

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of April 5th, 2017
APPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: Al Hall, Vice Chair; Tom Giffen; Ken Kustra; Judi Lindsey; Rudy Cartier; Carleton Robie, BOS Representative; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dave Murray, Building Inspector

Absent: J. Bedard

Vice Chair Al Hall called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes February 1, 2017:

T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the minutes of February 1st, 2017 as presented. J. Lindsey **seconded**. K. Kustra and A. Hall **were in favor**. C. Robie and R. Cartier **abstained**. **Motion passed (4-0-2)**.

Present: Dean Young; Mark Laliberte, BOS; Craig St. Peter; Joe Sobol; Cory Hill; Scott Komisarek; Donna Del Rosso; Sylvia Von Aulock (SNHPC); Dick Snow

Other Business:

High St. Surety Bond - 66 Vinton St. - Cory Hill – Discuss Stantec’s Surety Bond Estimate

Present: Cory Hill, 66 Vinton Street, LLC

C. Hill introduced himself; I’m Cory Hill here representing 66 Vinton Street, LLC. Quick review, we were here a short time ago for a subdivision that we had conditionally approved by the Board. We were waiting for a couple of housekeeping items which actually came in today so we’ll be back to get the Mylar signed and we have Stantec’s approval and conditional approval of the Board. We’re ready to move forward. The Surety Bond issue came up from Stantec so I just wanted to make a quick presentation. I wanted to discuss some of the quantity totals and some numbers that I actually came up with. This is from my PE, granted it is my PE but she was hired to do this, Jen McCourt. And her review of Stantec’s numbers. Some of her contentions; this is her email to me yesterday; *In review of the Surety Estimate supplied by Stantec dated 3-30-2017. The first test of reasonability is computing the cost per foot. The new road including the cul-de-sac is 1845 feet. The total estimate is \$800,849.51, which results in a cost per foot of \$434.06.* What I can say is this; right now in the City of Manchester there’s a 2000 foot road that’s up for sale and that Surety Bond is just over a million dollars. That includes sidewalks, granite curbing, water, and sewer. This road I don’t think could get any easier. No city water, no city sewer, no granite curbing, no sidewalks. This is a pretty straightforward road. I’ll go over some numbers and then I’ll work backwards as far as values. In my opinion, I know this road is going to be done for under \$300 per foot. In continuing reading through Jen’s email here, she talks about the sidewalks of course, no water, no, sewer. Some of the unit prices that Stantec has used are quite a bit higher than NH DOT prices. She comes up with an example of the finish course pavement. *Stantec used \$85 a ton for paving; NH DOT uses \$71 a ton and private bidding is \$70 a ton.* I have Continental doing this for under \$60 a ton. She goes on and talks about quantities for sand and gravel for the selects that are going underneath the road. I called the various pits that are close to us for these select materials. They don’t know if I’m getting a pickup truck load or 1,000 tons; in converting some of these numbers over, the quantities make no difference to me. It’s the unit pricing that’s the problem. So if we take a look at Stantec’s breakdown and I’ll start with the paving, *number 2 paving; the sand quantities.* In converting those cubic yards to tons there’s a multiplication factor you have to use. I’ve always used 1.5, you should use 1.4. For this I used 1.4 for this meeting. 3,554 cubic yards converts to 4975 tons. The unit pricing they used is \$18 per cubic yard. There total came to \$63,966.00 as

