

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
March 7, 2016

The Chairman Peter McNamara called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00pm.

PRESENT: Peter McNamara, Roger Montbleau, Paddy Culbert, Joseph Passamonte, Alternate Tim Doherty, Alternate Mike Sherman, Selectmen Representative William McDevitt, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Paul Dadak, Jason Croteau, Alternate Robert Molloy

Mr. McNamara appointed Mr. Doherty to vote in Mr. Croteau's absence and Mr. Sherman to vote in Mr. Dadak's absence. He then appointed Mr. Doherty as Acting Secretary.

OLD BUSINESS

PB Case #2015-00016

Map 22 Lot 8-130

52 WINDHAM ROAD, LLC - 52 Windham Road - Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review for proposed mixed use development consisting of a 1500SF retail building and 15 townhouse condominium units in the Mixed Use Overlay District

Mr. McNamara informed in light of the Zoning Board of Adjustment ruling (Case #ZO2016-00001), the applicant has requested date specification to April 4, 2016 to have time to respond to the decision.

The case was date specified to April 4, 2016.

PB Case #PL2015-00021

Map 39 Lot 1-51-1

SESTON, Carolyn - Sherburne Road & Mammoth Road - Seeking a Special Permit to approve yield plan for proposed conservation subdivision (*Note: full application for Conservation Subdivision will follow once Special Permit and density is established*)

Mr. Peter Zohdi of Herbert Associates and Attorney Ashley Scott or Cronin, Bisson & Zalinsky, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the requested Special Permit. Mr. Zohdi noted during a previous presentation the Board raised concern regarding traffic at the intersection of Sherburne Road and Mammoth Road. They've worked with traffic consultant Steve Pernaw to address concerns and answer the Board's questions.

Mr. McNamara questioned if the plan contained any changes from the previous presentation. Mr. Zohdi answered yes. He noted they were previously proposing a road approximately 300ft. from the Mammoth/Sherburne intersection; however, after speaking with the Department of Transportation ('DOT') and Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm), the proposed road was now shown at 500ft from the intersection. They requested a conservation subdivision with ten units (including the existing house). At the present meeting he wanted to focus on the traffic questions/issues.

Mr. Stephen Pernaw of Pernaw & Company came forward and presented the Board with the traffic impact study of the area. He explained the process of collecting data and information from previous reports (at the DOT from 2012 and 2014) and studies, which was then reviewed against fresh information collected by his firm. They created trip estimates by reviewing the proposed development and developed a future trajectory to allow the analysis of capacity and level of service. Mr. Pernaw stated manual traffic counts were conducted in December, 2015 at the intersection of Sherburne/Mammoth Roads. They found the busiest AM peak hour to be between 7:15AM-8:15AM with a traffic volume of 741 and the PM peak hour, between 5PM-6PM, had a volume of 785. He noted they began their PM count at 4PM and witnessed the Police arriving at 5PM to assist with traffic flow. Knowing that December isn't the busiest month, adjustment factors were applied to the study data and projected out to the year 2026. In terms of the development, Mr. Pernaw stated nine new lots wouldn't generate a lot of traffic. According to standard trip generation rates used in the industry, during the morning peak times the nine new residences would generate approximately seven new trips and during the evening would generate approximately nine new trips. With regard to the intersection capacity, Mr. Pernaw told the Board that the site driveway intersection with Sherburne Road would operate with a level service of 'C' or better. However, when reviewing the intersection of Sherburne and Mammoth Roads, the level of service received an 'F' with the existing condition. He noted the Police officer effectively managed the traffic queue during the PM peak hour. Using the raw numbers (unadjusted in December) the intersection met the criteria for a traffic signal warrant #2. Mr. Pernaw suggested take the information and share it with the DOT.

Mr. Pernaw reviewed their recommendation:

- 1) Share the study data with the DOT;
- 2) Subdivision road should operate and be controlled with a stop sign;
- 3) Subdivision intersection should have pavement markings, stop line, double yellow line to separate inbound/outbound vehicles;

Based on the State's requirements, Mr. Montbleau wanted to know if the intersection findings (at Sherburne/Mammoth) would necessitate a stop light. Mr. Pernaw replied by saying prior to consideration of a traffic signal the intersection would need to meet the minimum traffic count of the national criteria. He noted traffic signals didn't always have a positive result. But he felt given the existing condition, there was enough traffic to send information to the DOT for determination.

