Town of
Northumberland
Office of Selectmen
19 Main St
Groveton NH 03582
Phone (603) 636-1450
Fax (603) 636-6098
www.northumberlandnh.gov

Town of Northumberland
Board of Selectmen
Meeting Minutes - Draft
Date: Monday, April 27, 2026
Place: Town Meeting Room – 10 Station Square
Time: 6:00 P.M.

Board members present: Jim Tierney, Al Rossetto, Wayne Montgomery
Others present: Joanne & Ray Benoit, Susan & Daniel Becker, John & Amanda King, David & Jennifer Lyon, Pat & Bob Akesson, Lisa Pitts, Ruth Lupine McDonough, Ren Pluta, Grace Phillips, Jim Buss, Mary Kugel, Arthur Pitts, Mark DeGennero, Joe Keenan, Tracey Morrill, Elizabeth Pierce, Charles Jordan, Michelle Randall, Rebecca St Cyr, Minute Taker/Transcriber

1. **Chairman Opens the Meeting -** J. Tierney opened the meeting at 6:00 pm

2. **Pledge of Allegiance -** All

3. **Public comment -** Add on to agenda 4/28 - 6:00 pm

   R. McDonough - said I don't speak for everyone in the community, but I'm also in contact with a lot of the community and standing up on behalf.

   Our understanding is that there are some very important issues around the Vertical Bridge application that need attention. We wanted to make sure that you (before going into your closed session) heard from us and got information about our concerns. The timing and sequencing of the way that things are playing out is very tight, technical, and concerning, and so we can't lose any traction or time in terms of passing along what we can to you and expressing ourselves.

   J. Tierney asked T. Morrill if he had passed information to these folks that I gave you. Tracey - I did pretty much most of it. We're still missing information. Tierney said he received information today that Verizon, with another company (Atlantic ?) looked at another piece of property in town to put a tower on. The property owner signed an agreement with them that's good for another year, Verizon was definitely going on it, just like I believe Verizon is going on the Vertical Bridge one. (Public comment - proposes) Tierney said when a tower gets approved, the entity that owns the tower can put anybody on it they want, we have say on that. It seems odd that Verizon is looking at this and another one with some kind of signed agreement. The property owner isn't sure about it either.

   Someone asked why Dave Fortin (property owner) didn't come to the meeting. J. Tierney didn't know, it wasn't anything on the Boards part - we weren't planning on all of you being here tonight. M. DeGennero commented at the first Planning Board meeting we were told that it would house Verizon. It maybe be ancillary or interesting to know that they're pursuing other properties. but we are here for Lost Nation. J. Tierney doesn't have any further information. He hasn't heard from NHMA legal yet, but left another voice message today.

   R. McDonough - we have points that we want you to hear before the Non-Public session. We've prepared information, we've done research, we've spoken together and looked at ordinances and State law. We want to offer it to you so that you are as informed as we are. The information presented includes:

- A letter from our community that is signed by 16 members and there may be more who wish to sign if they haven't already.
- An appendix for the citations within it that include State law and our own statutes.
- Meeting notes from March 4th and April 1st and the video transcript of the April 20th Selectman meeting.
- The first 33 pages of a 390 page report written by the NH Commission on 5G technology from 2020.

This is information that our community knows and because it's such a steep learning curve, we wanted to also provide it to you in a way that was accessible.

J. Tierney asked if in your studies, have you found out if the tower they want to put up in Lost Nation is for 5G in the future, or for cell phone communication today. R. McDonough - the current application is for a cell tower. Tierney said he has been told it's in an area that has coverage. Ruth thinks if you look at the broader picture, it's clear that there is intention to use these towers for the next generations of technology and whatever they're deciding to do with that. It's not necessarily about the current application, but those details are things to take into consideration in the broader context of what we have to say tonight.

James Buss - is a resident of Northumberland. We're not asking this Board to take our word on health and safety. We're citing the findings of the commission created by NH itself. In 2019, the legislature established the commission to study the environment and health effects of evolving 5G review of this application served on it. Dr. Chamblin will also be giving a presentation to our community on the findings of the NH Commission as a public service. Their findings on health, and FCC safety standards have not been updated since 1996. They do not address long-term biological exposure.

