



Town of Plymouth
Planning Board Meeting Minutes: Public Hearing
January 16th, 2025

Approved 2/6/25

1) Call to Order

Christ called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

2) Roll Call of Members –

Present: John Christ (Chair), Susan Wood (Vice Chair), Phil LaMoreaux (Non-Recording Secretary), Mike Ahern, Matt Yeaton, Neil McIver (Select Board Rep), Michael Bouchard, Bradford Puffer (Alternate), Jason Neenos (Alternate), Molly McCahan (Alternate)

Absent/Excused: Zach Tirrell (Select Board Alt.)

Town of Plymouth Staff: Joseph Perez, Community Planner

3) Review of Minutes of the 1/2/25 Meeting

The Board reviewed the minutes of the 1/2/25 Planning Board meeting. Attention was brought to two grammatical errors to be corrected. LaMoreaux made a motion to approve the meeting minutes as amended, Wood seconded. All voted in favor.

4. Communications received by the Board

Perez brought attention to a letter received by Mountain Village Charter School regarding their extension request. 3 Lakes Landscaping also reached out about their continuation. A resident sent a letter regarding the zoning amendment hearing. In addition, the Selectboard has appointed Michael Bouchard a full member of the Planning Board. The National Guard will also present their proposed plans for the armory this evening.

5. Applications and Public Hearings

Extension Request/Compliance Hearing: Mountain Village Charter School

Christ recused himself for this agenda item; Puffer is seated as a voting member and Wood became the acting chair. This is a request for an extension of the one-year timeline for meeting site plan review conditions of approval and of the two-year timeline for beginning active and substantial development. The request relates to a site plan to develop a three-building educational facility serving approximately 120 students grades 1-8 on parcel 213-031. This will also include a continuation of a compliance hearing to review progress towards meeting conditions placed upon the site plan approval.

Delaney Carrier, trustee chair for Mountain Village Charter School was present to speak to the request. He wished to answer the Board's questions. Yeaton asked if they have a timeline, Carrier said hopefully 2 years. Their budget was not sufficient for the project and they are working to fill in the gap. They have plans to work towards their original goals. Upon a question from Wood, Carrier says he requests a 3-month extension request to the compliance hearing. LaMoreaux noted that a zoning amendment at town meeting could change the underlying zoning from agricultural to industrial commercial, but this would still fit the proposed use. If they had to come back for a new site plan in the event the extension was not granted and the amendment passes, it would be under the new zoning. The board takes note of this.

Wood opens a public hearing at 6:45. There are no comments and the hearing is closed at 6:45.

LaMoreaux makes a motion to grant a three-month extension to the compliance hearing, a one-year extension to the timeline for beginning active and substantial development (January 18, 2027) and a one-year extension to the timeline to meet conditions placed upon the site plan review approval. (January 18, 2026) The motion also included a continuation of the compliance hearing to review conformity with conditions of approval to the Planning Board meeting scheduled for the 17th of April be until January of 2026 and 2027. LaMoreaux amends his motion to continue the compliance hearing to the Planning Board meeting scheduled for May 15th. Ahern seconds, all vote in favor.

Site Plan Review Application Review of site plan review application from 3 Lakes Properties LLC

This is for possible acceptance and public hearing. The application is to establish and expand a retail landscape/material sales and retail greenhouse space on parcels 213-012-001, -002, - 003, and -004; located on both sides of Hamilton Way. The board was waiting for more information before proceeding to accept the application. The applicant is requesting a one-month extension, they are making progress but need more time. This has been extended several times, raising questions regarding whether a new notice to abutters is necessary. The board sees the one-month extension as reasonable. Yeaton makes a motion to continue the completeness review for acceptance of the site plan review application to the Planning Board's meeting scheduled for February 20th, 2025, McIver seconds. All vote in favor and the motion passes.