Mr. McDevitt spoke about the intersection, which he said had a long history of the Town dealing with the DOT. He noted approximately five years ago the Town started pushing the DOT to do something about the intersection. The DOT and a third party consultant met with the Selectmen, Town officials (Police, Fire, Highway, and Planning Director) reviewed the intersections at both ends of Sherburne Road. Suggested recommendations and solutions (both temporary and permanent) were presented to the Town. The ultimate recommendation was to install a round-about; the Town was cautiously optimistic that the problem at the State's intersection would be addressed. Simultaneous to discussions with the State, the Town began to work with the Nashua Regional Planning Commission to make certain that the State would include the intersection on their 10-year plan to be eligible for funding. The Town continued to push to get the intersection on the State's plan, unfortunately it didn't occur. Mr. McDevitt reiterated there was no solution between 2016-2026 for the State's failed intersection. In the meantime, traffic would continue to build.

Because the Selectmen and Police Chief were extremely concerned about safety, danger, potential accidents and tremendous -inconvenience to residents, the Police Chief decided to experiment with having a Police Officer (patrol officer) present during the evening peak hour. This has worked very well; however, the officer is still 'on patrol' during this time and is inclined from time to time to respond to situations elsewhere. The residents are thrilled that the presence of the officer has solved the problem, but the situation gets out of control when the officer is not there. The situation had caused the intersection of Marsh/Mammoth to also be effected, which may also be a State intersection. Mr. McDevitt described the recommendations/solutions that

were made during the time the DOT was working with the Town. He was concerned a tragic accident would occur and felt vehicles existing the proposed development during difficult hours would be in danger. At present the intersection was the single worst in the Town. Mr. McDevitt said his reaction to the proposal was based on the interaction and frustration with DOT over the past five years. He understood the State didn't have money and reiterated that the Town needed the intersection fixed. The Town has collected exaction fees totaling approximately \$50,000 that could be used to help the DOT solve the problem.

Mr. Gowan spoke about the State's Road Safety Audit process, which was conducted at the intersection and determined short, medium and long-term solutions. He summarized the determinations. He attended a meeting with the State to advocate for the Town and was encouraged to continue being an advocate. He intended, with the Selectmen's permission, to have an engineered solution (paid for by the exactions) that could be shown to DOT as a 'shovel ready' project. He recognized this didn't solve the problem and the process would still take a long time.

Mr. Pernaw stated they obtained crash records from the Police Department and saw there was a three-year average of five crashes per year. Based on expected accident rate predictions, the data was comparable. He referred to the study and spoke about the departure volume during peak house, which was believed to be imperceptible to what occurs at the intersection. Mr. McDevitt replied his concern was not the number of cars added to the intersection, it was the dangerousness of taking the turn.

Mr. Montbleau wanted clarification regarding the number of trips during peak hours. Mr. Pernaw replied based on nine new residents, during the AM peak hour there would be seven trips and during the PM peak hour there would be nine trips. There would still be trips before and after the peak hours; the traffic study analyzed the worst case situation. Mr. Montbleau questioned what the figures were for the total intersection volume. Mr. Pernaw replied the two-way volume on Mammoth Road, north of the intersection, was 1,077. During the evening the volume was 1,183 (both directions added together). The volume on the south of the intersection was 576; with a total (both directions) 670. Mr. Montbleau inquired if the study considered other projects on Sherburne Road that were not yet complete (Sky View and Long Pond Woods), which would add approximately 125 houses. Taking into account one of the developments was age restricted, Mr. Pernaw did some quick math and replied the additional developments on Sherburne Road would generate approximately 24 additional (east bound) trips during the PM peak period. Mr. Montbleau questioned if the future projections included the two additional developments. Mr. Pernaw answered no. He reiterated that the Sherburne/Mammoth intersection was presently considered an 'F' for the level of service, without adding in the proposed development or other future development. The study showed analysis of the traffic with and without the proposed nine-lot subdivision.