Setbacks - New wireless antennas should be set back from homes and schools, enforceable by municipalities. The proposed tower is within 500 meters of residential properties. That threshold is ours to enforce.

Environment - RF radiation affects insects, birds, and plants. This site sits in a naturally significant migratory bird corridor and less than 500' from registered wetlands. Our own ordinance names bird corridors as a concern. The approval process does not exist to protect. Precautionary principle - protect now, do not wait for federal action. NH's own experts said municipalities have both the authority and the responsibility to apply protected standards. J. Tierney asked who said that? R. McDonough believes it's in the commission's statement, but we can double check on that.

Susan Becker - Has been a resident in Lost Nation since 1986. We understand the legal standard for denial must be grounded in the record. We are not asking this Board to exceed its authority, we're asking it to fully use the authority that it has. Here's what's at stake:

Property values - Studies document 5% to 20% reductions near cell towers. Our ordinance names this explicitly. Health - There are multiple homes within 500 meters. Children live there, animals are there. The structure is permanent. The environment - 19,000 square feet of earth disturbance, 18,000 square feet of tree clearing, a 1,000 gallon propane tank will be on a hillside beside Dean Brook Wetlands. The wetland permit has not been obtained. The environmental review has not yet been completed. Permanents - future carriers can get antennas under State law with minimal local review. We're not approving one use, we're approving a permanent structure whose future is largely outside this town's control. Process - Abutters were not notified, a board member predeclared support. that same member holds a contract with the applicant's carrier and has refused to recuse. We have documentation for every one of these statements. We're asking this board to take them seriously.

Ren - We've come here tonight as a community, a community that's been working really well together. Each of the five requests that follow in this presentation is grounded in the existing law and our own ordinance as well. And within the Board's authority to act on, we ask that each be addressed on the record tonight.

Mark DeGennaro - Moved to Northumberland last year, but has owned property here since 2021. I have been a member of the Planning Board for a short period of time and wanted to let you know that because it's important here. One of the things I want to talk about is obtaining a written shot clock extension from Vertical Bridge. We want to make sure this shot clock extension happens before May 8th.

When I was on the Planning Board, I happened to sit on the first meeting that was held with Vertical Bridge and their attorneys (03/04/26). We had the developers, their attorney, and four members of the Planning Board. We talked about a bunch of things and we all recognized that the information had not been fully understood by the members of the Planning Board.

Nicole Canavan, the chairperson, recognized that she only had a day or two to read the information. I spent probably almost 30 hours reading all that information. I make these points because we all spoke about things on the application that were not apparent, that were not answered, we had lots of questions. Fast forward to the end of the meeting where we concluded and there was a motion to continue the meeting, because we recognized that information was still missing. A few days later, when I requested the meeting minutes from the Town Office, I got minutes that said the application had been accepted as complete. And I got a little concerned so I started communicating with the chair, Nicole Canavan. I copied Al Rossetto and Romy McMann from the office. We probably spent three or four days going back and forth. I realized that the chair of the Planning Board, Ms. Canavan, recognized that we in fact did not accept the application as complete. I have this on record, I have it in writing, and I'm prepared to put it forth at some date in the future, should that be important.

We understand that there is no shot clock, it was not accepted. The application was not complete. Everyone recognized that the application was incomplete. I did learn later from Nicole in a separate document that she and another member of the Planning Board met privately and discussed moving forward with the application so that everything could come together and the people could get on, the developers could get on and work with the Board at a later date.

So, I resigned my commission on the Planning Board. I first recused myself because I'm an abutter. Secondly, I resigned, and I resigned because this is not the way we need to do business as a community and as a town. We need to be upfront, we need to be honest, we need to be forthright. If an application, if someone likes it and someone doesn't, we need to have all the documents there. We did not have that. I don't want to take up a lot of time and tell everyone what my thoughts are because I have it all in writing. But I just want to make that point now before you deliberate.