we go across that. In converting this to ton, I like to use Plourde, I've used Manchester Sand and Gravel quite a bit, these select materials have to be DOT specced which Dennis knows about. They have to pass a sift test, you just don't go into a pit and buy whatever you want. Plourde Sand and Gravel generally has the best selects around that are close to here, including delivery; I'm going to go over the first number. 12" of sand, that's going to be placed underneath the roadway; 4,975 tons in the conversion from cubic yards to tons. Their unit pricing from Plourde Sand and Gravel delivered is \$9 a ton. That comes to \$44,775 dollars a savings of \$19,000 dollars on that one item. Bank run gravel is 2,880 cubic yards and that converts to just over 4,000 ton; Stantec's totals came to \$69,128.00. I can get that same material calling off the street, \$10.72 delivered; state specced material. That comes to \$43, 222; a savings of \$26,000 dollars. Next line item, crushed gravel. That's the top select directly underneath the pavement. Their totals in cubic yards of 1,160 converts to 1,624 ton for a total of \$32,000. I can get that delivered for \$10.81 which comes to a total of \$17,555 or a savings of \$16,000 dollars. Just in those 3 items, the totals of me just calling off the street, come to \$105,000, Stantec's total; \$165,000. That's a \$60,000 savings just on the selects alone and I'm just calling saying give me the over the counter retail price, including delivery. If we go to paving, they're using \$85 a ton. I don't know if I've ever used that number. In the late 2000's, I did Cinemagic in Hooksett for Zyacorp. That was a half a mile of water line I laid, along with all the sewer, all the site work, 20 foot fill, Stantec was on the job. I had that done for \$56 a ton for all the paving on that job and that was when fuel was over \$4 a gallon. Obviously diesel isn't anywhere near that, those prices aren't anywhere near that and I can tell you that \$84 a ton for asphalt, is astronomical. I don't know who could charge that right now. That savings alone on that; their totals came to almost \$72,000 for paving on the job. I got it at \$51,000. I'm looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of \$80,000 just in the paving part of this. If you scroll down, item number 3 drainage work; 3b, that pre-cast concrete box culvert is not anywhere near \$60,000, it's not even close. It's a little over half that. Again these are numbers where I haven't even started negotiating with any of these people yet. On top of that, if I called in Continental to do this job, which I probably would to have them pave it, they're doing all the work up on 93. All that crushing; their whole plant is set up over there. If I have them do the paving, "I'll buy the selects from you"; all their material their making on site for the highway there is all state specced certified. I could get it probably cheaper than Plourde. So my point is if it were close I wouldn't care. Because I don't have an issue with the way this needs to go with 10% in cash, I don't have a problem with that. Releasing as the project goes; keeping, I think it's 10% for maintenance afterwards, that's not the issue. The issue is these totals so I'm here looking for a little relief on that. If we were within 50 to 100,000 dollars I wouldn't say anything but I think they're over by at least \$300,000. I could keep going on with line item after line item but just those hard numbers I thought would be enough just to show you. Just me calling today from a pickup truck getting these numbers, these sand and gravel pits. And it's just not Plourde; I can go through Brook Hollow, I can go through Brox, Manchester Sand and Gravel, their delivery rates are all the same.

A. Hall asked Dennis does that make sense what he's saying. D. Lewis said without seeing all the numbers, yes I understand what he's saying. I would have to make the calls myself to make sure. Last year we paid \$60 something a ton for asphalt in place. I'm sure the numbers are going to vary from location to location.

C. Hill said Dennis had nothing to do with this, I think this is just Stantec looking at these numbers, these aren't even DOT numbers. DOT has a certain number that they're going to use when they're looking for bond money from these companies, like Audley, Severino and the rest when they're doing their work and these numbers are 20% beyond that. Their paving number, DOT \$71 a ton. Stantec's at \$85, that's \$14, that's almost 20%.

K. Kustra asked C. Hill if he would provide us with a breakdown like this estimate of his own numbers. C. Hill said we can have the site guy do that, absolutely. K. Kustra continued then we could compare. C. Hill said absolutely and that would be the site guy's retail number. He's gotta make money on it. DOT is using \$71 a ton. When a site guy goes in and charges somebody \$71 a ton, more often than not, their using...like on this particular job here, I would use AIA standards, standards used on this as far as

payments go, that's a standard form used across the country so that when somebody does some work, they get paid in 30 days. Along with that, there's 10% held in retainage. Everybody here knows that you can't live off the retainage, waiting until the end of the job. At \$71 a ton, if the state feels that paving number is a good number and 10% of that is going to be held in retainage, that brings that number down to \$65 or \$64. The guy that's laying that asphalt down, the site guy still has to make money, he has bills to pay. You can't break even and wait for the end of the job to make money. There's a 20% pack in there. The cost is \$14 is less than the \$71 if that makes sense. So if Stantec came in and said we think its \$600,000, I could say they're pretty close, that's a full retail number but they're pretty close. At \$800,000 it doesn't even work. There's 9 lots here, that's \$75,000 a lot just for the road. There's no money left. These lots are worth \$100,000; \$115,000 maybe on a good day. I wouldn't waste my time here or the Board's time for a year and a half to do all those pushups to make nothing on a lot, hopefully to make something on a house that I have to warranty for a year, it doesn't even make sense. The numbers don't make sense. So I was here looking for a little relief on that.

