

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES of February 1, 2017**  
**APPROVED**  
**Public Hearing**

Present: Sean James, Chair; Al Hall, Vice Chair; Tom Giffen; Ken Kustra; Mike Santa; Judi Lindsey; Rudy Cartier, Alt; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dave Murray, Building Inspector

Absent: S. Komisarek; Joyce Bedard, Alt; Carleton Robie, Alt

Chair Sean James called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes January 25<sup>th</sup>:

T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the minutes of January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017 as presented. A. Hall **seconded**. S. James; K. Kustra; and M. Santa **were in favor**. J. Lindsey **abstained**. **Motion passed (5-0-1)**.

Residents present: Becky Sarra

**Application Review for 17-001 Minor Subdivision Application for March 1<sup>st</sup> Planning Board Meeting:** Applicant: Robert L. Johnston Trust, 24 Currier Road, Candia, NH 03034; Owner: same; Property location: 24 Currier Road, Candia NH 03034; Map 402 Lots 78, 79, 80. Intent: To create 3 new lots (consolidate 4 deeds) and subdivide into 7 lots.

Present: Jim Franklin, surveyor representing the applicant Robert L. Johnston Trust.

S. James gave a quick update; Jim had submitted a minor subdivision application which we talked about at our last meeting. There was some question as to whether it was a minor or a major and whether it needed to be reviewed or not so Jim asked to come tonight and speak about it. It's on the agenda for the March 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

J. Franklin said that sums it up. I submitted this information with the application (*handed out 3 copies*). The first sheet is the present day tax map. It has 3 lots, Map 402 Lot 78, 79 and 80. This is part of a continuation of what we discussed last time, is it 3 lots or 4 lots, how many were we creating. The second sheet is the old tax map from around 1981. This is from the Registry of Deeds where all the old tax maps are filed. On this map, it shows lot 35, 31, 30 and 29, so there are 4 lots there. And that is supported by the last sheet which is from the Title Examiner who established the trust, the Robert Johnston Trust. She had to search the titles for this land in order to put it into the trust in the proper order. She has it labeled deed 1, deed 2, deed 3 and deed 3. But there were 4 separate parcels and she labeled them as Town lot 78, 79-a, 79-b and Town lot 80. My opinion is there are 4 parcels of land out there although there are 3 identified tax map lot numbers. We're going to have a total of 7 lots when we're done. The reason for the 7 lots is Mr. Johnston's family. He intends to keep the land in his own ownership under the Johnston Trust as long as he's alive. Once he dies, the land will be transferred to his children in equal portions which are the 7 lots. I understand that there is no guarantee, it's 7 lots, any lot could be sold at anytime and someone could come in and buy it and it's no longer in the family, that's all true. I understand that. As part of this, as required by the state, since we're creating lots that are less than the 5 acres, we had to go for *State Subdivision Approval*. We submitted to the state, we received a letter back from the state asking for additional information. They want to know where the driveways are going. How are the lots going to be accessed? That shows on the 11 x 17 drawings that Andrea gave you, they show in red. I labeled them as existing and proposed driveways. The State asked so I did it. We're proposing 2 new driveways. We have state approval, we have 2 proposed driveways, and my feeling is that this is a subdivision that does not require the Town's consultant to review it. If we looked at a matter of cost, Mr. Johnston incurred the cost of

having a boundary survey, topographic survey, wetlands delineation, soil mapping and test pits. That was to get to the point of submitting the plan to the state and to the Town. The Town's application fee was \$560. The state's application fee was \$2,100. If we go to the engineer's review, that's another \$1,500 or more or less. It doesn't say clearly, just that his estimate is based on an hourly rate. It could go to who knows what. So if you look at 2 to the state, 5 to the Town and 1,500, that's an awful lot of money just to get the information presented to the Board. When I talked to the review agent at the state, he said one of the applications he had reviewed and approved when it was reviewed and commented on by Stantec, it required a complete redesign with all new application fees. If this changes for some reason, the state will require a new application fee of \$300 per lot. All this just to divide this up amongst his children, it's an awful lot of money.