J. Tierney asked if the minutes were changed. He is going to guess that Mark saw the unapproved minutes. Have they been approved yet? A. Rossetto said yes they were approved with changes. It said that the application was complete and we changed it to, (I forgot the word) substantially complete and the minutes were voted on. Mark never saw the first meeting minutes. The minutes that he read said that the application was accepted as complete, the revision came after that. There was wording added that the documentation was enough. Al said they weren't accepted, it wasn't complete but mostly complete. The minutes were voted on with that change at the 04/01/2026 meeting. Marks stand is that the application is marked as accepted as complete and when he was at the meeting it was not. Al said when the minutes were accepted at the next Planning Board meeting, there was the change. The intent was that it was substantially complete.

J. Tiereny noted that we do that with our minutes, the minutes are out within five days of the meeting date. We have to approve them at the next Select Board meeting. I ask if there are any changes if none - the minutes are approved and are the official minutes.

D. Lyon said the minutes are available on the Town website, I can show you in there where it says to the taxpayers in this town, a motion to approve the application as complete and move forward to the April 1, 2026 Public Hearing. That motion was by Al Rosetto, seconded by Sean Durkin, and then it states All in Favor 4-0. Al said keep going down, there's a signature line below that. Lyon - If you don't have signatures, what are you posting it for if it's not signed? J. Tierney said it's the draft copy because a copy of the minutes has to go out within five days. But they don't get approved until the next meeting. But in this case, they simply haven't changed it to the correct minutes that did get approved. D. Lyon - What he's stating though is what was changed was that it was substantially complete. He didn't say anything about removing the motion to accept it as complete. So, what you're telling me is this isn't in here anymore? A. Rossetto - The signed minutes, which apparently are not on the website, have that it was substantially complete. That's what we modified prior to the three members, Sean, Nicole, and me signing them as the official minutes.

Rossetto said he's been in contact with the Town Attorney, and he's been in contact with Atty Will Dodge, Vertical Bridge agrees to not enforce the 65 day shot clock but move it to beyond the meeting, R. McDonough commented the shot clock should not have been started there is no shot clock. A. Rossetto - after talking to the Town Atty, when we substantially approve it we didn't realize. We didn't think we were saying yes.

Discussion continued regarding the project. Member of Public - I'll just say that there's a difference - complete means complete. Substantially complete means incomplete. J. Tierney - Substantially complete I don't think is terminology in the RSA. Member of Public - to us, substantially complete doesn't mean complete. Complete means complete.

David Lyon - I'm a resident in the Lost Nation. This next month will make 20 years of living at the same residence. At the April 1st hearing a Board member had to tell the Chair that the ordinance may allow the Board to require the applicant to fund expert review. The chair's response, is he suggesting we do that? The chair being Nicole Canavan. That provision was unknown to the Board's own leadership. We reviewed the Zoning Ordinance - Section 9, it's clear that if the Planning Board requires an engineering assessment to set the bond amount, the cost is borne by the applicant. That authority exists and should be invoked now. The structural and geotechnical questions about the wetland adjacent site demand it. Whether broader authority exists under State law is a question for the Town Attorney. Mr. Tierney committed to an answer by May 4th, we are asking for that answer to be shared publicly before May 13th and for the Board to use every bit of authority it has before any vote.

D. Lyon - I want to add to the section re: the shot clock, so pursuant to NH RSA for the Planning Board, we as abutters have to be notified 10 days previous to the acceptance of a site plan in its completion. If that's the date they are going off, we were not notified, which puts this Town in a substantial predicament. Lyon doesn't think it was intentional, I think it was by accident. However, we were not notified. A. Rossetto briefly addressed.

Elizabeth Pierce - I'm one of the abutters, in fact, I'm going to probably look out my window right into the tower. And I'm really worried about my house that I've spent blood, sweat, and tears building and my animals, which are very dear to me. At the March 4th meeting, one seat was vacant, at the April 1st meeting, two seats were vacant. The Board member with the most relevant technical expertise, Mr. DeGennero attended the April 1st meeting as a resident, not as a board member. He's concerned about drainage, soil, and wetlands. I agree with him, we live across the street and it's definitely not very good drainage. He was effectively sidelined while Vertical Bridge had four paid professionals at the table. A full 5 member board is not a formality it's a minimum condition for a decision of this consequence. We're asking the Board to make these appointments immediately. The shot clock extension request (in request 1) creates time to do this right? Community confidence and outcome depends on the quality of the Board that produces it. And please remember people, we live there, we should have a say on how our area is used. And we should have people on the Planning Board that respect that.

