

**This document is for informational purposes only.
The original document may be obtained at the Town Hall.**

Town of Danville
Board of Selectmen
Monday, January 24, 2022
7:00 PM

7:00 PM

Meeting is Video-Recorded

Selectmen Present: Shawn O’Neil, Chair; Steve Woitkun, Vice-Chair; Sheila Johannesen, Dottie Billbrough, and Scott Borucki

Others Present: Kimberly Burnham, Selectmen Administrator; Carsten Springer, Chair, Forestry Committee; Jimmy Seaver, Road Agent; Residents: Judy Jervis, Dennis Griffiths

Shawn called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and opened the meeting with a moment of silence for the troops who put themselves in harm’s way. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance

I. Delegates

Shawn asks if there are any members of the public not on the agenda who wish to address the BOS.

2022 Household Hazardous Waste Collection: Jim Seaver, Road Agent, has received an agreement from the town of Kingston for the October 2022 Household Hazardous Waste Collection. The BOS signs this agreement so that Danville can participate. Shawn confirms that Mr. Seaver has no other issues that need to be discussed.

Forest Management Plan: Resident Judy Jervis expresses her concern with being able to get copies of the new Forest Management Plan to read. She states that she did read the copy at the Town Hall and notes that the Heritage Commission would also like one because they have control over the road, etc. Ms. Jervis states that she called the Audubon Society on January 21, 2022, to “chat with them”. She spoke to Mark Nutter, who has temporarily taken over for Phil Brown. Mr. Nutter states that January 14, 2022, was the first time they reviewed the Forest Management Plan because Mr. Springer had brought it to them on that day. It was not signed until January 18, 2022. A copy of the signature was sent to the Forester and Chip Current (Forestry Committee). Ms. Jervis emphasizes that the Forest Management Plan was not signed until January 18, 2022. She states that she is “bothered that a Warrant Article was put out that they (the BOS) signed.” She states again her concern in being able to get copies of the Forest Management Plan to read.

Ms. Jervis states that she asked a couple of other questions during her conversation with Mr. Nutter. She asked if the Stewardship Plan should reflect these changes and that Mr. Nutter said yes, but was unsure if it should be recorded in the deed. Ms. Jervis explains that she reviewed the minutes from last week and was confused regarding the availability of digital copies of the Forest Management Plan. She expresses her concern that if changes are made to the plan, the plan will need to go back to the Audubon for approval after being voted on in the Warrant Article.

Carston Springer, Chair of the Forestry Committee, asks Ms. Jervis if she had looked at the Town’s website in the last few days. He explains that is now a link to the Forest Management Plan on the Forestry Committee Page.ⁱ Mr. Springer states that the Forest Management Plan was submitted to the Audubon Society at the end of 2020 and they approved it in February 2021, as per the Easement Plan, that if there is no response after ninety (90) days, the Forest Management Plan is assumed to be accepted and there should be a meeting after thatⁱⁱ. However, Mr. Springer states that there were no answers to follow-up contacts. On January 14, 2022, Mr. Springer states he went and met in person with the Audubon Society just to make sure... and he understood that “things went away because of COVID” and asked for another review. Mr. Brown had reviewed the Forest Management Plan when it was originally

submitted. Mr. Springer states that he received a signed copy within a day of his visit. Mr. Nutter had brought it to an Audubon administrator and they were “enthusiastic about it.”

Mr. Springer explains regarding Ms. Jervis’ questions about last week’s meeting, that the question was from Sheila regarding the availability of a .pdf form of the Forest Management Plan. He had said then that while the document was available in that format, he wasn’t going to put something on the website that was editable, noting that .pdf files are editable. Mr. Springer confirms that Ms. Jervis and Sheila had worked on the original Forest Management Plan and should know that the Plan is copyrighted and cannot be reproduced without permission. Sheila states there was a “battle” over Mr. Moreno’s copyright. Shawn explains that should not preclude that copyright law is still applicable today and to make that document publicly available, the Forestry Committee had to get the Forester’s (author) permission to do that. Ms. Jervis states that is understandable and she doesn’t know how multiple copies of Mr. Moreno’s plan became available, noting there were six (6) to eight (8) copies available. Mr. Springer emphasizes the need to be respectful of the copyrights, that they are legal and that “you can’t go printing someone else’s work.” The document on the Town website is a non-editable digital edition that is also copyrighted.

