

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
TOWN OF LITCHFIELD**

Held on August 7, 2012

Minutes approved September 4, 2012

The Litchfield Planning Board held a meeting in the Town Hall conference room 2 Liberty Way, Litchfield, NH 03052 on Tuesday, August 7, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Leon Barry (Chairman), Russell Blanchette, Thomas Young, Frank Byron, Michael Croteau, Joel Kapelson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bob Curtis (Vice Chair)

ALSO PRESENT: Joan McKibben (Admin. Assistant), Jen Czysz (NRPC Senior Planner),

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Barry called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and joined the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. **Robert Leary, 172 Charles Bancroft Highway, Tax Map 9, Lot 1 Application to subdivide one lot into four residential units. Application accepted on 7/17/2012. Site walk held on 7/24/2012.**

Jen Czysz read notes from the site walk, she was not personally there but her colleague Jennifer D. from NRPC was there:

- Garage and Carport in proximity to the driveway. At that time it was discussed shifting the driveway which has been done on the revised plans that were received since the site walk. The driveway now goes around the garage and the well, and not between the well and the barn. The distance between the well and the barn were measured on site and was 33', so there was adequate space to maneuver between those; however Jennifer did note that this new curve should still be run past the Fire Chief to make sure it is maneuverable by a fire truck.
- It was mentioned that the easement line would be revised, in which we have received to clarify that the common drive easement access is for lots 2 and 3, and only emergency access will be granted to lot 1. Lot 1 will only have emergency access to the easement area on lots 2 and 3.
- Another thing mentioned was about the curb cuts and whether a DOT permit was required.
- Looking at the easement area that was requested by the owner of Map 9 Lot 1, at that time it was stated that this would only be a paper road, it would not be developed at this time and if it were to be improved in the future the applicant would have to come back to the Planning Board at that time for a driveway. There was 500' of site distance available at the proposed driveway entrance.

- Jennifer asked for more information on the grading and what the proposed grading details would be. It was noted that there might be some rerouting, but it wasn't initially shown. Detailed has been shown for the proposed regarding of that area, and what happens now is that slope is reduced from just over a 7% slope to a 4 ½% slope.
- There was also some conversation about traffic and some suggestions were signage or fencing to slow the traffic into the driveway versus widening. There was also some conversation about widening that entry.
- Jennifer did note that there was some concern that was raised about having a combined driveway access for these two parcels with Map 9, Lot 1 given the potential that this lot could still be subdivided in the future. If that were to happen and that main driveway access were to go in, there was concern in the about how the traffic would merge.
- The last item that was mentioned at the site walk was the existence of the wetland, the proposed drive way runs directly tan gentle to that, it does not show as intersecting or having a direct impact, but it is right on the line.

Jen went over the staff review notes: Some of the remaining items to iron out as we move forward is focusing on the driveway; the E911 standards require that if the common driveway provides access to three or more structures it needs to be treated as a private road; and there are still concerns over the construction standards or how the road was to be built and whether that can bear the weight of a fire truck.

There are still 3 waiver requests that need to be acted on. We still have concerns from the Town Engineer; some have been partially addressed with the regarding, but we still need to make sure we are all set and resolve the issue of needing written documentation that a driveway permit is not required.

Item # 5, the driveway has been relocated to navigate along the existing garage and well. We need to make sure with the Fire Chief is okay with the curb if it is created and whether he can navigate through that area.

We still are looking for road profile so that we can visually see that slope and approach of how that road works. We know that the slope is better than it was before.

Looking for a detail of road construction standards, and how that road will be built.

We are still missing some of the topography on the plan; particularly for the approach of the southerly driveway.

The plan notes, on sheet one that mentions that there will be hay bales , silt fencing and other best management practices, but it is not indicated where on the plans, those will be employed.

With regards to the wet lands; Jen's recommendation would be to at least shift the road a foot or two off of the wet lands, so that it is not directly touching.

Attorney Prolman has for us something in writing from Dr. Calawa granting permission to traverse his land for the one driveway that crosses the abutting parcel. We have a revised right of access or common driveway language and deed language from Attorney Prolman which was submitted today; those recommend go to Town Counsel for review.

Jen stated that the only other question she had was regarding proposed tree line, it is pretty clear with parcel 2 in the middle. We know there will be a little clearing down by the driveway, but for the spare parcel we do not know how much clearing is proposed to happen.