J. Tierney - the Planning Board is supposed to have five, if there are three, it's a quorum and that constitutes a board. It does not have to be five. A. Rossetto - Currently on the Planning Board there's Sean Durkin, Nicole, Canavan, and I'm the ex officio. When I brought Mark on to try to bring the count up, and then he got off because of the cell tower stuff, so dropped it back down to three. We have vacancies on the Planning Board and we've had them for a long time. The problem is nobody wants to volunteer, it's a thankless job and it requires a lot. Al is hoping that after this is over, we can convince Mark to come back on because he's a wealth of knowledge and we need more volunteers. Al further discussed the issue.

R. Pluto - We would like to say that one person who's given their permission to be mentioned tonight, Gracie Phillips, she is a long-term resident of Northumberland, and is interested in volunteering. There's another person on the road as well, Eric, who is a military veteran whose specialty was telecommunications. He also has a master's in forestry and has mentioned that he would like to at least talk with you all about the possibility of being on the Board. J. Tierney - are either abutters? G. Phillips said legally no, but she certainly doesn't want the cell tower there. She would hope to be a fair and honest Planning Board member. I think what all of us want is just someone that is doing things. J. Tierney - as an abutter, you would have to recuse yourself. Gracie said I'm not and I agree to be impartial. I'll listen to all the stuff and make a decision. Her father Michael Phillips was on the Select Board for many years. R. McDonough - I'm so sorry, Grace, but having just heard you say that

you have a preconceived opinion, which doesn't allow you to meet the juror standard that has been established for voting members of the Planning Board.

Tracey Morrill - I've been living at 641 Lost Nation Road for 35+ years. What we're asking is that if we are able to get new members on the Planning Board, that we get some adequate time for them to review the information. So, here's what a newly appointed member would need to absorb:

- Nine separate waiver requests
- An NEPA review the applicant's attorney described as only at the beginning stages.
- Balloon test photos submitted to be supplemented when the application was accepted.
- An alternate site analysis delivered orally, not in writing as the ordinance requires.
- And an NHDOT driveway permit not yet granted for an access road on a steep incline and on a low visibility curve on a State highway. The 2022 New Hampshire Planning Board Handbook states an application should not be accepted as complete without evaluating the waivers.

Nine waivers were requested and none of them were evaluated on record when the application was recorded as accepted. A one month delay is not a delay, it’s a minimum standard for due diligence for a decision that will stand for decades.

Joe Keenan - I live in Lost Nation, in Northumberland. The facts are documented, Al Rosetto signed a contract with Selco Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless for his property in Connecticut in December 2025, two months before this application was filed. Before any public hearing, he called the application “a great idea.” At the April 20th Select Board meeting, he stated, “I have no contract with Verizon Wireless”. That statement is not supported by the documents submitted on April 20th. The RSA, the statutes, the NH statute 673:14, is not ambiguous. In the case of Winslow versus Holderness, it was established in NH that one disqualified member can void a boards entire decision. The Towns own telecommunications ordinance states that the Selectmen shall take immediate steps to enforce its provisions upon well-founded information of a violation. You have that information, we want to resolve this here. If we cannot, we will pursue every avenue available to us. Someone mentioned that the standard in the statute states that a member who would be disqualified as a juror for potential conflict of interest, not necessarily actual, but potential or perceived conflict of interest, needs to be recused. I don't think that standard's being met here, and I hope that this is a moot point.

A. Rossetto - my checks come from SPA for the tower, I have a land lease with them. I have no control over who's on the tower. Absolutely zero. I'm going to do what you guys want because it's just not worth fighting over. I'm not trying to be your enemy. Joe Keenan - What concerns me, Al, is you don't see what we're saying. You don't seem to be hearing what we're all seeing.

R. Pluto - we made five requests:

- A written shot clock extension from Vertical Bridge,
- A Town Attorney opinion on applicant-funded expert review, which you have a right to from Verizon.
- To appoint qualified Planning Board members if the opportunity arises and the right members come along.
- A one-month review period before any vote for any new members, so that they have time to catch up.
- To recuse the conflicting Planning Board member and appoint conflict-free alternative(s) or alternate(s).

