



**TOWN OF NORTH HAMPTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
NORTH HAMPTON SELECT BOARD MEETING**

**SEPTEMBER 13, 2021 7:00 PM**

**NORTH HAMPTON TOWN HALL**

***DRAFT MINUTES***

SELECT BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Jim Maggiore, Vice Chairman James Sununu, Selectman Jonathan Pinette

ALSO PRESENT: Town Administrator Michael Tully, Police Chief Kathryn Mone, Senator Tom Sherman

**AGENDA**

Chairman Jim Maggiore welcomed everyone to the September 13, 2021 North Hampton Select Board Meeting and called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Motion:** To seal the Non-Public Meeting Minutes of September 13, 2021.

**Motioned:** Vice-Chair Sununu

**Seconded:** Selectman Pinette

**Vote:** Motion approved by a vote of 3-0

The Select Board agreed to start with item 10.1 Proclamation by Senator Tom Sherman.

**10.1 Presentation by Senator Tom Sherman**

Senator Tom Sherman said North Hampton suffered a tragic fire on August 4, 2021 and he offered any assistance needed be made available to firefighters, paramedics, EMTs and police. He said he was concerned about the people who went into the building to rescue a victim who did not survive and said there is a way in the Senate to recognize real heroes here in North Hampton. He read one of the proclamations in full and presented a proclamation those involved in recognition of their exceptional bravery: Police Officer Kyle Manlow, Police Officer Matthew McCue, Firefighter Jeremy Parent, Firefighter Colin Chevalier, Lieutenant Angelo Puglisi (fire department).

***Disclaimer –These minutes are prepared by the Recording Secretary within five (5) business days as required by NH RSA 91-A:2, II. They will not be finalized until approved by majority vote of the Select Board.***

***A recording of the meeting can be found at: [http://www.townhallstreams.com/towns/north\\_hampton\\_nh](http://www.townhallstreams.com/towns/north_hampton_nh), and a DVD recording is available at the North Hampton Town Administrative Offices, 233 Atlantic Avenue, North Hampton, New Hampshire 03862.***

The Select Board recessed for a short break then resumed the meeting.

**First Public Comment Session**

*For comments please call 603-758-1447*

No Public Comments.

**Consent Calendar**

- 5.1 Payroll Manifest of September 2, 2021 in the amount of \$82,153.04
- 5.2 Payroll Manifest of September 9, 2021 in the amount of \$243,143.84
- 5.3 Accounts Payable Manifest of September 2, 2021 in the amount of \$82,153.04
- 5.4 Tax Abatement
- 5.5 Cemetery Deeds

**Motion:** To approve the Consent Calendar Items 5.1–5.5 as presented.

**Motioned:** Vice-Chair Sununu

**Seconded:** Selectman Pinette

**Vote:** Motion approved by a vote of 3-0

**Correspondence** - None

*Copies of all Correspondence will be attached to the minutes.*

**Committee Updates**

Chairman Maggiore said the *Heritage Commission* has not had a meeting; *Water Commission* is still moving ahead with several legal cases.

Vice-Chair Sununu said there was no update from the *Rails to Trails Committee* which should be meeting soon; the *Budget Committee* has not met, and the calendar is not yet available.

Selectman Pinette said the *CIP Committee* will be meeting this week on Thursday.

**Report of the Town Administrator**

*A copy of the Report of the Town Administrator will be attached to these minutes.*

Report August 24 through September 10, 2021: Department Budgets forwarded to Finance Director, looking at October 4th for Budget Workshop; Building Committee touring Stratham and Rye Fire Departments September 15<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>; Police negotiations first meeting November 20<sup>th</sup>; work on Route 111/152 intersection start date end of September-October; CIP presentation to Board on October 11, 2021; Philbrick Pond informational meeting held August 31<sup>st</sup> with bid opening September 21, 2021.

Town Administrator Tully recommended rescheduling the October 11<sup>th</sup> meeting due to Columbus Day and suggested Thursday, October 14, 2021. Vice-Chair Sununu recommended they tentatively plan on the 14<sup>th</sup> and decide at the next meeting. He asked that the Police Chief notify the School about the fingerprint scanner.

**Items Left on the Table** – None

**NEW BUSINESS**

**10.2 North Road Bridge Project Update**

NHDOT Project Manager Matthew Lampron said the purpose of the project is to replace a red-listed bridge carrying Route 1 over the railroad and looking at relocation/realignment of North Road E as it approaches Route 1. He said he would provide a current status update of the project and proposed action. Due to concerns raised at the Public Hearing (3/9/2015) about loss of open space, time was taken to develop concepts to mitigate that loss.

