakeside Park Committee** – N/A

~~**Methodist Hill Property Use Committee**~~ – Ended – not needed

**Municipal Facilities Advisory Committee (Design Team)** – Tracy Young

**Old Home Days Committee** – N/A

**Recreation Commission** – N/A

**Tax Increment Finance District Advisory Committee** – Eric Russell

Mr. Young made a motion to appoint each member of the Select Board to the committees as listed. Ms. Kennedy seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 4, 2024 Regular & Non-Public**

Ms. Stewart made a motion to approve the March 4, 2024, regular and non-public minutes as printed. Mr. Kluge seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Mr. Russell clarified that the non-public minutes would not be sealed.

#### **BOARD REPORTS**

Conservation continues to discuss stormwater management and future priorities. For most of the meeting, there was a discussion with the consultants for the Master Plan Phase II.

The Planning Board had public hearings for the Whitney Hall and Public Safety buildings.

#### **TOWN MANAGER'S REPORT**

The Police Officer position remains open, with hiring plans for June 2024. If a certified officer applies sooner, the timeline can be flexible.

Mr. Morris thanked everyone for their work at the Town Meeting and recognized Ms. Smith for her work on the Tuesday election and at the Town Meeting.

The Whitney Hall footings and foundation walls are completed, and plumbing opening prep will begin soon. Framing is planned for early April.

The Public Safety building has many RFPs open and is in the final budget stages, with a groundbreaking planned for May 2024.

Both building site plans were reviewed at the last Planning Board meeting. Some feedback was given, and both plans were approved.

Tomorrow morning, the final demolition of the Shedd Street property's remaining building will begin. The site grading and preparation to sell are expected to be completed within a few weeks.

In January 2023, the Select Board (SB) awarded the bid for the new ambulance \$265,367, which was higher than the CIP (Capital Improvement Program) had approved. After much review, a contract for \$256,889 for a new ambulance on order and an estimated delivery of 1.5 years was signed. Then, the town received a call that a demo ambulance came available with only 2200 miles on it for \$251,218. The demo ambulance cost was about \$5,000 less than the CIP had approved. This demo ambulance is the same ambulance that had originally been ordered and was delivered last week.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) did not experience any severe mud issues this year. The town is under on salt, sand, and liquid usage. Early indications suggest road postings may be lifted earlier than usual. Over 32 miles of tree-trimming has taken place with the mild winter temperatures.

The DPW hosted two water training classes put on by the Granite State Rural Water Association. These trainings were attended by 4 Enfield staff members, including the Health Officer. The classes were Water Distribution Best Practices and Topics of Cyanobacteria.

Highway staff are now working on RFPs for the plow truck, sidewalk tractor, and the 2024 paving.

## **BUSINESS**

### **Johnston Drive Property Discussion**

The legal opinion overall agreed the Johnston Drive Property Use Committee's recommendation fit within the legal allowances. The road would not be an issue for the suggested minimal use, with primary access from the Rail Trail.

Chair Russell asked if the board wished to move forward with the committee's recommendation, which was to sell one small lot (Tax Map 14, Lot 6) and maintain the two center lots (Lots 4 & 5) as-is, then leave the third lot (Lot 3) as-is until the lease reverts to the town.

Ms. Stewart, Mr. Kluge, and Ms. Kennedy agreed with the committee's recommendation.

Ms. Ruel asked if the first right of refusal was legal. Mr. Morris explained that it was part of the land acquisition for the parking lot across from the Copeland Block building.

Mr. Young added several conditions that he would like to see about the selling of "Parcel 6" (Lot 6):

- All legal expenses to be paid by the purchaser
- Clarification of access and parking to be part of the sale
- Land survey at the cost to the purchaser required
- The purchaser will not have any privileges particular to the adjoining land other than those available to any other resident of Enfield.

Mr. Gotthardt asked how the potential purchaser of "Parcel 6" would access the property. Chair Russell clarified that there would be no special access or extra parking available to that future owner, a condition suggested by Mr. Young.

Ms. Patten asked for further clarification regarding the first right of refusal. Chair Russell explained that the individual would have first right of refusal.

Mr. Patten asked if the SB had considered how to demolish the buildings on these lots and manage the traffic involved. Chair Russell moved the board on to this next section of the discussion. He suggested that the board would want to decide if they plan to demolish or board up the buildings. Mr. Morris added that there would be additional research for heavier vehicles used for complete demolition. Ms. Stewart also suggested demolition in smaller sections.

