

TOWN OF RYE – SELECT BOARD
Tuesday, April 2, 2024, 1:00 p.m.
Rye Town Hall & via Zoom

Select Board Present: Chair Bill Epperson, Vice-Chair Bob McGrath, and Selectman Rob Wright

Also Present: Town Attorney Eric Maher, Town Administrator Matt Scruton, and Asst. Town Administrator/Finance Director Becky Bergeron

1:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Epperson called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

- II. NON-PUBLIC SESSION per (1) RSA 91-A:3, II (c) Reputation
(2) RSA 91-A:3, II (d) Acquisition
(3) RSA 91-A:3, II (l) Legal Advice**

2:15 p.m. RECONVENE PUBLIC MEETING

III. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Epperson reconvened the public meeting at 2:40 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

- IV. PUBLIC COMMENT** – (at the beginning of the meeting for any comment by any Rye resident on any topic. Requested time limit, up to 5 minutes each person.)

Hugh Lee, 220 Pioneer Road, spoke in regard to his Right-to-Know requests and the lengthy amount of time it has taken to have those requests filled. He spoke in support of the proposed change to the Committee Policy, which calls for information of boards, committees, and commissions to be held in the public domain at the Town Hall or on the Town computers.

Tom King, 531 Wallis Road, asked that Right-to-Know requests be posted every quarter, along with information on who asked, what it was asked for, and the costs for providing that information.

Julie Tucker, 960 Washington Road, noted that it should be a line by line item of why it costs so much to answer a Right-to-Know request.

V. AGENDA ITEMS

A. Committee Policy – A Policy Establishing the General Rules of Procedure for Boards, Committees, and Commissions

Chair Epperson explained that they are present to talk about the Committee Policy. He noted that any town policy, ordinance, or other official document, should be and can be altered, and made in a way that fits the times. He agrees that this should be done all the time. However, in his opinion, they should not be taking a policy, which affects so many people, 130 volunteers, and having it become null and void on the very night that the Select Board is to be appointing people, which happened because of actions by his associates. He believes that the Select Board could've taken the nominees that were already out there, placed them into the positions based on the recommendations from the chairs and their willingness to serve, and go forward. After that is done, the Town can certainly take a look at this policy and adjust it, provided it's for the good of the Town. His recommendation is to go forward with the recommended people that were nominated and review the policy at a future date.

Vice-Chair McGrath read his response to an email received from a resident who could not attend the meeting.

We didn't schedule today's meeting to discourage public input. We are not changing our policy, but we are clarifying our policy. When I took office a year ago, I believed the process of appointments was not being followed correctly based on our written policy. Today, I hope new clarifications will allow for more residents to apply for board seats, who haven't been able to apply in the past. Fairness and inclusion are an important part of my governing principals.

Selectman McGrath pointed out this is not a new policy. First, it's a state rule that the Select Board has to make the decisions of who sits on boards. The boards do an amazing job and every volunteer in this town is a champion. He continued that the boards' power is to organize themselves with various officers. However, it's the Select Board's job to appoint the members. If this is pushed off onto the actual boards, it would invite people to choose their friends and pick people for other reasons.

Vice-Chair McGrath read from the policy.

It is the intent of the Board of Selectmen to ensure that the widest variety of citizens participate in government by appointing members who represent the diversity of our community.

He noted that when a term is over, it's over. That term creates a vacancy that others can apply for. The Select Board would then decide, based on input from the committee or commission, on who to put on that board, commission, or committee. He pointed out that there shouldn't be lifetime commitments. If there were, what would the three-year term really mean? He continued that getting people involved in public participation cures loneliness, depression, and substance abuse. People with disabilities should be able to be on the boards, as well. He wants to make sure that everyone has a fair chance in this town to be on the board they choose. If there are

popular boards, where many applications are received and only one or two are appointed, there will be applications from people who are willing to donate their time. Those people can be educated about other boards that don't have full participation. It becomes a resource.

Vice-Chair McGrath reiterated that a year ago, he said the same thing. This is not brand new. Not only in reading the policy, but as he campaigned, he heard from many people in the community saying that it's "rigged" and the committees decided who they want on their boards. He doesn't think this is fair, which is important to him. This is about being fair and inclusive.

Selectman Wright stated that the policy he modified, did not say anywhere in it that the position is deemed to not be vacant if the incumbent wants to rerun. That was the practice of the prior board. This was debated at a select board meeting last year. He pointed out that Selectman McGrath took the position that it was wrong and he was outvoted. There was an election. He can't remember a door he didn't knock on that he didn't make it abundantly clear that this was a position he felt was wrong and needed to be changed.