Jon Hebert of NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design provided a point-by-point presentation starting with a project overview. He said NHDOT recently bought rights to the PanAm/B&M RR corridor and are planning to rebuild the bridge and reconstruct North Road E & W approaches. A public information meeting was held 5/24/17 to discuss a 2-week road closure vs. a long-term phased approach to the project; met 10/18/18 with abutters and property owner Hale to discuss impact to open space with realignment of North Road E.

Mr. Hebert said US Route 1 is a main arterial carrying 18,000 vehs/day with 45 mph speed limit, 2-way left turn lane, and limited shoulders. North Road is rural carrying 1340 vehs/day E and 970 vehs/day W with 30 mph limit. There are safety concerns with skew and slope of intersection on North Road E creating poor sight distance and high traffic volumes on Route 1. The bridge (built 1936) is red-listed and is the impetus for the project with deteriorating span, cracks in superstructure and deck, concrete rail is failing, and the bridge substructure includes concrete abutments; granite block abutments in good condition. They intend to take the old bridge off, leave the granite abutments and put a new bridge on top.

Mr. Hebert said the plan provided at the Public Hearing in 2018 showed North Road W with a slight realignment brought to 90 degrees; replicate and lengthen turn lanes and add 4-ft shoulders; shift whole road approximately 4 ft on Drake Farm side. North Road E needs more realignment to get to 90 degrees; 12 ft of fill will be added to bring it up to grade (10%), and a tie-in provided for Sagamore Golf. This is the preferred location but there was pushback due to area taken from abutting parcel to realign road and reduce impact to open space.

Mr. Hebert reviewed three conceptual alternatives: Alternative A to balance cost and open space did not solve any issues; Alternative B which maintains more open space but bisects the property just moves the impact down Route 1; Alternative C which maintains maximum open space and follows the property line. He said they found Alternative B the least of all evils and approached the Town Administrator to see about possible cost sharing.

Mr. Hebert said they next met with EPA to discuss environment/historic concerns for the alternatives with regard to wetlands, surface water, protected species, and historic resources. Alternative B involves a big realignment; issue is wetland delineation because of hydric soils in the area; revealed a large wetland complex covering substantially more of the parcel than previously shown and wetland impact will exceed the 10,000 sq ft threshold for all conceptual alternatives. Information was shared with natural resources agencies; DES was concerned about additional and greater wetland impact, and other agencies said the alternatives fragment wildlife connectivity to a greater degree. Other alternatives would need meetings on site to go over impacts.

Mr. Hebert said the preferred alternative is still the hearing plan; they did trim a treatment swale south on Route 1, but the water needs to be dealt with before going across the bridge. He said due to the extensive wetland system there is a need for Stormwater treatment and the approaches for Sagamore

Golf are limited. He said if they feel they do not have the support for the current layout for North Road E at this time it could be removed the project, but felt it made sense to do both intersections at the same time with the impetus being the bridge. If North Road E is left out there will be no Stormwater treatment and no impact to the Hale property.

Mr. Hebert reviewed the anticipated schedule: Public Officials meeting September 2021, final design contract May 2022, advertising date fall/winter 2023, begin construction spring 2024.

Questions: Vice-Chair Sununu said he was not surprised the original plan was found to be best especially in terms of impact though it is not ideal to cut off open space on private property. He said it is a terrible intersection that is dangerous and difficult, and the original plan makes the most sense.

Chairman Maggiore said the Historic Commission was consulted which has a role by statute and asked the timing on how long it will take and how to divert traffic during construction. Mr. Hebert said they looked at different options of a phased construction of about 4 months and would have to go to 2-way alternate traffic on Route 1 which would not be great; or shut down the road for 2 weeks, build the bridge, and put traffic back on; the issue is Emergency Services. From the hearing people seemed to prefer the 2-week closure; a detour route will be assigned for trucks and heavy traffic, but they do not sign local roads.

Mr. Lampron said given the state of the project they will be giving the Report of the Commissioner, which is our findings after the public hearing, reported to a special committee, and have a finding-of-necessity meeting where they vote to give us permission or not, at that point entailing a Part B Contract with our consultants to further design the project; they can then get traffic control scenarios in the design process and sign on.

Chairman Maggiore asked if they need a decision from the Board now and what next steps are. Mr. Lampron said unless any objections that the Town does not support the North Road E alignment as shown at the public hearing, our plan is to issue the report of the Commissioner and go to finding-of-necessity to approve the project to move forward. He said the report was drafted back then and just needs simple corrections to remove the alternatives and get the signature of the Commissioner. He asked that major objections be addressed as soon as possible.