Zoning Amendment Public Hearing: Tenney Mountain Overlay District

The board proceeds to a public hearing on a zoning amendment under consideration for 2025 town meeting, to create a "Tenney Mountain Overlay District." Another public hearing had to be scheduled as substantive changes were made to the amendment. A legal review took place, and Perez introduced the notes it makes. The attorney proposed some small changes to avoid confusion. A change made to page 5 suggests the ski areas and resort do not need to be serviced by water and sewer, the attorney brings attention to this. As for the changes regarding residential uses, wording changes are suggested for clarification and consistency. None are considered substantive, other than a point made about height and how it is measured in proposed section 505(F).2. These changes could go against the discussion the board had and what was decided upon in the opinion of Christ. LaMoreaux agrees, and there is a discussion regarding what language is used to refer to superstructures not intended for human occupancy. The board sees this as clarifying the intent, not a substantive change. LaMoreaux suggested adding the language from Zoning Ordinance section 402 B and C as subsections of proposed section F2, with the current paragraph retained as originally proposed. Perez has no technical concerns with the formatting change. LaMoreaux says he is trying to evaluate if the proposed amendment could be easily implemented and added to the ordinance, and clarify the Board's original intent. Otherwise, the Board was in agreement with accepting the administrative/non-substantive changes proposed in the marked-up legal review Christ notes that this was a focus during the HOP discussions because of the housing component. Tweaks have been made to make sure it works. LaMoreaux notes that the underlying zoning also has a high potential for density. This amendment could allow for a village core within the PUD to create a small urban area, he supports the planning tool. Wood has concerns regarding water and sewer, she references a letter by the D'Aleos and says there needs to be more work done before the amendment proceeds. Christ responds that similarly to a site plan, if a developer were applying for approval under this, or any other section of Zoning, they would need to demonstrate that they can accommodate the water and sewer needs of the development. LaMoreaux suggested that a large enough development may even be able to provide its own wastewater treatment facility, and the

developer would need to be the one to answer questions of that nature from the Planning Board if applying for a development under the section.

McCahan read a letter from Judy and Eric D'Aleo raising concerns about several issues, including wetlands and infrastructure, such as water and sewer capacity. The letter suggested that the ability to access water was limited by the hydrology of the mountain, and expressed a concern about other services such as schools, fire, and police. The letter stated that Tenney Mountain did not have the terrain to be world-class, and that other mountains have already developed in the area. The letter also expressed concern over housing prices. McIver stated that he believed the letter was very speculative. The zoning change would require a developer to bring a plan before the Board that meets the requirements, and the Planning Board would need to decide whether it is acceptable. Ahern expressed that the letter raised many good points, and stated that he believes the change would be opposed to what the intention was of the other zoning amendment that would place limitations on certain commercial development in the AG zone. If this zoning amendment were adopted, Ahern stated the Town could quickly change. He stated that the amount of development would be too much, including burden on the school system like was seen in the 1980's, and that thousands of new residents would cause strain, and also that wetlands would be impacted.

Christ stated that the intent of the zoning changes for the Tenney Mountain Overlay, and the other zoning amendment to put some limitations on commercial development in the AG zone broadly, are both in conformity with the Master Plan. He also noted that the Board is not looking at an application, just whether to change zoning to allow for potential future applications, which would each need to be adjudicated based on whether they were acceptable and complied with the necessary requirements.

Ahern stated that the developer could always build under the current zoning requirements, he is worried that the mountain will be negatively impacted if the development is encouraged. He also expressed concern that the school system would be too burdened by additional students. Christ responded that the State as a whole has an aging population, and that school enrollment has been falling in New Hampshire for some time. He stated that instead of opposing the possibilities of young families with children, the Town should welcome them. If young families are not able to live in the area, it will be detrimental to the Town in the long run, much more than needing to accommodate some more students in the school system. Ahern stated that the school enrollment goes up and down, and we are currently in the downward part of the trend. He also stated that a development could double the size of Plymouth's population. LaMoreaux stated that the letter seems to raise a lot of questions, but not points. Rather than providing information, it turns questions on the Planning Board that are not the Board's to answer. Rather, in reviewing a proposed development, the Planning Board would need to ask the applicant to confirm that there is adequate water and sewer capacity for a development.