Mr. Springer notes his disappointment as well as that of others that a document that has been on file and displayed at the Town Hall for weeks has not been requested by anyone. He states that he does not understand why no one is working together on this and why Town Counsel had to be brought in on a 91-A request on something that is on public display. Shawn states that Mr. Springer needs to ask the person who submitted the 91-A request that question.

Sheila states that she was the one who filed the 91-A request because she had asked for a copy of the Forest Management Plan in the beginning. She states that the Forest Management Plan was brought to the BOS on January 4, 2022, and no one had any idea this project was being worked on.

Mr. Springer states the Forestry Committee has been talking about this project for over a year and a half, they have held meetings about it, and it was submitted to Audubon for review. Sheila expresses her concern that the Forestry Committee meetings are not televised because they are held at the Community Center where there are no cameras. Mr. Springer explains the meetings are held there to meet ADA requirements, that the Forestry Committee is no longer allowed to meet on the second floor of the Town Hall, and there are no more time slots available for them to meet in the Town Hall where the meetings could be videotaped. He emphasizes that all the Forestry and Conservation Commission meetings are fully posted, and fully open to the public. He notes that at the last meeting there were 12-14 members of the public in attendance.

Sheila states that the minutes are hard to follow, and there are no follow-ups to the discussions. She reiterates the BOS was unaware of the Forest Management Plan until it was brought forward at the January 4, 2022, BOS meeting. She states that when she asked for a copy of the Forest Management Plan, it was not in the BOS office, and then she asked for it in electronic form. Mr. Springer questions why she used a 91-A request to get the information when “all she had to do was simply wait for the Forest Committee to act upon what they said to her at the very last (January 18, 2022) BOS meeting. Sheila reads the following discussion from the draft minutes of the January 18, 2022, BOS meeting:

Sheila asks Mr. Springer if the new Forest Maintenance Plan is available electronically. Mr. Springer explains that it is not because it is not the finalized version. The current plan is only available as a paper version....

Sheila confirms with Mr. Springer that the Forest Management Plan is available as a .pdf file. Mr. Springer explains that there is a digital file, but it will not be distributed electronically for “several reasons.” Shawn questions what the discussion is about. Mr. Springer excuses himself from the BOS table and returns to the audience, stating that this discussion is a new subject.

Forest Management Plan: *Sheila clarifies that she was asking if the Forest Management Plan was available in a .pdf file so the BOS could be reading it. Mr. Springer explains that he was answering that question. 1) Yes, the Forest Management Plan is in a .pdf file. 2) No, the Forestry Committee is not distributing it that way. He states that a hard (printed) copy is available at Town Hall and he will be getting an additional copy for the Planning Board. Mr. Springer explains that the reason they are not distributing the Forest Management Plan electronically is that “if they (the Forestry*

Committee) have good feedback and good suggestions, there may be changes and he wants to have the final version, non-editable, on the Town website after the March elections/vote.

Mr. Springer explains there are problems with having multiple electronic editions of the Forest Management Plan. Sheila notes that happens with anything. Mr. Springer agrees and explains that he wants to avoid that issue. He states that he believes there is ample access to the document at Town Hall. Sheila expresses her concern that she doesn't have time to "come down and read" and requests a hard (printed) copy in hand to take home and read. Mr. Springer states that he will leave a copy with Shawn that the BOS can read and mark up. He reminds the BOS that the Audubon Society, the Conservation Commission, and the Forestry Committee have already reviewed and approved the Forest Management Plan as authorized under State Law ⁱⁱⁱ as he explained last week. Mr. Springer further explains that the Forestry Management Plan is being distributed to provide "transparency for the public" and reiterates that the problem with electronic distribution is that any changes result in multiple versions and no one is looking at the same version.

Mr. Springer notes that this discussion has wasted fifteen (15) minutes and the 91-A was "highly unnecessary" because the Forestry Committee did what they said they were going to do. He explains that the version on the Town's website is the updated version that he previously referenced, it is fully copyrighted and listed as such, and it is not editable but is there for everyone to see. Sheila states "that's fine". Mr. Springer agrees and states that it is entirely in compliance. He notes that 91-A requests are designed to get information that someone is trying to hide out of public view. Sheila disagrees, noting that is not necessarily the case. Mr. Springer states that is what the law states, and the Forestry Committee has put the Forest Management Plan on public display.