Selectman Wright read the addition he made to the policy to Term of Office/Qualifications.

At the expire of its term, a seat on a committee shall be considered to be vacant.

He noted that this is all he inserted. The rest is style, text, grammar, and legal language that was advised by Attorney Maher involving right-to-know and other statutes, which the Selectmen do not disagree on.

In regard to the timing, Selectman Wright noted that if this is passed at this meeting, it becomes the Town's policy. The policy includes that there is a thirty-day notice period for any vacancy. He is very aware of the fact that this may have a hardship on committees that may not have a quorum. He is also very aware that there are some committees that are undersubscribed. He pointed out this is a new board. If enough people think this is horrible, they won't vote for him next time and a new person will be on the board and the rules can get changed. However, right now, this is what he's proposing and there is no question where each of the selectmen stand.

Chair Epperson commented that he doesn't have any issue with anything that has been said. The issue he has is that the "goal post" was moved at the very last moment and that's not fair.

Chair Epperson opened to the public for comments.

Shawn Joyce, 270 Washington Road, noted that this issue was brought up by the Select Board; Bill Epperson, Phil Winslow and Kerrian Roman. The Select Board had agreed, which is in the public minutes, that the Select Board would look into it and the policy would be changed. Because there was talk about "moving the goal post," it was said that the next year, before there were reappointments, that the policy would be looked at and changes would be made. Last year, the same thing was brought up again. With regards to saying that the goal post was moved at the last minute, it's been known that this is a contentious issue in the Town, which was chosen not to be addressed. He continued that the voters placed these two guys onto the Board. They are deciding what the voters want.

Steven Borne, 431 Wallis Road, stated that he disagrees that this is the most important article of business that the Town had to address at its first meeting. He thinks the Town has a lot bigger problems and this is the first thing that was taken up. The real issue is getting more people to participate, having more involvement, and more people on boards. If the Town wants more people involved, and less vacancies on the boards, he recommends that the chairs of the boards with elected positions make sure the open positions are posted two weeks before so people can decide if they want to run for office. For all appointed positions, he recommends asking the chairs to make those decisions before the Deliberative Meeting. He pointed out that those positions could be posted at every board's booth at the Civic Fest. This gives a window of time for people to go to the boards' meetings to show they have some interest. They should go to the meetings to do some training and learning. It takes a while to learn what the board does and the skillsets that are needed for that team to best fulfill the mission. The people who are on the boards know best, as they have been doing it for two or three years. They make recommendations. Mr. Borne commented that he disagrees with the theory that by making the position vacant, it will create different and better boards.

Vice-Chair McGrath pointed out that it's a state rule. The people elect the Select Board and they give them the responsibility to make appointments to committees. He is sure that everyone would agree that if the committees had elected positions that would be better, but they're not. It's the Select Board's responsibility. By deferring that responsibility to the commission itself, the Select Board is not doing its job.

Mike Garvan, 220 Washington Road, Rye Conservation Commission Vice-Chair, commented that at the last select board meeting, Selectman Epperson said that he thought these changes were a solution looking for a problem. Mr. Garvan agrees. Right now, there are eighteen openings on eight existing committees. There are an additional eleven openings on two new committees. That's twenty-nine opportunities for people to serve the Town. As a long-standing member of the Rye Conservation Commission, he would like to address the complaints and concerns that the current policy somehow ends up favoring certain committees and certain people. It has been said that it's a lifetime position. Mr. Garvan noted that it's certainly not a lifetime position. There are boards that have long-standing members; however, it's within the power to remove anybody. If a committee or commission appoints someone who has been on it for fifteen years, there is an opportunity for the committee or select board to say that's enough and there should be some new members.

Mr. Garvan continued that on the Conservation Commission, they have been told that it's a lifetime position and the members are there forever. Currently, there are three members that have greater than fifteen years on the Commission. There is one member with ten years, one with eight years, two with four years, and two with one year. There are people with lots of experience, some with a good amount of experience, and a couple of newbies. It's a really good mix of experience and new members. It's important to have institutional knowledge. Some of the acquisitions and issues that the Commission deals with are longstanding and it's helpful to have people who have been around for a long time. Mr. Garvan pointed out that the Select

Board is the appointing authority. He doesn't see any reason why the Select Board cannot exercise their authority if they feel something is going wrong under the current system.