These requests are not extraordinary, they are steps in the process that we're always supposed to be following. We're not asking the Board to decide the tower issue tonight. We're asking it to ensure that when a decision is made, it's made by a complete, impartial, and informed Board. A fair process protects the town legally, it honors the community's trust and it produces a decision that everyone can live with.

J. Tierney - I can't agree to all those points because I don't know legally if we can. Because they waived the shot clock for the 65 days and they tolled the federal 150-day shot clock. J. Tierney didn’t know exactly what that means. J. Keenan asked if we could we get this clarified in writing? We can try. M. Randall noted that she has an e-mail from our lawyer who I contacted to get further clarification on an e-mail that was sent to me about the shot clocks, the 65 day and the 150. Atty Dodge's waiver allows the board to resume consideration of the application on May 13th without liability for missing these deadlines. Both deadlines may be extended with

consent of the applicant by statute. The deadlines do not reset, so the board should be prepared to act on the application at that time.

Public asked - Is that shot clock in play even if there was a failure to notify the abutters? J. Tierney - That question is being asked of NHMA. Joe asked if you could state for the record what NHMA is? New Hampshire Municipal Association, we are a paying member of it. Joe - Will you share their opinion with us? J. Tierney said sure,
went it's received..

R. Donough - Because of the sensitive time nature of this, how can we keep the information flowing. Is there a system in place for us to learn about steps and advances in between meetings? I know your next scheduled meeting as a Board is May 4th. As information becomes available, is there a way for us to conveniently access it? Tierney - I've got Tracy's phone number. If that works for you folks, he'll get it as soon as I know about it and he can pass that out to all of you agree. Tracey agreed

A. Rossetto - I was told by Vertical Bridge in an e-mail they were planning to have additional information. Al further discussed. Atty Dodge came back and said he would have it the week of May 4th for us to review. Al was hoping to be able to have an informational meeting with this group so we can look at it, if the other Board members agree. You people deserve the answers, but he doesn't have answers to give. J. Keenan - Everything you just said suggests to me that the application is not complete. Al said if it's been changed that may be the saving grace.

E. Pierce - If I got a building permit to build a new house and you okayed it, then I decided I really don't like that lot and I'm going to move it two lots down, the building permit would start all over again, wouldn't it? Al - Yes. We don't know what they're going to do. J. Tierney - I believe the RSA says substantive, there has to be substantive changes. If they want to move it 3 feet, I'm not sure in a court of law that would pass for substantive. J. Keenan - They're acknowledging that they have not completed a wetlands evaluation, which sounds incomplete. Tierney - that sounds substantive because of what DES can say. A. Rossetto - And that's one of the things my research showed. In court when there were wetland omissions and shaky stuff that was one of the main reasons how the refusal (thumbs down) was approved by the court.

Arthur Pitts - lives at 689 Lost Nation Road, and I live directly across, my driveway is right there. The cell tower is right there and I'm mostly concerned about the location of it. Being so close to my house, it's 350' exactly to my front door, and 250' from my mailbox. He would like to at least get it moved back. I'm all for cell towers, but they gave us such short notice on the balloon test, which was from 9:00 am-1:00 pm on a Monday. He believes it was while everyone was at work. He didn't know about it because he didn't get the mail, I got notified like 10 minutes before when my neighbor told me. I took some pictures but was wondering if we could have a fair balloon test and have it up for at least a day. So that perhaps anybody else that would be able to see it could take pictures. I think it would help our case.

J. Tierney - I'm not going to say yes we can do it because the other side's going to have something to say about it too. M. Kugel - I wasn't notified of the balloon test at all. J. Tierney asked do you have to be notified of the balloon test? If the RSA says you've got to be notified of a balloon test, that's law.

T. Morrill - Following up on the tolling question, tolling says that in the law, the suspension of or the pausing of a statute of limitation preventing the legal time limit to file a lawsuit. So basically, it's a suspension, same thing as waiving or delaying it. Tracey's question is, can you also find out from the attorney if the 150 day shot clock trump's the 65 day clock in any way. A. Rossetto - Said the Federal trump's, the State. 150 days is the Fed shot clock. May 13th was the 65 day State shot clock. In effect, you don't have to vote on the 13th. J. Tierney - by NH State law if there isn't a decision in 65 days, it's automatically approved. They have waived that right and the 65 day shot clock will end in late May. We need to check on that, discussion continued.