Mr. Montbleau questioned why Mr. Pernaw indicated traffic signal lights didn't always have a positive result. Mr. Pernaw replied there were always advantages and disadvantages with any controlled devices. He advised that a traffic signal could actually increase the number of crashes at an intersection per year but at the same time reduce the severity of the crashes. He explained that the problem with an un-signalized 'T' intersection was the left turn departure causing cross-movement, high injury, crashes. He stated if a round-about was installed there should be less crashes than there would be with a signal. Mr. Montbleau spoke of his experience with an intersection in Lowell, MA where vehicles are waiting to make a turn into, and out from, a fast food restaurant through a line of traffic waiting for a signal light to change. He explained the exiting vehicles end up blocking the line of traffic and creating a grid locked situation. He was concerned a similar situation would occur at the exit point of the development. Mr. Pernaw noted the proposed subdivision road would be 500ft away from the intersection. He didn't expect the few exiting vehicles would have difficulty based on the movement of queued vehicles having a steady flow. Mr. Montbleau stated he witnessed the traffic queue being backed up approximately a half mile and didn't see how the vehicle movement would allow for a vehicle to exit the development. He then spoke of his concern for vehicles accelerating onto

Sherburne Road once they cleared the Mammoth Road intersection to gain momentum up to the 40mph speed limit. Mr. Pernaw told the Board he arrived in Town early to witness the situation his field personnel studied. He saw how the Police Officer handled the traffic queue.

Mr. Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) came forward to discuss the traffic study with the Board, which he felt quantified the problem though the solid numbers. He agreed with Mr. McDevitt that the situation was a larger problem that would be dealt with as a Town issue. He directed the Board to Figure 1 in the traffic study, showing the real count traffic numbers. He then spoke about Table 4 – queuing analysis that had been done with a raw count. Mr. Keach reminded the Board that the purpose of the traffic analysis was for consideration of the proposed subdivision. He said it wasn't reasonable to expect the applicant to solve the State's problem at the intersection. He believed it would be appropriate for the Board to consider what mitigating measures the applicant could do to not exacerbate the problem by virtue of the added volume of traffic the subdivision would contribute.

Mr. Keach referenced his letter to Mr. Gowan in which he suggested Mr. Pernaw look at what would happen if the applicant developed a separate right turn lane (on Sherburne Road at Mammoth Road) that wouldn't impede the sight of a left turning vehicle. Based on the numbers, Mr. Keach said the data suggested traffic in and out of the development ought to work based on ensuring the queue didn't back up beyond the intersection by getting the right-turn traffic into their own turning lane. He said the problem was having one turning movement for traffic turning left at the intersection which created the long queue. He didn't disagree with the numbers contained in the study. He would like the applicant to develop a full width right turn lane (on Sherburne Road with striping, signage etc) by reconfiguring the approach to Mammoth Road. He understood this wouldn't solve the problem at the intersection, but felt it would mitigate the additional trips from the development and serve as a safety benefit.

Mr. McNamara questioned if it would be possible to have the proposed roadway in the development made into a through road from Mammoth Road to Sherburne Road. Mr. Keach replied he'd been asked that question and wanted to hear Mr. Pernaw's opinion. Mr. Pernaw was concerned about creating two points of access and the potential for shortcuts and additional traffic within the development.

Mr. Sherman asked if the Board had voted to allow a conservation subdivision. Mr. McNamara answered no. Mr. Sherman wanted to know if the applicant would still be able to provide the 500ft. distance from the intersection if the Board denied the conservation subdivision and it became a conventional subdivision. Mr. Zohdi believed he would be able to do so.

Mr. Doherty felt it would be good to look into how the road within the development could be laid out to be a through road. He believed the applicant should look into having the access road either be onto Mammoth Road, or have it be a through road from Mammoth to Sherburne. He believed the proposed lay out was the worst case scenario. He noted if the development had a through road it could be used to divert traffic in the event of an accident or if the Sherburne/Mammoth intersection was under construction. Mr. Doherty didn't believe the development road would only be used during peak hours. Mr. Keach was concerned with creating additional problems by adding two additional intersections, one being close to the Marsh Road intersection.