Mr. Garvan stated that it's been said that it's just a group of friends just appointing friends. He pointed out that when he joined the Commission seventeen years ago, he didn't know anyone on the RCC. Everyone who has been appointed since, he had not known before they came before the Commission and asked to serve. He continued that transparency has been a big issue and is important. He doesn't know what isn't transparent. The candidates go before the RCC in a public meeting that's zoomed and livestreamed, along with minutes. If the person is recommended, they go before the Select Board in a public venue. The openings are posted on the Town website and Rye Civic League. The openings are also posted in the Town Newsletter and social media. The opportunity is there and it's a very transparent process.

Julie Tucker, 960 Washington Road, commented there's no argument that there are other positions open on boards. If someone sees a board they want to be on, that's the board they are interested in. They should have every opportunity to try for that board. When a term ends, a term ends. It's a three-year term, it's over and it's now open to the public. It's open to the full public to apply, not just for the person who had the seat.

Referring to the RCC, **Joe Marttila, 96 Alehson Street**, stated that it's been a number of years where this commission has been "locked down." Going back to 2007, there are currently four people who are still on the Commission in 2024. He noted that he has worked with RCC since 2014 with regard to the Goss Farm. When the farm was finished, the barn was going to be used for agricultural purposes. That hasn't been allowed because the RCC chair wouldn't allow it to be used for agricultural purposes. When this is brought up, the public doesn't have a voice. This group keeps electing its own people who agree with them. There's no one that has any dissenting view and that's a problem.

Vice-Chair McGrath commented that the RCC is the hardest working group in this town and the members are the most dedicated. Sadly, they are being looked at in this light that they don't deserve. He believes this policy will allow for committees to have some different points of view joining them. The RCC is a victim of how things have been done in the past.

Cindee Carter, 28 Cable Road, stated that the policy feels rushed and it doesn't seem to address what the Board is looking for. She pointed out that she spent many years as a volunteer coordinator for a non-profit and volunteered in her town. There are many reasons why people do not volunteer. If the Board is interested in creating a policy that will bring more people on, this is not it. She read what was proposed and would not volunteer. There will be more barriers to volunteering than what was there before. Ms. Carter continued it's a wonderful thing to have institutional knowledge. The Select Board always has the ability to say no. It's almost like people will have to run in an election for these positions. That is not what volunteering is about. Volunteering is about feeling a passion for a particular area of which you feel like you have some expertise. She pointed out that volunteers are the heart and soul of local government.

Karen Stewart, 546 Washington Road, commented that she is a longtime volunteer in the Town. She disagrees with the policy and is frustrated by the policy. She has been on a number of committees and knows that it's hard to get members of the public to show up. People will not readily commit to every week or every month. It was said that this is a fairness exercise. She would like the Board to think about the fairness to the volunteers in town who are showing up and doing the work. This takes the control and authority away from the committees, away from the committee chairs, and puts it on someone else. In her opinion, this is not fair.

Referring to the Conservation Commission under RSA 36-A, **Selectman Wright** noted that it says the Commission shall be appointed by the Select Board. In the past, the practice has been to accept nominations, recommendations from the Commission itself. Only last year, when there was a push to introduce members from outside that process, they were approved and it felt like they were "rubber stamped." He pointed out this is primarily the reason why he ran for office. He thought it was a very bad policy that led to self-selection and was a waste of taxpayers' dollars. It's clear that when a term has expired, it's vacant and is open to anyone who wants to come in.

Ritchie White, 30 Lang Road, stated that he supports the change, as it's long overdue. It encourages fairness. The Select Board will now be doing their legal duty, which has not happened in the past on the Conservation Commission. The Conservation Commission has been choosing when there is a vacancy or an appointment and the Selectmen accept that. He continued that the Selectmen need to interview people. The Selectmen need to look at qualifications. The Selectmen need to look at people who are on boards to see how someone will fit in and bring new experience. It should not be the commission picking the person.

Dania Seiglie, 63 Central Road, stated that with this policy, everyone loses, particularly the residents and volunteers. She asks that the select board members embrace this policy without looking at themselves first. At the end of the day, the Selectmen are the ones who are responsible for accepting the chairs of all the committees, commissions, and boards, who are making recommendations for positions. What has the Select Board done to really assess those candidates against other candidates? She wants the Town to be as wonderful as it has been and would like it to be even better. Change is good when it's on a positive note that is organized and thought through carefully. People who are on the boards and committees should have an equal chance, just like everyone else. Her recommendation is that everyone should be put into the basket and the chairs give all the information the Select Board needs. The Select Board should meet and interview with them. She thinks there should be more thinking and more respect for the chairs, and for the committee/commission volunteers.