Shawn states that when the BOS receives the bill from Town Counsel, he will publicly state what Sheila's 91-A request cost the Town. He states that he concurs with Mr. Springer that posting a copyrighted document without permission would have been improper for the Town to do and when the "Forester decides to exercise his rights to sue the Town over copyright infringement and the Town has to pay that bill...."

Mr. Springer refers to Sheila's complaint that the BOS was not informed of the project, reminding her that oversight of the Town Forest is not the purview of the BOS under State Law.^{iv} The Forestry Committee is trying to do a good job in their stewardship and putting the document in front of the Town. He notes that was not done with the Forest Management Plan that Sheila and Ms. Jervis worked on. Mr. Springer then retracts that statement, noting the plan was turned down by the Town. Mr. Springer notes that there are features of the new Forest Management Plan that are superior to the previous Forest Management Plan. Shawn agrees. Ms. Jervis also agrees. Sheila states the problem was trying to get copies that "they" could look at. Mr. Springer notes that she is a Selectman and has more access to the Town Hall than anybody. Sheila states that the only ones with access to the BOS office are the Chair and Vice-Chair, Kim, and Gail. Kim states that the BOS office is accessible during all the operating hours and that Sheila just can't access that office during after-hours.

Shawn reiterates that the online edition was not available until the Forestry Committee received permission from the Forester/Author to post it. Ms. Jervis confirms with Mr. Springer that there was a copy at the Audubon Society in November 2020, but no person. Mr. Springer states that he has all the signatures and receipts. Mr. Jervis states that she is only reporting on what she was told. Mr. Springer states that she was not informed correctly. Ms. Jervis reiterates that she was told the paperwork was up there (at Audubon), but there had been no person or communication about it. Mr. Springer reminds her that the Audubon Society had locked their doors during COVID. He explains that when he went up there a couple of weeks ago, he had to wait until a security officer opened the door for an administrator. He followed them in and had the administrator sign the receipt. That person said it would be put in the appropriate hands promptly and it was. Mr. Springer explains that he was told that they (the Audubon Society) were not functioning in a fully-staffed fashion last year because of COVID and notes that "everyone was in that boat and the Forestry Committee is simply trying to be accommodating and work together."

Scott asks if there are any concerns with this issue moving forward. He notes the discussion is all in the past and no one can go back and change it. Ms. Jervis responds that this is the way it appeared to many people, that it was brought forward with no signatures from Audubon. Mr. Springer had stated it was signed, but nobody saw it and there was nothing there. She states that "we don't know if it wasn't signed until January 18, 2022, and the BOS had a Warrant Article on it on January 4, 2022, they accepted it, but nobody read it, nobody had seen it, and there was no signature in front of them from Audubon and that's the point".

Scott confirms that there is no issue moving forward and asks to move on from the discussion.

As no more members of the public wish to speak, Shawn closes the Delegate session at 7:22 PM.

II. Agenda

Default Budget Update: Shawn reminds the BOS of last week's conversation with Mr. Collins from BudCom and that he had agreed to look at the default budget again. Shawn notes that he had made some updates. He explains the "yellow blocks" are the items he changed or are the items the BOS would have the discretion to change. He gives the example that if an item was \$300 in the FY2021 approved budget, the BOS could take that "verbatim cost of that 2021 expense and move that into the Default budget." But, if BudCom or the BOS had changed that amount and lowered it the BOS has the discretion to keep the recommended lower amount. Shawn states that he wants to highlight that point. He notes that he made changes in equipment lines after he ascertained if the equipment needed to be updated due to mandates that required those increases. The BOS reviews the updated Default budget.

Shawn notes there is a change in #4166 Property Liability insurance. The BOS had approved \$51,140, but the actual premium is \$65,302.

Sheila notes several questions in the Selectmen's budget that were updated:

- ✚ #430- Equipment Repairs- \$200 for the Porter Machine Contract. Sheila asks if this is a contract, shouldn't it be reflected at the FY2022 contract price for \$350. Shawn states the comment doesn't make sense because the cost of the copier's maintenance is more than that and is built into the Town's "cost per sheet", not as a separate expense.