Mr. Zohdi noted if there were to be an intersection from the development to Mammoth Road, it would be located approximately 275ft from Sherburne Road and 400ft from Marsh Road. He said they worked with DOT and change the scheme of the project to move the Sherburne Road access 500ft. from the Mammoth intersection.

Hypothetically, Mr. Montbleau said if the development road was a through way it would eliminate the dangerous situation of vehicles turning left onto Sherburne Road. He said the road could be open to through traffic during specific peak hours and closed the remainder of time. He was familiar with that type of scenario and saw it work effectively.

Mr. Gowan appreciated the discussion but was concerned with creating an additional intersection in close proximity to the 'Y' intersection of Mammoth and Marsh Roads. He reminded the Board that the plan was in front of them for the yield plan. He asked Mr. Zohdi for a description of how the applicant earned the extra lot within the conservation subdivision. Mr. Zohdi replied he wanted to focus the present meeting on the traffic study to understand what direction the Board preferred. He didn't want to have the applicant spend additional money until the traffic was resolved. Mr. Doherty spoke about the traffic flow of the area and didn't agree vehicles existing the project by turning left onto Mammoth Road would have as difficult a time as those vehicles exiting onto Sherburne Road turning left into the traffic queue.

Mr. Zohdi felt the project was going in the right direction. He wanted to continue working with Mr. Pernaw and Mr. Keach to come up with a solution and come back in front of the Board.

Mr. Gowan asked Mr. Zohdi to work on the road name. Mr. Zohdi replied he would follow the proper procedure and submit a selection of road names to the Fire Chief.

Mr. Sherman asked that the access road on the conventional plan be shifted away from the Mammoth Road intersection, similar to what was shown on the conservation plan. Mr. Zohdi told Mr. Sherman he would do so.

Mr. Zohdi asked the Board to date specify the case to the first meeting in April.

Mr. McNamara opened the discussion for public input. No one came forward.

Mr. Doherty stated he wasn't usually in favor of shared driveways, but in this instance questioned if thought had been given to possibly reducing the number of lots within the project and creating shared driveways onto both Sherburne and Mammoth Road to eliminate some of the traffic flow. Mr. Zohdi replied the DOT allowed a certain number of accesses to a parcel. The current proposal showed one existing and one new curb cut; at the same time there were two curb cuts being eliminated.

The plan was date specified to April 4, 2016.

NEW BUSINESS

PB Case #PL2016-00002

Map 30 Lot 11-93

RICHARD, Michael & Danielle - 95 Dutton Road - Special Permit for driveway access over Wetland Conservation District

Mr. Doherty read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

The applicant Michael Richard came forward to discuss the request for Special Permit to allow driveway access over the Wetland Conservation District ('WCD'). He explained they would like to construct a single family home on a ten acre lot. He told the previous owner requested a 15-unit elderly housing project. He

purchased the property in 2014 and was now proposing a home sitting back approximately 400ft from Dutton Road. He displayed a plan of the property outlining the location of the proposed house and driveway.

Mr. McNamara understood the applicant met with the Conservation Commission and went on to read aloud their letter of support (dated February 11, 2016) and suggested recommendation to move the driveway to the north east following the property line 300ft and the along the edge of the WCD until it reaches the hammer head turnaround. Doing so will eliminate the WCD between the driveway and the home, which was to become lawn area. Mr. Richard spoke to moving the driveway. He said while he respected their opinion, he made the point during their meeting that the current driveway drawn on the plans matched the previously approved roadway for the prior project.

Mr. McNamara read aloud a letter dated February 21, 2016 that was sent personally by Paul Gagnon, speaking as a Pelham resident, not the Conservation Chairman. Mr. Gagnon requested that the Planning Board restrict development on the 95 Dutton Road parcel to the current single-family home proposal, with no further subdivision. Mr. Richard told the Board he and his wife intended to keep the back portion of the lot and most of the property undeveloped, they wanted to reserve the right to add a future in-law apartment or an additional building (such as a barn). Mr. McNamara confirmed with Mr. Richard that he didn't intend to further subdivide the parcel. Mr. Richard replied they would like to keep the property as a ten-acre lot as long as they were financially able to do so. They did not plan to put in a full subdivision. Mr. McNamara asked Mr. Richard if he had any objection to a condition of approval that there be no further subdivision, with the stipulation (and proper approvals) they would be entitled to put in an in-law apartment or additional building pertinent to the home. Mr. Richard understood having a restriction against putting in a full development, but wanted to reserve the right to break off a portion of the lot in the future.

