TOWN OF ALTON
ALTON PLANNING BOARD

JULY 21, 2009

Members Present: William Curtin, Chair
Timothy Roy
Scott Williams
David Collier, Alternate
Thomas Hoopes

Others Present: Sharon Penney, Town Planner
Stacey Ames, Planning Assistant
Members of the Public

I. CALL TO ORDER

William Curtin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p. m.

II. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

Dave Collier was appointed as an alternate for this meeting on a motion by William Curtin seconded by Thomas Hoopes. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to accept the agenda as presented by Timothy Roy, seconded by Thomas Hoopes and passed by unanimous vote.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

Chairman Curtin opened the floor for case non-specific public input. Hearing none, he closed public input.

Before the Public Hearing for Case P09-15, Map 26, Lot 10-1, David Collier asked to be recused. Chairman Curtin granted recusal.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

Case #P09-15	**Map 26, Lot 10-1**	**Site Plan**
Bahre Alton Properties LLC		**Homestead Place and Range Road**

Chairman Curtin asked representatives for Case #P09-15, Map 26, Lot 10-1 to come forward and state their names for the record.

Mark Sargent with the firm of Richard Bartlett and Associates here to represent Bahre Alton Properties. Along with him were Tim Golde of Golde Planning and Design and Cindy Balcius of Stoney Ridge Environmental.

M. Sargent stated that the site they are here for tonight is on Homestead Place, identified on Map 26 as Lot 10-1 and has a total area of 12.75 acres. It is currently occupied by the Hannaford Grocery Store and Meredith Village Savings Bank. They were before the Board in 2005, at which time they had the Hannaford and Meredith Village Savings Bank site plan approved. Also at that time, they had this pad that is before them this evening approved for a 6,500 square foot restaurant building. Since that time, the Bahre family has not had any luck attracting a tenant for a restaurant so they have decided to change direction and are looking more toward a retail store.

The pad they are presenting this evening shows a 10,000 square foot retail store with the associated parking. As of this date, they have met with the DES wetlands and site-specific people as well as the Alton Conservation Commission. Although this site, if it were standing alone would not require site specific approval, because it is part of the overall complex they have to amend their site specific approval and since the date of the original application, the site specific regulations have changed substantially, which Tim will get into more. They also have to update the wetlands permit, which Cindy will address.

Thomas Hoopes made a motion to accept the application. Timothy Roy seconded the motion.

There was a question as to whether there were any waivers. S. Penney stated that there was confusion because waivers were checked off on the site plan checklist but listed as no or none on the application face page.

The two items are Fiscal Impact Study and an Environmental Impact Study, which were waived on the original application. C. Balcius stated that they had certainly done the Environmental Impact Study as part of the Wetlands application, and that those are items that are asked for and not usually included in the application, so in that case they are not waiver requests. S. Penney answered that she really didn't know how they wanted to proceed…if they are not applicable to this instance, or a letter stating they would like those because they were previously adhered to. Cindy B. stated that the Environmental Impact Assessment was covered in the Wetlands application through the Functional Value Assessment and the assessment of the impact to get the original permit for the 82,000 square feet of impact, so that was passed in at the time of the original application. S. Penney clarified that that should have been checked off as provided; C. Balcius agreed, saying that it is inside the original application, and that still stands.

S. Penney raised the 7.5.1.1 Fiscal Impact Study, asking if it was previous. This is usually done at the request of the Board, and is not required of every application. S. Penney stated that she thinks they are just looking at a clerical error and perhaps a letter

expos facto that asks for a waiver on the Fiscal Impact 7.5.1.1, just to keep the paperwork straight.
Tom Hoopes asked for clarification making a new motion with the correction of the waiver for 7.5.1.1. The Environmental Impact Study, which is included in the previous overarching application, is just a clerical error on the form. T. Hoopes stated that they never asked for one on the Hannaford project itself; S. Penney referred back to C. Balcius statement that it was included in the wetlands, and stated that technically they need a piece of paper that asked for the waiver at some point to back this up because that is an application requirement, if they do indeed want a Fiscal Impact Study waiver from the checklist.

Thomas Hoopes amended his motion to accept the application with correction of the waiver 7.5.1.1. Motion was seconded by Timothy Roy and passed unanimously.

W. Curtin clarified that the original plan was for a 3,500 square foot restaurant; M. Sargent stated that he had mistakenly said 6,500 earlier.

T. Golde asked if all members of the Board had a copy of the plans that were submitted; the half-scales are better because they could flip through them and look better. He has a large scale if they needed to look at it. S. Penney said that she has the certified as-built from the original project. T. Golde went on to say that on the large foam-core board, they show the whole property; the Hannaford, its parking lot, the savings bank, and then the corner that is being talked about tonight, which is the pad out by Homestead Place.

T. Golde said he was going to go through the project narrative, hitting the highlights. He was going to pick a couple out and ask Cindy or Mark to speak on them when he was done. In going through that and looking at the plans, he thought they could get through it pretty quickly.

Referring to Sheet C-2, which is the site plan, the first number in the significant features of the project narrative they had submitted was entitled *Site and Emergency Access*. Access to this part of the site will be from the main driveway that connects Homestead Place with the main parking lot for the supermarket. They are proposing a 36 space parking lot for the new retail store. It's in a counter-clockwise, one-way pattern with 70-degree angle parking. They felt that in order to minimize impacts and to have a safe and efficient access and egress the one-way pattern, because you don't have to have as wide aisles, would have less impact and work quite well as they have laid it out.

Emergency access, obviously, there would be full access for fire completely around the building to any side of the building.

The second number on the narrative was *Off-site Improvements*. As part of the original approval in '05, they made significant off-site improvements, with the construction of the signal at the main-site access driveway, with the widening of Route 28 for the exclusive left turn lane, with the widening of Route 28 for the exclusive right turn lane, and improvements made along Range Road. In addition to each of those physical,

constructed improvements, there was a significant financial contribution to the NH Department of Transportation for improvements to be completed by them along the Alton traffic circle. All of the computation of those amounts and what was necessary was with the assumption that we would have a restaurant on this pad, which generates more cars than the retail they are talking about now. The impact and off-site improvements have already been completed to handle even more than what they are talking about. There are no additional improvements above and beyond what has already been constructed on Route 28 and Range Road and the financial contribution that has already been made.