Shawn notes this and several other examples of updates that he made:

- ✚ that the #430- Equipment Repair FY2021 budget is for \$200, but the BOS and BudCom approved \$350, so he is using the FY2021 amount and not the updated one.
- ✚ He notes the same issue with the Advertising line. FY2021-\$1200. FY2022- Selectmen approved \$800, BudCom approved \$500. The amount carried over to the Default budget is \$1200. Shawn notes there is a lot of flexibility that the BOS has as they go through each line of each budget.
- ✚ Sheila confirms this is the same issue with Line #740- Equipment- it is the rental contract for the copier. FY2021-\$2432, Default budget- \$3800. Sheila notes that one is a service contract and one is a rental contract.
- ✚ Shawn also notes the Auditing Contract had changed. FY2021-\$28,000, the new one for FY2022- \$16,250. The BOS could move over the \$28,000 into the Default budget, but Shawn states he feels that would not be in the "spirit" of the Default budget. He states that if they are going to make an issue of one side of the judgment, then it should be looked at in its totality.

Sheila confirms the pay raises and COLA increases were not changed on the Default budget. Shawn states that if Sheila wants to rescind her vote- Sheila states that she wants to revote because there were only three (3) BOS members at that meeting. Shawn notes the new Default budget will need a new vote. He states that he wants to add in the \$65,302 actual premium costs to the Default budget.

There is a discussion of other adjustments made to the Default budget which is now \$4,106,887. The FY2022 Operating budget is \$4,213,684. The difference between the two budgets is \$106,797.

Shawn gives another example in the #4140.10- Town Clerk budget. Line #610- Supplies: in FY2021-\$3000, but he only carried \$2000 for that line in the Default budget.

Steve motions to approve the updated Default budget for \$4,106,887. Second by Scott. Vote is 3-yes, 2-no, 0-abstentions. (3-2-0). Sheila and Dottie voted no. The Default budget passes.

Shawn asks Sheila and Dottie why they voted “no” on the Default budget. Sheila states that it was pointed out last week that it was not in the Default budget law to include salary and COLA increases. She states that Shawn has publicly stated that he wants the voters to vote, but it seems like he “only wants them to vote on certain things and he is not letting the voters vote on the budget the way it should be by law”. Dottie states that she believes that Mr. Collins (Chair, BudCom), “made some good points, and when they (the BOS) took their oaths of office they stated that would follow the law, and if that is the law, she can’t vote for the Default budget in good conscience with the salary and COLA increases included, as much as she worked on those increases and wants them to get it.” Sheila states that she agrees. Steve notes that Dottie stated “if it’s the law.” Dottie clarifies that “it is the law.”

Scott asks what they would propose the Default budget to be. Dottie explains it “should be the same as last year (FY2021) with increases in contracts and can’t include COLA increases and raises. So, it should be the same exact as last year.”

Shawn notes the BOS can change the Default budget up until the printing of the second ballot. He asks Sheila and Dottie to put together their idea of a Default budget and to bring that back to the BOS for review. He notes that he “had to do the Default budget at the last minute, and this will give them an opportunity to bring another proposal to the table.” Scott asks what the difference would be without the raises and COLA included. Sheila states it’s approximately \$115,000 not including the costs for Social Security and NH Retirement. Shawn discusses how he would like their proposal to look using the current Default budget worksheets. Scott states that he’s not opposed to a different Default budget and he’s not opposed to asking Town Counsel if there is a difference of opinion. He notes that he’s not in favor of wasting money on Town Counsel, but the BOS should get an opinion from the person who is going to represent the Town in any type of litigation.

Sheila states that is what Mr. Collins was asking for last week. Scott states that he watched the meeting. He notes that Shawn stated he was going to work on the Default budget and bring it back- which he did, but reiterates that he would rather get it clarified through Town Counsel. Shawn agrees. Kim reminds the BOS that everything must be posted by January 31, 2022. Shawn states the BOS will have a meeting on January 31 just to review the Default budget and to vote on it again.