M. DeGennero -And if there was no shot clock started if there was no legitimate vote on the application.

Tierney - That question is with NHMA also, specifically that. Since you weren't notified, does that make the meeting and votes taken legal? DeGennero wanted to reassert that there was no 4-0 vote. Tierney - I'm asking is it legal? If they say no, because you weren't notified, then no vote. According to the law, it says no.

M. DeGennero - I'm saying I was a member of the board at that time. I did not vote for that and I have acknowledgement from the chair (N. Canavan) that said she did not vote for that. J. Tierney asked was that changed in the minutes too? We haven't seen the minutes, all we've seen online are the original minutes that were not signed.

R. McDonough - I think it's worth asking about whether our Town lawyer or someone, whether Vertical Bridge even realizes that we don't think that this is complete. Have they been informed that perhaps our town processes have not allowed for their application to be accepted? If they're talking to us about a shot clock, I think we should tell them there might not even be a shot clock.

A. Rossetto - This is attorney stuff. I'm talking with these two gentlemen about bringing on the paid counsel. Will Dodge is an expert on that end of this stuff, I'm sure he's got hundreds of these things, hundreds of these meetings, and he knows this stuff in and out. The Planning Board members are all just volunteers trying to do their best. We need legal counsel, because this is not simple and we cannot afford to make a mistake.

R. McDonough - As you said, on the legal topic, and with all due respect, I'm sure it's not intentional, but there are concerns about you being on the Board because of a conflict of interest. It is also an issue for you to be the contact person for the lawyer and to be moving communication. I'm not suggesting, but all I'm saying it seems odd if we have an issue with the conflict of interest on your being on the Planning Board for you to be the contact person for Atty Dodge and to be passing information to our Town Attorney as well. A. Rossetto discussed the process of communication between the Town Lawyer and Atty Dodge, the Planning Board, etc. J. Keenan asked if it's conceivable that Al will no longer be on the Planning Board? Al doesn't plan to get off the Planning Board, he has recused for this project. W. Montgomery will start taking the emails and will be the Select Board rep to the Planning Board for this project.

D. Becker - Wanted to point out that the criteria for an abutter in an incident like this is insignificant, because you can't convince me that a decline in property value stops at the furthest boundary of the person who's right next to the person who wants to have a cell tower on their property, or that necessarily that any other health effects, environmental effects would similarly stop at the end of the property of the person next to the person who wants to have a cell tower. We're here because we care about our neighbors, because I wouldn't want someone to have callous disregard for my well-being as a property owner because you're down the road a little bit, we care about that. So maybe the law says you only have to let a handful of people know, but clearly more people care about it than officially qualified abutters.

A. Rossetto - believes that State law determines the extent of the abutter notification and we have to follow the law. There was a list of abutters in the paperwork. The first meeting was an informational meeting and the April 1st meeting was the real Planning Board meeting looking at the application. D. Lyons - the notes were from the informational meeting with you motioning to accept it. Al - the first time they came was informational. Lyon - the high end lawyer will use that against us. J. Tierney - that's why the question went to NHMA lawyers - was the meeting legal? If you have an illegal meeting, you also have illegal votes. J. Tierney - is waiting for the lawyers to say it's moot, because it was an illegal meeting and the shot clock never started. Then we find out about April 1st.

R. McDonough - when it's time to speak with the lawyer, this list of out of the ordinary aspects from the March 4th unverified meeting notes may be of use to help point out things that might have not allowed that meeting to be legal from the beginning.

J. Buss - We are abutters and were not notified on the March 4th meeting, but were for the April 1st meeting. At the last meeting we suggested maybe they could move it up further. They said they would look into it. Is there a way to get that information prior to May 13th. If they say we can do it or we can't do it, does it die on May 13th or do we have any options? The reason he's asking, we could get a forester to look at the property to

say there's a plateau up here that's dry. We don't have that information, and it would be nice to have. There may be other ways to access the upper property without going through the wetland. There are some other properties that might be a better site and better coverage. There should be a way to communicate with them and work together to get a better option. J. Tierney said we can pass that on to the Town Atty to pass on to Atty Dodge. We are not sure that Mr. Fortin would allow it somewhere else on his property. J. Buss - there are other roads that are highly passable - there are alternatives but we need to be able to communicate with them. We were kind of blindsided, we were not notified. J. Tierney - if that's what they come through and say, then that would solve the problem.