T. Golde asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he moved on to *Parking Circulation*, which had already been touched on it *Site and Access Improvements*. 36 parking spaces will be provided; the town zoning requires 34, so there are a couple of extra. Delivery vehicles and whatnot would be on the west side of the building facing Range Road. The dumpster would be on that side, inside an enclosure.

Fire Protection and Domestic Water Supply is number four in the project narrative. Again, as part of the original construction there was a 6" water main that was constructed, looped through the site, and supplemented by the installation of a cistern and a fire pump to boost pressure. The new building would be tied into that system so that there would be both domestic supply and fire suppression supply.

Item #5 on the narrative is about *Wetland Impacts*, which he is going to defer to Cindy and ask her to follow up afterwards.

Item #6 is *Storm Water Management*. The storm water management or drainage plan for the site originally included managing the runoff from the parking lot, from the roof of the supermarket and the bank, sending it in different directions so they did not have concentrated flow in any one spot. The site was such they did not want to create a large detention basin with a chain link fence around it, and by breaking this up into many parts; they are able to manage the storm water so that it is not all concentrated in one spot. Since the construction, they have seen some pretty serious storms and they feel pretty confident that it works pretty well. As part of this pad, as Mark had mentioned earlier, they're dealing with some new rules from the State of NH Department of Environmental Services. In getting the state permit for any project, if you are more than 100,000 square feet of impact you need to apply for that permit. Although the retail store and the 36 parking spaces is nowhere near that number, they are part of a larger project, so they still have to go through that process. They obviously had a site-specific permit from the state that has since expired because the construction is complete and everything was signed off, so it is not there and they are going back to amend it because they are doing more construction on a site that had been previously approved.

There is a whole new set of rules; the new rules are more about pre-treatment of storm water runoff. Runoff that comes off a paved parking lot with cars parked on it; unfortunately, there is nothing they can do about it. There are pollutants in that runoff, just what comes off your car, and what comes out of the sky. There are pollutants that come off the roof of your house. It's what the particles pick up as they come down. We

now have to treat that. It's now more about what you're doing with the first ½ inch of water as opposed to the old rules which were more what you do during the 25 year storm, when it has been raining for hours and hours. We still have to do that too, and it's not a linear process. We try one thing, it seems to have worked, as far as the pre-treatment, then they go back and analyze how they did as far as the big storm, and that didn't work, so they try something different that may work for the bigger storm but it didn't work for the smaller, earlier storm. It's going to take a while before all the new rules are really figured out. They spend a lot of time talking to the people at DES about what to do when this happens, then this happens, and this happens, and they get a lot of answers like gee, we were hoping we wouldn't get that question. In this case they have laid out two bio-retention ponds. They will direct storm water to a depressed area and literally mulching it and landscaping it. They're kind of pretty, and that first ½ inch of water, rather than getting it into that big detention basin or the underground detention or whatnot where you've done nothing to pull those pollutants out, you're sending it through mulch and layers of soil and sand and whatnot and those remove the pollutants and then you have to deal with what happens if it keeps raining the second hour and the third hour and the fourth hour.

What they've done, looking at sheet C-2, which is the grading plan, you'll see that there is a bio-retention pond to the north side of the parking lot. That's going to deal with the water that's off of that lot. They're not putting it into catch basins and through pipes; they're literally getting it to a corner of the parking lot through a paved swale. Anytime they do the bio-retention ponds they always start with a sediment fore-bay so any sands that come off the parking lot will end up in there. It is much easier to maintain because over a number of years enough sand is going to build up that someone is going to have to go in there with a little Bobcat and scoop it out. They don't want that in the area that has the filter sand and the mulch so they have a berm that separates them. It overflows into the bio-retention pond and by going through the mulches and the sand filters those contaminants are taken out. Then a pipe is typically run underneath it that then gets it through a pipe and back into that system, but it's been "pre-treated". Then by determining what ends up where they make sure they've got everything sized properly all the way through the system. There is one in the back that handles that end of the parking lot and the one in the front that handles the front parking, which is a smaller amount of pavement surface, and it also handles what comes off the roof.

In the area in the front they do have water from upstream. In order to direct water coming from upstream through the wetlands and so forth, they are constructing a diversion ditch around the bio-retention pond, and then it would go into the culvert as it does now under Homestead Place, out under the traffic circle then out to the Merrymeeting River.

They've done all those designs and gone through all those worksheets and depending on how they make out tonight and if there are any requests for changes they will do whatever tweaking is needed and then they are fully ready to submit all those calculations and analyses to the state to amend that permit.

T. Roy asked if that coincided with the alteration of terrain, even though they did not have to have an alteration of terrain. T. Golde said that was correct; they wouldn't have to for this alone, but because it is part of the bigger project it is clearly more than 100,000 square feet and they definitely do.

T. Hoopes asked S. Penney if she know whether they have a copy of Peter Julia's report. She answered that no, she had just received it so obviously they hadn't. T. Hoopes said they should get copies because there are some wonderful questions there that they're going to want answers to and if they have a copy, it is going to be much easier.

T. Golde said that instead of getting off on other things, he would like to go through the rest and then while the others were talking he could read through it a little and if he could answer stuff immediately he would. He was sure there was a lot of stuff in there; Pete has asked them to do an analysis that they'll go through and answer his questions that might require something. After doing that if there are some tweaks they have to do from his report or something that one of the Board brings up tonight, they'll do the tweaking and then submit to the State rather than submitting something then having to change it because the town reviewer wanted them to do something different.

Item #7 is *Snow Storage*. Again, due to the importance of minimizing impact on the wetlands, they haven't created a lot of grass area which would require more impact. There's not a lot of areas for snow storage so, in those cases, and this is similar to Hannaford's, if you have a small storm of ½ inch or an inch, that snow will be plowed to the spaces that get used the least. Here in Alton there is definitely more activity in the summertime than in the wintertime. There is a double aisle on one side and a single aisle with parking on the other side, so the snow would probably be pushed to the far aisle during the smaller storms. After the third or fourth small storm it needs to be loaded and removed offsite, as is done for the supermarket.

Sewer service he is going to ask Mark to speak on because he was a lot more involved in the design of the onsite septic.