Kim asks for clarification of what she should be asking Town Counsel. Sheila states that she should be asking for the definition of a Default budget. The BOS disagrees, stating that is too broad. Scott states that they should be asking questions on specific areas of contention- the salary and COLA increases. That is what they should be asking Town Counsel. Dottie agrees. Shawn notes the important part of that question is that these salaries and COLA increases have already been updated (in 2021). Scott states that Town Counsel should be made aware that the BOS has already adjusted the pay scale. Sheila notes the pay scale was updated at the last payroll of 2021. Scott states that he believes that is irrelevant. Sheila disagrees. There is a discussion of how the raises should have been implemented. Sheila states the salary increases should have been implemented as the BOS worked through each budget. Scott reiterates that, based on the legal definition, it would not have mattered when those increases were implemented and the definition of a Default should be the same regardless. Sheila states she disagrees, stating that those increases would have been implemented with each budget, and “not just one big sweep.” Scott states he believes the result is the same. Shawn agrees.

Warrant Article Updates: Kim provides the BOS with an updated mailer for the 2022 Warrant Articles. She notes that she still needs the correct amounts to put in for the FY2002 Operating Budget and the FY2002 Default budget. Shawn clarifies that only the Default budget amounts have changed and she can put in the latest approved Default Budget amount. He confirms that the highlighted discussion amounts have been updated by the Trustees of the Trust Funds and the “cost per thousand” is based on the total Town valuation or \$575,606,000. The BOS reviews the updated Warrant Articles. Scott asks if there is a required number of decimal places that must be used for the tax impact, noting that the number has been carried four (4) digits out. He suggests rounding the tax impact amount to the nearest cent. Sheila agrees. Scott notes that based on past votes, he’s not sure the voters realize how much the tax impact is when everything is added together. Kim explains she has created a handout that will sum up all those costs for the Deliberative Session. Shawn explains that in the past, the tax impact costs have gone out to three(3) places, the “cents” and then 1/10 of a cent. Scott notes that with the re-evaluation if voters multiply the tax impact

costs by \$500,000 (the average home price) they will get a true dollar amount of what each Warrant Article will cost them.

Kim explains that the math used to calculate the amounts reflected in the Warrant Article for modifying the elderly tax exemption was incorrect. She has corrected them from the amounts reflected in the 2017 Warrant Article with the agreed-upon 5% increase in the income limits. Sheila questions which numbers were incorrect. Kim clarifies that according to the 2017 MS1, the numbers reflected in the Warrant Article were a 5% decrease rather than a 5% increase. The new numbers are a 5% increase from the last valuation in 2017.

Sheila asks Kim where she got her numbers from. Kim explains that she used the numbers from the 2017 Warrant Article on the MS1 (DRA form) and the actual figures that were presented to the residents on the Elderly Tax Exemption Application. She added 5% to the net income limits. Sheila states that was not where those numbers came from, clarifying that these numbers were on the MS1, but that was not where the original numbers came from. Kim reiterates that these were the amounts listed on the Elderly Tax Exemption Application that the Town has used since 2017 and those were the numbers she used to add the 5% increase to. Shawn confirms that this was just on the income side. Kim states the changes were made to the net income which is used to determine if the applicants qualify. Kim reiterates that the Elderly Exemption form from 2017 had these numbers on it. Shawn clarifies that once residents qualify, the Warrant Article details the amount of exemption that they receive. There is further discussion of what numbers were used to base the 5% increase on. Sheila explains that she and Fred (Fred Smith, Town Assessor) came up with the numbers she used when she updated the Warrant Article. Kim offers to provide a copy of the Elderly Exemption Tax Application form that the Town has used since 2017 to clarify how she did the math. Sheila states she's fine with the changes if Kim is positive her numbers are correct.

Scott questions the difference between the spelled-out amounts and the numeric amounts shown in the parenthesis. Kim explains that she only changed the numeric amounts to reflect the 5% increase. Shawn asks her what numbers were presented in that Warrant Article at the public hearing. He explains that any changes in those amounts will need to be made at the Deliberative Session because BudCom already had the public hearing on the Warrant Articles. The BOS cannot make any dollar changes to those amounts now.

Scott asks for more clarification. Kim provides the BOS with copies of the Elderly Tax Exemption Application that was approved in 2017. Shawn confirms the BOS was trying to increase the three (3) income levels by 5%. He states that Kim needs to change her corrections back to what was originally put in the Warrant Article at the public hearing and ask to change the Warrant Article to reflect the correct amounts at the Deliberative Session.