J. Keenan said there is a fair amount of information that hasn't been presented tonight that will be in due course.

R. McDonough - Tonight we've been focused on the Town process and your purview as Selectmen, your role in ensuring the process from the Town goes smoothly and correctly by our ordinances. But the issue of the application from Vertical Bridge is also a can of worms, including some pretty serious gaps in the application that we identified as lay readers. It's worth noting that the burden of proof is on the applicant that they have checked out other sites, and that there is a significant gap in coverage that will be addressed by this tower. Those 2 things need to be proven by the applicant and the application materials. The quality of them and the level of detail doesn't do that. She sent a 91A request on Friday to the Town Office for the March 4th signed minutes. M. Randall said she can stop in with a copy of her request and she will provide what she can.

P. Akesson asked if anyone checked on the conservation easement on the Town property (water tower). W. Montgomery said he has reviewed it and there is no conservation easement on the property. J. Tierney said that opens up another parcel that might be available. B. Akesson - wouldn't it make more sense to put it on Town property then the Town would get paid.

J. Buss - when can we be notified that they've considered some alternate sites? We are not talking to each other. W. Montgomery - As a result of this meeting, whatever questions are raised, tomorrow he will begin to do that and as soon as he can provide any information, he will. Jim we are all trying to make this work we don't want to be put down by the tower people. We are all on the same side.

R. Donough - Part of our expert analysis is from Dr. Ken Chamberlin, his radio report will involve alternative site analysis. J. Buss - somehow that needs to get to the people. Ruth - on May 13 if the report can demonstrate that there are alternative options, then the Planning Board is impowered legally to say no to the proposal.

J. Keenan commented he doesn't appreciate a big corporation pushing its way into our Town altering our landscape permanently when there is 100% coverage for cell service already.

J. Buss - The 4G is what gets through to the rural territories, we went with Net Mobil, they aren't making any money, the fiber optic is, Jim further discussed. It appears they are trying to get the 5G capability going. That's what they are pushing for, if we can give them some better sites with more coverage. But we need to be able to talk with them.

4. **Next Board Meeting Date**: Monday, May 4, 2026

5. **Non-Public Session: (Pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II (c)(l):**
   Motion to go into Non-Public session by: A. Rossetto, 2nd by: Wayne Montgomery, All in Favor 3-0
   Roll Call - J. Tierney -Yes, A. Rossetto -Yes, W. Montgomery - Yes

Into Non Public session at 7:19 pm.

a. Legal Matter(s) - SEALED
b. Resident Matter
c. Employee Matter

Motion to come out of Non-Public Session by: W. Montgomery, 2nd by: A. Rossetto, All in Favor 3-0

Out of Non-Public Session at 8:20 pm.
Into regular session at 8:20 pm.

Motion to Seal section a. per 91A3 of the Non-Public minutes by: W. Montgomery
2nd by: A. Rossetto, All in Favor 3-0

J. Tierney asked about the Financial position. M. Randall has approx. 4 application and will be setting up interviews soon.

6. Adjournment:

Motion to adjourn by: A. Rossetto, 2nd by: W. Montgomery, All in Favor 3-0

Meeting adjourned at 8:22 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca St. Cyr - Minute Taker/Transcriber

*Agenda is subject to change

**Deadline for Agenda items is 12:00 noon on the Friday before scheduled business meeting (by vote of Board of Selectmen at 7/11/2005 meeting). This deadline may be amended by the Board of Selectmen at will (by vote of Board of Selectmen at 06/17/2024 meeting).

Minutes approved by Northumberland Select Board Members on_____

X _____
James Tierney
Northumberland Select Board Chairman

X_____
Alan Rossetto
Northumberland Select Board Vice Chairman

X_____
Wayne Montgomery
Northumberland Select Board Member