S. James asked so you got subdivision approval prior to you coming here? J. Franklin said we do, we just received it Monday. I received an email from the state saying we want to see x, y and z. I hand carried it to them on Monday and I had the letter of approval on Tuesday. I have submitted those here.

S. James asked on the 3<sup>rd</sup> sheet, lot 78 is 8.85 acres. J. Franklin replied yes. S. James continued on your sheet, 78 and 78-1 is only 7.5. So that's I guess deed 3 on hers, is deed 2 supposed to be lot 79? J. Franklin said 79-a. That shows up on deed 1, lot 79-b which you have to tie back to the original tax map, would be part of lot 31 and part of lot 30. When the tax maps were drawn, they did the best they could with the information they had and based on the information provided to them by the land owner. These deeds were...there was some assistance given by Mr. Gunnarson, the surveyor, when these deeds were prepared. I've had a difficult time explaining to Mr. Johnston the methods of surveying then as opposed to now. I believe that accounts for the discrepancies in the acreage. For example at the far end of Currier Road, it shows up on the first sheet as map 402 lot 85, 11.1 acres. It's actually under 9 acres. It's quite a change and it's been difficult explaining to Mr. Johnston the methods used then, which might have included pacing, a cloth tape and you say well if you measure back from Currier Rd, westerly to the stone wall and down the stone wall to Currier Rd again and call that a square and multiply it out as a rectangle and you have 11.1 acres. But when you actually measure, we did survey that, the acreages, there's a guide. S. James said I get it. So on this last sheet, 79-a and b, if I traced it the outline of that, would that roughly be your 79, 79-1 and 79-2? J. Franklin said yes. S. James continued and deed 3 or deed 80 is this 80 and 81? J. Franklin said yes, a portion of it. Lots 402-81, 82, 83 and 84 came out of that lot 80.

S. James said so this last page for lot 80 shows 725 feet of frontage and your showing 400. J. Franklin said again, those lots 81, 2, 3 and 4 came out of that. I'm sorry, 81 and 82, because 83 and 84 came out earlier from Mr. Davis. Mr. Johnston married Ms. Davis and that's how his property got into Mr. Johnston's ownership. Part of the land was deeded to him and part he got through an estate settlement, a will.

SJ continued so this deed number 3 lot 80 shown on this drawing is now 80 and 81 plus...J. Franklin replied yes. S. James asked when did it go to 81 and 82. J. Franklin replied I'd have to go back in my research and find out when those came out of the Davis ownership. S. James continued so in your opinion it's a true statement then that the tax map shows 3 lots, they're only paying for 3 lots but there are 4? J. Franklin replied pardon? S. James reiterated the 3 map lots shown on the tax map should actually be 4? J. Franklin replied correct. S. James asked so they're only paying for 3 lots but there should be 4? J. Franklin replied correct. S. James said which would affect the tax rate I would imagine. J. Franklin replied except that they're in current use. One ownership, current use; and as long as they remain in one ownership, then the current use stays in effect. That was one of the reasons he waited so long. S. James said until he sells or break it up. J. Franklin replied even when they do. Even when they divide these into 7 individual lots, as long as they stay in one ownership, they can remain in current use. It's once they sell off one, if they sold 79-1, there could no longer be that 10 plus acres you need for current use on both sides. We had the division line between lot 78-1 and 79, we had a lot line adjustment maybe 5 or 7 years ago. That was because they expanded, you see the division line between 78-1 and 79 the little black squares, the granite bounds that we set and there was a lot line adjustment so they could get all the paddock onto lot 78-1 and

have a reduction of the insurance on lot 79. It's been a real struggle keeping these all straight, at least for me. J. Lindsey asked how many feet for frontage? 200. There's one here for 173? J. Franklin replied plus L13. Ok. S. James said 60.33 feet. M. Santa asked are you asking for a waiver, is your opinion we're interpreting the regulations incorrectly? J. Franklin said no, it's a matter of 3 lots is a minor subdivision and 4 lots is a major. So that is part of it. If the Board's opinion is that this is a minor subdivision, then we would have one public hearing. If it's a major subdivision, we're required to have two, which will add on another \$560 onto the application fees. M. Santa replied so it's the confusion as to whether there are 4 existing lots now or 3. J. Franklin said correct. When we came in for the informational, that's what I tried to convey to the Board but I didn't come in with enough information. I should have come in with this beforehand. T. Giffen commented it sounds like the 3 lot issue vs. the 4 lot issue could be resolved possibly with some deed research. J. Franklin said its 4 lots. She has deed 3, deed 2, deed 1 and deed 3 again. T. Giffen said the 2 lots that the tax map shows as 1 lot, were those 2 lots ever combined at some point, after her research was done, 79-a and 79-b on the 3<sup>rd</sup> page. J. Franklin replied no they were not.