Kim states there are three versions of the Warrant Articles: the mailer, the ballot, and the Deliberative. Shawn explains that the Warrant Article that is posted needs to have the original numbers that were approved at the public hearing. The "mailer" Warrant Articles are brought to the Deliberative Session for information. He reiterates that the Warrant Articles need to be exactly as presented at the public hearing because any changes can only be made at the Deliberative Session. He notes that he supports the "verbiage changes" and the discussion points that Kim has added. Kim states that she understands she can only reflect the amounts presented and approved at the public hearing.

III. Old/New Business

Signature File: Shawn notes that he will need BOS authorization to sign the annual Dragon Mosquito Control application. Sheila motions that Shawn have the authorization to sign the Dragon Mosquito Control application. Second by Dottie. Vote is unanimous (5-0).

Shawn states that he also needs the authorization to sign the annual Auditors Letter. He explains this letter goes to various entities including pending threats or threatened litigation, claims, and assessments (excluding unasserted claims and assessments), and publicly discloses the Town's finances for any pending lawsuits. Dottie motions to authorize Shawn to sign the Auditors Letter. Second by Sheila. Vote is unanimous (5-0).

Minutes: The BOS review the minutes for the January 18, 2022 public BOS meeting. Sheila asks that on Line #127, the address of 599 Main St. be added to Elm Farm. Shawn agrees that needs to be included and suggests that it read “Elm Farm (599 Main St.)” Sheila notes that somewhere down the road when these board members are no longer on the BOS, someone is not going to know what “Elm Farm” is or even if it will be standing. Scott suggests perhaps the minutes could be in a larger font. Dottie motions to approve the minutes as amended. Second by Sheila. Vote is 4-yes, 0-no, 1- abstention (4-0-1). Scott abstains due to his absence from that meeting.

BOS Letter for the Town Report: Dottie did not send the electronic copy of her draft letter until today, so Shawn wrote another draft for the BOS to review. He notes that in his viewpoint, no one person (board member) should be singled out, stating they all work hard. Dottie states that she has no problem with the changes that Shawn made. Sheila motions that the version of the Board of Selectmen’s Letter that Shawn drafted will be the one used for the 2021 Annual Town Report. Second by Shawn. Vote is unanimous (5-0).

Town Announcements: Shawn reads the Town Announcements listed below. After a short discussion, the BOS determines that they will need to meet on Monday, January 31, 2022, to review a final draft of the Default budget. Shawn asks that if Sheila and Dottie finish their version of the Default Budget, they send it to the BOS as quickly as possible. Sheila asks Shawn to send them the current worksheets electronically so they can work on them. Scott asks if there is a plan for a Candidates’ Night. Shawn agrees that is a good idea. Kim notes that Mr. Hantman (Town Moderator) has recommended the BOS wait until the candidate filing period closes on January 28 to see if there are any contested races and then decide about Candidates’ Night at that time.






ARPA Grant: Steve asks when the BOS will begin discussing and voting on the ARPA grant funds. Shawn agrees the BOS needs to get back to those discussions. Steve confirms with Kim that there are still requests on the table. Kim reiterates the requests are there, but that everyone was focused on the budgets. Shawn reminds the BOS that at the last discussion, they were “heavily exploring” the digitizing project and were looking for multiple quotes, which they have since received. He states that he believes the BOS could start a discussion and decide on that. Sheila notes that the BOS had discussed meeting with other vendors.

Steve states that when all the requests are in, the BOS should have a public hearing on them. He notes that he has received and provided three (3) bids on the Fire Dept. requests and he believes the public should have a say. Shawn agrees. Scott asks about previous discussions on getting guidance from the State or Federal level to ensure that the projects qualify. He notes the last thing the Town needs is to have to pay that money back. Sheila reminds the BOS that they were told they could not get that kind of guidance because those agencies do not want to be liable and the BOS is responsible for “doing their own homework.” She states that the Final Interim Rule has been published and there are “numerous webinars” available. Sheila notes that she has already attended one and there is still “not a lot of information available.” The first report is due at the end of January. Sheila notes that it should be easy because the BOS has not done anything with the grant yet. She reminds the BOS that was their goal, not to do anything until the Final Interim Rule was decided.