The last item in the narrative is about *Site Lighting and Underground Utilities*. What they have shown is a combination of cutoff luminaires that are dark-sky compliant on poles around the outside of the parking lot and wall packs, again dark-sky compliant cutoff mounted on the outside of the building to provide consistent illumination of the lot without having more than .1 foot/candles go off the property onto other lots. In addition to site lighting other utilities include electric, telephone, cable… they're all available right on the main drive going in, so they will come off the nearest pole with a drop underground into the building for those other utilities.

T. Golde directed attention to some of the other plans. Plan #C-4 is the landscaping plan. What they have shown here is to try to provide a nice amount of plantings along the east side of the building because that is what's most visible from Route 28 and the traffic circle, and even the main drive into the supermarket lot. Nice plantings along the planting strip along the south side of the building, some larger shade trees along the

periphery of the parking area. When first planted they may only be a two or three inch caliper and might shade the hood of one car, but in a few years they will provide significant shade for a number of cars in the lot.

Sheet C-5 is the lighting plan. It simply shows some lighting contours that show the evenness of the lighting across the lot and then there is sort of a grid pattern that shows what the foot/candle lighting levels are on the various places of the lot.

Sheet C-6 is a little bit larger scale of the bio-retention ponds and the grading of them is just a little bit easier to see on the larger scale. When they submit to the State, there is certain information they're looking for – what is the 50 year storm elevation in those ponds? – what is the 25 year storm elevation in those ponds? With the cross sections off to the right hand side, they've provided all that information as well as all of the specification information of the filter material that is used to construct the bio-retention ponds. Then there is a detail sheet which is all the standard pre-cast catch basins and so forth, as well as erosion notes and seeding requirements.

Unless there were questions from the Board on any of those plans or any of those items, T. Golde was ready to ask Cindy to talk about the wetlands and Mark to talk about the onsite sewer.

C. Balcius stated that the original permit for the Hannaford site plan was issued on December 21, 2004, and the total impact at that time was 82,235 square feet. As part of the project mitigation the project preserved a 58.8 acre parcel which the Town of Alton Conservation Commission monitors that easement. That was part of the mitigation plan at that point, and out of the impacts of the 82,235 square feet 3,617 square feet were for the proposed restaurant at that time. Since that time, as Tim and Mark have discussed, they have had problems finding a tenant to fill that spot. They have gone to the DES Wetlands Bureau several times because of the small size of that area to try to expand on the impact so they could utilize that site because it is in the commercial zone of Alton, which is relatively limited. As part of the process with the Wetlands Bureau, discussion revolved around the Alteration of Terrain permit, which Tim expanded upon, and the use of the greener technologies such as the bio-retention basins in the process. Coupled with that, and minimizing our impact by using the retaining walls you see that are being proposed on the plan they have been able to limit their expansion on the impact to 4,020 square feet. The DES Wetlands Bureau does not categorize that as a significant impact because it is well under 20%; it's roughly 4.8% so it is considered a minimal expansion of that. As part of that they also have mitigation to still deal with, but it's only a 4,020 square foot impact. The DES Wetlands Bureau has allude to they feel that that should fall into an in lieu fee type program because of the smallness of the impact they're not going to be able to develop any preservation or creation at that size level because you're talking 4,000 square feet. Doing a rough calculation, the in lieu fee option at 4,000 square feet ends up being around $800, so you can see, to build a wetland or buy land for around $800, you're not really going to come up with it, and that's why the in lieu fee program was created.

The wetland they are proposing to impact is relatively degraded down in that section of the lot, and it has been for a long time. It's a scrub/shrub area that has been impacted in the past, so they are going to try to focus their impact in that area while maintaining the higher function in values as they did before without any impacts.

C. Balcius invited questions. S. Penney asked, for her own edification and for the institutional memory, where the wetlands that were impacted before in the original project that had the restoration, how adjacent are they – where are they.

C. Balcius answered that during the original application they also did a little bit of restoration, because there was a yellow house located on that lot, and there was a driveway that came off Range Road. That driveway was located (indicated on map) and as part of it they pulled out the driveway, brought it down to a wetland soils grade and revegitated it. Their proposed impact is down from that, so that should be relatively unscathed. S. Penney said she has a copy of the final restoration report, and it looks like that is all kosher now. C. Balcius agreed; everything was all set.

T. Hoopes stated that there are a couple of instances that Peter Julia mentions the calculations for the runoff from some of the wetlands and the bio-ponds, so it's something they simply need to look at. It raised questions for him, but he is not an engineer.

T. Golde commented that when you get into doing the modeling, there is never ever a case where two people will end up modeling a watershed the same way. They've worked a lot with Pete, and he knows him very well and knows how he likes to do it. Sometimes they agree with him and sometimes they don't. T. Hoopes said he raises good questions. T. Golde agreed and said they would get with him and say "let's try this…" and he might say "that won't work because… why don't you try that?" Then we'll say "okay." But we will get with him. T. Hoopes said he just wanted to point out that he (P. Julia) had raised specific points, and rather than try to reiterate his points…

T. Golde agreed stating that they would get with him and go through each one and make sure they are getting close to a model they are both comfortable with.

M. Sargent said that, to finish up, he would speak about the septic system. They have designed and approved a leech field for the restaurant pad. The leech field is located north of the Hannaford site (indicated location on a map). The system was originally designed and has been approved for 2,350 gallons per day based on the seating capacity of the restaurant. A 10,000 square foot stand-alone retail building requires a system for 500 gallons per day. This system is still approved, so they're going to hold off resubmitting something until they have a tenant in place so they can find out if 500 gallons per day meets their requirements or if they want something a little bit larger. The force main that runs from the site is in place; it was constructed at the time but the field was not constructed, nor were any of the pump components.

S. Penney asked if there was any idea at this point of a number of employees; she realizes it is still kind of iffy, but are they talking about 2 or 5 or major jumping increments? M. Sargent answered that he does not think there is going to be a large number of employees; probably in the 5 range. Mr. Bahre does not have a tenant in place at this time, and his feeling is that if he has a nod from the town saying that a 10,000 square foot building can go in here… Conversations he has with potential tenants going in there say that 10,000 square feet is the minimum building they are looking for that he feels they could get somebody in there.

What they did on a previous approval is that they presented the restaurant pad without a tenant and they had an approval with the provision that at such time as they do have a tenant they would come back before the board with some architectural renderings to show what the building is going to look like and discuss who the tenant is and such. S. Penney stated that brought up a salient point that they would get to this evening which is the absence of specific architectural renderings which brings up a lot of questions.