T. Giffen replied so the title search demonstrates that there's 4 lots but the Town thinks 79-a and b are in fact 79. J. Franklin said yes, fairly accurate. T. Giffen continued the other comment with respect to the inaccuracies. I have familiarity with a tract of land in Raymond, NH that was surveyed by the same Mr. Gunnarson, it was deeded at 15.2 acres and it actually measured 32. If there are dimensional inaccuracies in Mr. Gunnarson's work, I'm not surprised and all bets are off with respect to his dimensions. Would that be fair to say? J. Franklin agreed. When he first started, he did excellent work and over the years, as many of us old timers do, we tend to slide a little bit and we get pretty used to doing things in one way. At one time there was a loose affiliation with RSL, Ritchie Ladd and Bill Gunnarson. It was less than a year and Ritchie went out on his own. S. James said so tax map 402-85 at the end of Currier, is part of deed 3. Is anything changing with that? J. Franklin replied no. As part of the trust, we made an illustration as to how that could be divided into 3 equal parts, but there's no intention of doing that now and he's not asking to subdivide it. The attorney asked for this division on paper, blueprint marked out so you could see what is there. S. James said so Jim we talked about this in our last meeting. We don't have a written formal policy, nor do we always decide whether we have the Town engineer or not at a meeting. Typically what we do if it's a major anything, major site plan, major subdivision, we would definitely call on the Town engineer to work on these. At first glance, it seems like we were going from 3 to 7 and that's where the 4 came from. I get the cost and the 2 hearings and maybe we don't need all that but I think regardless of all that, this one is so confusing to me, I don't feel comfortable doing a plan review on it. I look at this map and one of the lot lines is at this angle but on your drawing it's this way and trying to resolve all that in my head; and this shows a lot that no longer exists in our Town, it's been changed so...it's confusing to you and this is what you do? J. Franklin said if we look at this in the sense that I brought up in the informational meeting, we could come in as a minor subdivision and divide lot 78 and we'd have 78 and 78-1, minor subdivision. Doesn't require any plan review, nothing. We could then come back the following week or month and divide lot 80 into 2 lots, lot 80 and 81. Then we've got lot 79 to dispose of and we have 3 lots total, creating 2 new lots so we're not having a major subdivision there. We could have made 3 applications. If we go to a major subdivision on this, we're going to have 2 applications. We're only saving \$560 but the Town's going to tack on at least \$1,500 from Stantec.

S. James asked are you saying 78 and 78-1, aren't those the 2, which 2 aren't on the tax map; shown correctly? J. Franklin responded lot 78 is shown relatively correct. S. James so lot 78's the one the Town shows as one and you're saying it's two. J. Franklin replied lot 78, if you look on the Title examiner's sketch, she has deed #3, Town lot 78. She also has just to the left of that written in 78-a. I don't know when the Town directed the tax mapper to go from 4 lots to 3 lots. In the early mid 80's there were a lot of changes made to the tax maps that should not have been done. Even so far as to taking and assigning ownership to parcels that were not owned by people. Like down in Moose Meadow they had a parcel here and a parcel here, it didn't fit; oh that must be up there. And the tax mappers drew it somewhere else. I just don't know why they did that. He has 4 separate parcels that he could sell at any time; any one of them.

S. James said I guess my opinion would be I wouldn't necessarily have a problem with this coming in as a minor. Save you the extra meeting, save you the extra whatever. I'm not inclined to waive Stantec reviewing it though because I don't feel comfortable doing it, as a plan review. J. Franklin commented you have a surveyor, like myself, several years old licensed in 3 states, and is going to submit this plan to Stantec for them to review? You have a soil scientist, wetland scientist who was licensed in the very first round of licensing who did all of the soil mapping. Stantec's going to review his work? For what? What is the sense of having licensed professionals submit plans to the Town if you're just going to give them to an outside consultant to spend money on. What is the point? Are you saying we're lying with our presentation of the information? I can understand if there's a road design and an intersection should be 1% and they have it designed as 3. I understand that. But when we're coming in with information that's existing, it all exists and all we're doing is cutting it up into 7 pieces, I don't see why we need to submit it. S. James responded no, I'm not saying we don't trust you at all, you or the soil scientist...J. Franklin interrupted it has to be because what are they going to find when they review it? They're going to look at it and say well topography is required, topography's here. Boundaries required boundaries here. 4K areas required by the state, he's done that. Driveways required by the state, he's done that. Well, done that. So it's all here. So the only thing they can find to criticize is; must be lying. S. James said I don't agree with your logic. I'm an engineer and we design things everyday but nothing goes out of our office without being checked. J. Franklin said I agree. S. James continued I trust the PE's that work on our plans. It's not that their lying or doing things wrong it's just trust but verify. It's quality assurance. J. Franklin said I understand that but it's already gone through the review process at the state. And he's gone out to the site. You can call Darren King and ask him. He was out on the site Monday. He looked at two other sites here in Town that were under his review as well.

T. Giffen said I'm with you, I don't think anybody questions the integrity of the applicant's engineers. I view it as due diligence and one final check. In my insurance office, we're all licensed with the state and we have everything quality control reviewed by someone in house before it goes out. There isn't a single thing that leaves our office without going through a second quality control step just for due diligence because we don't want to have anything missed or escape us. So I don't think it's a question of integrity, it's a question of due diligence. Having said that, in reality if there's 4 lots and we're creating 3 new, at that point I tend to look at it as a minor, based on past precedence if nothing else. If past precedence indicates that we call in the cavalry when there's a major and we don't if there's a minor, just to be consistent with past practice and to be fair, I'm thinking we don't need to have a professional engineer. As far as Stantec goes, they're not the only choice that you have. Under New Hampshire law, recently enacted within the last year or so, you have your choice of engineers as long as the Planning Board views the engineer that you select as professionally qualified. So you could use anyone, and we don't have a formal guideline set up as it's relatively new but we would look at their certifications, type of work that they do, their familiarity with the Town's regs so on and so forth. There could be an opportunity were we to look at it as a major, and we were to say it needs a professional engineer for due diligence. At that point, there's an opportunity to shop it on the part of the applicant to reduce the overall cost. If there are 4 lots, and you're going to end up with 7, I see 3 new lots and by the standards that we've applied in the past, I see that as a minor. And if it's a minor, to be fair and consistent, we'll let the review process stand aside because we haven't done it in the past for other people with minors.

S. James commented and just to add we had an earlier subdivision, I'm sure you're aware of it, just up the road from this one and we had a lot of concern raised from residents of that road, actually abutters to this property, about the traffic and the condition of the road. As part of that, those new lots were all assessed \$1,000 toward road improvements. Which, I think we need to discuss here whether we apply it or not is certainly up to the Board. J. Franklin replied fair's fair. I understand that.

S. James said so is there any reason that they shouldn't have that, these lots shouldn't go in the same way or not, and that's a discussion for the Board. So just to make sure I understand (*to T. Giffen*), you're saying it comes in as a minor, we don't have Stantec, and someone on the Board reviews this plan. T.