Karen Oliver, 1159 Washington Road, commented that the proposed changes do not change the policy at all. There is already a thirty-day notice. There is already the Select Board making the final decision. The way the Town has approached this issue in the past, is to have people who are interested in commissions, and boards, approach that commission or board and figure out whether they are really interested and possibly volunteer to do some other things. To her, this policy is trying to shortcut that and not use what has traditionally been the method in town,

which is to get to know people. The idea that this is somehow going to produce more volunteers is a sham. That is not what this is about. This is about circumventing the process that Rye has developed. This is about exercising power. She thinks the consideration of this policy should be delayed, as rushing through this will not help anyone.

Stacey Smith, 51 Central Road, Historic District Commission Member, noted that her concern is with the process, as the process does not start until the term is over. This puts the people who are doing the work on the committee/commission in a bind. There will be thirty days or more, come April 1st, to find someone new and get them onto the board. She reiterated that she is concerned about the process. She wonders if the Select Board could give some consideration to backing this up to possibly sixty days ahead of time for upcoming vacant seats. She pointed out that the Historic District Commission already has three vacant seats and will not be able to function.

Vice-Chair McGrath noted that the Select Board has talked about commissions that can't make a quorum because of the thirty-day delay. He thinks there is an opportunity for a solution.

Selectman Wright pointed out that this impact would only be a one-time impact, because he chose to submit this as a change in policy this year. What should have been happening is that names should have surfaced in advance of the expiration, thirty days ago. There are two things that he is suggesting to be changed. One is to make appointments May 1st, instead of April 1st, because it doesn't give an incoming office holder an opportunity to participate. Going forward, he thinks the seats would be greatly publicized because it's in everyone's best interest. The only change is that at the expiration of the term, it will be considered vacant, not to dismiss the office holder, and it will be opened up to anyone who chooses to participate. The current office holder can reapply for the seat. Selectman Wright continued that Attorney Maher suggested that a clause be included that allows for an out this time for certain circumstances; such as, the Historic District Commission where it has vacant positions for new interest.

Cory Belden, 146 Clark Road, Recreation Commission Chair, noted that the Recreation Commission has been operating for a number of years with a seven member board with five or six members. The Commission has recently been able to finally pull in some more people to fill those seats. It's now at the full seven member board. He noted that at the recent Recreation Commission meeting, five members showed up to the meeting. However, there are two members who have not been reappointed and the Commission did not have a quorum, as there were only three sitting members. The Recreation Commission is in a position where they are trying to make decisions for contract work, but cannot move forward without a quorum.

Mark Epply, 267 Brackett Road, commented that this change to the policy seems to be RCC driven. There's a hidden agenda. He thinks there are some long-term members on the RCC that have a lot of knowledge and have done a great job over the years. There are some long-term members on the Conservation Commission who are at the Goss Farm probably twenty hours a week in the summer, picking blueberries and watering apple trees. They are doing all the things

that nobody else is doing. By throwing those people off the Commission, the Town will be losing that help that comes for free.

Mary-Ann Sullivan, 754 Central Road, Beach Committee Chair, commented that the Beach Committee is a small committee. There may be times when they won't have a quorum. She also feels the Town has a very transparent process. If someone is interested, they send an email and they'll be invited to a meeting. The Select Board Representative on the Committee gets to meet that person. The person will talk about themselves and will interact with the Committee. The person will then go to a select board meeting to be appointed. She pointed out that the Committee tries to do it in fairness in the order in which an inquiry was received. She thinks its fairly transparent. She also thinks the timing would be difficult. The Committee would be losing people for the beach cleanup, which was decided to be done regularly in Rye. There are also people who are learning to test water and they could suddenly be off the Committee. She thinks there are a lot of factors that would negatively affect the Committee.

Attorney Eric Maher stated that there is a version that he has reviewed and revised, which some folks don't have. There are some concerns that may have already been addressed by and through the editing process. He continued that it's ultimately up to the discretion of the Board as to the process they want to employ as to how to fill vacancies on town boards and seek reappointments of existing members.

Susan Ross, 333 West Road, suggested that the Select Board continue this meeting, if they are not prepared for the public to see the changes.

Paula Mahoney, 32 Fairhill Ave, commented that it's clear that people are not feeling comfortable about the rush. There are so many things from the warrant articles that are supposed to be dealt with by the Select Board. She suggested tabling this and making this a deliberative item. People can think about it and vote on it.