LaMoreaux said that he suspects a development centered around a ski area would include some single-family homes, many vacation rentals, as well as second homes and condos. Waterville Valley, which has a similar development pattern to what is being discussed, has between 1000 and 1100 housing units. Prior to the pandemic, its school enrollment was 16, after the pandemic this increased to 65 students. This is still a very small number relative to the number of units. Based on this, he argues that the increase in tax revenue would far outweigh any increased education costs. McCahan also noted that a developer could already build housing in the area under current zoning, it would just look different. LaMoreaux also noted that the Board would need to ask these tough questions to developers, but it is also the Board's responsibility to take a high-level view of zoning to create opportunities for developments that would be beneficial. The Planned Unit Development style of development would allow for a higher density core, that would make utility extension and service provision more efficient

than spread out, piecemeal development. Waterville Town Center is a good example of what a village core could look like, and while it may take 20-30 years to get there, growth is necessary and that would be a beneficial way for it to take place. McIver suggested looking at tax rates, and that he believed a large development of Tenney Mountain would help provide needed tax revenue to the Town.

Ahern stated that the Planning Board supported limiting by-right commercial uses in the AG zone overall, but in this amendment would allow a wide range of commercial uses in the Planned Unit Development, and suggested that this is contradictory. LaMoreaux stated that the entire AG zone is not homogenous – the purpose of zoning is all about regulating where development should be encouraged vs. discouraged. Neenos noted that redefining the AG zone, and adopting the TMOD zoning district were not incongruent – some types of development might make sense in certain areas and not others. He is newer to Town, but has seen housing prices increase dramatically since he has moved here. Opening areas to development could help provide more housing to meet the high level of demand.

The public hearing was opened at 7:38.

Nick Mason, of High Street, stated that the Board should take the D'Aleo letter seriously about water and sewer concerns, but he is not convinced by the other arguments. He believes that development in that area would likely include a lot of Airbnb rentals, as opposed to primary residences. He also stated that the Town does not own the ski area, even though it is valued by the local residents. If the Town values it, the Town should provide the opportunity for the mountain to be developed in a way that would improve its chances of succeeding. While it might mean that the small-town ski area feel could change, the Town needs to diversify its economic drivers. Plymouth State University enrollment is declining, and this is a reasonable way to bring an economic driver to the community.

Chris Woods, of Fairgrounds Road, is on the Water and Sewer district Board. He asked whether the Board should promote something that might be feasible, or should say no to moving forward because there is a chance that the infrastructure is not there. The water and sewer district has been playing catch-up with repairs and does have excess capacity, but it is hard to say what would be needed to support a fully built-out Tenney Mountain ski area. He believes a developer installing a wastewater treatment facility separately would be unlikely, as the PVWSD has estimated the cost of expanding the current facility at \$50 million. The Planning Board will need to make sure a proposal is feasible when the time comes.

Ahern asked about the agreement under which the sewer line was extended to Tenney Mountain. This expansion was done in the 1980's, and was paid for by a developer at the time. LaMoreaux noted that while the overlay is approximately 3,000 acres, under current configurations there are really only a few parcels that could use a Planned Unit Development to have more intensive development. Under the amendment, these PUDs could be developed without a core if they are over 100 acres, and could include housing, but not in a higher density village core like a 250+ acre PUD. Christ noted that if an application was proposed and the PVWSD stated that there was not adequate capacity, the Board could deny the application.

Dean Yeaton, resident, stated that he remembers when the sewer was extended to Tenney Mountain. The cost of the line was paid for by the developer. He has seen many developers make an attempt at running the mountain unsuccessfully. He is against the amendment. He believes there will be a traffic impact, and is concerned that his taxes are high and he does not want them to increase.

Tom Hand of Siteform Studio, representing North Country Development Group, spoke via Zoom. He stated that he appreciated the time and effort, and that those behind the development effort at Tenney Mountain are looking to the future. Many of the concerns raised will be the burden of the developer to

ensure that any plan which may be proposed in the future could work in accordance with the Planning Board's standards. He believes the changes to the amendment made last meeting were beneficial, and that they align with the fact that the Tenney Mountain area is designated as a growth zone in the Master Plan. Hand stated that Steven Kelly, the owner, is already in talks with Town departments and with the Plymouth Village Water and Sewer district. There has already been a major investment in snowmaking, and he wants the resort to be able to thrive. The development team has been working on a detailed hydrological study to look at the water issue, though he is not the best one to speak to the details of that as it is being done by Horizons Engineering. He understands the conversation about the AG zone, but this particular area of Town is designated as a growth area and is significantly different from the rest of the AG zone. Development could already take place today but it would be more spread out. The Village Core option is a key tool in the toolbox to allow for a more vibrant, successful development. Hand asked for clarification of the five units per acre of residential that would be allowed on a PUD, he wanted to confirm whether unbuildable area had to be excluded from the calculation, or if the non-buildable area information was intended to guide where the units should be placed. McCahan and LaMoreaux expressed that the interpretation seemed to make sense.