Ms. Jones said she supported the recommendation and felt that JPUC did a great job. She asked, after all the discussion about roadway access, how residents of Johnston Drive manage this additional traffic if a non-abutter chooses to utilize the property. She also stated concern for road maintenance for more regular use. Mr. Morris stated that he would investigate this and recommended that the town put gravel into some of the areas (as an owner of four parcels, it would make sense for the town to be partially responsible for this upkeep). Ms. Stewart added that adding gravel would help lessen silt runoff, which impacts the lake.

Mr. Young made a motion to see an RFP for the sale of "Parcel 6" (Tax Map 14, Lot 6), which the SB would review and incorporate discussed conditions for. Ms. Kennedy seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Chair Russell moved on to the discussion of Parcels 4 & 5, which are under full town control. Mr. Morris recommended that they oversecure the existing buildings, with police monitoring their use to determine whether they need to be demolished. Board members agreed that this was a good plan.

Mr. Young said he would like to see roped-off spots for ADA parking and added signage for these spaces. Mr. Young also said he would like to see an annual review of the use each September/October after primary summer use has ended. This way the board can have a public hearing on how the JPUC recommended use is going.

Ms. Stewart said she would like to see all of the committee's suggestions go forward to the budgeting process.

Mr. Young suggested signage for "swim at your own risk." Mr. Morris said that the town is exempt from liability for public use.

Ms. Ruel asked about the "A-frame" and wondered what the purpose of keeping the building was. Chair Russell said that the short-term purpose is to see how the park's use goes without prematurely expending town funds. The town would not spend money on the removal if a lower-cost option is available, and securing it is a lower-cost option.

Ms. Jones said that she would like to see friendly signage. Mr. Morris said that he would work with residents on signage.

Mr. Gotthardt asked if the attorney's report would be available to the public. Mr. Morris said it would not be.

Ms. Stewart asked to include a recommendation for "Parcel 3" for the record. The SB supports the recommendation to sell this parcel when it becomes available.

Ms. Jones asked if an abutter could look at the attorney's report. Chair Russell said this was not possible, per state law for legal opinions.

Chair Russell thanked the JPUC committee members for their work.

With no further questions or comments, Chair Russell moved on to the next agenda item.

#### **Methodist Hill Property RFP (Request for Proposal) Discussion**

Chair Russell explained that the board would be discussing the RFP that has been put together.

Chair Russell suggested changing the wording from "developer" to "buyer" or "purchaser" throughout. Members agreed with this change throughout the document.

The board reviewed the edits made by Mr. Miller (who had chaired the JPUC) to the RFP. Members discussed these and additional edits. Those contested were:

-70+ acres conserved vs. 75 acres conserved

Mr. Morris recommended that the RFP be put out for one month after it is released.

Mr. Drinkwater stated that he believed the clock was running for two different procedures: redeeming the property by the original property owner and the RFP. He asked when the timelines would begin for each. Mr. Morris clarified that the town's decision to sell the property starts the clock for the prior owner's redemption of the property, and the RFP will run concurrently with that process. Mr. Morris said that he believed there was a 30–40-day period for the previous owner to pursue redemption once the town decides to sell the property and notifies the prior owner.

Mr. Drinkwater asked if it is fair to say that when the original property owner is notified that the redemption process has begun, they would be given priority over a serious review of the RFPs. Chair Russell stated that if the former owner chooses to redeem the property, there is no property to sell, and no one will be picked for the RFP.

Mr. Drinkwater asked when the proposal would become public. Mr. Morris said that this discussion had yet to take place.

Ms. Patten asked how much land is being discussed and if the RFP is to sell all or part of the property. Chair Russell stated it is 100 acres, and the RFP would be to sell all of it.

Mr. Gotthardt asked for clarification on the “3-5 houses” listed in the RFP and whether these should be “house lots” instead. Mr. Morris stated that the preferences are listed intentionally with flexibility.

Ms. Stewart made a motion to move forward with edits agreed upon with 75 acres listed in the preferences of the RFP. Mr. Kluge seconded. Vote in favor of the motion (4-1).

Mr. Morris will make the edits and notify the prior owner of the SB’s choice to sell the property.

Ms. Balgrosky stated that she appreciated the edit from “developer” to “purchaser” to allow proposal flexibility. She asked if there was language within the RFP to clarify that all types of proposals are welcome. Chair Russell confirmed that it was.