T. Giffen commented I think Ken's idea made a lot of sense. He comes back with an itemized list comparable to this and we can then show that to Stantec and let them comment on the unit pricing, the calculations. It wouldn't surprise me if Stantec's estimate was high in order to be as protective as possible to the Town, trying to do their job. I can also sympathize with this gentleman. I'd like to be able to support his numbers before I could say yes to him.

A. Hall asked how soon he could get the numbers to us. C. Hill replied as soon as possible, we're going to be submitting a Mylar here pretty quick for signature and this has to get paid along with that to have that Mylar recorded. We'd like to have it reviewed pretty quickly. The only down side, the only gripe that I would have, is now I'm going to have to pay an engineer to review that again.

R. Cartier asked if he had a site contractor lined up yet. C. Hill replied Colinbrooke Homes. R. Cartier continued so could he give you an estimate? C. Hill replied yes, I can get the breakdown and for me, I'm looking at a detailed breakdown, broken down even further entering into a contract going by those AIA standards for legality purposes, because that's the way I would do it. But for his purposes, I just want the lineal foot price. I don't care how you break it out but it's not going above this. R. Cartier said would you have any objection if they used the actual NH DOT numbers. C. Hill replied yeah, I'd like to see them all, sure. Again, full full retail. R. Cartier said if you do the site work, the price you get from the site contractor will be a firm contract to you anyway. My concern would be if the project stopped in the middle of it, that would the amount of that bond be enough to have another contractor come in to finish it. C. Hill said absolutely, I think so. Absolutely, without a doubt. If this road goes beyond 60 days, I'd be shocked. From start to finish. It gets paved in a day. This is a big driveway. R. Cartier said so your plan is to have this road done within 60 days. C. Hill said weather providing, start to finish, right now. R. Cartier said this building season. C. Hill replied yes. This has to get done ASAP.

A. Hall asked C. Hill if April 19th, two weeks worked. C. Robie asked if that gave him enough time. C. Hill replied yes, I'll have this broken down, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. A. Hall suggested he talk to Stantec too. C. Hill replied we have, every time we pick up the phone its \$300.

R. Cartier asked could you also get a bottom line price from your site contractor to compare what the difference is. Getting the breakdown is fine but the big thing is Stantec is saying it's about \$800,000 to do the project, but if you have a site contractor lined up. C. Hill replied this number should be between \$500,000 and \$600,000, it will be lower for me, but for your purposes, to be safe, you are well within that.

C. Robie said he doesn't have to reveal his contract price to the Planning Board to build a road, that's not our business. R. Cartier said no I just want to have something to compare; it's not going to be his price, he's going to have one. It's not his price to it. C. Hill said it's what I'm getting charged. R. Cartier said it's what he's thinking is the reasonable price not the \$800,000, something less. That's why I asked about the NH DOT number. C. Hill said I didn't know how far we'd go tonight so I'd bring just a few breakdown numbers that were legit real numbers. A. Hall said is everyone agreeable? *(To C. Hill)* you'll be

back on the 19th? C. Hill said I can get that to Andrea, I don't think we need to come back and waste everyone's time unless you think I need to come back. C. Robie said we'll be good, we got this.

Appointment of Planning Board Alternate:

Al Hall read the letter from Michael Santa dated March 31, 2017 addressed to the Candia Planning Board, High Street, Candia, NH 03034:

Dear Candia Planning Board,

I respectfully submit this letter expressing my interest in serving on the Candia Planning Board as an alternate member. I have enjoyed my last three years while serving as a seated member and would like to continue my involvement this year. I believe our Board has accomplish a great deal over the last three years; and with the passage of our new Master Plan it is time to determine how much can be implemented and when. Sincerely, Michael Santa

MOTION:

Carleton Robie made a **motion** to accept Mike Santa as an alternate to the Planning Board. T. Giffen **seconded. All were in favor. (6-0-0) Motion passed.**

Housekeeping Items:

Postage Rates Increased: Postage rates increased for certified mail. All Planning and Zoning applications have been updated to reflect the new cost of \$7.56 per abutter. Revised applications have been updated on the website.

Rules and Procedures: The Board should review and re-approve the current rules and procedures.

MOTION:

T. Giffen made a **motion** to re-approve the existing rules and procedures as currently stated. C. Robie **seconded. All were in favor. (6-0-0). Motion passed.**

Application Review of 17-002 Major Site Plan Application: Applicant: Wildcat Land Development Services, LLC 43 Lawson Farm Road, Londonderry, NH 03053; Owner: same; Property location: 285 Old Candia Road, Candia NH 03034; Map 410 Lot 137 & 137.1 Intent: Convenience store expansion. Application reviewed by two Planning Board Members on March 30, 2017. Discuss application review and vote to accept application as complete or incomplete.

Present: Craig St. Peter and Joe Sobol of Wildcat Land Development Services, LLC.

R. Cartier went through the application checklist for missing or incomplete items on the application;

1. *Item #3 – Identifying the owner of record* on sheet 5. C. Robie asked if they could get that cleaned up. C. St. Peter and J. Sobol agreed. This will all be taken care of; we know these things. Yes we agree.

2. *Item #13 – Mylar* but we understand that's going to be final as submitted so there's no problem with that.

3. *Item #17 – Use of abutting properties shown with all structures thereon and access roads.* The buildings that are close by were not referenced on the building; one of them is the lot just west of that area. C. St. Peter and J. Sobol agreed to take care of that. We concur.

4. *Lot consolidation* – Carleton and I had concern on that. We understand the letter that came through but we did have concerns on that. The way it's structured now, the setbacks aren't allowable. Once the two lots are combined, there won't be any problem but right now it's not meeting the regulations. We'd

like to see a legal document. C. Robie said 137 and 137.1 need to be combined to a Deed before I feel you can build too close to the property line or in the property line; those two lots need to be combined. C. St. Peter and J. Sobol agreed. C. St. Peter said that's the intent so we should put a note on the plan that it's conditional on a lot consolidation. C. Robie said I think the note is on the plan. It just needs to be done. J. Sobol asked does it need to be done before we get approval. C. Robie said it's just a matter of the attorney writing the Deed and recording it. J. Sobol said for whatever reason if we don't get approval, we may not want the lot to be one. We're certainly confident we'll achieve the approval. C. Robie replied certainly. J. Sobol continued that's good. R. Cartier suggested at the time for putting the application in for a Major Site Plan Review an application for a lot consolidation be done at the same time. C. Robie commented I don't think they need to come to the Planning Board for a lot consolidation, they own both lots. They need to go to their attorney and he would draw them a Deed and they record it. It's recorded, the Deed comes back to the Town and the Town has one Deed instead of two. R. Cartier and said we can make sure the tax maps are updated as well. J. Sobol asked before the 19th? C. Robie suggested I guess if you had a letter from the attorney that stated, or a Deed written that when this becomes approved, this Deed will become recorded. C. St. Peter replied so draft a Deed. J. Sobol said this lot was one lot before we developed the gas station, 2006. C. Robie confirmed the gas station was subdivided off for that big lot. J. Sobol said correct. So we can go back to that with the same description. A. Hall said approval subject to that is agreeable? J. Sobol and C. St. Peter said absolutely. C. St. Peter said we can put a note on the plan to say exactly that so you can't get a building permit until that's done. Until it's recorded.

5. *Size of lot site specific plan* – was that done? C. St. Peter said AOT, it's been submitted and we have the application. C. St. Peter commented it's a take-off on the other AOT that was approved for the work that's being done now, but it's a separate AOT.

6. We didn't see *percentage of the site finished with impervious cover* – C. St. Peter said we'll put a note on there; it's about 60% green space.

7. We didn't see the *25 year storm design for drainage* and I understand there is a drainage analysis that was done but we didn't see it. J. Sobol said its part of the AOT, it's in here. C. Robie said we have that; we just didn't have it for the night of the review.

8. *10d – pipes adequate for the 25 year flood plain* but I think Stantec's going to be looking at that anyway. Also in your AOT.

9. We did have a question on the *permits being secured* but that was the AOT and you do have that.

10. We have the letter from the Police Department but not from the Fire Department and the Building Inspector. C. Robie corrected that we had one from Fire; we didn't have one from Police. R. Cartier said so we need one from Police and Building. J. Sobol said that would be up to Mike, we'll check with him. Dave Murray. We'll check with him.