Howard Kalet, 90 Colbourn Road, Telecommunications Interface Committee, Energy Committee Co-Chair, commented that this feels rushed. If there is a desire to bring new members on boards, they should serve as an alternate. People being considered for new positions should have some experience on the board and have a feel for what the board does. To him, volunteering should not feel like the person is running for political office. It should be something that people have the passion to do. If someone feels they are going to have to run for office every time their term comes up, it's going to detract from the people who are interested.

Michael Bean, 112 Grove Road, stated that he believes they've "kicked the can down the road" on this issue for quite some time. He doesn't agree that this is being rushed. He wants to commend the board for their actions on March 26th when they delayed making any hasty decisions about making appointments on the recommendations. This made it certain that everybody that does get appointed in the future is done under the same pretense and under the same policy, in a matter of fairness.

Jeff Ross, 333 West Road, commented that removing any kind of opportunity for current serving members to be recommended by their committee and their committee chair is a bad idea. He pointed out there is nothing in the policy that says anything about interviews, the need for letters of recommendation, or anything other than simply contacting the Select Board. He thinks if the policy is going to be changed, it needs to be spelled out in the policy what the policy is; particularly, with regard to the process that is going to be used.

Attorney Maher clarified that the decision of whom to appoint is the Select Board's. How they reach that decision is really up for discussion. As far as the comments and concerns about the distinction and treatment of sitting members and new candidates, this was addressed as part of the revisions. The process envisions that somebody can submit their candidacy to the Select Board. The Select Board can seek a recommendation on the candidates, not just the sitting member, but the new candidates as well. There's an opportunity that if a candidate wishes to have an interview or discussion with the committee on which they are seeking to be appointed, they can meet with the committee and that committee can provide a recommendation. He thinks the policy as revised envisions that process.

Richard Furber, 124 Washington Road, commented that he thinks there's a question as to how the Select Board is going to be able to make a decision about individuals on the boards.

Jennifer Madden, 620 Central Road, noted that this isn't adding a layer that didn't already exist. The policy addresses vacant positions and it addresses lapse in positions. The difference is that the person who is lapsing, may now be in a competition because somebody from the outside can potentially be introduced. The recommendation still comes from the commission and goes to the Select Board. They are not giving up any opportunity to recommend someone.

Frank Drake, South Road, stated that he has heard that the changes in this are minor and really no big deal. It seems like there is a lot of much ado about nothing from a certain group of citizens. He sees that a lot of people are just afraid of the change in this process. It's a very small procedural change that really doesn't need this much attention and discussion.

Alex Herlihy, 55 Lang Road, noted that he has been on the Heritage Commission since it started. He started on the Commission as an alternate and he is now chair. He continued that a lot of people don't show up and a lot do not communicate with the Commission. If a lot of people had been showing and sending letters to the Select Board stating that they'd like to serve, he might not even be on the Heritage Commission because he'd like to step aside; however, that hasn't happened. Right now, there are three openings on the Heritage Commission.

Karen Oliver stated that it's important to talk about what is happening. It's not encouraging volunteers. It's not getting more people on boards. It's to send a message to a particular board. This demonstrates the length to which some of the Town's elected officials will go. They will disrupt and cause this ruckus in order to deliver a message.

Roger Wiegley, 673 Central Road, stated that it was said earlier that the committees may not be able to make an objective decision when they send recommendations to the Select Board because they are friends and treat their friends favorable, which is human nature. The Select Board is also subject to human nature and might make a decision based on friendships or political persuasions. If the Select Board is making selections, he doesn't know how they are going to weigh a recommendation from a committee that someone be reappointed against a person who is simply saying they want to be on the committee. He continued that the process has been rushed, as it's obviously important and controversial. There are people who feel very strongly on both sides and want what's best for Rye. People need a chance to read and reflect on this, and there should be more public comment.

Joe Cummins, 990 Washington Road, commented that there are committees that have their clear favorites, who are channeled into alternates. He thinks it's healthy for people to have the opportunity to step forward and volunteer.