Mr. Patten asked if the land would be sold for the cost that the town has put into it and asked if the board would choose the submitted proposal they like best. He said he needed clarification about the cost as well. Chair Russell clarified that an RFP could be higher, but any money above what the town has put into the property goes back to the prior property owner. Mr. Morris added that the RFP is intentionally flexible, but there are no covenants as part of the RFP (though they could be added later if the town chooses.)

Mr. Vianco asked if the town must survey the land before the sale. Mr. Morris said it was not.

Ms. Beaufait asked for clarification between the 100-acre parcel and the 70/75 acres discussed by the board. Chair Russell clarified that the RFP outlines a preference of 75 acres to be conserved out of 100.

With no further questions or comments, Chair Russell moved on to the next agenda item.

#### **Shedd Street RFP Priorities Discussion**

Chair Russell asked board members if they agreed that pursuing an RFP is the best way to move forward with this property. Members agreed.

Mr. Morris recommended an RFP similar to the Methodist Hill RFP, with flexibility and preferences.

Mr. Rich asked how large the lot is and if it is on town water/sewer. Chair Russell confirmed it is a little over 2 acres and is on town water and sewer. He noted that Annes Place is on a smaller lot. Mr. Morris said that a previous developer showed a plan suggestion for 20 housing units.

Mr. Gotthardt asked if the purchaser would be required to follow the current zoning for the area. Chair Russell stated that any proposal would presumably be evaluated under current zoning. Mr. Morris clarified that the town would not be the developer, that a developer would purchase the property, and that a zoning/planning review would be required if needed, as is always required.

Ms. Beaufait asked the board to consider the Master Plan for Enfield and the need for workforce and senior housing. She suggested keeping the RFP open but stating a preference for a portion of workforce housing. Ms. Stewart suggested potential language “aligns with the vision of the Master Plan.”)

Mr. Regan reiterated that taxes have been a common topic of discussion in town and felt that leaving the RFP open could allow for a more significant tax impact. Mr. Patten stated that he agreed with the open RFP.

Priorities for this parcel that the SB recommended are:

- Emphasis on creativity (willing to accept a wide variety of mixed uses, possible emphasis on housing)
- Expediency in development (ASAP)/anticipated development timeline

### **Town Electronic Sign Policy**

Mr. Morris introduced the draft policy to allow the use of the town’s electronic sign in front of the Community Building for official town messaging and events open to the public at the Enfield Community Building and Huse Park.

Ms. Kennedy asked for the context of this policy. Mr. Morris stated that a new policy was developed due to the zoning variance discussion regarding who can put messages on the sign. The variance was approved, but some potential guidelines around who can post to the sign were not included.

Members discussed some confusion on Policy Guideline item 3. If needed, Mr. Morris will review and update this in a second draft.

Mr. Beaufait stated that the Candidates Forum is a popular public service event held at the Community Building. He felt that allowing the use of the sign for this type of event would benefit the community.

Mr. Miller asked if events at the Enfield Village School were permitted. The board stated that it would not be allowed, even if the Lions Club held the event at EVS. He said that he felt it was not appropriate to use the public sign to allow a single entity to use the sign; this is not a good policy.

Chair Russell suggested that the town follow the zoning ordinance that states one thing per day can be displayed on the sign, except for timely public notices (such as road closure). Ms. Stewart suggested allowing the changes but having a longer time between changes.

Additional minor edits were suggested. Mr. Young added that he would like to see the town logo on the upper portion of the sign. Mr. Morris said that they are working on addressing this.

Mr. Morris will bring an updated version to a future meeting.

### **Town Meeting Discussion**

Ms. Stewart stated that the location, parking, and length of the meeting were possibly an issue. She suggested considering the Mascoma Valley Regional High School auditorium for improved parking, comfort, and sound quality.

Mr. Young asked if the town owns the sound equipment or if it is leased, and if so, can a microphone with more flexibility be leased?

Members agreed that the attorney was very informative.

If possible, Mr. Young stated he would like to have the meeting recorded.

Mr. Young suggested a photo board of projects underway and upcoming.

Mr. Young suggested supporting the Town Moderator by being as diligent as necessary in controlling the timelines. The SB stated that they are in full support of the moderator. Mr. Morris added that he and the attorney also discussed with Ms. Smith potential ways to speed up conversation when necessary.

Mr. Kluge stated attendees were generally very pleasant when working through difficult things and learning more about the town.

Ms. Kennedy commented that Mr. Deserranno's presentation was comprehensive. She stated that she felt Ms. Smith handled moderation very well; ensuring no one feels silenced and everyone feels heard is difficult.