There was one technical correction that one of the abutters had flagged and that was the abutter list has the incorrect parcel number for Dr. Calawa, it should be Map 6 Lot 38.

- Mr. Barry stated that a question was brought up about the wet lands and wanted to know if they got permission from Mr. Calawa to move the road at some location. Attorney Prolman stated that there is not a wet land issue in respect to Dr. Calawa's property. Today Mr. Leary's driveway comes across Dr. Calawa's property and has an e-mail from him giving his consent to that access point. The only wet land that is involved is the small pocket shown on the map.
- Mr. Barry asked what they are asking for in that corner to enlarge the area to go down. Mr. Prolman stated that they are not touching it. The Leary family has been using this point of access as it is today since the dawn of time, and they are going to continue that.
- Mr. Prolman stated that Jen mentioned that there is no topography in this area; he stated that they are not touching that area at all. The easement is designed such that Lot 9-1-1 is intended to continue to use this Calawa access point. The two new lots are intended to come out of the road except for emergency purposes.
- Mr. Barry mentioned that the distance between the barn and the garage, there is 20' that you need for the road, which leaves 13'. We questioned that at the site walk, now there is only 13' between the well and the barn, and when we walked the site you gave us the impression that was okay, because the well can take a 65,000 pound fire truck coming down that road where that well is. Attorney Prolman stated that they found at the site walk that there was ample room on either side of the driveway from both the well and the barn. Mr. Prolman stated that they need help with the Fire Chief, they cannot get in touch with him and there are many comments in there that the Fire Chief should weigh in on. Mr. Prolman stated that he could use some help from the Planning Board getting in touch with the Fire Chief.
- Mr. Barry asked if Mr. Prolman considered the piece of land going from 3A down along the old Litchfield Road, not to be too steep in order for a fire truck to go down. Attorney Prolman stated that this is being leveled out so that it is being a 4 ½% slope and the rest is not changing from what it is today, so if a fire truck can get down there today, they can get down it tomorrow. They are not touching that section with any grading, culverts or anything.
- Mr. Barry stated that in respect to the wet lands, is the 20' at the edge of the driveway. Mr. Prolman stated that he will run through his legal stuff and Gregg Jeffrey will answer any other questions. Mr. Prolman stated that he submitted copies of the driveway easement and will explain to the Board what it says. He stated that he did put in a provision (which will do to Dave Lefevre and Steve Buckley) that says Lot 9-1-3 is subject to a 50' access easement as shown on the plan, this access easement is intended to allow for a future road if that were to come back before the Board, In such case, the common driveway easement area on Lot 9-1-3, it may shift in a westerly direction, approximately 40'; such that the common driveway access is the Charles Bancroft Highway through the access easement area. If this road comes to be, then this shouldn't have a three way intersection, which would shift this common driveway to the west so that you have almost a T intersection, so that this owner will know that this may shift some time in the future and the cost of this shift will be borne by the owner of the back parcel of land. Mr. Prolman stated that he sees this fixed quick access point that Margaret Parent had mentioned at the last meeting as a backup access point because what was talked about at the site walk was a better traffic design and would have

access coming directly across from Cummings, so you would have a full intersection instead of staggered intersections. This is the better approach and better topographically, it doesn't hit the wetlands. If for some reason the DOT does not want a curb cut here, or the Town does not want a road or driveway to go here, then we have as a backup this access point.

- Mr. Prolman stated that there is language about the emergency access that states the Town is not responsible in any way or form for this common drive maintenance. The Town protection Language comes from Litchfield's Town Attorney.
- Attorney Prolman stated that the deed that he has prepared specifically calls out for Lot 9-1-3 is subject to 52' access easement. Dr. Calawa has given consent to come across his property. Attorney Prolman handed out the e-mail sent by Dr. Calawa. Dr. Calawa stated in the e-mail that he has no problem with the Leary family cutting across his property. He would prefer not to give an easement because it is such a small lot and intend to donate the property to the Town sometime in the future. Mr. Prolman explained that this area is treated like a license to these property owners, it is personal to the Leary's, such that in the future, when this property transfers, these two neighbors are going to have to continue the license or grant and easement or work together in some fashion. If these two property owners don't allow this license to continue, this lot owner would have to shift his driveway northward so it comes out onto his property, which is probably not going to happen.
- Mr. Barry asked if the license is for a period of time. Mr. Prolman stated that a license is only between these two lot owners, it doesn't get recorded.
- Attorney Prolman stated that they are okay naming this road as a private road. Some communities will put up a sign stating that it is a private road.

