

TOWN OF ENFIELD, NH

Moderator David Beaufait opened the meeting at 9:00 am on March 16, 2002. He introduced the Board of Selectmen: Donald A. Crate Sr., Ilene P. Reed, and Keith Oppenneer; Assistant Town Manager: Steve Griffin; the Town Attorney, James Raymond, Chairman of the Budget Committee, Holly Sanders, and Dominic Albanese, Vice Chairman of the Budget Committee. He explained the rules of order.

The pledge of allegiance was recited, and a moment of silence given for the victims of 09-11-01 and for Howard Walton, recently deceased resident who had served on the Conservation Commission and as a town volunteer firefighter.

The audience welcomed Milt Wilson, newly elected School District moderator, as a guest.

Articles 1 – 9 were voted on by ballot on March 12, 2002.

Article 1. To choose by ballot to serve for:

Six years: One Supervisor of the Checklist
William H. Hayes Jr. 492

Three years: One Selectman **Keith D. Oppenneer 492**
One Town Clerk **Ilene P. Reed 371**
E. Steven Plumley 146
One Treasurer **Donna I. Schmanska 490**
One Trustee of Trust Funds **Walter Paine 463**
One Cemetery Trustee **Fred Altvater 478**
One Fire Ward **Richard D. Bean Sr. 329**
Wayne W. Claflin 156
One Library Trustee **Philip N. Cronenwett**
One Zoning Board of Adjustment Members **Craig Daniels 232**
Meredith C. Smith 210
Two Recreation Commission Members **Stephanie Small 463**

Three Budget Committee Members
Lori Bliss 278
Richard A. Crate Sr. 288
James C. Gerding 167
Paul “Alan” Gove 242
Gayle Hulva 264

Two Years: One Moderator **David Beaufait 476**
One Recreation Commission Member

Article 2. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 as proposed by the Enfield Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the town will create a new Rural (R10) District to be located in the Eastman Hill/Methodist Hill area of town. The new district is intended to reduce the density of the area recognizing the great distance from Enfield Village Center. The new district will have a ten-acre minimum lot size and uses similar to what is currently permitted. (See map display located in the Selectmen's Conference Room and at the polls on Election Day.)

Add the following:

305 Rural Residential-Agricultural District (R5)

Change first sentence to read: All remaining areas of the Town of Enfield not previously included in R1, R3, CB, C/I, R10 and Conservation Districts.

306 Rural District (R10)

1. That area bordered on the north and east by the Commercial/Industrial (C/I) District, on the west by the Lebanon Town line, and on the south by the Plainfield and Grantham Town lines.
2. That area bordered on the north and south by the Commercial/Industrial District, on the east by the Conservation (C) District and on the west by Interstate 89.
3. That area bordered on the north by the Lebanon Town line and the Conservation (C) District, on the west by the Commercial/Industrial (CI) District and the Lebanon Town line, on the south by Interstate 89, and on the east by the Conservation (C) District and the Commercial Industrial (CI) District.

Change "306" to "307."

401.6 Rural District

In the Rural District (R10), land may be used and buildings may be erected or altered for the following purposes only and subject to the following regulations and limitations:

- A. One-family dwellings including manufactured homes on individual lots.
- B. Cemeteries, churches and places of formal worship.
- C. Home occupations subject to the provisions of Section 404.
- D. The growing of grain, fodder, fruits, vegetables and ornamental plants.

E. Produce stands for the sale of fruits, vegetables and ornamental plants, whether or not grown on the premises.

F. Fairs run or sponsored only by local church, school, fraternal, youth or other civic organizations.

G. Private yard sales and auctions.

H. Growth and harvesting of forest products, but not the clear cutting of timber since this can result in run-off and soil erosion problems and create an undesirable visual impact to surrounding landowners and the community in general. This does not preclude the clearing of land for a structure, bona fide agricultural, wildlife management, and silvicultural purposes, and other uses permitted in the District and by special exceptions. (See Section 403.)

I. Non-commercial outdoor recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, hiking, cross-country skiing and snowmobiling.

Accessory uses customarily incidental to A through I of this section.

K. Minimum lot size shall be ten (10) acres except for dwellings, in which case minimum lot size shall be ten (10) acres per dwelling unit [i.e. one (1) dwelling unit = ten acres, two (2) dwelling units = twenty (20) acres].

L. No structure shall be located nearer than thirty (30) feet from any edge of the lot line contiguous to the street or twenty (20) feet from any lot boundary or shall be higher than 35 feet or 2 and one-half stories; however, this provision shall not apply to conventional television antennas, lightning rods, cupolas, church steeples, chimneys, and silos.

M. No structure shall be placed, located, or constructed within fifty feet from the seasonal high water line of any river, stream, wetland, lake or public pond, and no dock may be located nearer than 25 feet from a side lot line. Dry hydrants, culverts and bridges may be permitted by Planning Board and with State wetland permits as required.

N. At least two (2) on-lot parking spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit with three bedrooms or less and one (1) additional parking space for each additional bedroom. Each individual open-air parking space shall be at least ten (10) feet wide and twenty (20) feet long.

O. No lot shall have more than one dwelling or principal building.

P. The width of any lot shall be a minimum of 250 feet at the public right-of-way and minimum of 250 feet at the front of the proposed building. A Special Exception to this requirement may be granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment (where soil and

slope conditions permit) for counter-balancing considerations such as preservation of wetlands, natural features, open space and habitat such as deer yards.

- Q. Cluster development is permitted as per Section 405.
- R. Back lots are permitted if a minimum right-of-way of 50 feet is provided to the lot and the width of the lot is a minimum of 250 feet wide at the front of the structure. The area of the right-of-way shall not be included in determination of lot area.
- S. A recreational vehicle such as a motor home and camper may be permitted on a lot with an existing dwelling unit, so long as it is not used for occupancy or as a dwelling in excess of three weeks in a calendar year.
- T. A recreational vehicle such as a motor home or camper may be permitted on a lot without an existing dwelling unit so long as sewage and gray water disposal is in accordance with state law. Occupancy shall be limited to six months per year.
- U. Agriculture, including farm animals and other generally accepted land uses for farm purposes.
- V. Riding stables and non-commercial equestrian activities.

Special Exceptions

403

7. R 10 District

- a. Public buildings, utility stations and other essential services
- b. Seasonal recreation camps and camp grounds
- c. Saw mills
- d. Antique Shops
- e. Bed and breakfasts
- f. Home occupation in an existing accessory building
- g. Boarding and/or breeding kennels
- h. Two-family dwelling
- i. Sand and gravel pits

- j. Day care centers
- k. Professional offices
- l. Recreational facilities
- m. Educational facilities and museums
- n. Bus stop shelters
- o. Commercial equestrian activities
- p. Wireless Towers
- q. Estates

228 Yes, 278 No. Article 2 was defeated.

Article 3. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 as proposed by the Enfield Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the town will vote to set a limit on the number of dwelling buildings allowed per acre to two (2) per acre in the Community-Business (CB) District. (There is currently no limit.)

Under Article IV, Section 401.4 add the following:

V. There shall be no more than two (2) dwelling buildings per acre.

188 Yes, 335 No. Article 3 was defeated.

Article 4. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #3 as proposed by the Enfield Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the town will vote to further restrict the density of the Conservation (C) District from ten-acres per dwelling unit to twenty-acres per dwelling unit. (See map display located in the Selectmen's Conference Room and at the polls on Election Day)

Amend Article IV, Section 402k that currently reads:

k. Dwellings shall be limited to a density of one dwelling unit to ten acres of land and no structure shall be constructed within 300 feet of an existing river, stream, wetland, lake or public pond.

To read:

k. Dwellings shall be limited to a density of one dwelling unit to *twenty* acres of land and no structure shall be constructed within 300 feet of an existing river, stream, wetland, lake or public pond.

183 Yes, 327 No. Article 4 was defeated.

Article 5. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #4 as proposed by the Enfield Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the town will vote to correct the title of the individuals qualified to delineate wetland areas.

Under Article IV, Section 406

1. B. Delineation of Wetland Areas

Change ‘Plant Scientists’ to ‘Wetland Scientist.’

320 Yes, 188 No. Article 5 passed as printed.

Article 6. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #5 as proposed by the Enfield Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the town will vote to add a new section that is intended to prevent excessive clearcutting of forests.

Under Article IV, Section 406 add the following:

3. Forested Areas

The purpose of this section is to prevent excessive clearcutting of forests. It is designed to:

- A. Prevent clearcuts that do not recognize silvicultural guidelines and do not give appropriate consideration to forest regeneration, soil productivity, water quality, and plant and animal habitat.
- B. Prevent clearcuts greater than 10 acres in size;
- C. Prevent clearcuts on slopes greater than 35%;
- D. Prevent clearcuts on thin organic soils on top of bedrocks as classified by the Natural Resources Conservation Services soil surveys;
- E. Prevent clearcuts on soils classified in Natural Resources Conservation Services soil surveys as having severe erosion hazard;

- F. Prevent clearcuts in riparian zones;
- G. Prevent clearcuts in or around seeps or vernal pools;
- H. Prevent clearcuts in highly visible or aesthetically sensitive areas.
- I. Clearcuts shall be separated by a manageable stand of at least the width of the area being harvested. This stand shall be maintained with at least 70% crown closure or full stocking as recommended in silvicultural guides. This manageable stand shall be located within the same lot as the clearcut.

Definition of a clearcut

A clearcut shall be defined as any tree harvest that leaves less than 40 square feet of residual basal area per acre on a minimum area of three acres.

Permitted uses

In a Forested Area, permitted clearcuts shall be only those that are planned and conducted with the assistance of a forester licensed in the State of New Hampshire. Clearcutting for land conversion purposes is permitted if all permits have been obtained. Said permits include, but are not limited to, building, subdivision, excavation and site plan approval where necessary.

And add the following under **Appendix Definitions**:

Basal Area: Sum of the cross-sectional areas [at 4.5 feet high] of all trees on an acre.

Clear Cutting: Change definition to read: Any tree harvest that leaves less than 40 square feet of residual basal area per acre on a minimum area of three acres.

Riparian Zone: Flood plains, banks, and associated areas that border free-flowing or standing water.

Seeps: A spot where groundwater oozes slowly to the surface forming a small pool. Soil at these sites remains saturated for some portion or all of the growing season, and often stays wet through-out the winter.

Vernal pools: An ephemeral body of water that fills in the spring, holds water for at least 10 days, and dries up by fall in some or all years. They have no defined inlet or outlet, or contain fish.

297 Yes, 195 No. Article 6 passed as printed.

Article 7. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #6 as proposed by the Enfield Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the town will vote to exempt man-made steep slopes from the Steep Slope regulations.

Change Article IV, Section 406 that currently reads:

2. The purpose of a Steep Slope Area is to prevent development on slopes in excess of twenty-five percent.

To read:

2. The purpose of a Steep Slope Area is to prevent development on slopes in excess of twenty-five percent. *Man-made steep slopes are exempt from regulation.*

234 Yes, 243 No. Article 7 was defeated.

Article 8. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #7 as proposed by the Enfield Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the town will vote to add the following definition to the Appendix Definitions:

Multiple Family Dwelling: A permanent structure used as a residence consisting of two, three or four dwelling units.

222 Yes, 263 No. Article 8 was defeated.

Article 9. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #8 as proposed by the Enfield Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the town will vote to amend the existing Town Building Code by adopting the 2000 International Building Code (IBC) and the 2000 International Residential Code (IRC). (Copies are on file at the Enfield Town Offices)

275 Yes, 201 No. Article 9 passed as printed.

Article 10.

Shall the Town raise and appropriate the sum of two hundred thirty thousand dollars (\$230,000.00) (gross budget) to provide underground electric, telephone and cable wiring in conjunction with the NHDOT reconstruction of the Main Street Bridge, from the project's southern terminus to the Main Street-High Street intersection, eighty thousand dollars (\$80,000.00) from the Town's undesignated surplus, and to authorize the issuance of not more than one hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000.00) of bonds or notes in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act (RSA 33), and to authorize the Selectmen to issue and negotiate such bonds or notes and to determine the rate of interest thereon? This appropriation is in addition to Warrant Article 11 and has no impact on the tax rate in 2002. (2/3 ballot vote required.)

The Board of Selectmen recommends passage of this article.

The Budget Committee recommends passage of this article.

K. Oppenneer made the motion to accept the article as printed; D. Crate seconded. K. Oppenneer and H. Sanders spoke in favor of this article. D. McIntire, member of the Main Street Program, gave a presentation in favor of the article, with pictures showing the area as it looks presently. He explained that the NH DOT work on the Main Street bridges presents the perfect opportunity to bury the utility lines. Areas for planting would be created, and decorative fences installed. It would greatly improve the downtown area and foster economic development of the area. K. Withrow asked who would be responsible for paying for future repairs if the lines had to be dug up. H. Sanders explained that it would be the utility company's responsibility unless it was a water and sewer department problem. D. Carr asked what section of downtown did this cover, and what was the projected cost to the property owners to hook up to the new lines. D. McIntire explained that the area is from High Street to the old hardware store building and across the street to the Out of the Woodworks building, and that the Enfield Village Association (EVA) had voted to assist with one year, no interest loans to assist with the hook up costs. T. Jennings spoke in favor of the article. T. Taylor asked where the transformers would be located, and if street lighting was included. D. McIntire explained that the transformers would be hidden behind the buildings and street lighting was included in the cost. L. Gardner asked how many poles were going underground, the lineal feet to be buried, and what was the contribution from the utility companies. D. McIntire explained that 4 or 5 poles would be eliminated with about 660' of wire, and that with deregulation the utility companies weren't contributing anything. H. Sanders clarified that since the poles have to be moved anyway for the NH DOT construction the utilities would be paying for that portion. L. Gardner questioned that perhaps the money might be better spent on improving parking in the area. P. Martin questioned the "no impact" statement, in that someone had to pay. H. Sanders explained that the money was to come from the surplus fund, but that this was part of a long term project to improve the center of town so there would be a tax impact in the future, hopefully to be funded by a note or bond with about 3% interest. C. Sanborn asked what the impact would be in 2003 and in the future. H. Sanders explained that based on the present it would be about 35¢/\$1000 in one year, lower if spread out over several years. B. Prior said that it would make more sense to use the unspecified funds on ongoing projects that need funding. D. Marchetti stated that he would rather see the money spent on improving parking; you can remove the wires and still have no parking. D. Albanese spoke in favor of the article. D. McIntire explained that the parking problem was recognized but that because of the NH DOT work this was the time to deal with the underground utilities. K. Oppenneer explained that the EVA diagrams show 12 parking spaces by the Laundromat, and 25 by the flagpole, and some may be developed behind the buildings. S. Brown asked if downtown was a historic district, and if so were any funds available from the government. D. McIntire explained that a heritage commission was in place but the BOS had not filled any seats on it, and that several of EVA's committees were looking into funding sources. I. Reed spoke in favor of the article. P. Mirski said that he believed this will help with taxes in the long run and urged support of the article, as did S. Hagarman. J. Patten moved the article, which received support from a voice vote. At 10:15 the Moderator declared the polls open for one hour, and declared them closed at

11:15. He gave the **results as 82 Yes votes, 43 No votes, which was not a 2/3 majority vote.** D. Smith asked for a recount of the votes, and received voice support for it so the Moderator asked for a recount. **The recount results were 82 Yes votes, 43 No votes. H. Sanders made a motion to reconsider Article 10 at 9:00 am on April 6, 2002, P. Cronewett seconded the motion.** Some discussion ensued about the requirements of another meeting. The Moderator called for a voice vote on the motion, which was unclear. He called for a hand vote, 48 Yes votes, and 40 No votes. After some discussion about how to restrict discussion on April 6th to only Article 10 H. Sanders made the motion to do so, N. Scovner seconded. **A voice vote supported the motion.**

(At this point D. Marchetti made the motion for the meeting to consider Articles 19 & 20 before Article 11. M. Wheeler seconded. The Moderator declared that this request needed a 2/3 majority vote. L. Gardner made a request to overrule the 2/3 necessity. A voice vote was unclear, a hand vote was 50 Yes votes, 55 No votes. The Moderator stated a 2/3 majority vote was required. A voice vote was taken; H. Sanders and L. Gardner both appealed for a hand vote. The hand vote was 81 Yes votes, 30 No votes. The Moderator declared Article 19 on the table for discussion. For clarity of these minutes it will be recorded in order after Article 18.)

On Saturday, April 6, 2002, the meeting reconvened at 9:00 a.m. at Whitney Hall. The Moderator delayed opening the discussion until 9:30 to allow the audience time to check-in with the Supervisors of the Checklist. At 9:30 the Moderator declared the meeting opened. The pledge of allegiance was recited, and a moment of silence observed for Carol Keating, recently deceased longtime resident and town employee. The Moderator explained the rules of order.

C. Sanborn made the motion to limit the discussion to Article 10, J. Patten seconded. A unanimous voice vote passed the motion. H. Sanders made the motion to accept Article 10 as printed, K. Oppenneer seconded. H. Sanders, D. McIntire, B. Oppenneer and R. Howe all spoke in favor of the article. The cost advantage of burying the utilities while the NH DOT was replacing the bridges was pointed out, and the need to attract businesses for economic development discussed. S. Routhier spoke against the article, pointing out that businesses don't want to be "downtown" but on Route 4. B. Prior presented three questions to the meeting: What will become of the flagpole? Is street lighting included in the \$230k cost? If parking is all to be on the left side of the street, why do we need to remove the utility poles from the right side? D. McIntire answered: The flagpole ownership is shared by the two property owners on either side of it and is a private matter between them. Landscaping is not included in the cost, although the NH DOT would provide the soil. Lighting preparation would be planned by the NH DOT but only the lights on the bridges would be provided by the NH DOT. Parking would be on the left side of the street. B. Prior presented an overhead projector sheet contrasting the tax rates of towns with and without underground utilities, including population and average income statistics, pointing out that underground utilities do not mean that a town's tax rate will decrease. He spoke of the history of the flagpole for Santa Claus and Memorial Day parade gatherings, and stated that both the flagpole and the utility poles are part of Enfield's history and should not be removed. D. Smith spoke in favor of the

article. He said that EVA has contracted to buy 78 Main Street, a burned out building. He stated that revitalization will continue whether the article passed or not but that Main Street would be much prettier if it did pass. D. Kiley spoke against the article, pointing out that if street lighting was not included in the cost then the cost was not true.

M. Bryant, property owner adjacent to the flagpole, pointed out that the BOS had the opportunity to purchase the flagpole property in the past and did not have the foresight to do so. C. Sanborn moved the question, to which the Moderator called a voice vote which agreed. The Moderator declared the polls open for one hour for voting on Article 10 at 10:08, and subsequently the polls closed at 11:08. **The Moderator declared the vote as 110 Yes, 129 No. Article 10 was defeated.** (He mentioned that the Supervisors had also recounted the ballots).

K. Oppenheer made the motion to adjourn, B. Prior seconded. To assent from a voice vote the Moderator declared the meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Article 11.

Shall the Town raise and appropriate the sum of four million, one hundred sixty thousand, and nineteen dollars (\$4,160,019) which represents the operating budget. Said sum does not include special and individual warrant articles addressed. [Estimated tax impact of \$8.54 per \$1,000 valuation.] (Majority vote required.)

The Board of Selectmen recommends passage of this article.

The Budget Committee recommends passage of this article.

D. Crate made the motion to accept the article as printed; I. Reed seconded.

H. Sanders and D. Albanese both spoke in favor of the article and explained that the Budget Committee had worked hard to keep the budget down, and that not every department got what they asked for and all departments were cut. P. Cronenwett made the motion to amend Article 11 by adding the sum of five thousand two hundred and seventy-five dollars (\$5,275) to the bottom line of the Town operating budget; said sum being in addition to any other changes to the Town operating budget approved by this Town Meeting, to read:

Shall the Town raise and appropriate the sum of four million, one hundred sixty five thousand, two hundred ninety four dollars (\$4,165,294) which represents the operating budget. Said sum does not include special and individual warrant articles addressed. [Estimated tax impact of \$8.54 per \$1,000 valuation.] (Majority vote required.)

G. Crilley seconded the motion. P. Cronenwett and G. Crilley both spoke as Library Trustees explaining that the library was on a very tight budget and that the cost of books goes up 20-30% a year so cutting \$5k from the book line was disastrous. The library has its own trust funds but keep those for physical improvements such as furniture.

H. Sanders and D. Albanese both spoke defending the cut, explaining that all departments were cut. L. Gardner stated that he thought it was time the town looked into a new library building. J. Patten spoke in support of the library. S. Stancek said he wasn't against the library but understood the budget committee's position. C. Sanborn moved the question, to voice vote approval. D. Marchetti asked about the sum of money

in the budget for Anne's Place, and H. Sanders explained that it was a capital outlay of \$350k but the money comes from the State and is an in and out item, with no impact. D. Marchetti asked if the police and water & sewer departments were asked what impact Anne's Place would have on them because the long term affect would impact the budget. H. Sanders explained that it was a planning board issue, and I. Reed stated that the planning board did do an impact study and approved Anne's Place. P. Giese commented on the budget committee. The Moderator called for a voice vote on the amendment, which passed.

A voice vote was taken on Article 11 as amended and passed.

Article 12.

Shall the Town raise and appropriate the following sums to be placed in the designated Capital Reserve Funds previously established?

Capital Reserve Account	Appropriation	Estimated Tax Impact Per \$1,000 Valuation
Land Acquisition	25,000	11.2¢
Municipal Building	10,000	4.5¢
Technology Services	35,000	15.7¢
Downtown Revitalization	10,000	4.5¢
Ambulance	10,000	4.5¢
Fire Vehicle/Equipment	10,000	4.5¢
Whitney Hall Renovation	15,000	6.8¢
Police Equipment	10,000	4.5¢
Public Works Vehicle/Equipment	50,000	22.5¢
Total	\$175,000	78.7¢

This appropriation is in addition to Warrant Article 11. (Majority vote required.)

The Board of Selectmen recommends passage of this article.

The Budget Committee recommends passage of this article.

I. Reed made the motion to accept the article as printed, K. Oppenneer seconded.

K. Oppenneer explained that the capital reserves were a good way for the town to save for big purchases. L. Gardner asked if the monies could be spent without a vote of town meeting. H. Sanders said that some could, others couldn't and that she would get a list to him. **A voice vote was taken and Article 12 passed as printed.**

Article 13.

Shall the Town raise and appropriate sixteen thousand dollars (\$16,000) to be added to the Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund previously established; this sum to come from undesignated surplus? This appropriation is in addition to Warrant Article 11 and has no impact on the tax rate. (Majority vote required.)

The Board of Selectmen recommends passage of this article.
The Budget Committee recommends passage of this article.

K. Oppeneer made the motion to accept the article as printed; D. Crate seconded.
K. Oppeneer explained that it was hoped that we wouldn't have to have a town wide reappraisal done but might have to in 2005.

A voice vote was taken and Article 13 was passed as printed.

Article 14.

Shall the Town raise and appropriate seven thousand dollars (\$7,000) for support of West Central Services? This appropriation is in addition to Warrant Article 11. [Estimated tax impact of 3.2¢ per \$1,000 valuation.] (Majority vote required.)

The Board of Selectmen recommends passage of this article.
The Budget Committee does not recommend passage of this article.

D. Crate made the motion to accept the article as printed; I. Reed seconded.
Ronald Michaud was introduced as the director of West Central Services. He gave the audience an explanation of the agency's work and cited numbers of Enfield residents assisted in the past year. H. Sanders explained that the budget committee felt this should be presented as a separate warrant article. P. Giese, S. Carr, and E. Palmer spoke in favor of the article. P. Mirski asked why this agency was singled out in a separate article, to which H. Sanders replied that this was the first time they asked for funds. C. Laurie asked how much of the county tax from Enfield goes to the agency, to which R. Michaud said he didn't know exactly but that it was a small amount.

A voice vote was taken and Article 14 passed as printed.

Article 15.

Shall the Town raise and appropriate the sum of two thousand, three hundred fifty dollars (\$2,350), from the undesignated fund balance, for deposit into the Cemetery Maintenance Fund, an expendable general trust fund previously established under the provisions of RSA 31:19-a for the purpose of maintaining cemeteries? This money represents 2001 revenue from the sale of cemetery lots in 2001 and is available to offset the appropriation. This appropriation is in addition to Warrant Article 11 and has no impact on the tax rate. (Majority vote required.)

The Board of Selectmen recommends passage of this article.
The Budget Committee recommends passage of this article.

I. Reed made the motion to accept the article as printed; K. Oppeneer seconded.
P. Martin asked if Oak Grove cemetery was included in this, and D. Crate replied no, that it was private.

A voice vote was taken and Article 15 passed as printed.

Article 16.

Shall the Town discontinue the Library Automation Capital Reserve Fund created in 1999? Said funds, with accumulated interest to date of withdrawal, are to be transferred to the Town's general fund? (Majority vote required.)

The Board of Selectmen recommends passage of this article.

The Budget Committee recommends passage of this article.

K. Oppeneer made the motion to accept the article as printed; D. Crate seconded.

M. Carr, town librarian, stated that the technology project was not completed so it may be premature to close this account. D. Albanese asked if the monies could be transferred to the library, H. Sanders replied that it had to go to the general fund.

A voice vote was taken and Article 16 was defeated.

Article 17.

Shall the Town discontinue, completely and absolutely, a portion of NH Route 4A defined as described as being between station 17 + 00 and Station 19 + 50 of New Hampshire Department of Transportation Project Betterment – P-3673 as authorized by RSA 231-43? (Majority vote required.)

D. Crate made the motion to accept the article as printed; I. Reed seconded.

D. Crate explained that when the state redesigned NH Route 4A in the early 1960's a piece of the old road was left to provide access to some properties. L. Gardner asked if abutters had been notified, to which S. Griffin replied yes. S. Stancek asked why it had been deeded to town instead of individuals, which J. Raymond explained.

A voice vote was taken and Article 17 passed as printed.

Article 18.

Pursuant to a petition of twenty-five (25) or more legal voters:

Shall the Town preserve, by whatever means necessary, the existing railroad underpass on Main Street in the Town of Enfield for the following reasons: This underpass has historic significance as part of the Northern Railroad; it acts as a natural gateway to the Town; it serves as a speed and traffic governor as vehicles enter the village; it helps to foster the goals of the Main Street Program; and it is a bridge on the Rails to Trails network. (Majority vote required.)

D. Smith made the motion to accept the article as printed; C. Sanborn seconded.

D. Smith explained that he was the petition's originator and that it had arisen because EVA had heard an overwhelming sentiment that the underpass was threatened by the State DOT's plans to straighten the road. It is felt that the underpass serves to slow traffic down and to restrict truck traffic for safety and that it is an historic landmark.

D. Marchetti said that he understood that the State had bought the old motel and that the road would go through that property, bypassing the underpass. To which D. Crate replied yes, and said that the petitioners want to keep trucks out but that people who own cars and trucks pay to drive them over the roads. C. Sanborn said that traffic would move

faster without the underpass and a crosswalk would be needed. He had read of a proposal to return railroad service to the area, in which case the underpass would be needed.

P. Martin said that he agreed with D. Crate. S. Carr said that she had signed the petition but since had second thoughts about it. She said it was a nice thought to keep a historic structure and to slow traffic and keep trucks out but that we shouldn't have to depend on the underpass for that and that trucks are a fact of life. T. Jennings said that if we want to revitalize the downtown area we need tourists and that tour buses can't get through the underpass, and that he didn't think it had much historical worth. D. Carr said that he didn't think the underpass was safe, that he walks through it often and has almost been hit several times. Kids walk to the beach that way and it isn't safe for them. Perhaps it could be left as access to the rail trail. S. Stancek said that the State plans to build the road around it and that school buses and fire trucks can't get through it. If the railroad comes back it would be up to the State and railroad to build a new one. S. Hagerman asked if this article would change the State's plans? D. Crate replied that the State owns it but we could end up with property that we don't want to maintain. D. Smith stated that the point of the article was to let the BOS know how we feel. C. Sanborn stated that the State purchased the railroad land and turned it into the rail trail and need to uphold the rail trail. K. Withrow stated that we shouldn't depend on the underpass as a speed governor.

A voice vote was taken and Article 18 was defeated.

Article 19.

Pursuant to a petition of twenty-five (25) or more legal voters:

To see if the Town will vote to appropriate zero (\$0) dollars for payment of the contract between the Town and Municipal Resources, Inc. Corporation and the Selectmen shall not expend any money for the purpose of paying for Municipal Resources Inc. Corporation services.

D. Crate made the motion to accept the article as printed; K. Oppenpeer seconded. D. Marchetti explained that at the 1996 town meeting it was voted to go to the town manager form of government and that since then the BOS had contracted with MRI to provide coverage. He gave cost calculations that he had estimated on how much MRI was costing versus what outright hiring an individual would be. He said that we wouldn't contract for a police chief, fire chief, or director of public works and shouldn't for a town manager. He asked for support for Article 19 to give the people and town employees a full time town manager as they had voted for in 1996. C. Sanborn made the motion to table Article 19, L. Gardner seconded. The motion carried by a voice vote. H. Sanders made the motion to consolidate Articles 19 and 20 for discussion on both, K. Oppenpeer seconded. The motion carried by a voice vote.

After Article 20 had been voted upon D. Marchetti made the motion to take Article 19 off the table, M. Wheeler seconded. A voice vote passed the motion. D. Marchetti made the motion to withdraw Article 19 from discussion, with permission from M. Wheeler. A voice vote passed the motion. **Article 19 was withdrawn from discussion.**

Article 20.

Pursuant to a petition of twenty-five (25) or more legal voters:

To see what sum the Town will vote to appropriate to hire a town manager and the Selectmen shall forthwith appoint a town manager per RSA 37:2.

D. Crate made the motion to discuss Article 20, D. Albanese seconded. The motion carried by a voice vote. D. Marchetti made the motion to amend Article 20: “ To see if the Town will vote to appropriate the sum of fifty-eight thousand dollars (\$58,000) for a full time town manager who will be an employee of the Town and that the Selectmen shall forthwith appoint such town manager per RSA 37:2”, M. Wheeler seconded.

H. Sanders pointed out that social security and insurance needs to be a separate line item. T. Jennings said that he didn't understand why we're discussing these details; we need an amendment to tell the BOS to hire a full time town manager. He asked the BOS if they would do that, to which D. Crate and K. Oppeneer nodded yes. He said we don't need to discuss dollar amounts. D. Carr said he assumed that the pay scale would add a step 26 and how would that look in coming years? H. Sanders replied that the cost of living increase had been approximately 3% based on federal figures and that does not include step or merit increases, which would add another 2 to 5% so at least plan on a 5% increase. D. Albanese said that he agreed with T. Jennings in that how can we tell the BOS what to do then tie their hands as to money. I. Reed stated that as a selectman she represented the people as far as money goes. She hears all the opposition but hasn't heard any good things and that as selectman and town clerk she has seen MRI do a good job for Enfield. D. Crate said that as a Selectman for over 20 years he thinks the town should be run like a business and that we need a full time manager. K. Oppeneer said that MRI has done a marvelous job and got the town out of a bad situation in 1996. It's a question of needing full time coverage. L. Gardner said that he was astonished that the town had \$1.5 mil in surplus. He said that the BOS will negotiate salary and benefits with prospective employees and that we need a manager with loyalty to the town and the BOS, not to a contractor. T. Jennings made a motion to make an amendment to Article 20: “We the citizens of the Town feel that the Board of Selectmen should hire the best possible candidate for the full time position of Town Manager that the budget to be approved at this Town Meeting can reasonably afford. The Town of Enfield expects and demands a highly qualified, experienced municipal manager to guide the Town in the coming years and looks to the Board of Selectmen to fulfill the Board's responsibility in this matter as professionally and as thoroughly as possible”. D. Barrel seconded. L. Gardner asked if the Moderator was prepared to rule that the amendment fits within the parameters of Article 20; the Moderator so ruled. H. Sanders pointed out that there was \$74k in the line for contracted town manager. MRI has a 30-day buy out clause and after that money would still be in the line. S. Laliberte stated that she was opposed to Articles 19 & 20. MRI has done an excellent job and now the town has long range planning that it never had before. A town manager living in town divides the town. Why change something that's running well? D. Barrel asked if the town manager needed to be a town resident. N. Scovner said she didn't think residency could be insisted upon. L. Gardner said the BOS could appoint one not a resident. D. Albanese said it's up to the BOS and we shouldn't restrict them. T. Jennings agreed. D. Marchetti stated that since 1996 we've

never had a full time town manager. J. Raymond stated that by statutory authority it is up to the BOS to hire a town manager and that any vote on this article would be advisory only. D. Marchetti asked if that meant that the BOS could continue contracting with MRI, to which J. Raymond replied yes. S. Stancek said this was a case of “be careful what you wish for” and that we’re moving too fast with this. He made the motion to amend the amendment to: “We the citizens of the Town direct that the Board of Selectmen should investigate the best possible candidate for the full time position of Town Manager for the fiscal year 2003. The Town of Enfield expects and demands a highly qualified, experienced municipal manager to guide the Town in the coming years and looks to the Board of Selectmen to fulfill the Board’s responsibility in this matter as professionally and as thoroughly as possible”, and said that this would give us some time to look into the financial details. N. Scovner seconded. G. Crilley asked what the cost to the town had been with the MRI changes in personnel and what did it cost the town to change from a town administrator to a town manager? K. Oppenneer stated that it cost the town about \$75k to buy out the town administrator, and that the changes in MRI personnel have not cost the town anything. C. Aufiero said that she thought the BOS could hire a full time manager and didn’t need a dollar amount specified to do so.

C. Sanborn said that we need a full time, live in town manager now, not next year. S. Carr said that her understanding is whatever comes out of this article it’s non-binding. We are saying that we want a full time manager and we should trust the BOS to hire one, whether it be contracted or outright hired. F. Phillips said that he’d found that asking a government to investigate something was equal to sending it to committee. It is the will of the meeting for the BOS to hire a full time manager, not limiting them as to salary, benefits, where they live. I oppose this amendment. J. Patten stated that the BOS have our faith that they’ll do the best job they can. A voice vote was taken on the amended Article 20, and failed. C. Sanborn made a motion to make an amendment to the amendment: “We the citizens of the Town direct that the Board of Selectmen shall hire the best possible candidate for the full time position of Town Manager that the budget to be approved at this Town Meeting can reasonably afford. The Town of Enfield expects and demands a highly qualified, experienced municipal manager to guide the Town in the coming years and looks to the Board of Selectmen to fulfill the Board’s responsibility in this matter as professionally and as thoroughly as possible”. J. Patten seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken on the amended amendment to Article 20 and passed. **A voice vote was taken on Article 20 as amended and passed.**

Article 21.

To see if the Town will vote to direct the moderator to appoint forthwith an advisory committee of 5 persons to review town manager applications, sit in on interviews and make recommendations to the Selectmen.

No motion was made to place the article on the table.

Article 22.

Shall the Town maintain Harris Brook Reservoir as a recreational facility? (This article is advisory only.)

K. Oppenneer made the motion to accept the article as printed; D. Crate seconded.

D. Crate explained that the reservoir used to be a water supply for the town but now wells have replaced it. In order to keep water in it we need to maintain the dam and spillway. It's a good recreational site but the BOS need the town's input on it. T. Jennings stated that it was a pristine site in an urban area, a great place to walk to and enjoy. It is also located within the wellhead protection area and he was afraid that if it was sold there would be camps built all around it. H. Sanders said that right now it cost about \$300 a year to maintain it but it could need sizable expenditures in the future. It is actually located in the town of Canaan. J. Patten asked if this was the one off the end of Maple Street, and D. Crate replied yes. C. Sanborn said it was a good recreational area and an emergency water source and supported keeping it. **A voice vote was taken and Article 22 passed.**

Article 23.

To hear the reports of agents, auditors, committees, or any other officers heretofore chosen and pass any vote relating thereto.

D. Crate made the motion to accept the article as printed; K. Oppeneer seconded. **A voice vote was taken and Article 23 passed.**

P. Mirski and T. Jennings spoke in favor of the traditional town meeting.

Henry Cross explained that he was working on a proposed veteran's memorial park off US Route 4 and asked the people to look at the model and see what they thought of it. He said that it would not require any monies from the town.

The Moderator recognized the staff.

K. Oppeneer made the motion to recess the meeting until April 6, 2002 at 9:00 a.m.; S. Laliberte seconded. The Moderator declared the meeting recessed at 2:10 p.m.

Included under Article 10 within this record are the results of the reconvention of the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. on April 6, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolee T. Higbee
Deputy Town Clerk