Giffen agreed. Based on past behavior by the Board, if we're only coming up with 3 new lots; if in fact there are 4, making that assumption that the deed research is accurate, I don't have any reason to suspect it at this point, the tax map is known to be not entirely 100%. You can't look at a tax map the same way you would a piece of property that was surveyed. Representation may not be accurate. Once we start down that path, if we agree that there are 4 lots simply based on faith and what Jim has said, I believe he's honest and works with honest people, if we have that leap of faith, then the next step; there are only 3 new lots, logic right...4 to 7, that's a minor and then we proceed down the path we normally do for a minor. As far as what would happen going forward, if the intent is to simply divide them up now, building could take place, could be 2 years or 20 years on any given lot. At any random time, whenever someone decides to do something. At that point it would have to leave the ownership, then someone's got to come in for the normal process to put a house on a piece of land and at that point, if the situation in Town requires a special assessment be made to assist with future road work, I think it would be appropriate to take place at the time the building is proposed. And that's fair and consistent as well. The other one, which is across the street, involved - we do this, we're building houses now, we're changing the traffic flow. We're adding more cars. This isn't right there yet. If they were coming in ready to build houses, then I'd say yes we need to get some help.

J. Franklin said timing I don't know. You're right. Mr. Johnston could die tomorrow and the kids could go out there and start building the following week. I don't know but at that point, those lots would come out of current use and they would pay the current use assessment as well as the road improvement fee, which seems to me reasonable; more than reasonable.

S. James commented to me the timing is irrelevant. You have a road with 55 houses on it and you're adding 3 more lots, you're making a bad situation worse whether they build on it today or in 5 years. I don't necessarily think it's fair to the other applicant to not but I want to be careful, we're discussing the actual project and we haven't even accepted the application. I think it's germane to try to figure out which way we're headed with it.

K. Kustra asked if the land, 7 pieces were in the trust. J. Franklin reiterated the entirety of the land is in the trust. If it's approved, it would divide those lots with new metes and bounds and acreage but they would still be in the trust. There is no need to write new deeds until they come out of the trust. T. Giffen reiterated and the change of ownership would trigger the current use. J. Franklin agreed.

S. James said I think we need a motion and a vote. M. Santa asked so on the 3<sup>rd</sup> page Jim, was this the document that was recorded at the Registry of Deeds. J. Franklin said no. M. Santa asked so where did this come from? J. Franklin said this came from the Title Examiner, an attorney, she does trusts. Title examinations and trusts. M. Santa said so this was just for the trust. J. Franklin said that's all. M. Santa asked so is this the only document we have that shows the 4 lots, this page 3? J. Franklin said and the tax map. M. Santa said the tax map shows 3. J. Franklin said the new one shows 3, the old original showed 4. J. Franklin said do you really want to get confused? This is what I put together when I did my land record research (*puts plan on table.*) We have the yellow, we have the green, we have the red and then we have the yellow. We have four parcels. There's a deed description for this, there's a deed description for the green that overlaps onto the yellow. Part of this land went into this. That's why the Title Examiner had a problem. They show on this sheet here as deed 3, deed 3, deed 3 and deed 3. Mr. Davis dies, leaves the land to his daughter, who is Bob Johnston's wife. When she died, it reverted to him, Mr. Johnston. It's like if I were to drop dead, everything reverts to my wife even if I didn't have a description of the property.

S. James confirmed so the yellow one on the right is 29 here? J. Franklin said yes. S. James continued so 29, 30, 31 wacky shaped one and then 35. M. Santa asked so are we changing lot lines too? J. Franklin said this is what was done with the lot line adjustment, this right here. This was a deed; this green was the deed, until we came in with a lot line adjustment, maybe 5 or 7 years ago. We put the line here. At that time the Board waived the requirement for a full boundary survey because we were moving the lot line over that much. T. Giffen commented it certainly does get messy. J. Franklin agreed and said you're right. M. Santa asked where the stone wall was on the plan. J. Franklin pointed it out and said 528 feet it calls for the wall, by deed it calls for the stone wall. M. Santa said so that lot lines going over and then you get the 4

lots. J. Franklin said we could do lot line adjustments but why not just do it all at once, which maybe I shouldn't have done. In hindsight. All of these lots, everything you see on the first tax map, parcel 75, 75-1, 76-1, 76, 77, all of those 80; 86 and 87, 85; they all came out of lot 85 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> division and it was all in one ownership at the time.

MOTION:

S. James said so I guess I'm looking for a motion that we agree to accept it as a minor or a major and that we should have it reviewed by the Town engineer or not. T. Giffen **moved** that we accept the application as a minor application and to be consistent with past practice, that we waive the requirement for the engineering review. A. Hall **seconded**. K. Kustra and J. Lindsey **were in favor**. S. James and M. Santa **were opposed**. **(4-2-0) Motion passed.**

S. James recommended an application review committee to meet with the applicant, go through the plan and go through the checklist. R. Cartier and M. Santa volunteered. S. James said Andrea will get back to you (*Jim Franklin*) with a time on that.

**Continuation of the Planning Board Public Hearing on the Transportation Plan Approval:** The Planning Board will be discussing and voting whether to accept the Transportation Plan completed by the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission for which a Public Hearing was held on January 4, 2017. The purpose of this plan is to provide guidance to the Town of Candia in transportation planning and infrastructure improvements. If approved by the Planning Board, the Transportation Plan would become a part of the soon to be completed Master Plan update. **\*NOTE: A copy of the Transportation Plan is available for public review on the Town web site and at the Land Use Office during normal business hours.**

Present: Nate Miller from SNHPC

S. James opened the public hearing.

Nate Miller stated his name and said Jack Munn had been helping the Town with this and I think you all know that Jack is retired now, yesterday was his last day. He had done the lion's share of the work working with the community over the past better part of a year or so putting this plan together. I'm here just in case the Board has any final comments or edits that you want the commission to incorporate into the plan or any technical questions for the commission. I believe you had some comments at your last meeting. My understanding is that you're continuing the hearing tonight and hearing final comments and making final edits to the plan. S. James said exactly, we had a previous hearing on this. Some comments were addressed and after that the Transportation Sub-Committee met again and had some last minute tweaks to it. The version that's been on the website since then is the current version.

K. Kustra asked what effect will Article XVI have on this. S. James confirmed the proposed warrant for planning? K. Kustra said the \$15,000 for an engineer. S. James said that was a warrant put together by the Select Board.

D. Lewis commented it really won't have any effect on this. It's basically to provide engineering to maybe implement one portion of this, which pertains to the intersections over here. That's all that does. It provides \$15,000 for us to get us some engineering and get is on the state's list on the 10 year road plan to do improvements over there. If the warrant article doesn't pass, this still stands the way it is.

N. Miller said the warrant article is really about doing an engineering study looking at what specifically the right of way impacts would be and really be honing in on a cost. This is certain to be as envisioned a seven figure project and putting the justification into the state's 10 year plan for that. The more information we can provide about the potential right of way impacts and the cost of the project, the

stronger the case is to include that in the 10 year plan. It shows that the Town has done its homework about the potential improvement and that is what I think the warrant article is really focused on.

S. James said as far as this plan, it's similar to other parts of the Master Plan, there was an Open Space Plan that was completed and that was something we adopted into it. There was a Natural Resource Inventory completed by the Conservation Commission and that's been adopted. So that would be the same intent with this should it be adopted. It's a part of it. Just a quick Master Plan update, we have our last meeting for the Steering Committee on February 7<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 pm here. The final draft's going to be reviewed and then it's going to public hearing on March 1<sup>st</sup>. This is incorporated by reference into that. We wanted to have this approved by the Board first and then if we do the Master Plan, it would be incorporated.

M. Santa commented that the plan was great. I was disappointed that we lost the \$67,000 that we had collected in impact fees and never used them in Town and I thought that was a crime. It was good to hear only one more payment on the CIP bond at the recycling center and that we can potentially do something else.

S. James said there was no road CIP this year? D. Lewis replied there is a warrant article for one but in there we talk about replacing the transfer station bond with a road bond. There's no additional impact to the tax rate because we're already paying that so when that one disappears, the thought process was that we could pick up that amount of money for doing infrastructure improvements on the road. The selectmen and myself did *not make an issue for that. (unintelligible)*

M. Santa said it talks more about the impact fees going forward and re-adopting them. I'm not sure how that works but if they do want to re-adopt them I'd like to be involved in the writing of the impact fee ordinance. Because I think ours is a little out of date. D. Lewis commented our impact fee ordinance turned into being very limiting as to what the money could be used for and Jack Munn had said for \$1,900 or so it could be re-written to allow us to use that money in other areas. We had such small development at the time it didn't bring in enough money to do a capital improvement on anything, too small amounts.