Mr. Gregg Jeffrey owner of Jeffrey Land Survey from Litchfield, NH stated that there was a question about the wetlands.

- Mr. Barry stated that the drawing that he is seeing shows the driveway as running right over the wet lands. Mr. Jeffrey stated that he would like the board to envision the easement as a line; it is not the actual top of the slope that was seen on the site walk. This line does not go into the wet lands, but it is close within a foot or so. The actual roadway itself is off the wetland. The road way itself has always been there, there has always been a separation from the top of the slope of the shoulder down to the wet land.
- Mr. Barry asked if the roadway that is there now is 20'. Mr. Jeffrey stated that the driveway width from shoulder to shoulder is not 20'. The easement is 20' wide. The physical road is always narrower than the easement because of sloping and cutting.
- Mr. Barry stated that his concern before is that when that little jog in the road is coming between the shed and the barn and the well there, he is concerned that the well doesn't fail because of the limited traffic that will be on that road, and considering between the shed and the barn is only 7' on each side because the road is 20'. Mr. Jeffrey stated that a fire truck is not 20' wide. You need easement on either side so when the fire truck swings, it is able to pass.
- Mr. Barry is worried about the heavy fire apparatus destroying the well. Mr. Jeffrey stated that it is a reinforced concrete culvert driven into the ground and weight tends to go down and does load somewhat laterally, but it is a concrete reinforced culvert. Mr. Jeffrey said he cannot guarantee that a truck will never due damage to a well.
- Mr. Jeffrey stated that they are looking for the Fire Chief's input on the turning radius; he would be an expert on that.

- Jen stated that reading from the Fire Chief's memo dated June 27th, noting that the fire department access road shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20'. The original plan shows 15'. They were showing the easement as 20' so what we need to understand is what is the paved area of that 20' roadway, we don't know what the paved portion of the 20' right of way, we don't know what the paved portion of the 20' right of way is. All we know is that there is a 20' right of way; what is the paved width, what is the drainage going to look like on the sides, what is our cut and fill and how is that road going to be built and what load can that road sustain. Jen stated that this is why she asked the detailed drawing be submitted so that they can have that informed discussion of what we got and how it will perform in the future. Jen stated that what she would like to propose to the Board is that once we have those details, we schedule a time where they can all sit down with the Fire Chief in a meeting once we have those details. It would be most productive if we have the complete details at that time for that conversation.
- Mr. Jeffrey wanted to clarify what was said about the paved width; the whole length is gravel all the way through. Mr. Byron stated that if you're going to make the road gravel, you still have to consider the ability of the fire truck on that road.
- Mr. Croteau asked about the wet land, he stated that basically it is not intersecting but it is touching. Mr. Jeffrey stated that in the drawing it is not touching, it just so happens that the darker line, the cad program draws the line thicker so it looks like it is touching. It is not touching.
- Mr. Croteau asked about the water supply for the hydrant. Mr. Prolman stated that the intent is to have private sprinkler systems in each of the new homes; because that is the best option we have for these new homes. The nearest hydrant is 1 to 2000' feet away. The other fire protection options are: fire pond, or a cistern. The sprinkler system based on new wells, will be the best option.
- Jen stated that as an administrative detail regarding sprinklers, the Board may not require sprinklers as a condition of approval. If the applicant is going to propose sprinklers, they need to propose it in writing on their own documents, but it has to come from the applicant.
- Mr. Prolman stated that he did speak with Kevin Lynch, and he does agree that this is the best solution for this issue.

Public Input:

None

Mr. Prolman suggested that the Board take a look at the waiver requests.

Waiver for Subdivision Regulation 530.00 k & m – sedimentation and erosion control plan

– Mr. Jeffrey stated that what they are proposing is minimal disturbance of the site as it is. We are looking to not build any retention ponds for the gathering of water from the two homes; we are looking for the natural drainage. Mr. Jeffrey stated they are looking for a waiver on this request. After some discussion from the Planning Board this waiver was **tabled**.