11. *Building height conforming*. R. Cartier said we didn't have any architectural renderings. C. St. Peter said we can provide those, the plans are all done. It's the exact same height, it's an extension. R. Cartier said that what's we figured but it wasn't on the plans so we wanted to make sure it gets on there.

12. *Subdivision lot line adjustment plan* – same as what we just talked about.

13. *Drainage calculations* you said were with AOT so that's fine.

R. Cartier continued the only thing I didn't see was the test pit for the new leach field. Is that the area where they're doing a lot of changes to the terrain in that area? J. Sobol replied not yet. It's pretty far to the west, near the end of the lot. They will be doing a test pit. Severino is out there. Dubay was going to do it the day it rained, yesterday and they cancelled it so they're rescheduling. Then that will be submitted to DES, septic people section of DES. R. Cartier asked if it would be a mounded system in that area. J. Sobol said it will definitely have some grade to it because of the sloping ground. R. Cartier said that's fine. J. Sobol reiterated they need to do that and it will be submitted for state approval very soon.

K. Kustra asked about the parking requirements per our zoning ordinance. Our zoning ordinance, 83 spaces and says here 106 spaces. How many are 9 x 18 and how many are 12 x 75. R. Cartier said we didn't count every one of them. I put in the 12 x 75 because they did have the 9 x 18; I'm not sure what the

breakdown is. K. Kustra said we don't have an ordinance that goes for 12 x 75. C. Robie said well that's the size of a truck. K. Kustra asked to we have to get an ordinance? R. Cartier replied I don't think so because it's existing; they do have truck parking over there now. C. St. Peter said last time; they were counted as parking spaces, just so you know. K. Kustra asked if they had spaces for five vehicles now, are they marked out. C. St. Peter and J. Sobol replied yes. There are five in the back. R. Cartier confirmed they are behind the building now.

14. The only other item was the *construction cost estimates and completion schedule* were missing. C. St. Peter and J. Sobol said ok.

15. R. Cartier said obviously we talked about this, probably on the front page of the whole package, a space for Planning Board approval. C. St. Peter confirmed a sign off box, absolutely.

C. Robie said there's 24 truck spaces, 106 with 83, subtract 83 from 106 and you have 23, I might be off one.

MOTION:

C. Robie **motioned** to accept the application. T. Giffen added subject to the conditions we just talked about. K. Kustra **seconded**. **All were in favor. (6-0-0) Motion passed.**

J. Sobol said on the 19th, those will be in place, on the plans when we arrive for the review. R. Cartier asked if we could get them a few days before to take another look at them. J. Sobol agreed.

C. Robie asked if they had heard back from Stantec yet. J. Sobol said Andrea just sent it. There were 74 comments.

R. Cartier asked if Stantec had the AOT too. J. Sobol said he would have to check with Doug from Dubai on that. C. St. Peter said he has all the drainage calcs. A. Bickum replied anything that came to me electronically, went to Stantec. So if that came in, it went to Stantec. I think they have everything; they would let me know if they were missing something.

Continuation of the Public Hearing for the Master Plan Update: The Planning Board is seeking input for an Update to the Town of Candia Master Plan completed by the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission. The Master Plan is intended to assist the Planning Board in protecting and preserving the qualities on which resident place great value while allowing the Town to grow and prosper in a responsible and controlled manner.

Present: Sylvia Von Aulock, SNHPC; Colleen Bolton, Master Plan Committee; Carmel Druchniak; Scott Komisarek; Dennis Lewis

Al Hall said Sylvia Von Aulock, the Deputy Director of the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission (SNHPC) is in the audience and we have the Master Plan hopefully as of April 5th, times will change, just like a budget but we do have to formerly adopt it. Do you have anything to say Sylvia? S. Von Aulock said I'm just a sponge tonight, waiting to see what the group says. A. Hall said thank you.

C. Robie said at of our last meeting we postponed voting on the Master Plan because some of the voting members weren't here and there were a few changes that we asked for corrections. This is the new one. A. Hall said at some point we're going to have to approve them. As soon as we approve them, my understanding is they're will be more changes needed. We need to adopt them.

MOTION:

C. Robie **motioned** to adopt the Master Plan as presented with the changes from our last meeting, SNH updated this for us. We'll approve this document. That will become our working document from this point forward. That's my **motion**. T. Giffen **seconded**. C. Robie said I do want to say that Mr. Sean James deserves a lot of credit for his effort in the time that he spent with the Steering Committee, Master Plan Committee and everyone that worked here, Sean was here last time and would like to have voted this in and

that didn't happen but he deserves a lot of credit for this and we should send Sean a letter of our thanks. T. Giffen agreed. C. Robie said we have numerous people in the audience who worked on this, Carmel and Colleen, Mr. Komisarek and Mr. Lewis and Mrs. *Phelps (unintelligible)*, we thank them all. **All were in favor. (6-0-0) Motion passed.** A. Hall said a big thank you to SNH planning. The copies are on the website and we do have a limited supply because of the size, 50 pages.

Other Business:

Elections for Chair and Vice-Chair

Al Hall **motioned** that Tom Giffen be appointed Planning Board Chair. R. Cartier **seconded**. **All were in favor. T. Giffen abstained. Motion carried (5-0-1).**

T. Giffen commented I appreciate the confidence that everyone has shown in me in my ability to conduct the activities of the Planning Board effectively. I'm willing to accept the nomination and promise to do my best to:

- 1) To fulfill the vision of the Town as expressed in the Master Plan through our activities
- 2) I'd like to start an initiative through the Zoning Review Committee to develop a systematic procedure to review our regulations and pinpoint those that need the most attention so that we can start to focus on updating; so we're providing regulations that are a) easy to work with for applicants and b) that respect the Master Plan and it's intent for the planned growth of the Town. Those are my two big things. Thank you for your confidence in me and I'm willing to serve.

C. Robie **motioned** that Mr. Hall stay as Vice Chair. T. Giffen **seconded**. **All were in favor. Al Hall abstained. Motion carried (5-0-1).**

Conservation Commission and Planning Board Work Session

J. Lindsey suggested that the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board could have a work session because there are issues that come up, Conservation doesn't see them until after the fact. If we could work together on those and be on the same page. May perhaps? A. Hall suggested the 17th.

T. Giffen asked if it would make sense for one person on the Commission perhaps the Chair, to receive documents that come into the Planning Board. J. Lindsey agreed but the issue is that things get approved here but then after the fact sometimes things that were on the plan change in real life and reality and things start happening so I guess if we knew ahead of time what's been approved and it's brought to our attention we would know. It would be good if we saw. I'm a member of both but I see things that are approved so I figure not worth...you share what happens at the Planning Board with the Conservation Commission but then other things that just never come up. T. Giffen said so having good lines of communication. J. Lindsey agreed that would be awesome. T. Giffen said I see that as an evolving project to improve on over time.

C. Robie asked do we have a representative that goes to the Conservation, other than yourself (*to J. Lindsey*), you're doing both. J. Lindsey replied and I'll report what issues are happening on the Planning Board but these are issues that didn't come up naturally so it's good if we see all the plans on the Conservation Commission as well. Once in awhile have a work session together on what's happening and get input from all committees.

Bond Issue

D. Lewis commented on the road bonding issue that came up earlier, we have to make sure we're careful on that because we allow a building permit to go out on a road before it's paved and then we hold up the CO until it's paved. So someone can start construction off the gravel sub-grade and build a house

and we need to make sure we're covered because once a home's built in there, and if the developer should walk away from this, which we've been caught before, we have to make sure we have money enough to finish the project. I'm sure his numbers were low, Stantec's numbers are high, somewhere in the middle is probably the actual number but we have to make sure the Town's covered because unlike a site plan, Irving Station and it's private property, it's their project, their land, there isn't going to be a third party like a home being built. The last time this happened to us there was a home constructed on a road and it sat there for 3 months and the people were living in a hotel, they were after the Town, "why can't we get this road finished" and we just have to make sure we're careful in those situations, that we're covered. R. Cartier asked Dennis if the NH DOT numbers were a reasonable number to use. D. Lewis replied absolutely. R. Cartier said it did seem it was between the two. D. Lewis said if you use DOT numbers and that is what you could go out to bid to anybody and get the job done for that or less. R. Cartier replied you can have someone that comes in and they don't finish the road because they underbid it, they won't be able to finish it. D. Lewis said and everyone has high expectations in the beginning and everything's going to go like clockwork but we know things don't do that.

C. Robie said he'll come back with a number. R. Cartier said I feel comfortable with the DOT numbers.

MOTION:

J. Lindsey **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 7:55 pm. T. Giffen **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (6-0-0).**

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary
cc file