David Nash asked if the Board intended to stall development, if so he stated that going to 2 or 3 acre minimum lot size seemed the way to do that. If the overall density is being preserved in a PUD, however, he did not see a reason not to allow that since clustering units would not be different from those units being developed otherwise.

Christ noted that a purpose would be to allow development, but ensure it is done prudently. Ahern stated that last year, the Planning Board updated the Open Space Residential Development standards, so it was already possible to cluster units using that. He believes everyone wants more affordable housing, but is concerned that larger buildings of over six units would be a concern. Christ stated that a higher density within a core could allow for more efficient use of infrastructure.

Tom Hand stated that housing could already be developed under the current zoning, but it would be lacking the economic engine that the TMOD zoning amendment would allow for. He stated that having housing for workers, as well as resort housing, coupled with research and lab space would be a major driver for economic growth. Other business growth would also occur, and this would be hand-in-hand with residential growth. Large business growth would be a great benefit to the Town's tax base.

David Nash stated that the Town's tax rate did not come down after Wal Mart came to Town.

LaMoreaux pointed to page 44 of the Plymouth Master Plan, and to economic development goal seven, which calls for encouraging development at Tenney Mountain. There are other tools that could be used for infrastructure upgrades and to support development there, such as a TIF district. He also pointed to goal eight, which called for not allowing business in areas not identified for business growth. He believes that these two sections are relevant to both the Tenney Mountain Overlay District and the other zoning amendment that was previously discussed related to commercial uses in the AG zone.

Dean Yeaton, resident, asked whether DOT had approved anything. He expressed that additional traffic from such a development would probably need a second entrance. Christ stated that if a development were proposed at some point, driveway permit questions would need to be addressed. LaMoreaux noted that this was a fine detail question about potential future development, but the purpose of creating zoning was to allow for those developments to be proposed in the first place.

Yeaton stated that he agrees with much of D'Aleo's letter, and is concerned about traffic and opposed to the proposed amendment.

Dan Marion of Point of View Drive asked whether approval of this amendment would allow for more State or Federal support of potential development at Tenney Mountain. Christ stated that it was not clear that it would, and LaMoreaux noted that the developer has referenced that it could help with obtaining private financing. Marion stated that if Plymouth is on the map as a place where housing is being built, it could be attractive to State and Federal organizations who could provide funding. Housing development is an issue broadly, and if this could make a large dent in housing needs, he would prefer to see development concentrated with other areas remaining open, as opposed to low-density sprawl across the entire area.

The public hearing was closed at 8:17 with no others wishing to speak.

McIver stated that protecting agricultural land is important, by creating an opportunity for major development in this area it could help allow development to take place without taking away prime agricultural lands. LaMoreaux stated that he believes this amendment is a workable solution to promote beneficial development.

LaMoreaux made a motion to send the Tenney Mountain Overlay District zoning amendment forward to be voted upon on the 2025 Town Meeting ballot, with the administrative edits agreed upon earlier in the meeting. LaMoreaux, McIver, and Christ voted in favor. Bouchard, Ahern, Wood, and Yeaton voted opposed. With a vote of three in favor to four opposed, the motion did not pass, as such the amendment does not proceed to a vote at Town Meeting.

Christ noted that the Board did send several other Zoning Amendments forward to Town Meeting, and there is also a citizen-petitioned Zoning Amendment that will appear on the ballot. The Board will need to discuss community engagement opportunities to help increase public understanding of the amendments that will be going forward as Town Meeting approaches. LaMoreaux acknowledged the Board's work of getting through zoning amendment season.

6. Informational and pre-application reviews

David Nash/30 Fairgrounds Road – Potential retail conversion of garage

Christ explained that David Nash of 30 Fairgrounds Road was appearing before the Board for a conceptual consultation related to a potential retail use of the garage on his property. Christ explained the purpose of a conceptual consultation, noting that it was an opportunity to discuss possible applications on a non-binding, conceptual basis.

Nash stated that he had acquired the old Livermore School property on Fairgrounds Road. He has added an attached garage on one side of the property, and the other side of the property had an existing, approximately 50' long, detached garage. He would like to explore the idea of converting this pre-existing garage into a retail shop/farmstand-type business, which could include packaged food, coffee, and other retail goods, along with a few possible picnic tables. Motorcycle riders often travel to Fairgrounds Road for a scenic ride, and he believes there is a good opportunity for a small shop of this type. This would be a change of use, but he would not anticipate making significant changes to the building footprint.

LaMoreaux noted that if the citizen-petitioned zoning amendment is approved by the voters, a special exception would be necessary for a retail use in the AG zone. Other Board members asked about the current use of the property, and he confirmed that it is currently used as a single-family residence. Members discussed if it was a home occupation, or if it would require Site Plan Review. Christ noted that

usually, something of this nature would not fit the criteria to be a home occupation, but would be a change of use of a portion of the property requiring site plan review. LaMoreaux noted that he believes that this is just the kind of business that he perceives as being a good candidate for a special exception. The proposed changes would allow the Zoning Board to consider the impact of this type of business differently from a box-store. Others agreed that the use seemed reasonable. Members asked where the farm goods would be acquired, and Nash noted his goal would be to use local goods as much as possible.

There was discussion of the Local Foods Plymouth pavilion to the east, but that is a pickup location for online orders, rather than a retail store that customers would stop by to shop in. Christ noted that one way to view this would be competition for other farm stand-type businesses in the area, but the other way to view it would be supporting the creation of a critical mass of this type of business which could draw in more customers overall. LaMoreaux agreed, and noted that it seems to be in harmony with the neighborhood, though the ZBA ultimately decides on special exceptions. Christ stated that this seems to be a great example of the type of business that should be promoted in the AG zone.

Nash asked if a bathroom would be required. Board members stated that they were unsure, but that there would likely be some requirements if the store will include sale of food, etc. There was further discussion of whether this may be a home occupation, but members stated that a business intended to draw a steady stream of retail customers did not seem to fit those criteria. Wood agreed that the proposal seemed like a good use of the property and advised that NHDOT should be contacted, since they may require a new driveway permit for the change in use. Christ noted that the zoning changes would be important to review, and Nash stated that he views this as a longer-term project.

NH National Guard – Presentation on new Readiness Center concept for N. Main Street property

Christ thanked the National Guard for presenting and noted that the project that was proposed for discussion would not be subject to Site Plan Review. Ben Stevens, design and construction branch chief of the NH National Guard introduced himself, as well as other members of the project team including Owen Smith (Architect), and Eric Deremas (Civil consultant). Stevens explained that the proposal was to build a new readiness center on the existing Armory site on Main Street. (Parcel 102-016) The building would be moved to the sloping, southern portion of the lot, and would be two stories with the parking area moved to the north side of the lot accessing the first floor. The second floor would also be a walkout level due to the slope, and the existing curb cut would be maintained. Christ asked if the old facility would be maintained during construction, and Stevens responded that the old facility would be torn down first. Ahern asked about the property owned by the Armory on route 3A, and Stevens stated that he was not able to speak to that site at this point, but if interested individuals wanted to put in a written question through Scott he could look at providing a written response. He did state that the 3A site was not a part of what is being discussed currently.

Deremas of Tighe and Bond, Architect, gave an overview of the updates to the curb cut updates which would feature a revised concrete apron. Utilities would be obtained from the southern/Armory Road entrance. Access and circulation would be designed to accommodate WB67 tractor-trailer vehicles. Photometric lighting plans will be prepared to ensure the minimization of light trespass. There is currently minimal stormwater management on the site, but the new plan would include rain gardens and gravel. These would ultimately channel any excess stormwater towards the rear of the site where there is an existing wetland. An Alteration of Terrain permit will be needed for the project. Utilities from

the south will require some rerouting of the existing 8" sewer line through the site. The staffing for the building will not change, but the size of the building is increasing to meet operational needs. There is adequate utility capacity for the water/sewer demands of the building.