Waiver for Subdivision Regulation 530.00 n – Letter of intent from electrical company

Mr. Barry stated that the applicant request a waiver from the noted section on the following basis: Historically the section is met to deal with subdivisions where multiple new power boxes and poles are to be added. The proposed subdivision has a long existing power line on 3A. Mr. Prolman stated that the subdivision regulations are really designed for when a big subdivision comes to town. We see this as unnecessary cost and expense to chase down letters from utility companies to where we know there is power on Charles Bancroft and there is power to Bob Leary's house now, and we don't see that there is going to be an issue providing power to the two new lots. Mr. Barry asked where they would get their power from, when you run it from the house wouldn't you have to run it to a post and the houses that are that far back, wouldn't you need a utility post on the property to the street, or is it going to be one line running from the homes there right to 3A? Mr. Jeffrey stated that they haven't figured out where they are going to put the poles yet, they don't even know where the houses are going to be. Mr. Jeffrey stated that his guess would be to come down, branch off and come down and branch off with private utility poles along the driveway. Mr. Barry asked if this is something that should be addressed later when there is more detail for the Board. Mr. Jeffrey stated yes. Mr. Barry asked if when the road is put in, they would have a better idea where the posts will be going. Mr. Jeffrey stated they would have a better idea. Mr. Jeffrey stated that this is a request for a waiver to commitment from the electric company as to whether or not they would provide power. Mr. Byron explained that what they are looking for is a waiver from the requirement from the zoning ordinances as to contact the power company and see whether they have sufficient capacity to provide a subdivision with power. In this particular case it is two houses. It is not a subdivision; you are not running heavy duty lines to a 30 building subdivision and distributing that out to multiple houses. The location of the post isn't part of the waiver request.

MOTION: *by Mr. Young to allow the waiver 530.00 n – letter of intent from the electrical company*

SECOND: by Mr. Kapelson

VOTE: 6-0-0

Subdivision Regulation 530.00 e - Topography

Mr. Barry stated that this section of the regulation deals with providing existing and composed topography for the entire lot. The applicant request a waiver from the noted section on the following basis: two foot topographic was created for the two lots that are now to be created. The existing lot proposed 9.1.1 and the remaining parcel 9.1; 51 acres are not to be changed for development. Mr. Jeffrey stated that this time they are proposing just these lots, this lot for the purpose is not going to be changed. The remaining 51 acres are not being proposed for development. We are asking for relief for the request to topography 51 acres, when we are only looking to improve less than four. Mr. Barry stated that his concern is that the remaining 51 acres, if in the future they ever decide to develop it, where would the road come out, would it come out to the existing road? Can in the future this road that is here now become a road for the subdivision in the back, or is there another way to get from the 51 acres and is it land locked. Mr. Jeffrey stated if you look at sheet one, it has 540' +/- of frontage. There is also a road that is built for the purpose of PSNH maintenance. Mr. Jeffrey stated to the chairman that he doesn't believe the waiver request is about where someone's future development is going to take place.

Mr. Jeffrey stated that he believes that what he is asking for is reasonable because to top 51 acres that he is not developing nor have an interest in is cost prohibited. Right now there are no plans for the remaining 51 acres.

Jen stated that she has a small concern; she would like to see topography on the length of the roadway on Lot 9-1-1, and the waiver is requesting a waiver for topo for the entirety of Lot 9-1-1 and the entirety of the back 51 acres. She has no objections to the waiver requests of the back 51 acres. Jen stated we should have topo for the length of the road, especially where the recommendations coming in are that the length of the driveway needs improvements, if there is going to be easements granted for emergency access back and forth. Mr. Prolman stated that when they talked to Lou Carron, when he was talking about the improvements; Mr. Prolman believes that Mr. Carron said it was from the barn northward, so that is all they captured in the topo. Jen stated that the Fire Chiefs concerns were generically the length of the driveway. Mr. Prolman stated that nothing is proposed for the existing driveway, it works well today and they are not changing anything on that area. The Fire Chief simply said (which he is thinking as a private road) because he was thinking of it from the E911 prospective that three or more structures equal private road and he says generically; the private road which would indicate the entire length must be maintained year round to provide access for Litchfield apparatus. The existing dirt drive shall also be maintained and meet the same surface preparation and maintenance as the new dirt drive. This drive must accommodate apparatus that weighs 65,000 pounds. This is a memo that came dated June 27th. Mr. Prolman stated that notwithstanding the Fire Chief's memo, we are still not doing anything to that part of the driveway. It works today perfectly fine. The request is for a waiver for the topographical information for this remainder lot and lot 9-1 in this area of the driveway.