M. Santa added quite often, impact fees are used for schools and this wouldn't even allow us to use it for schools. D. Lewis said no.

S. James said we did talk about that back in the fall. For the Planning Board budget we put \$10,000 in the budget for assistance with planning. We were looking to add a school one. The Budget Committee removed that from the budget. It then went to a \$10,000 warrant article and there was a \$15,000 for transportation, both by the Select Board. The \$10,000 got dropped for planning and the \$15,000 is very specific to planning for this. I agree with you, we had it in the budget and the Select Board had a warrant article and it got dropped. Because of timing, we didn't have time to put our own in.

R. Cartier said I read it and thought it was really well done. The \$15,000 for the design for the roads out here, part of it in the plan, shows 3 different options. D. Lewis said there's a DOT version, a roundabout version. But we're open to other suggestions. R. Cartier said the plan now is not really cast in stone for that area, it's just a guideline. We know it's a problem; it's been a problem for 15 years. I'm concerned if the public looks at that they'll say why should we spend \$15,000 because the designs already done, choose option a, b or c. I think it will be educational to let them know that these were ideas, concepts and now it's time to take a step and do something about this. It's 80 pages, I wasn't quite sure if there was an executive summary or maybe like a one page? D. Lewis said we did discuss that. Was it added? R. Cartier said it should be in the beginning. D. Lewis said one of the members wrote one but I'm not sure it got inserted. Jack Munn came to the meeting and he had another version.

M. Santa commented my impression of the 4 corner re-design was that it was just an idea but what we were trying to accomplish was to have kids walk from the Moore School over to the Rec Center and I don't see how that was addressed in this version at this time. R. Cartier said it was in the version on the website, it had sidewalks. Re-design of intersection, lower speed limits. D. Lewis said we did not address that that will be part of the engineering. We had a lot of ideas, but none of them worked well. We had Sky Bridge, tunnel, everything you could think of.

S. James said I think the road, if it happened, would be the best way to get the sidewalk in. They have the TA projects but I don't think our Town could run one of those. It would be better as part of a bigger project.

N. Miller confirmed the Transportation Alternatives Project. The local public agency administrative process, because it's federal money and the administrative requirements, they used to allow small communities to hire a third party consultant to manage the project on their behalf but they no longer allow that in the regulations and it's very difficult for small communities to be able to administer those projects. I agree, unless you have a Town staff person who has experience and expertise with running a project like that, they're very cumbersome to manage. The strings that come along with small federal grants are challenging. S. James said their 3-5 year projects so you need continuity with your staff as well. N. Miller continued Jack had shown me an initial draft of a one page fact sheet, executive summary and if you want some help from us getting this to the finish line, we'd be happy to do that also. I have a marked up version but I can send one around to the Board, something that's easily digestible and hits the high points of it. S. James said I think we'd be interested in a final version. N. Miller said I'll follow up with you on that and try to put that together so you have something that's easy to hand out. Jack will be happy to know the plan was adopted. I'll send him a note that the plan has been approved. He will enjoy that in his retirement. S. James thanked Nate Miller for coming

S. James closed the public hearing.

MOTION:

M. Santa made a **motion** to approve the transportation chapter to be included in the Master Plan. A. Hall **seconded. All were in favor. (6-0-0) Motion passed.**

Other Business:

A. Hall **motioned** to cancel the February 15<sup>th</sup> meeting due to lack of applications. T. Giffen **seconded. All were in favor. (6-0-0) Motion passed.**

S. James said just a reminder the Master Plan Steering Committee is meeting February 7<sup>th</sup> and then on March 1<sup>st</sup> we'll be talking about it. Once the draft is available, Andrea will email around a link to it, so if you could take a look at it. One thing the committee was trying to do a little differently from last time, and it was one of Jack's suggestions, if you look at the last Master Plan, there's a lot of specific goals and overlap. The revised plan is to be more general and have less overlap. The goals are all in there and area specific goals but it reads different from last time.

MOTION:

T. Giffen **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 8:03 pm. A. Hall **seconded. All were in favor. Motioned carried (6-0-0).**

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrea Bickum  
Land Use Secretary  
cc file