Tom King, 535 Wallis Road, stated that this doesn't really change the crux of the issue that the Select Board dealt with last year. It still says that the Select Board may seek a recommendation for the people seeking reappointment. By default, the committee doesn't even have the right to make a recommendation, which he thinks is a mistake. The fact that the Select Board could refuse a committee's recommendation, or just not take it, is wrong for someone they've worked with for three years. He continued that the procedure is that the letter requesting appointment goes to the Select Board. Nowhere in the process does it go to the chair. The procedure needs to be correct. He thinks the policy needs work. This wasn't thought out. It's not appropriate to put this in place when the Select Board and the public doesn't know what's being done. People go to committees because they have a passion and a desire for a volunteer position. They don't want to be running against someone. Referring to the Conservation Commission, he noted that anyone can apply any year. Not many people ever apply. A person was put on, who was not recommended by RCC, and now that person is gone. The RCC now starts over again with another candidate to attempt to gain expertise and knowledge to go forward. He feels that "jamming" people on the boards is not ideal.

Linda Toumpas, 10 Bass Drive, noted that transparency is really important and there really wasn't any on this. She respectfully requests that this whole topic be tabled and rescheduled for a board of selectmen public work session, so people who are involved in the committees have a chance to absorb this and ask questions.

Hugh Lee, 220 Pioneer Road, stated these are relatively minor changes to the existing policy. The existing policy has not been followed, in that the Select Board did not advertise and ask for expressions of interest thirty days in advance of the March 26th meeting in which the Board was preparing to make appointments. The Select Board didn't even follow existing policy, let alone a new policy. The new policy makes it clear that a term ends at the expiration of the term. He thinks what is being done is improving the situation. There may need to be more changes in the future, but it's a whole lot better than the way the Select Board has been selecting candidates in the past.

Suzanne McFarland, 1324 Ocean Blvd., RCC Member, noted that the person who was on the Conservation Commission this past year, decided to not continue and it was because of the workload. RCC tries to tell people what the Commission does. People are told that if they are going on as a regular member, they are going to get a project. She pointed out that Selectman Epperson had a great idea by suggesting that the Commission tell the Select Board what the Commission needs. At that time, the RCC needed a grant writer to replace someone who left. The Commission also needed someone who could look at every single plan and cross reference the plans for native plantings. She noted that there is an idea that needs to be flushed out about alternates. She also thinks for RCC it's much better to go on as an alternate, learn what the Commission does, and then try and keep going. It's up to the committees and commissions to tell the Select Board what they're looking for and what they need. Ms. McFarland noted that there are RCC projects that do not go from year to year. There are some projects that take eight years and some forty-five days. However, a lot of the projects are long term. She thinks it's important for the Select Board to take the recommendations of the chair because they are working with the members.

Chair Epperson closed public comment.

Chair Epperson stated that he is in favor of tabling this and creating a work session.

Bill Epperson moved to table the policy and create a workshop, so people can be better informed about all the redlines and changes.

Motion failed for lack of a second.

Rob Wright moved to adopt the change to the Town of Rye, New Hampshire, Policy establishing the general rules of procedure for boards, committees, and commissions, as annotated and marked up, and reviewed by this Board and legal counsel; with one addition that Paragraph L be added as follows:

Waiver: The Select Board may, within its discretion and for a good cause, waive any of the procedural requirements set forth in this policy. Any such vote to waive the requirements of this policy shall be made in a public meeting.

Seconded by Bob McGrath.

Chair Epperson noted that the Select Board is willing to take that motion, accept it, and change the policy without the entire participation of the citizens of Rye; especially, the board members and volunteers. His suggestion was, and continues to be, let these positions go and have a work session, so next year, it will all be on paper and can be proven. He would ask for that consideration.

**Vote: 2-1 Opposed: Bill Epperson
Motion passed.**

Rob Wright moved to waive the appointment timeframe for any commissions, committees, or boards which do not have sufficient members to create a quorum, and they can come before the Select Board to make that case, so the Board can seek to appoint those people immediately. Seconded by Bill Epperson.

Vote: 3-0

Motion passed.

Motion by Bob McGrath to post all the committee vacancies, under the new policy, for an additional thirty days starting April 2nd. Seconded by Bill Epperson.

Vote: 3-0

Motion passed.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

DPW Director Jason Rucker spoke to the Select Board about his request to move forward with the hiring of a part-time town custodian. The current custodian has given his notice with his last day being April 12th. Director Rucker has already posted the position and has held some interviews. He has chosen a candidate for the position. He is waiting for approval from the Select Board on this part-time hiring before reaching out to the candidate. Director Rucker confirmed that the position is covered within the 2024 budget.

Motion by Bill Epperson to authorize Director Rucker to go forward with the hiring of a part-time custodian, which is within the bounds of the budget. Seconded by Rob Wright. All in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Bill Epperson to adjourn at 4:40 p.m. Seconded by Rob Wright. All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dyana F Ledger