Mr. Prolman made a suggestion to the Board to break the waiver onto two pieces.

MOTION: by Mr. Byron motioned to the Board in terms of the waiver request the applicant for subdivision 530.00 e = Topography that the Board waives the requirement for the topography for the 51 acre, section Lot 9-1 of the development, but tables decision on the three lot subdivisions Lot 9-1-1, 9-1-2 and 9-1-3 until future meeting.

SECOND: by Mr. Kapelson

VOTE: 6-0-0

Attorney Prolman stated that he is going through the staff report and just to report to the Board Greg and himself have been trying to get something from DOT saying that they don't need a curb cut, because it is an existing historic road. We expect to have this for the next meeting.

Jen stated that she would like to recap their follow up items:

- When she has additional details from the applicant, they will schedule a meeting aggressively pursuing the Fire Chief that will be a staff meeting with the applicant and the Fire Chief to go through those details. Jen will forward the common drive way and Calawa license to Attorney Lefevre.
- Jen will flag for the Fire Chief the revised grading to see that it does meet or address his concerns; turning radius on Lot 9-1-1 and driveway construction standards.
- Water supply in the proposed solution of sprinklers in lieu of a cistern or other means.

- Jen proposed that they do a quick follow up with Lou Carron, Town Engineer, once we have the details to discuss whether to look at the impact of the fire truck, and how that will work, passing on the driveway, and maneuverability there and the revised access.

Mr. Prolman stated that he needs a date certain.

MOTION: by Mr. Byron that the Planning Board continues consideration for approval of the Leary subdivision case #1206 LITM9L1 SD until August 21, 2012 at 7:00 pm at Litchfield Town Hall.

SECOND: by Mr. Blanchette

VOTE: 6-0-0

Road Acceptance:

Joan stated that the regulations don't need to be changed, the way we are actually doing things need to be changed. For example; Tanager Way, they have paved the road and have a maintenance bond for two years, typically we haven't accepted the road until the two years are up. People having been living there since 2005, the problem is the school buses will not go down there because the road is not a Town road yet. We want to keep everything the same; have a maintenance bond after they pave the road, and the Town has been doing winter plowing after the final paving is done. We think that we should accept the road and still keep the maintenance bond and recommend to the Selectmen to accept the road as a town road. Mr. Byron questioned why we would want to accept the road if it hasn't had its two years of trial and error and then find out there is something wrong with the road. Joan stated you still would have the maintenance bond for two years. Mr. Byron asked what you are going to base that on. Joan stated, the same thing you always base it on. We either need to talk to the School Board and say it has final pavement on, but they have been adamant that they will not go down that street until the town accepts the road. Joan stated that the Board could either say to the Road Agent not to plow the private road until the Town accepts it and historically the Town hasn't accepted any until the two year maintenance bond is up, and that means the school buses do not go down there. Mr. Barry asked how long the town has been plowing the road. Joan stated that on Tanager they will be picking that up this winter because they just paved it. Mr. Byron stated that there is a design phase where the engineer looks at the road and says does that road meet Town standards and he says yes or no. If it doesn't meet Town standards then we want nothing to do with it because it is going to be money out of the tax payers' pockets to get it fixed. If the engineer says it meets Town standards then we put it onto a performance bond, which goes on for two years so if anything is a design problem of the road, we can get the developer to get it fixed, and then we can make determination on whether we accept it or not as a Town road. If there is nothing wrong with the Town road in that two year time frame, then the Town accepts it and at that point the Town will start to do maintenance on it and start plowing; up until that time the people who own that road is the developer. Joan is asking the Board to accept the road earlier than the two years, and they would have to have everything; the as builds, deeds, inspections, etc. and still have the maintenance bond. Mr. Byron asked what legal authority does the Selectmen or Planning Board have to require the developer to have a maintenance bond for a Town road that we now own if we accept it. Joan stated that this was a good point.