Vice-Chair Sununu felt it was fair to say they have consensus and agree with your assessment and evaluation and preferred approach and agree with that as a Board. Selectman Pinette said he wanted to make sure this is not falling on the Select Board to make the decision in the event of a public outcry. Vice-Chair Sununu said it is our consensus to agree with their preferred alternative, but not a decision to be voted on.

Mr. Lampron said they wanted to document that they came here and provided alternatives, and if there is a huge outcry they will go back to the commissioner. He said they want to give all these roads due diligence for safety and what the people want. Town Administrator Tully said they want the opinion of the Board, and we will follow through with any comments.

### **10.3 PFAS Update**

Chairman Maggiore said several months ago the Town contracted StoneHill Environmental due to possible issues with PFAS contamination on a municipal site.

Tim Stone of StoneHill Environmental said this has been going on for several years since PFAS was originally identified in some wells in our area, which we are only detecting now because they are down in the parts per trillion level. He said he sees PFAS as being a fairly remote risk and said they are talking about ground water issues and exposure to ground water in a supply well but most of the area has municipal/public water and few private supply wells.

Mr. Stone said with a site like this he looks at layout and drainage of the site and where things are going. There is a railroad grade running north/south, Little River draining in wetland area and draining off to the southeast, with other draining and wetland south of Atlantic Avenue eventually connecting with the Little River. High areas of the topography surround the Town hall and Fire Station. He said he expected to see ground water flow to the south with a split in flow along Atlantic Avenue and a split in flow to the N/NE into drainage running out to Little River.

Mr. Stone said there was some work done here by Sanborn, Head & Associates a few years ago with a number of soil bearings and only 1 groundwater sample, and additionally several monitoring wells associated with work at Lamprey Bros Bulk Storage Area and some supply wells sampled and PFAS in the monitoring wells at some significant concentrations, still in the parts per trillion (ppt) level; found ground water contamination from a temporary well installed on the corner of the property.

Mr. Stone said our objective was to see what was going on with the ground water on these 2 primary properties, the direction of groundwater flow, and type of contamination there; Sanborn Head found no contamination in soil samples, but PFAS is a Teflon-like compound that does not break down and biodegrade in the environment. He said they confirmed the depth of the bedrock was relatively shallow and had 3 overburdened wells installed above bedrock and installed 3 bedrock wells. He showed a cross-section of what was found, and their interpretation of surface groundwater elevations used to create a contour map.

Mr. Stone said the data found fit in with what we were expecting. The groundwater table is essentially 7 ft below ground surface; have flow to south from Atlantic Avenue and flow to north back to bulk storage facility and have good water flow across the site; will look at ground water data and surface water data and see if it makes sense for groundwater flow. Samples were collected on-site in May; primary PFAS compounds they are looking for are PFOA, PFHXS, and PFOS. He presented a total of those 3 compounds as well as trace concentrations of other compounds there and added in Sanborn Head results. He said all figures are draft at this point.

Vice-Chair Sununu asked if DES or EPA sets a standard for the total of these 3 or just the individual compounds. Mr. Stone said they used to look at the total but now have standards for each individual compound and gave the separate standards for each. He said he is not so concerned about the standards because no matter where you look you will find one of these compounds that exceeds the standard.

Mr. Stone said MW-5 in Sanborn Head wells (15 ft apart) have a concentration of 400+ ppt; concentrations in the 40 ppt range were found in ground water at the back of the property boundary; in bedrock nearby greater than 100 ppt; MW-2 overburden 66 ppt, with bedrock a little lower. He said they might have expected to see higher concentrations with the leakage from floor drains in that area; the southwest corner was highest at 303 ppt which is a bedrock well; in general regular bedrock flow is through fractures and depends on orientation of the cracks.

Mr. Stone said basically they found PFAS throughout the property, but he felt the concentrations were not that extraordinarily high. He said ground water did not tell us we found a source area here and Sanborn Head found nothing in the soils. He said they also did some surface water sampling with the original sample collected at SW-1, several monitoring wells in the woods, and several around the bulk storage facility which all had PFAS, some relatively high compared to what we saw. We took another sample at SW-1 2 years later and got a remarkably similar number; went further downstream and the numbers dropped due to dilution.

Mr. Stone said clearly ground water is discharging to the surface water body. The supply well data from the storage facility is now at 105 ppt and 111 ppt total PFAS; whatever the source/sources, the data is pretty consistent. The supply well is bedrock pulling from fractures in many directions and the numbers do exceed drinking water standards. He said they were unable to locate where the catch basin daylighted but sampled standing water downstream in the low area and the number came in greater than 2,000 ppt PFAS compounds. They did collect a soil sample from underneath the catch basin and found only trace concentrations of a few PFAS compounds.

Vice-Chair Sununu asked if it was standing water, could it be the result of a contaminant that was under the soil there. Mr. Stone said it is hard to say and there is a lot coming from septic systems and water from septic systems is discharging to the shallow water table, then to nearby surface water. He said we may be dealing with impact of local septic systems in that area or residual from storm drains from years ago. He said he does not want to make conclusions based on one sample and recommends a second round of sampling at these locations and go deeper. He said he did collect a sample from a supply well with less than 1.8 ppt.

Mr. Stone said the big issue with PFAS and any contaminant is direct exposure, and the only real areas that might be an issue are in a few drainage areas. With PFAS you first identify where it is; if no definite source area just catalog what we find and check every few years to see if it is up or down. They can put whatever controls are necessary to eliminate exposure. For DES right now they want to figure out what we have and minimize the exposures. He added that PFAS is also not easily treated. He said for right now get a second round of samples and do a little more investigation where we found higher concentrations. Further down the road they might do a formal risk characterization.

Mr. Stone said DES has received millions of dollars in settlement funds for MBTE contamination from several sources and is working on reallocating some of those funds for PFAS investigation.

Town Administrator Tully asked if there were any recommendations on anything else the Select Board should be taking action on. Mr. Stone said they can get help from DES and agencies to help explain to the public how to put this in perspective and look at risk. He said these investigations take a long time and data is difficult to interpret, but it is all about exposure. He said COVID numbers are thousands of times more risky than any of this PFAS could present under these concentrations (parts per trillion).

Mr. Stone said this is a challenging issue, the investigations are challenging, and solutions especially with PFAS are very challenging. One thing promising here is because of the 2 surface water drainages nearby the extent of contamination is relatively limited. He said in the instance of Coakley there is a lot of contamination but not much exposure. When the PFAS Fund is established, we will be looking at treatment systems and sites where there are exposures and risks.

August 9, 2021

Town Administrator Tully said DES will reach out to us on what they would like to see going forward and right now they are in a monitoring phase. He said any private citizen can have their well tested for any dangerous compounds in their water.

**10.4 Acceptance of Grant for the Police Department from the New Hampshire Department of Highway Safety**

Police Chief Mone said this is an Office of Highway Safety Traffic Enforcement Grant and she is requesting the Board allow Town Administrator Tully and I to be signers to enter into the agreement. The money is starting October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022. Total amount is \$3,400 with a matching amount of \$850 towards overtime for officers to conduct specific traffic enforcement duties.

**Motion:** Move that the Town of North Hampton, NH, under the authority of NHRSA 21P:43, accept funds and enter into agreement with the Department of Highway Safety Office of Highway Safety in the amount of \$3,400, and further the Select Board empowers Town Administrator Michael Tully and Police Chief Kathryn Mone as designated signing authorities for the Town of New Hampshire in pursuit of those funds.

**Motioned:** Vice-Chair Sununu

**Seconded:** Selectman Pinette

**Vote:** Motion approved by a vote of 3-0

**MINUTES OF PRIOR MEETINGS**

**Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of August 23, 2021**

**Motion:** To approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of August 23, 2021 as presented.

**Motioned:** Vice-Chair Sununu

**Seconded:** Selectman Pinette

**Vote:** Motion approved by a vote of 3-0

**Any Other Item that may legally come before the Board**

**Second Public Comment Session**

*For comments please call 603-758-1447.*

Jeff Hillier of Glendale Road said he wanted to alert the Town about a concern he expressed last year regarding safety on the Rail Trail. Last year he was cycling on the trail and encountered a group of hunters out for muzzle loading season using a not approved hunting method. He described the process in which several men go into the woods to drive deer toward the trail where others are waiting to shoot. He said there is a great deal of regional hunting in town which is potentially a real danger for folks using the Rail Trail and wanted to make the Board aware of the situation.

Vice-Chair Sununu said it has come up in discussions at Rail Trail Committee meetings. He said it is State-owned land and will be their determination. He felt it should be prohibited at some point and they should speak with DOT; when Rail Trail management is turned over to the town, they will need to see what is in the agreement and make a note that DOT address the issue. Chairman Maggiore said he was concerned that people be alerted locally to ensure safety.

**Next Regular Meeting:** September 27, 2021

**Adjournment**

Select Board Regular Meeting  
August 9, 2021

324  
325 Chairman Maggiore adjourned the meeting at 9:27 pm.  
326  
327 Respectfully submitted,  
328 Patricia Denmark, Recording Secretary  
329

DRAFT