Mr. Gowan said if applicant wanted to construct an in-law apartment or an additional structure (if it encroached into the WCD), they would need to go in front of the Zoning Board to request a Special Exception. Otherwise, he said the applicant had the right to build on their property as anyone else. He said they also had the right to construct a duplex because there were more than two acres. He stated the restriction being discussed would not prevent the applicant from doing so, as long as the structures weren't within the WCD as that would follow a different process.

Mr. Doherty stated the Board wasn't reviewing a subdivision of land, the matter in front of them was the request for Special Permit to have a driveway access across the WCD. He couldn't recall the Board asking an applicant to deed restrict their property from subdivision when the matter being discussed wasn't a subdivision. He didn't feel it was appropriate for the Board to ask the applicant to deed restrict their property.

Mr. McDevitt understood the recommendation and recalled the Board restricting a property in the past. However, he didn't feel strongly about including a restriction and felt he could rely on future Planning Boards to make appropriate decisions.

Mr. Gowan noted the proposed driveway was long and the Fire Chief had authority under NFPA to sign off on such. He noted there may be a requirement to add a pull-off so emergency equipment could get past each other. Mr. Richard understood that his civil engineer sized the driveway width at 14ft. to match requirements of the fire truck and the turn-around.

Because of the amount of wetland and WCD on the property, Mr. Sherman didn't believe there would be much of a chance the property could be subdivided. Mr. Gowan couldn't say it would be impossible, but he agreed it would be a challenge. Mr. Sherman pointed out the reduction of impact with going from the previously approved project to the proposal now being shown to the Board.

Mr. McDevitt questioned if the Conservation Commission's recommendation to shift the driveway was reflected on the plan. Mr. Richard replied it was not reflected on the plan. He showed the Board the proposed driveway location and how it would be shifted if they were to follow the Conservation Commission's comments. He said they hoped to keep the driveway as proposed, given it was being shown in the same location as the previous plan in front of the Board. Mr. McDevitt told the applicant he was inclined to follow the Conservation Commission's recommendation for driveway placement, but he was not inclined to restrict further subdivision. Mr. Doherty suggested allowing the Fire Department to make the final decision regarding the driveway placement.

PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Larry Major, Major Realty Trust, asked the Board where the septic system would be located and if it would be impacted by shifting the driveway. Mr. Richard replied the septic system was located behind the house outside any wetlands or WCD. Mr. Major questioned if moving the driveway would circumvent immediate emergency response. Mr. McNamara replied they wanted the Fire Department to provide input on that point. Mr. Major wanted to know if a restriction on subdivision would prohibit the landowner from donating a portion of their property (in the wetland). From the sense of the Board, Mr. McNamara didn't believe a restriction for subdivision would be placed on the property. Mr. Gowan stated when the Town is the recipient, they aren't bound by the same restriction. Mr. Major was in favor of the applicant's proposal.

Mr. Gowan suggested if the Board were to grant an approval, that it be subject to the Fire Department making a final determination, with the understanding if they can negotiate the geometry recommended by the Conservation Commission the movement of the driveway should occur. There was no objection.

MOTION: (Doherty/Montbleau) To approve the Special Permit for the driveway placement, subject to Fire Department recommendation on the placement of such.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

PB Case #PL2016-00003

Map 41 Lot 10-279

MATTE, Christopher (Ace Cigarettes) - 28 Bridge Street - Modify existing Site Plan – applicant proposes relocating parking spots.

Mr. Doherty read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

The applicant, Christopher Matte and his representative Paul Martin of Barlo Signs came forward to discuss the Site Plan modification. Mr. Martin displayed a plan and outlined four parking spaces that would be shifted to make room for a free-standing sign. They will be meeting with the Zoning Board at their next meeting to request approval for the sign, but need Site Plan approval to proceed.