Planning Board Budget for 2013

After going through some of the proposed 2013 budget and some discussion from the Board; Mr. Barry asked the Board to look over the Planning Boards 2013 proposed budget and discuss at the next meeting when they have more information.

Joan stated that she received a proposal from Bruce Mayberry (BCM). Jen stated that she did post what they received on the meeting site. Mr. Barry stated that Mr. Curtis was asking at the last meeting how far the \$10,000 was going to get us and what we are getting for our money. Mr. Barry stated that Mr. Mayberry laid it out pretty well with what he anticipates to do. Mr. Barry stated that it seems that the format now shows that Mr. Mayberry speaks about public schools and public road systems. Mr. Barry stated that this proposal is much more detailed than the proposal Mr. Mayberry sent out in June. Jen stated that her concern about the Mayberry proposal is that what he is saying here is that if you read the objective line under 1 and 2, for (1) Public Schools, you are getting the full update and revision, you will have a revision done. For (2) Roads it will do enough to decide to whether or not to proceed, but it is not actually doing the update. Jen's question is parsing it out this way so that we are saying we are doing this for a fee not to exceed \$10,000 where he will bill hourly; can the remainder of that complete scope of work that was sighted out at \$23,500 be completed for \$13,500 or is it going to cost more in the end. Jen is reading this as we are only reaching a decision point, we are not actually revising. Jen stated that we need some clarification in relation to the way it is worded, and if we parse it out and it cost \$10,000 to do schools and reach a decision on whether or not to proceed on roads, can we then complete road plus complete the other three that we are still waiting for \$13,500.00, which is what is being put in the budget, or is it going to be another situation where you put out the RFP and can't quite get through all of it with what you have and the cost is escalating. Jen stated that she likes the fact that he is being cognizant of the fact that you need some more information to decide whether or not to go further. Mr. Barry asked if it means because the Fire Department, Police Department, Rec Department is not in here, that would be over and above the \$23,000? Jen stated no, those are the things we are budgeting for 2013. Mr. Barry asked if this is something we are just reviewing or voting on to accept. Jen stated that is Mr. Barry's choice. Mr. Kapelson stated that we can't accept it if we are not sure what it is. Joan stated that we need a clarification on the road section based on his wording. Joan will ask for clarification for the roads from Mr. Mayberry's proposal. Mr. Barry asked Joan if she believes she will have this information for the next Planning Board Meeting. Joan stated yes. Mr. Byron stated that if you are going to go to the voters this year, tell them roads are going to carry into 2013, schools get done this year, so you can get your time point in December, and as he is going through roads, it is not a decision point issue, it is now you are going to implement it and you have a contract that should be available in March. Joan asked if the Board if they want to ask him if he will go for a two year schedule for the \$23,500, but it has to be written in based on voter approval. Mr. Kapelson stated the second half (\$13,500) contingent upon approval.

9:30 p.m. – Mr. Byron left the meeting.

2. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Joan stated that she did get an e-mail from DES that we don't have well protection in our zoning, and is our community planning on considering well head protection this fall, has the Board discussed it, have they considered it or are they not going to do it. If your community is

interested DES can provide the paper or digital map. Jen stated that what Pierce Rigrod, from DES, is doing is reaching out across the state to Towns that may or may not have well head protection ordinances within their zoning and offering technical assistance from DES to aid in that effort if it was something that was in interest. Mr. Barry asked what well head protection is. Jen stated that well head protection is zoning that looks at your source water so that if you have municipal wells, setting up regulations, certain distance of a protective radius around those areas to protect that source water.

Approve Minutes of June 19, and July 17, 2012.

MOTION: *by Mr. Barry to approve the minutes of June 19.*

SECOND: Mr. Croteau

VOTE: 5-0-0.

MOTION: *by Mr. Croteau to approve the minutes of July 17th as amended.*

SECOND: Mr. Blanchette

VOTE: 5-0-0.

MOTION: *by Mr. Barry to adjourn*

SECOND: Mr. Young

VOTE: 5-0-0.

The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Leon Barry, Chairman

Bob Curtis, Vice Chairman

Frank Byron, Selectman

Michael Croteau

Thomas R. Young

Russell Blanchette

Minutes taken by: *Donna Baril*