Christ asked whether the design team was aware of the Town's proposed Ten-Year Plan project to flatten and realign the section of Main Street in this area, and to provide a sidewalk. Deremas stated that there should be no impact on that project as a result of the work related to the new readiness center, as he believes there is adequate space in the existing right of way. He also stated that the goal was to be a good neighbor and that the building should be available for community use. LaMoreaux asked if holding elections would be possible in the space to alleviate space concerns at the elementary school. Stevens stated that it was not possible to use the facility for elections. Christ asked about the Asquamchumaukee memorial plaque that is located on a rock on the edge of the road nearby. The design team was not aware of the plaque but would do an archeological review as needed. There was a discussion that the plaque may be slightly north of this property.

McIver asked if the building could serve as a crisis shelter, and Stevens stated that this would be the case. Ahern appreciated the availability of the building for community use, such as the Scouts. He noted that the school is at the bottom of Old Ward Bridge Road with only one entrance that does not require passing through a residential neighborhood. He stated that options for a second school bus exit from the school property would include one that accesses Route 3 through this area. LaMoreaux asked whether that would be more likely on the property to the north. The design team noted a large topographical difference between this property and the property to the north, but if there were specific requests that could be passed along to Scott in writing, they would be considered.

LaMoreaux mentioned the new National Guard facility in Pembroke, and asked if this building would be LEED Gold certified. The design team responded that the building would be LEED Silver, and include solar and geothermal. The goal was for a 100-year, high-quality building with a copper roof, and triple-glazed windows.

The team explained the building design and layout which includes an assembly hall suitable to hold 300 people, with offices to the east. The upstairs area could include flexible meeting spaces that could be made available to the Town and Plymouth State University for community purposes. Another goal of the building was to be able to be self-sustaining for many days. There was a discussion of the geothermal wellheads. There would also be a backup generator and fuel storage, with occasional generator tests. No battery storage facility is proposed at this time. Christ asked about the flow of traffic in the event of a major need, such as when the facility was used for COVID vaccinations. The design team noted that the small size of the site made circulation challenging, but in an emergency, they would make things work as needed.

Christ noted that in the future, it would be beneficial to have more of a heads-up so it is possible to make the public aware of the presentation. McIver asked about the geothermal well depth, and it was stated that the depth is determined by ground temperature, but 400' is not unusual. McCahan asked about the timeline, and it was stated that 2026 construction was the goal, including demolition, though it does depend on funding.

7. Other business from members of the Board and Planning Staff

HOP Round 2 Grant – Housing Academy 2025

Christ reminded the Board that the Town has been awarded funding for the Housing Opportunities Planning (HOP) Grant Round 2 project, to undertake a portion of the originally proposed project. The Town received \$25,000 to create a Housing Master Plan chapter. Perez noted that HOP grant recipients are each able to send three volunteers to attend the Housing Academy training sessions which focus on housing and community engagement and are hosted by the Cooperative Extension. Board members discussed attendance at the Housing Academy, and Christ advised of some context for the materials covered in such trainings which could be beneficial for community engagement generally. Ahern noted that he enjoyed the Housing Academy sessions he attended under the previous HOP project. Perez advised that the Town may provide stipends to the three officially designated Housing Academy attendees. There was a discussion of the program and the schedule of the sessions, as well as the possibility that virtual sessions would be recorded. The Planning Board did not designate official representatives at this time but agreed that individual members could check their calendars and register on behalf of the Board. Perez asked that members email him to advise of these registrations.

On the topic of engagement, but not related to the HOP project, Christ noted that the Board may want to consider how to handle public engagement for the Zoning Amendments that will appear on the ballot in March. He suggested a Q+A session, perhaps at the March work session, or perhaps more Planning Board created videos to discuss the amendments.

Christ noted that for the first HOP project, the Board created a Housing Committee, which was very productive but also a big commitment. He suggested the Board may want to consider for this round 2 project whether a separate committee would be beneficial, or if it is something the Planning Board would like to take the lead on. There was discussion of the engagement that will be needed and the work that it will take to create a Housing Master Plan chapter, and members expressed appreciation that Barrett will be able to contract with the Town to facilitate. Some members suggested that having the Planning Board take the lead on this round of the project seemed to make sense.

Engineering Discussion

Wood has communicated with Mark Halloran, Joseph Perez, herself, Scott Weden, Steve St. Pierre, and Norma Jean Morrison, all of whom would be willing to assist with a committee to assist the Planning Board by looking at how best to handle the Board's engineering needs. Wood asked the Board for recommendations on what they would like to see from such a committee, and if they had any other recommendations or requests. She stated that the current engineering consultant for the Board is good, but there might be a benefit to broadening the pick of engineers available, possibly having many contracts instead of just one, possibly with differing specialties. She advised that the group has not officially met yet, since they would first ask the Board to formally create a committee and provide any guidance.

Christ stated that he had considered the matter. The Board has an engineering consultant in Mike Vignale who has worked with them for many years, whom the Board is usually happy with, and whose rates are reasonable. There was an instance where the Planning Board was not satisfied with the depth of his report on the proposed hotel traffic study. Christ agrees with that but also feels that there is a longstanding relationship between the Planning Board and the current engineer. Before putting out a new RFP and seeking new potential engineers, he asks whether the Board might consider sitting down

with the current engineer and having a conversation about whether there are ways to make the current arrangement work better in the event of another situation like the hotel. It may be worth not risking that relationship by not at least having a conversation first. Yeaton noted that there was the possibility of having multiple firms available, rather than just a single one. Seeking more proposals does not mean that the current consultant would be completely removed. Wood noted that she was not disappointed with Mike Vignale's work, but that she did not view it as eliminating a relationship with him. Christ noted that in general, the Board has seemed happy with Mike Vignale's work, and may not want to risk the relationship. Bouchard noted that in Nashua and other Towns, the GSA and standardized list of engineers used by NHDOT was an option where participants were already screened by DOT and the Town could pick who it wanted. LaMoreaux expressed that there was a possibility that, if the Board put out an RFP, the current consultant could still come in as the most cost-effective pick, but at a higher rate, which would be a risk if the market is more competitive now than it was when the initial contract was created. He is not sure that putting out a new RFP while the current contract is working well would result in a better situation. Ahern agreed with Christ that it is important not to risk the relationship that the Town has with Mike Vignale, who he has also worked with during his time on the Select Board. He believes that Mike Vignale is a great consultant, who provides good service to the Town, often helping the Select Board out at no cost. Those types of things are only possible with a longstanding relationship. He did note that the traffic study review for the proposed hotel development was probably not what the Board was looking for, but the Board also has the right to ask for its own traffic review as a special study. The Board needs to be specific in what they are asking for. There was a discussion of whether it would be advisable to request Mike Vignale subcontract certain things to a traffic specialist, and Perez confirmed that the current contract does allow for Vignale to subcontract out a review in certain circumstances. Ahern stated that it would be the best way to handle this. It was also noted that Steve at the highway department would be a good person to obtain input from, as the Highway Department has a new MOU with Mike Vignale for other work. Christ agreed that it might be a good idea for the Board to consider asking more specifically for work to be subcontracted out in specific circumstances or being more specific in what it wants out of a review. Neenos agreed and suggested that the time for a conversation would be when a project comes up where the conversation becomes relevant. He does not see a need to have that now. When a situation arises where the Board feels it wants something more specific, the Board can be more specific then. Holding a conversation now seems like an unnecessary rocking of the boat if the Board is getting good service and prices from the current consultant. Ahern also noted that Vignale was good at communicating, which is an important skill. After discussion, members agreed that the consensus was not to move forward with preparing an RFP or having a conversation at this time, though many thanked Wood for her research.

Zoning Board of Adjustment Update

Perez suggests that a member of the Board join the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) as a Planning Board representative. This has been done in the past and the ZBA is trying to gain more members. They meet once a month on the first Tuesday if they have business to hear. Anyone interested should come to the next ZBA meeting before requesting appointment by the Select Board. Upon a question by McCahan, Perez informs the Board of the ZBA's duties. These include hearing requests for Special Exceptions, Variances and Appeal of Administrative Decisions.

8. Public Comments - None

9. Adjournment

Upon a motion by LaMoreaux, a second from Bouchard, and a unanimous vote of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:33 pm.