Sheila states that the BOS had decided to do the digitizing project first and to bring in the other two vendors who had bid on the project. She feels the BOS needs to do that. Steve states that his personal opinion, as he has stated in the past, is the employee merit pay for the people who worked through COVID. He reiterates that the grant was for COVID response, and he can justify the Fire Dept. requests for radios because they are responding to three (3) to five (5) COVID calls each week. He states that he does not see what digitizing records has to do with a COVID response and he doesn’t want to see the Town get in “hot water for misappropriation of funds.” Scott states that he agrees with Steve in principle, but notes this is the Federal government. Sheila asks if Steve had applied for the separate \$50,000 grant. Steve states that he has not done that yet. Sheila encourages him and the Police Dept. to apply for these separate grants that are exclusive to their departments. Scott suggests the BOS start with projects that they know will not be challenged. Sheila explains that the digitization project has gone through with other towns and that it depends on how the project request is written. She encourages the BOS to read the grant, noting it is very difficult to explain.

IV. Town Announcements

Calendar

-  **January 31, 2022- Monday:** Board of Selectmen’s Meeting will be held at 7:00 PM at the Town Hall
-  **February 5, 2022- Saturday:** Deliberative Session will be held on Saturday, Feb. 5, 2022, 10:00 AM at the Community Center
-  **February 7, 2022- Monday:** Board of Selectmen’s Meeting will be held at 7:00 PM at the Town Hall
-  **February 22, 2022- Tuesday:** Public Hearing to re-establish the Health, Well, and Septic fees.
-  **March 8, 2022- Tuesday:** Town Elections at the Community Center 8:00 AM- 8:00 PM.

As there are no further items to discuss, Sheila motions to go into a Non-Public session under NH RSA 91-A 3:II(c). Second by Dottie. Roll call vote: Shawn-yes, Steve-yes, Scott-yes, Sheila-yes, Dottie- yes
The public session of the BOS meeting ends at 8:12 PM

Minutes derived by video provided on the Town of Danville website.

Respectfully Submitted
Deborah A. Christie

ⁱ Town of Danville, NH. Online at www.townofdanville.org/forestrycommittee. January 24, 2022.

ⁱⁱ Rockingham Registry Book# 5076. Page 76 This Conservation Easement is recorded. GRANT OF CONSERVATION EASEMENT. “Approval of Stewardship Plan”. The Easement Holder shall **review** and act to approve or disapprove Stewardship Plans, Updates or Amendments submitted by the Fee Owner within ninety (90) days of the Easement Holder’s receipt of each Plan, Update or Amendment. The 90- day review period may be extended upon the written agreement of both the Easement Holder and the Fee Holder. If the Easement Holder fails to act to approve or disapprove a Stewardship Plan, Update, or Amendment within the 90-day period or other mutually agreed upon extension period, a meeting of both parties shall convene within 14 days after the end of the 90 day period. In acting to disapprove any Plan, Update, or Amendment, or any provision thereof, the Easement Holder shall state in writing its reasons, referencing the specific provision or provisions of such Plan, Update, or Amendment with which it does not approve, and how such provision or provisions are inconsistent with the Purposes or Stewardship Goals. The Easement Holder may rely upon the advice and recommendations of the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department, the New Hampshire Natural Heritage Inventory, or their successor organizations, or other wildlife experts, conservation biologists, foresters or other experts as the Easement Holder may select to determine whether the Plan, Update, or Amendment would be in accordance with the Purposes and Stewardship Goals identified in Sections 1 (“Purposes”) and 2.B (“Permitted Conservation Uses”.) The then existing Stewardship Plan shall remain in full force and effect until such time as any Plan, Update, or Amendment is approved.” **Town of Danville, Rockingham County, State of New Hampshire**. As provided by Selectman Sheila Johannesen at the January 10, 2022 Board of Selectmen’s Meeting.

ⁱⁱⁱ State of New Hampshire. NH RSA Title III-Towns, Cities, Village Districts, and Unincorporated Places. Chapter 31: Power and Duties of Towns. Town and City Forests. Section 31:111- Purpose and 31:112- Management. Online at www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html. January 18, 2022.

^{iv} *ibid*