T. Hoopes said that the first question Bob Bahre asked when he came before them with the Hannaford request was "What do you want to see?" The response that everyone had was that they did not want to see a flat roof. They needed to see something that has some kind of New England architecture. M. Sargent answered that they would maintain that with something that is of the motif of the Hannaford store; he doesn't want anything to clash. He owns that property, and he wants to attract people to it.

S. Penney said that, on behalf of the fire captain, she has some fire access and safety questions. She addressed the narrative, specifically the third sentence that says "the proposed building can be reached on all sides by emergency vehicles." She can show a copy of the document she has that has the regular department head commentary on the project by Assistant Chief Ed Concentino – "the plan does not reference any fire lane or fire access design. There is no location of FDC for sprinkler support. There is no location of entrances to proposed store and location of loading dock not shown. Location of dumpster needs further detail and can be no closer than 10 feet to any construction combustible or sources. He added a caveat somewhat in contrast to their take, which said that the travel pathway around the building may be difficult for fire apparatus to maneuver, especially if vehicles parking block or restrict the travel way. Snow banks in winter may also further restrict emergency vehicle access.

T. Golde answered that it had been designed for the design vehicle, but they are trying to strike a balance between minimizing impact and providing easy access, not just for emergency but for patrons, and without a defined architectural design they don't know where every single doorway is. Obviously they assume there is one on the front, on the back and on the end where they have the dumpster, but they are in that chicken and egg where it's hard to solidify the tenant without some kind of nod. S. Penney stated that he (Assistant Chief Concentino) just had these specific concerns and she wanted to make sure they were aware of them.

W. Curtin pointed out that a lot of that would be echoed with Farmhouse's part. Whatever tenant they got in there might want something totally different than a square building. T. Golde said that was right, but they were going to have to live within the footprint that they were taking not only through the town process but also through the state process. He went on to say that the tenants are reluctant to go down that road without something more concrete than "Don't worry; we'll get it approved."

There was discussion about the proposed size – question was asked if this was an up 10,000 square foot building. The answer was that 10,000 square feet is a small store for any of the possible tenants Bob has talked to. S. Williams pointed out that the Hannaford is the smallest store they have ever built; it is doing very well and they are happy they built it, but it is under all of their other models. T. Hoopes pointed out that they are talking about what was proposed as a 3,500 square foot and they're now talking about potentially 10,000 square feet and it's like putting 10 pounds in a 5 pound bag. If you look at the pavement, the roofing, and everything else, the amount of coverage on the lot is really substantial. At what point do they reach a question about the amount of space at the back end near where they are having to impact the wetlands already maybe part of that building is going to have to move away to create more space if it's needed for more space for apparatus or vehicles that travel there in the winter time. They're going to have to consider that. They (the Board) definitely weren't thinking of something this size when it was originally proposed, so it's a whole… He was surprised when he saw that there was not much space around there.

T. Golde said that what might be a little deceiving is that they have set up the plan sheets to show that one corner of an almost 13 acre site. As they compute coverages, when they look at the whole 12.75 acres, and as they're designing it they are very focused and myopic on this one little corner. As you look at the one little corner it seems like they're really trying to squeeze it on there, but remember, it's really a pretty large piece of land in total. He was looking to see if he had computed on the zoning summary what the overall coverage was; they obviously have that information, and can provide it. T. Hoopes said that he just does not see a lot of space. M. Sargent said he thought that was true with the original proposal as well; they had a smaller building, but they had more parking when they were anticipating a restaurant. T. Hoopes said that was right, but from their point of view they are looking at what is saleable because a certain size for a commercial point of view is needed. From the other point of view of looking at it from a viable function from the town's point of view, if it's too big on a small site, then it creates concern. C. Balcius said she thought that was part of the reason why they had the 4,000 square foot wetland impact addition as well; to compensate for some of that.

At the request of Board members, T. Golde referenced the plan showing everything on that piece of land. The whole lot is highlighted in yellow and there is a box around the little corner where all the attention is focused with this amendment. He pointed out Route 28 and the signal for the main site drive – the upper area remained wooded, the area in front of the main site drive remained wooded, the supermarket got tucked back in the corner with the site access coming in and the pad that had the ranch house, and it was always the intent that it would be sort of an out parcel that would be developed. This is

just a leg sticking down. In a future submission, they could include a sheet like this (indicating larger map) that shows the whole property. The focus and all their analysis of the pretreatment runoffs was all very much myopically on that one little corner of the parcel because nothing was being proposed other than the septic system up on the other side of the supermarket, which will probably be ½ or ¼ of the size of what was originally shown.

T. Hoopes has one suggestion for the traffic flow – make the arrows so big and anticipate idiots going the wrong way. S. Penney expanded on that, saying she has some real concerns. This is a good project, but with the bumper car mentality that is going on already between McDonald's and Hannaford, which seem fairly well controlled. She hopes, even though it is a short stretch there, any traffic calming with clearly delineated directional signage; there is a tipping point where that becomes clutter.

T. Hoopes said that instead of a T-joint, at the Shaw's in Concord you can only go one way because it really directs you coming up the Heights so you can't turn from the other side. He anticipates a lot of fender benders because of stupidity; S. Penney agreed. T. Golde said that they constantly fight the battle between insufficient signage where people don't know what to do and sign clutter, where they're just confused. T. Hoopes said that the fire lane is just privileged parking right now. S. Penney said that she could not stress this enough, because she thinks people just are not going to pay attention. She has watched people on the Homestead Place road come to a stop and not know where the road is. T. Hoopes said he has seen people try to go out across the grass onto 28. S. Penney said that is a concern to her; she asked what the traffic projection had been for the restaurant. T. Golde said he wasn't sure, but could provide one. S. Penney wants to know what this will generate. T. Golde said it would be significantly less than the restaurant because at a restaurant you have patrons coming and going a lot more. S. Penney agreed that at a certain time of day… T. Golde said that the restaurant they had been thinking about was like a chain restaurant, so it would generate traffic throughout the day. W. Curtin said they could not answer that question, as they didn't know what was going in there. T. Golde answered that the only projection he could give would be for your small, under 100,000 square foot retail by square footage. W. Curtin said you could probably put a 10,000 square foot Hannaford in there and still be busy. S. Penney stated that a consideration near and dear to her heart is that they very clearly guide the traffic through there because that's the connector to these two somewhat chaotic areas.

T. Golde said it's not so much the Hannaford site – the main entrance is an M1A1 lane going in, left turn and right turn lane going out. S Penney said it is the creative drivers she is concerned about, going the back way with the delivery trucks. T. Hoopes said if they are coming from Hannaford, toward the McDonald's, they're going to want to go in the first entrance they come to and that's what they have to look at to try to find some sort of a traffic calming thing to stop that, rather than just a "one way" or "turn around idiot" you need something, because if they can go the wrong way they will.

S. Penney commented on the ADA sidewalk which will be great and will help delineate some and keep people like her from getting hit from behind.

S. Williams voiced a concern about all the parking right up next to the building, if a fire department ladder truck needed to go in and ladder that building. Cars would be there and they would not move while the emergency was active. They would be better than 20 feet away from the building, by the time they had their outriggers there they would be – the parking spaces are about 20 feet long? T. Golde said they are 19' but on an angle, so probably 18' plus the 5' walk. S. Williams added the 5' offset for the drip edge on that side of the building, so on the south side they are 40' away from the building with the outriggers on the ladder truck, by the time they get the ladder up, they have a 75' ladder and they are going to have a hard time making that roof. Is there any way to get a fire lane along that building, at least on one of the sides so they can get onto the building, close up to it. T. Golde said they would take a look. S. Williams pointed out that Hannaford has a fire lane right there. Access around that building, in general, except for he south side parking lot where the cistern is and things like that, there is parking there so they can't make access there, but on the front, the rear, and on the other side, they can gain access to that building. This one the two gable ends would be the only chance they would have of getting on that building.

T. Hoopes stated that he thinks it is on the back side where they are probably going to have their loading, and almost everything today comes in a big box trailer, so if you've got a big box trailer parked back there and there is other traffic trying to get around it there is going to be some sort of restriction. He doesn't know if they have computed a box trailer and another box trailer coming around? T. Golde restated that they had laid it out with the design vehicles to do that. Is there a possibility that one of those parking aisles that is up against either the north side or the south side of the building could be flipped and be opposite so you had access directly against the side of the building. S. Williams said the south side would be the logical choice because that's all one road. T. Golde went on that the patron would have to walk across, they would rather be close to the sidewalk. S. Williams said that is really a concern, and he doesn't think it is a monumental thing to overcome.

T. Roy asked if the swing radii allowed for a tractor trailer to negotiate through this site. T. Golde said it did. T. Hoopes pointed out that if they put the flow closer to the building it is going to change the radius. T. Golde said the swing works now because they are coming from that angle that is further away from the building, so what he might come back with is that he tried this and tried that, and here is what he ran into, but he will give it a whirl.

W. Curtin opened the floor to public input pertaining to this case.

Ruben Wentworth came to the table to speak. He commented that he felt that T. Hoopes' use of the word "idiot" was a poor choice of words for a public official.

He went on to address the chairman, stating that he was speaking for himself, Ruben Wentworth, not for the Alton Business Association or anybody else. As a business person who has been kind of hit by planning board members in the past and the Board of Selectmen, especially on one piece of property on Main Street, it was stated to him once

that he didn't do something with a piece of business for two years and there was an RSA quoted that after two years this didn't exist anymore and he had to go through full site review plan. As a grandfathered business that doesn't pertain to that, but it was his understanding that after a plan had been approved and finalized, after two years if something did not happen on that project the Planning Board could require a full site review plan. He might be mistaken; he is not a planner, but he is just asking because this was what was thrown at him by the town council. If that's the case, 3,500 to 10,000 square feet is a significant change in the plan, he feels. He is also a businessman; he is not against change, but a 50 foot by 200 foot building, which is 10,000 square feet, that's a big building for that lot, he feels, especially for someone who plowed next door and saw Hannaford stack all their snow down in that lot. He understands the gentlemen talking about removing the snow. It is getting harder to remove snow offsite and stack it because of the runoffs and the salts and everything. Less impact to the septic is great, cutting it back down, but for the traffic count, you could expect 200 more cars in that roadway a day. An average store in Alton increases about 200 – 300 transactions in a local store. He doesn't know what their ideas are that they have – he is sure they have some and they are just not releasing them. He knows that Hannaford, when they first opened far exceeded their traffic counts, and they still are and they could far exceed their traffic counts now. In his store alone there are well over 300 transactions this time of year; that's 300 cars that pull in and out of his parking lot in a day, and he's on Route 11; they all know it's busy, and it's an old store so, thank God, he's grandfathered. But if he had to do it all over again, he would be sitting where they are, and he knows you guys (the board) would be making him do a full site review plan. So, the only thing he would ask, and he doesn't know how they would prove anything, or amend anything with what he just brought up, but another 200 cars on that little road right there is quite an impact.

W. Curtin asked if there was any other public input. Hearing none, he closed public input.

T. Hoopes asked if they could specifically ask Attorney Sessler about what Mr. Wentworth had asked. T. Golde pointed out that on the original Notice of Decision, October 25, 2004, on line 16, "proposed restaurant will require an amended site plan review." T. Hoopes said that the point he thinks Ruben was making was that if it hasn't been used in two years, does the site cease to exist and you start from ground one with a site plan review. In this particular case, he saw it simply as it was specified in the beginning as a potential site and we provided space for an amended site plan review. That's what this meeting is all about; this is an amended site plan and it would have to come back again when there is a specific applicant. S. Penney stated that in her opinion it would anyway because they need more details. If that's an overall site, which it is, they are definitely vested on a very large portion of their site.

W. Curtin said that if you have a 5 or 7 lot sub-division and you don't do anything with it after a certain period of time, you have to start from scratch again, which is almost on the same idea as this. If there was an extension granted prior… C. Balcius pointed out that it wasn't under the normal extension route, it was known that something was going to happen – the wetland impact has already happened over there, there is grading that has

already been done, it was finding a tenant, which she thinks is a little different than if you're not building a subdivision and a road. In this case, the project was substantially vested, it was known it was there, but with the economy and the size a tenant just wasn't found so now we're at the point where we are trying to fit the tenant, which means an expansion, which is why they put specifically in the approval to come in for an amended site plan once we had a tenant. W. Curtin said that was specifically for a restaurant. C. Balcius said that was right, which is why they are coming in to amend it, because the restaurant idea wasn't working.

T. Hoopes thinks some of the questions that have been raised were dealing with unanswerable questions at the moment because the tenant is an unknown quantity. We don't know what kind of traffic flow we're going to get. S. Williams pointed out that retail stores are not created equal; they all have different characters and features to them. T. Golde said there are similarities retail to retail, but different types of retail have a little different idiosyncrasies of when things peak, what the store hours are, and so forth.

W. Curtin said he wants to know what is going in there before he will give anything. T. Hoopes said the other question becomes the one of first lot coverage and it is not just that. As Tim pointed out, the whole property has to be considered, but the way in which the structure fits adjacent to the back wetland and the flow along there, it does become a constriction factor. That is of slight concern to him; he realizes that they need a certain size, but can you fit it into the area? That's the question. C. Balcius said that, in answer to Tom's question, that was the purpose of the wetland impact. In a town where you have relatively small commercial zoning you're relegated to the areas where it is zoned commercial and it fits, and if you go downtown and you go to the circle, that's what you're driving into. T. Hoopes said he understands that, but still the space between where the flow actually is and if the building was five foot different that makes a huge difference in terms of what fits behind the building, in regards to traffic flow or whatever else. C. Balcius said that from a hydrological standpoint, that's what Tim has been analyzing for the alteration of terrain with the newer stringent rules, to make things work. T. Hoopes said that was right, but the expansion, almost tripling in size from what was anticipated. That is a severe impact as far as he is concerned. It's going to look like a big building with just a little spot to get around it. It's going to seem… you know you can't go into the drainage area because…

W. Curtin asked about flip-flopping the building instead of going 80 X 125 with the 80 on the front, go 125 on the front? T. Hoopes said he is sure they have thought about everything, but then they lose their parking.

M. Sargent said they have tried many different configurations for this building, and this is the one that did work. He went on to address the chairman, saying that he is a bit confused. He thought they were presenting a full site plan; they are presenting all the plans that are required by the town, and he wants to know if he is missing something. T. Hoopes said that on the architectural side they have zero idea. M. Sargent said that the comments that were made that they were not quite following the site plan review

regulations. T. Hoopes said that, in part, what they are looking at is if, depending on what kind of business it is, the number of supply vehicles that are going to be coming in. M. Sargent said he understands that, but the comment was made that they are not going for full site plan review. T. Hoopes said this is an amended site plan. M. Sargent asked if that was much different than a full site plan review. They're presenting all those plans, they know they need to do architectural renderings, the board has asked for some additional information, so they will bring that back to them. What other information would they be required to provide if this was a full-blown site plan review? S. Penney answered traffic. M. Sargent said they have done a traffic study and they can have it updated. He stated that they are providing all the essential information of a full site plan review. T. Hoopes said they would review after M. Sargent and Peter Julia got together on the concepts of what he (P. Julia) is talking about it raises some questions as to the size of what can be done in the back there. To him, any kind of a site plan is looking at how the building fits on the property. Obviously, it's going from a restaurant to something retail, and he doesn't know what something retail is.

T. Roy asked if this would be a single tenant or a store with a sub shop or something like that. M. Sargent answered that it would be a single tenant. S. Williams said this goes beyond the architectural part of it; they should show a loading dock area because it is important for the traffic flow of how that loading dock will be addressed. Also, a dumpster, because there is not a lot of room to be jockeying equipment around. T. Golde said that the way it was laid out, it did not include a dumpster (corrected himself to say loading dock). The people Mr. Bahre is talking to do not have a loading dock at their other locations. They do have a dumpster and the dumpster was shown. S. Williams said it was shown on one of the details but not on the map. T. Golde said if you look on C-3, it shows a proposed dumpster and it shows the gates of the enclosure. S. Williams asked if that was 10' away from the building; T. Golde answered that it is not; it is adjacent to the building. The requirement that it be 10' away will have to be addressed in a revision. S. Williams said he would be happy to call the assistant chief to go over it with him.

S. Williams said he did not want to assume anything, but could he imagine that a tractor trailer would not be entering this site? He knows there are other businesses around and they have a tractor trailer come in and they open a side door and they put the little roller wheels in there and they slide everything out. That works, but how is that going to block the traffic when that happens? T. Golde said they have laid out the geometry to allow what S. Williams had just described, whether it's the FedEx truck or the Penn Transport truck that stops – out goes the roller and whatnot, to allow the passenger car to go around it. The have not laid out the geometry to allow the one Penn tractor trailer to have the rollers out and have another one get around them. S. Williams said that is not what he is concerned about; he just doesn't know if you can get general traffic by it. This roadway in this area is not quite 20' wide of asphalt on the gable end corners on the east end of the building, and if the tractor trailer is parked across the gable end of that building, then the traffic that is now on the front of the building, with the traffic flow, might not be able to get by that tractor trailer. T. Golde said they have a program that shows the travelling paths; he can do some plots that show here's when the FedEx truck is unloading, and Scott wants to drive around in his pickup truck. S. Williams said he does not see a

problem with the FedEx and the UPS trucks. T. Golde went on to say here is the pattern with a 55' trailer. S. Williams said that is what he sees as a possible problem. T. Golde said he could do some plots to show how they have laid that out and even if they look at some different options of trying to get something for fire access right next to that south side.

T. Hoopes restated the question of what do they really need for a site plan review; what requirements do they have to meet. S. Penney said they need more information. If this were in context with the other one, it would be subject to landscaping and architectural; she knows they have made some inroads to lighting and the more aesthetic stuff. Personally, as a planner, she would like to see more delineation of the whole traffic flow issue because as it connects to the two other entities on either side of it, she thinks they need to be very careful because it is very pivotal there. S. Williams said that the traffic flow is probably the biggest concern; S. Penney agrees. T. Golde said that is a valid concern, and they would go through every analysis to make sure everyone is comfortable. He thinks that separate and aside from whether this is somehow something less than a full site plan review. He thinks the only things they have not provided that they might ask for under the regulations of a full site plan review are the traffic study. Since they are not talking about generating more than what was in the original traffic study, they didn't go ahead and assume that that would be wanted. If they do want that, it can be provided. The other thing is the architecturals, which as they said, there is sort of a quandary where they don't know exactly who the tenant is, and they're not willing to commit until they are sure this is going to work, and what not. S. Penney said she knows it is difficult, and yet they want to proceed. T Golde said they would talk to Mr. Bahre to see how he wants to proceed with that part of it.

T. Hoopes said they could not give a final approval until there was a known entity; S. Penney said she didn't think so. She suggested that the parties speak with Pete Julia on his concerns and hoped that everyone had had a chance to look through that. M. Golde said he had read through Pete's comments, and they go through that all the time. They will get with him. S. Penney said that in that case, usually the applicant comes back a second time, and usually they have some documentation from Peter saying that these have been resolved; they get the information. That would be for starters – then another submission of some additional information, certainly regarding traffic patterns, if not a traffic study on a grand scale, and architectural renderings would be great, but that may be the chicken and egg thing. T. Hoopes said that the route to P. Julia would be through the planning office. S. Penney said that was right; they could do it more officially by giving them the paperwork. M. Golde said it is the easiest thing and they document it very well; they talk to Pete about what the C factor is going to be for the ditch on the right side of Range Road; they agree on that, then they go on to the next one. They document by e-mail. S. Penney said that he (T. Hoopes) was talking about protocol; she would call Pete, so that would keep it clean. T. Hoopes made the point that Sharon could not be left out of any information. T. Golde said they wanted to document that he was okay with that .5, so that's why they did that. He said there were a number of times, if they didn't do that, where they would come back and say that they didn't say /5 was okay.

S. Penney suggested to the Board that she would contact Peter; she would also send them the electronic version of that, then when Peter got back to her, she would give dispensation for them to talk, and they would all keep each other in the loop with information. She said that the rest would be at the Board's discretion, but they knew her opinion on additional information.

T. Golde said that as far as the parking goes, Steve Parnault had done the traffic study in '05; to ask him to prepare a memorandum commenting on what the difference is of this versus what the numbers were included in the original study, and how that affects things. S. Williams asked if he could also discuss that they are going to be making some alterations to the circle, and include that into it. S. Penney asked that it be in context with what is going on at Hannaford's already. T. Hoopes said that he thinks the traffic flow on site is more important than the additional traffic coming on. T. Golde said they have heard some comments about them generating a lot more traffic than they had originally projected. S. Williams said you can't get a parking space there; it's brutal. T. Golde said that was good for them as far as their cash register receipts, and that they could check by putting the tubes down on the road and get some data. S. Williams said they were using this site as employee parking. S. Penney said it is the internal circulation she is concerned about. T. Golde said he has spent a fair amount of time just parking and watching it. Some of this stuff – he knows they have to be careful about what terms they use, but you can't find a sign or geometry that will prevent what some people will do.

T. Hoopes said that when they change the circle they are going to be putting up a lot of new signage to the fact that the people in the circle now have the right of way. T. Golde said that is the way it is supposed to be. T. Hoopes answered that they have been afraid to change it, to which T. Golde replied that this is the only one in the country that is this way.

S. Williams asked if they should summarize what they should really go talk about. S. Penney said she thought they were looking at a continuation. W. Curtin said they were going to have to get a hold of Attorney Sessler, too because there were some questions. S. Williams said that some of these things, they can work on in the meantime – see if they could get a fire lane against the building and check for tractor trailers and still drive by traffic and whatever else has been mentioned. It is a busy site there. T. Golde said he didn't think Mr. Bahre would have built it if it wasn't going to be; they are doing a good business. S. Williams said everything is great there, and it is an asset to the community, and he is certainly in favor of business. T. Hoopes said that the Hannaford engineer who was in charge of sites around, the kind of cutting they did at the Hannaford site, I saw him again, and he has done that same type of selective cutting at other sites. T. Golde said they did get the visibility without cutting. You can see it; you don't drive up 28 and not know there is a Hannaford there. T. Hoopes said there are a couple of places where you can see it, but there are a lot of places where you don't see it at all. You don't need to; otherwise you would have to take down that whole wetland, and that would be really ugly.

W. Curtin asked for a motion for a continuation to next month's meeting, asking the presenters if that would work for them. T. Golde asked when the next month's meeting was – it is on August 18th. S. Penney pointed out that because this could be a continued application, their deadline for submission of additional materials would be August 4th; otherwise if it were a new application, it would be Friday. August 4th is the date to make the August meeting. T. Hoopes asked if that is physically possible. M. Sargent said that if they want to do some updating of the traffic study, that wouldn't be possible. S. Williams said they didn't want to push them out any further, but it was their call if they wanted to go to September. S. Penney said that the next meeting was September 15th with a September 1st submission deadline.

M. Sargent said they would go for the 18th and if they couldn't then they would let them know. The critical thing is if they want some additional traffic information on the site then it would be up to when they could get their traffic engineer up there to do it.

S. Williams made a motion to continue Case P09-15, Bahre Alton Properties, LLC, Map 26 Lot 10-1 to August 18th. Tim Roy seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

S. Penney asked that notification be made to the abutters, so they would be aware.

At 8:20 p.m. David Collier rejoined the Board.

At 8:20, Cynthia Balcius joined the Board.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 16, 2009

On page 3 of 10, where it says "it tends to be a very quiet setting between 11 and 7 p.m.", that should be 11 p.m. to 7 a.m..

Balcius spelled wrong on Page 6

S. Williams made a motion to accept the minutes of June 16, 2009 as amended. T. Hoopes seconded the motion which passed with one abstention (C. Balcius).

February 17, 2009 (Work Session)

W. Curtin made a motion to accept the minutes of February 17, 2009 for the work session of the wind energy at 6:00 p.m. as presented. D. Collier seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

W. Curtin would like to discuss changing the meetings from 7:00 to 6:00 because they could either get out earlier or they could get more done. Most members had no issues with getting there at 6:00, but C. Balcius felt that the reason the meetings had been set at 7:00 was so people could get there; she hasn't ever been to one earlier unless it is a special. W. Curtin said they could get other business done before the hearings. C. Balcius suggested 6:30; it's hard for her in the summertime because it doesn't get dark until 8:00. S. Penney said she would hate to lose any of their members because between recusals and such, it is kind of thin. C. Balcius said she could get to 6:30 more easily in summer; winter is a different story. W. Curtin said that if applicants had a problem with the times, they could find out who didn't have a problem with it and schedule them that way. The selectmen start their meetings at 6:00. C. Balcius said they would have to advertise in the paper so abutters know. S. Penney agreed; there is a precedent for 7:00.

Motion by W. Curtin to start the meetings at 6:00 p.m., seconded by T. Roy, passed with one dissenting vote (C. Balcius).

W. Curtin said this would be on a trial basis, with the next meeting starting at 6:00. Notify the paper and put up a notice that will catch the eye on the boards downstairs and at the post office. Also was suggested that the time for the meeting be put in bold letters on the agenda. The Bahre continuance has already been set for 7:00, so this will not start until September. Further discussion moved the August meeting to 6:00; they will get the other business out of the way.

S. Ames brought up that the Alton Bay Christian Conference Center is looking for an 18 month extension for their subdivision because of the current economic issues. W. Curtin said he thought they would do a 6 month extension and if they want to come back for more at the end of that, they can do so. T. Hoopes asked if they shouldn't say that under advice of attorney they only grant 6 months at a time. S. Ames pointed out that they got their original approval in March of 2007. The project has changed hands from Prospect Mountain Builders. ABCCC now owns all the engineering.

T. Hoopes made a motion that they grant a 6 month extension for Alton Bay Christian Conference Center, under the advice of counsel.

S. Ames asked if it made a difference that they came in for site plan approval in 2009. There was discussion about what constituted vesting; S. Ames thought it might be covered by doing the site plan, but it is roads and construction. T. Hoopes asked if they could add that to their questions for Attorney Sessler. S. Penney stated that this has gotten so out of hand that it is very confusing.

T. Roy made a motion to continue the question from the Alton Bay Christian Conference Center until the August 18, 2009 meeting. Seconded by D. Collier and passed unanimously.

S. Williams asked about the outside storage at Andrews Marine, which he had been under the impression when they approved, he had said there would be absolutely no outside storage of anything. He is now saying that is not in there, and S. Williams wants to know how that happened. S. Penney said that was the last item, that there would be nothing outside for sale, at the meeting that ran until 11:25 p.m. after they spent hours and hours on the elderly housing project, and several projects that were horribly contentious. It never got in the Notice of Decision per se. They had cut him some slack while he was under construction, now that time is long over. There was discussion of checking the tapes and video to see what was said. None of the documentation says that. There was discussion of being very specific in stating what needs to be done. There was a conversation that was not picked up in the minutes per se; it was not in the narrative, and it was not in the Notice of Decision. There was also discussion of the Right to Know Law and that tapes are supposed to be destroyed once the minutes are approved.

S. Penney did say that next year he would not be using the individual boat trailers, which is a large part of the present outside storage. She also said that he needed a certified foundation print; he has submitted an as built, but they are not the same thing. There was further discussion of what an as-built actually means, and how that is different from a certified foundation print. Getting back to the outside storage, it was inferred in the notes and mentioned in the plan, but it was not in the Notice of Decision and it was not explicit in the minutes. The note on the plan says no outside boat storage; it does not address trailers or other equipment.

C. Balcius said that some places she has dealt with give conditional approvals then put together the conditions of approval for the next meeting. The applicant would then have a chance to review them before the meeting; discussion continued about this being a good idea for the future.

W. Curtin introduced discussion concerning the Finnegan property; C. Balcius recused herself. W. Curtin said the original decision was in March, 2008 and he is looking for a year extension. S. Ames said they had come in asking if they would be allowed to sell the three lots that have frontage on the main road; that was okay, and they have been sold. S Ames asked if they had to come in and ask for an extension, or whether the sale of the three lots constituted vesting, or should they just go ahead and get the extension. T. Hoopes said those three are not vesting because they are being sold because they have frontage on the main road, so there is no investment for making that sale. S. Williams said they had actually taken away from the subdivision by selling those lots. S. Ames asked who made the decision that putting in the road was the only source of vesting; it came from workshops.

T. Hoopes made a motion to grant a 6 month extension for the Finnegan property; motion was seconded by S. Williams and passed by unanimous vote of all non-recused members.

C. Balcius is back in.

S. Ames brought up the issue of mailing fees for certified mail. Right now they charge $5 per certified piece. W. Curtin asked if they could establish a scale. S. Ames is proposing an increase to $6; they will figure out a sliding scale later.

T. Hoopes made a motion to increase the notification fee to $6.00. Motion was seconded by T. Roy and passed unanimously.

Mylars are now charged at $5 postage; that has also increased. This is random because of the number of pages. $8 was proposed.

W. Curtin made a motion to raise the mailing fee on mylars to $8. S. Williams seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

S. Ames asked if they could add a caveat to increase if there are more than 4 or 5 mylars. S. Williams asked if they could live with it for a month, then come up with a formula to increase the postage according to the cost of the postage or the cost of tubes or whatever.

T. Hoopes said he has a pile of tubes, so they can get tubes from him.

S. Ames brought up a letter she has from Rick Lundy of Ridgewood Estates asking for relief from the installation of a water cistern as stated and required on an approved plan.

C. Balcius recused herself.

There was discussion of the fact that some of the lots have already been sold or transferred with the understanding of a cistern being in place. This would be an 11,000 gallon cistern. The people who have already purchased could have done so with the understanding of the cistern. There was more discussion concerning the cistern being made a condition based on the erroneous thought that the Board of Selectmen had passed a cistern requirement, which they had not. T. Hoopes recalled a subdivision where they had put a cease and desist on the site and pulled their subdivision plans until they built their cistern, because they had sold lots.

S. Ames suggested that they deny the request; if Mr. Lundy would like to appeal he could do that. However, people who already bought parcels would have to sign the appeal request to the ZBA. There was further discussion of how to restrict the sale until some of these things are done; it is not in the regulations. In order for the town to protect itself, these things would have to be put in the regulations. No lots to be transferred without final approval and monumentation. There was more discussion of the road being put in and the intention to phase. S. Penney said they get a question that is theoretical, they give an answer that is theoretical with a caveat that they need some documentation, and then they find out that the whole thing has been circumvented. That particular project is a full time babysitting job, and the paperwork is not up to snuff.

T. Hoopes made a motion that they send a letter denying relief because lots have been sold or titles have been transferred with the understanding that there would be

a cistern. T. Roy seconded and the motion passed by unanimous vote of all non-recused members.

C. Balcius is back in.

S. Ames brought out two invoices from Farmhouse that need approval. There was discussion concerning CMA and the fact that they had done a Reduction of Funds. S. Williams said this is why they need certificates of insurance from everybody.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

S. Williams made a motion to adjourn, seconded by W. Curtin and passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Tetreau
Acting Recorder, Public Session