Ms. Stewart stated that she found very helpful the number of people interested in further development and thoughts on items such as the Short-Term Rental Ordinance. These items are a clear priority for the board to discuss and decide on a path forward this year.

Ms. Patten asked for the petitioned warrant articles that were not legal. Does town counsel review all articles and make this determination? And if so, does the town notify the petitioners that the articles are not legal or binding before the Town Meeting? Mr. Morris said that town legal counsel does review these, and the petitioners are not notified, but the Select Board meeting where they are reviewed is public. Ms. Patten asked if the town could contact the petitioner and advise them that it was not legal or binding. Mr. Morris stated they must have them on the warrant if the petition requirements are met. Ms. Patten suggested more education around written warrant articles, possibly a training session. Mr. Morris said that the articles are non-binding but still advisory, so those that may pass overwhelmingly would be a point of discussion for the SB. He also stated that the Town Manager's Office is open and willing to assist with writing warrant articles and have town counsel review them for appropriate wording. The town office is here to help citizens and the select board move things forward that they want to see in place. Mr. Kluge added that community members can bring possible articles to the board and Town Manager ahead of gathering signatures for feedback, so they can help ensure the articles are legal and provide appropriate feedback. Mr. Young echoed that community members can utilize the town's resources.

Mr. Kiley said that the person running the audio contributed to the issues.

Mr. Regan commented that Mr. Deserranno prepared an excellent presentation and that Ms. Smith did a great job moderating. He asked if there could be a limit to speaking to help keep the meeting on track. Ms. Stewart said that her understanding is that everyone must be treated equally. Chair Russell said they could pass this feedback to Ms. Smith for review.

Ms. Labrie said that regarding the audio, there seemed to be some challenges with leaving mics live and picking up excess conversation versus turning them off to lessen this issue. She also stated that regarding recording, Mr. Bonner from Enfield Channel 8 was present and recorded at least part of the meeting.

Mr. Beaufait said that if a time limit is set, it is also possible for the body to extend this.

With no further questions or comments. Chair Russell moved on to the next agenda item.

### **Strategic Planning Review and Discussion**

Mr. Tracy suggested postponing this discussion to the next meeting. Ms. Bonnette noted that not all members would be at the next meeting. Mr. Kluge will not be at the April 1 meeting but has already submitted his edits.

Mr. Morris asked that board members review the document (he will send the Word file to the board) and send edits to him as soon as possible.

**Acceptance of Donation to Community Nursing Fund - \$2,500**

Motion – Stewart – accept with thanks

Second – Kluge

Unanimous

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

**Property Tax Abatement (BMB Real Estate)**

This is for the interest that accrued when a payment mistake was made. The payment was made on time but put into the wrong account. Mr. Young noted that this should be a one-time thing.

Ms. Stewart made a motion to abate the interest that accrued while the payment was written to the wrong account. Mr. Young seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

**OTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE SELECT BOARD**

**Public Comments**

Ms. Beaufait thanked the board for tonight's meeting. She felt the board discussion was thoughtful, and it was a good meeting.

Mr. Kiley agreed that tonight's meeting was a good one.

Mr. Beaufait agreed and said that tonight's meeting was very productive and easy to follow. He said that the board clearly wants to see the community work together despite differences.

**Other Business**

With no further business, Chair Russell moved on to the next agenda item.

Ms. Stewart made a motion to enter non-public session under RSA 91-A:3 II for (a) and (c) at 8:06 pm. Mr. Young seconded. Roll call vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

**Non-Public Session RSA 91-A:3 II**

**(a) for Town Manager Annual Evaluation**

~~(c) Health Officer issue that could adversely affect the reputation of a person~~ Note – the SB proceeded with only the Town Manager Annual Evaluation during the non-public session.

Ms. Stewart made a motion to exit non-public session at 8:38 pm. Mr. Young seconded. Roll call vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Ms. Stewart made a motion to give the Town Manager a raise equal to the COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment) amount of 2.8%. Mr. Young seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).



407 **NEXT MEETING**

408 April 1, 2024

409

410 **ADJOURNMENT**411 Ms. Stewart made a motion to adjourn at 8:39 pm. Mr. Kluge seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the  
412 motion (5-0).

413 The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 pm.

414

415

416

417

418

419

420 

---

Katherine D. P. Stewart, Chair

421

422

423

424

425

426 

---

Erik Russell, Vice-Chair

427

428

429

430

431

432 

---

John W. Kluge

433

434

435

436

437

438 

---

Alice Kennedy

439

440

441

442

443

444 

---

Tracy Young  
445 Enfield Select Board

446