Mr. McNamara wanted to know how many feet the parking spots would be moved. Mr. Martin believed the parking spots would be moved approximately 22ft-24ft forward (toward Tiger Avenue).

Mr. Culbert questioned where the store entrance door was located. Mr. Martin replied it was centered on the building front. Mr. Culbert asked why the handicap parking spot was located toward the side of the building. Mr. Martin noted the parking spot was next to the entrance for the handicap ramp. Mr. Martin pointed out by moving the handicap spot forward it not only continued to have the striped area on the driver's side, it would also allow for access to the passenger side of a vehicle. Mr. Gowan asked for confirmation that the site was

ADA compliant. Mr. Martin believed so. Mr. Gowan suggested if the Board approved the modified Site Plan, they add a condition that the Building Inspector confirm that fact.

Mr. McNamara opened the discussion to public input. No one came forward.

MOTION: (Montbleau/Passamonte) To approve the modified Site Plan, subject to Building Inspector confirming ADA compliance and give the Building Inspector leeway to recommend how ADA compliance can be achieved.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Planning Board to determine a threshold to define “active & substantial development” for purposes of implementing impact fee.

Mr. Gowan told the Board they would begin to see many applicant’s (primarily for developments that have begun building) seeking a waiver to the impact fee. He referred the Board to the Impact Fee Enabling Ordinance and outlined the section of waivers. There are six ways an applicant can seek a waiver. Mr. Gowan felt the Board needed to reach consensus and be consistent on what active and substantial development is. He said they should then describe it in the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board’s engineering review firm) came forward and explained that the term ‘active and substantial’ is supposed to indicate the point of no return. He suggested this be when a road is constructed through subgrade preparation, which is a point in a development when all the utilities, drainage and a good portion of the infrastructure is complete. He noted through case law, this represented an irreversible action.

Mr. McNamara asked if specific improvements would need to be described to make the point legally defensible. Mr. Keach believed in a non-phased subdivision, a case could be made if an entire road had progressed through subgrade inspection. In the case of a phased subdivision, the same level of completion should be for one full and complete phase. Mr. Keach said another point for lots with no infrastructure vesting could be when the first Certificate of Occupancy (‘CO’) was issued. He told the Board specifics could be plugged in as a matter of Regulation because the Statute enables the Board to do so, or the Board could do so on a case by case basis. He said if there was no definition of active and substantial development, either by regulation or stipulation, the time clock of two and five years would run. He noted vesting protects the plan from subsequent changes to the planning/zoning regulations.

From what Mr. Keach explained, Mr. Gowan understood for a project with a road, active and substantial development threshold would be met when the road is at subgrade, with drainage and utilities that enjoy satisfactory inspections. Mr. Keach said it was when they were at the threshold where they could place gravel (‘gravel ready’). Alternatively, Mr. Gowan understood in a phased project, active and substantial development would meet the same standard (as a project with a road) for a full phase. Mr. Keach said it was important not to make people do things prematurely that would then sit. Mr. Gowan further understood for a project without a road, active and substantial development would be when one CO is issued. Mr. Keach replied they could either have it at the time of a building permit or CO. He noted the impact for which the fee was being collected didn’t exist until the CO. He suggested confirming the fact with Mark Fougere, who reviewed the impact fee.

Mr. Doherty wanted to know where the 'clock' would start for a development that was initially brought in as a conventional then came back to the Board as a phased conservation subdivision. Statutorily, Mr. Keach said when it came back the road was early in construction; however, they had done significant off-site improvements and spent substantial money.

Mr. Gowan stated during the interim the Board now had a baseline for any project that came through until language was ensconced into the Regulations. If they are to include language into the Regulations, a public hearing would need to be held.

DATE SPECIFIED HEARING(S) / DISCUSSION(S) – April 4, 2016

Case #PL2015-00016 - Map 22 Lot 8-130 - 52 WINDHAM ROAD, LLC - 52 Windham Road
Case #PL2015-00021 - Map 39 Lot 1-51-1- SESTON, Carolyn - Sherburne Road & Mammoth Road

MINUTES REVIEW

February 1, 2016

MOTION: (Montbleau/Culbert) To approve the February 1, 2016 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Sherman abstained.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:22pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary