

**Planning Board Meeting - Minutes
Tuesday, March 17 2009
Cumberland Town Hall
290 Tuttle Road, Cumberland, Maine
7:00 PM**

A. *Call to Order*

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. *Roll Call*

Present: Bill Ward, Board Chair, Bill Richards, Vice-Chair, Pam Russell, John Ferland, Bob Vail, Bob Couillard

Absent: Chris Neagle

Staff: Carla Nixon, Town Planner, Pam Bosarge Board Clerk

C. *Approval of Minutes*

Mr. Richards moved approval of the minutes with the stated corrections.

Mr. Ferland seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

D. *Consent Calendar / Deminimus Change Approvals:*

There were no Consent Calendar Items.

E. *Hearings and Presentations:*

1. *Public Hearing: Major Subdivision Amendment to Cumberland Foreside Village, to amend the subdivision plan to Phase I and Phase II; Phase I will include lots 1-6 along Route One, and Phase II will amend lots 7 - 12 to one lot; Tax Assessor Map Ro1, Lot 11, sub-lots 1-12; Cumberland Foreside Village, LLC, Owner, Tom Greer, Pinkham Greer Consulting Engineers, Representative.*

Ms. Nixon presented background information as follows: This request is to allow the continued marketing of the lots, if this were not done the Planning Board approval would lapse as stated in the Ordinance. A subdivision must be substantially complete within two years. When lots are sold there will be site plan review for the uses.

Mr. Tom Greer, P.E., representative from Pinkham & Greer Consulting Engineers gave an overview of the proposed amendment; there will be no change to the access, stormwater, and utilities to the six lots abutting Route One. The current lots 7 - 12 will be combined into a single lot. The details of the reclamation plan are shown on Sheet R1, gates and mounds will be added between lot 1 and 2. The current chain gate will be replaced with a bar gate on September 1st. The bar gate will be fifty inches high, with two eight foot wide center swinging gates, the bar gate will have four individual bars.

Mr. Ward asked for clarification on the plan of the location of the existing gate.

Mr. Greer reviewed the existing gate location and grading plans. The proposed gate will remain between lots 1 and 2 until a lot is sold and then the gate will move up to the back of the lots to prevent entrance.

Mr. Ward asked about the two entrances south of the property in Falmouth.

Mr. Chase stated there is one entrance and a clearing.

Mr. Ward asked if there would be access up the hill from Falmouth.

Mr. Greer stated not when the gate is moved.

Mr. Richards asked if it would be possible to restrict access from Falmouth with two or three big boulders.

Mr. Greer stated yes.

Mr. Couillard asked about access from the Johnson Road in Falmouth.

Mr. Chase, Owner stated there will be a barricade from Falmouth with a row of boulders. The Falmouth property has a cable across the entrance. His intention is to prevent vehicle access after the reclamation plan has been finished.

Mr. Couillard asked if there would be ATV access.

Mr. Chase stated it is difficult to restrict ATV access; his intention is to have a sign posted stating "No Unauthorized Vehicles Beyond this Point", there have been people walking their dogs, which he does not intend to restrict; but vehicle access will be prohibited. .

Ms. Russell asked what is being planned for any water pooling or ponding with the quarry space, and is their anything being done to control erosion.

Mr. Greer stated the reclamation plan shows re-vegetating all of the areas that has been disturbed. There are some sediment basins that were constructed as part of the original Phase I plan; those will remain in place. The drainage system is open swales.

Ms. Russell asked if there were any places where there would be standing water.

Mr. Greer stated he wouldn't think so; it is pretty well graded off; we made an inspection prior to snow and it was well graded.

Mr. Ferland asked what type of access has occurred from the Cumberland side to the Falmouth side.

Mr. Chase stated they are regularly working the site, however; they had an issue this spring with someone living out of a pick-up truck at the top.

Mr. Vail asked the time frame for the reclamation project.

Mr. Chase stated it will be finished by September 1, 2009.

Mr. Couillard asked for clarification on the type of gate.

Mr. Chase stated they do not want a permanent gate, on the first gate because with development it will have to be moved. There will be a bar gate replacing the cable as of September 1, 2009. The gate will be 50' high, two 8' wide centers swinging gates with four individual bars (similar to a cattle gate).

Mr. Ward opened the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Tom Foley, representing True Spring Condos stated this is an example of how far they have come with this project; there are only five people in the audience. All are in agreement that safety, security, and appearance are all to the benefit of the Town, Mr. Chase and abutters. He wanted to clarify the location and timing of the gate; which would be placed at the end of the reclamation in September; but thought he heard the gate would be installed after the lots were sold.

Mr. Greer stated the gate would be re-located at the sale of lot 1 or 2.

Mr. Foley continued, stating that he and Mr. Chase have discussed installing some boulders and evergreens with the bar gate at the end of the reclamation process. The proposed gate will be an effective barrier to deter unauthorized access. He hopes the lots are sold rapidly and thanked the Planning Board and Applicant for their cooperation with the process.

The public portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Ward asked Ms. Nixon about the letter of credit as discussed in the peer review comments; should this be a condition of approval.

Ms. Nixon stated she didn't list any conditions of approval but the Board should do that. As far as the letter of credit, there is a bond in place that will be reduced. The Board can suggest that as a condition also.

Mr. Ward suggested # 4, regarding an Escrow Account for the necessary observations.

Mr. Ward asked about the findings of fact.

Ms. Nixon stated the findings of fact are the same as when the project was approved, it might be appropriate to waive the reading of the findings of fact.

Mr. Richards moved to accept the findings of fact as stated relative to amending the Cumberland Foreside Subdivision and to waive the reading of such findings of fact.

Mr. Couillard seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

Mr. Richards moved to grant the requested subdivision amendment for Cumberland Foreside Village, Tax Assessor Map R01, Lot 11, sub-lots 1 - 2 as shown on the plan with acceptance of the standard conditions and the proposed conditions of approval stated as items # 1 - 4 in the Town's peer review engineer report contained in the Planning Director's review.

Mr. Couillard seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT - Subdivision Ordinance, Section 1.1

The purpose of these standards shall be to assure the comfort, convenience, safety, health, and welfare of the people, to protect the environment and to promote the development of an economically sound and stable community. To this end, in approving subdivisions within the Town of Cumberland, Maine, the Board shall consider the following criteria and before granting approval shall determine that the proposed subdivision:

1. Pollution. The proposed subdivision will not result in undue water or air pollution. In making this determination, it shall at least consider:
 - A. The elevation of the land above sea level and its relation to the flood plains;
 - B. The nature of soils and subsoil and their ability to adequately support waste disposal;
 - C. The slope of the land and its effect on effluents;
 - D. The availability of streams for disposal of effluents; and
 - E. The applicable state and local health and water resource rules and regulations;

The project will be on public sewer, therefore the soils do not need to support waste disposal. The applicant has provided a soils report prepared by Alan Burnell, Certified Soils Scientist describing the soils as they relate to the design for the proposed drainage system. The MDEP has issued a Site Location of Development permit which includes a review of the erosion control plans.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

2. Sufficient Water. The proposed subdivision has sufficient water available for the reasonable foreseeable needs of the subdivision;
The proposed subdivision will utilize public water. There is a letter on file from the Portland Water District dated 6/22/06 that states that there should be an adequate supply of clean and healthful water to serve the needs of the proposed 12 lot mixed use subdivision.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

3. Municipal Water Supply. The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply, if one is to be used;
**The proposed subdivision will utilize public water.
There is a letter on file from the Portland Water District dated 6/22/06 that states that there should be an adequate supply of clean and healthful water to serve the needs of the proposed 12 lot mixed use subdivision.**

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

4. Erosion. The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results;

The plan has been reviewed and approved by the Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation Commission, the Town Engineer and DEP.

The amended plan has been reviewed and approved by Al Palmer, P.E.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

5. Traffic. The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed;

There is a traffic study on file dated 1/12/07 which has been reviewed and approved by the MDOT and Tom Gorrill, the Town's peer review traffic engineer. The project has received a traffic movement permit dated 1/22/07. The project has received an entrance permit dated 1/8/07 for a location 487' northerly of the Cumberland-Falmouth town line. The project has received an entrance permit dated 1/4/07 for a location 3372' northerly of the Cumberland-Falmouth town line.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

1. Sewage disposal. The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal and will not cause an unreasonable burden on municipal services, if they are utilized;

The project will utilize public sewer. Ralph Oulten, the Town's sewer peer review engineer has stated that the revised plans dated 1/16/07 are ready for approval. There is a letter on file dated 9/15/06 from the Town Manager, Bill Shane, stating that the town has agreed to accept the flow of at least 7,000 gallons per day to its municipal sewer system from this project.

Based on a letter dated 2/27/07 from Bill Shane, Town Manager, the applicant is in possession of the necessary 25 sewer user units.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

7. Municipal solid waste disposal. The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste, if municipal services are to be utilized;

There is a letter on file from Troiano Waste Services dated 6/22/06 indicating there is committed capacity for the waste generated by this project.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

1. Aesthetic, cultural and natural values. The proposed subdivision will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline;

A letter dated 8/20/02 from Department of Conservation states that there are no rare or botanical features documented specifically within the project area.

A letter dated 9/3/02 from the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife states that there are no known significant wildlife habitat or threatened or endangered species in the vicinity of the project.

A letter dated 9/4/02 from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission states that this project will have no effect on historic resources.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

9. Conformity with local ordinances and plans. The proposed subdivision conforms to a duly adopted subdivision regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan or land use plan, if any. In making this determination, the municipal reviewing authority may interpret these ordinances and plans;

The plans have been reviewed and approved by the Town's peer review engineers and town staff.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

10. Financial and technical capacity. The subdivider has adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section;

Technical capacity is evidenced by expert engineering, surveyors, soils evaluators, traffic engineers and landscape architects.

The Town has a bond in place for the amount recommended by the Town Engineer for the stabilization of the site.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

11. Surface waters; outstanding river segments. Whenever situated entirely or partially within the watershed of any pond or lake or within 250 feet of any wetland, great pond or river as defined in Title 38 chapter 3, subchapter I, article 2-B, the proposed subdivision will not adversely affect the quality of that body of water or unreasonably affect the shoreline of the body of water;

This section is not applicable.

12. Ground water. The proposed subdivision will not, alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water;

The project will be served by public sewer.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

13. Flood areas. Based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps, and information presented by the applicant whether the subdivision is in a flood-prone area. If the subdivision, or any part of it, is in such an area, the subdivider shall determine the 100-year flood elevation and flood hazard boundaries within the subdivision. The proposed subdivision plan must include a condition of plan approval requiring that principal structures in the subdivision will be constructed with their lowest floor, including the basement, at least one foot above the 100-year flood elevation;

The parcel is located in Zone C- Areas of Minimal Flooding.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

14. Storm water. The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate storm water management;

A stormwater management plan prepared by Pinkham and Greer has been reviewed and approved by the MDEP and the Town's peer review engineers.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

15. Freshwater wetlands. All potential freshwater wetlands, as defined in 30-A M.R.S.A. §4401 (2-A), within the proposed subdivision have been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application, regardless of the size of these wetlands. Any mapping of freshwater wetlands may be done with the help of the local soil and water conservation district.

Wetlands were delineated by Mark Hampton, Certified Soils Scientist.

The total impact to wetlands will be approximately 8,600 square feet. The wetland impacts have been approved through the DEP NRPA process in conjunction with SLODA.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

16. River, stream or brook... Any river, stream, or brook within or abutting the proposed subdivision has been identified on any map submitted as a part of the application. For purposes of this section, "river, stream or brook" has the same meaning as in Title 38, Section 480-B, Subsection 9. [Amended; Effective. 11/27/89]

There are no rivers, streams or brooks on the site.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

Standard Conditions of Approval

This approval is dependent upon and limited to the proposals and plans contained in the application and supporting documents submitted and affirmed to by the applicant. Any variation from the plans, proposals and supporting documents, except de minimus changes as so determined by the Town Planner which do not affect approval standards, is subject to review and approval of the Planning Board prior to implementation.

Proposed Conditions of Approval

1. Based on a site visit conducted during the week of February 1st, the majority of the areas shown as "To Be Stabilized" are covered with either stockpiled material as a result of the road construction and blasting operation or snow, thereby precluding our ability to assess the existing conditions. Therefore, we would recommend the following:

➤ The Original Letter of Credit for the Development included the following items which we would recommend be extended or renewed as part of a new Letter of Credit for the proposed reclamation:

i. Erosion Control and Maintenance

➤ Letter of Credit Amount	\$25,000
➤ Released to Date	\$4,500
➤ Remaining	\$20,500

ii. Restore 11 Disturbed Acres

➤ Letter of Credit Amount	\$82,500
➤ Released to Date	\$0
➤ Remaining	\$82,500

RECOMMENDED AMOUNT
FOR LETTER OF CREDIT \$103,000

When conditions permit, our office would conduct a site visit with the Applicant and their representatives to review the site stabilization work that is appropriate.

2. The current gate that is installed at Route 1 is a cable between two posts. While this is reasonable during the construction with the Contractor being on-site on a daily/weekly basis, it may not be suitable to deter unauthorized use by vehicles, all terrain vehicles, etc. after the site has been reclaimed. We would recommend that the Applicant submit a revised detail for gating that would be of a more permanent nature, potentially a tube or bar style gate, with rocks installed from the gate posts to the edge of the cleared opening to minimize the likelihood of circumventing the gate.

3. No further blasting shall occur on the site after September 1, 2009.

4. An Escrow Account of \$2,500 is in place for peer review during the stabilization process; and the annual visit and preparation of an inspection report.

2. Public Hearing: Shoreland Zoning Permit: to add a seasonal addition to an existing dock system at 3 Ledge Road, Tax Assessor Map U06A, Lot 28; the addition to include a 3' x 36' ramp and a 12' x 30' float to provide the owner with added tidal usage; Peter Spencer, Waterman Marine, Representative, Scott Searway, Owner.

Ms. Nixon presented background information as follows: The Applicant, Janice Searway, is seeking approval for a Shoreland Zoning Permit and Conformance with Section 423.4 (Piers, Docks, Wharves, and Floats) for an extension to an existing dock system. The applicant is also requesting that the Board approve the original pier and dock that was incorrectly permitted by the previous Code Enforcement Officer.

The application has been reviewed by the Coastal Waters Committee who holds a site walk, notifies abutters and advertises the request; when all concerns are satisfied the Town Council issues a Wharfing Out Permit, this has been issued by the Cumberland Town Council. Outside agency permits have been received from Army Corps of Engineers; Maine Department of Environmental Protection; and Maine Department of Conservation.

Mr. Ward stated basically the Planning Board conducts a public hearing.

Ms. Nixon stated as did the Town Council and Coastal Waters Commission.

Mr. Ward asked if the pier application was heard by the Town Council.

Ms. Nixon stated yes.

Mr. Vail stated he is acquainted with Mr. Searway they went to the same school at different times; and he uses his mooring when he is working on Chebeague Island; Mr. Searway owns the Chebeague Island Boat Yard. Mr. Vail didn't think he would have a conflict of interest and feels he can review this application with an unbiased opinion.

The Board agreed, Mr. Vail had no conflict and would continue with the review of the request.

Mr. Peter Spencer, Representative of Waterman Marine, stated this process was started as an application for a seasonal ramp and float. In that process Mr. Longley (Code Enforcement Officer) made the decision that the permit issued to build the original pier in 1999 was inadequate. The permit from the Army Corps of Engineers has been obtained. There is no permit for the Department of Environmental Protection because this is a seasonal application. The seasonal components of this system are to be stored off site on Chebeague Island in the off season. Currently the existing ramp and float are on an adjacent property, but the applicant has agreed to comply with the Coastal Waters Committee request to remove these from the shore floor. The additional seasonal components are to be secured with helix anchors which are large screw type anchors that are put into seabed with hydraulic equipment; there will be no mushrooms or other items to interfere with boating. These will remain in the water during off season and unlike mushroom anchors will not be drug 500 feet away with the ice, which often happens in these intertidal areas. The application complies with all the requirements of the Shoreland Zoning Permit and he welcomes any questions from the Board.

Mr. Couillard stated the permit requires any changes to the existing float should be on skids. Does this have the skids?

Mr. Spencer stated all of their floats have skids; this comes from Inland Fisheries and Wildlife to prevent the piers from sitting on the mudflats at low water. We have about 7 - 8' of rise for the new floats and sometimes in soft mud the float will sit on the bottom. With the new float part of the condition is to raise the float 18' with a sub-structure underneath. If there are any renovations to the existing float skids would be added at that time.

Mr. Vail asked if with the helix anchors would only have an exposed ring in off season.

Mr. Spencer stated they go down in the mud and the ring is approximately 1 ¼" off the bottom. .

Ms. Russell asked if there was any proposed lighting.

Mr. Spencer stated no.

Mr. Ward opened the public portion of the meeting, noting there was no one in the audience. The public portion of the meeting was closed.

Ms. Russell asked if the Shoreland Zoning was going to be changing in Cumberland in the near future.

Ms. Nixon stated it is, by July 1st we need to adopt some State mandated changes.

Ms. Russell stated she understood the changes were pretty dramatic, is that true?

Ms. Nixon stated they are very detailed and comprehensive, our Shoreland Zoning is very brief,

Ms. Russell stated her understanding was that the Ordinance had to be as strict as the State requirements.

Ms. Nixon stated our Ordinance will have to be at least as strict as the State requirements, but it can be more strict.

Ms. Russell asked if we had notified people within that zone of the upcoming changes.

Ms. Nixon stated no, not until we have a draft to show them; and we may want a workshop with the Council prior to a public hearing.

Ms. Russell stated it was her understanding if someone wanted to do changes to their Shoreland property under the current zoning they would need to apply prior to July 1.

Ms. Nixon stated for review under the current ordinance an applicant would have to apply prior to the adoption of the new ordinance.

Mr. Ferland asked for help with a definition of a term in the findings of fact on page 2 in Section 423.4.2 (*The location shall not interfere with developed beach areas*). What is a developed beach area?

Ms. Nixon stated we do not define it, but it would be an area that is known to be used by the public as a beach area, something people walk on.

Mr. Ferland stated than a beach area that gets regular use by the public, not necessarily a beach that something has been built upon it.

Ms. Nixon agreed, there are some locations where piers and wharfs are located that are not upon a beach...they come right of the rocks. This pier is not upon a beach, but if there was a beach we try to protect it to allow people to walk under the pier.

Mr. Ward asked if the Findings of Fact were prepared by Ms. Nixon or prepared by the previous reviewing entities.

Ms. Nixon stated she references the submission provided by applicant, review and approval of the plan by MDEP, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Cumberland Coastal Waters Commission, the Board finds the above standards have been met. Each of these things have been covered the findings are as proposed in the Costal Waters Permit and any conditions of that permit.

Mr. Ferland moved to approve the findings of fact and waive their reading.

Mr. Richards seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

Discussion - None

Mr. Ferland moved to grant the Shoreland Zoning Permit with the conditions of approval as stated in the Planner's report dated March 11, 2009.

Ms. Russell seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

Discussion - None

3. Review and Recommendation to the Town Council; 2010 - 2014 Proposed Capital Improvement Plan.

Ms. Nixon stated as per the Town Charter, the Planning Board is required to review these proposals for conformance with the Comprehensive Pan and the overall planning objectives for the town. A recommendation to the Town Council is required.

Ms. Nixon stated that she and the Town manager work closely on this project each year. The project involves the submission of proposed projects from the department heads. These items are submitted to the Planner, they are then organized and reviewed by the Town Manager and prioritized. This is not the entire binder; this is an overview of the C.I.P. plan.

Ms. Nixon reviewed the CIP Completed Projects list.
The first list includes what has been completed within the last year.

CIP Completed Projects **Fiscal Year 2009-2014**

Department	Project	Cost
Val Halla	Roof Replacement	\$75,000
Val Halla	Irrigation	\$500,000

Library	Brick Re-pointing	\$30,000
Assessing	Property Revaluation	\$300,000
Planning	Comprehensive Plan (mapping & opinion survey consultants)	\$60,000
Fire	Laptop Computers in 5 Fire Trucks	\$50,000
Public Services	West Cumberland Recreation Hall Improvements	\$75,000
Public Services	Drainage Projects	\$2.7 million
Public Services	Paving	\$10.3 million
Public Services	New Roof – Town Garage	\$55,000
Public Services	Twin Brook Water Supply	\$75,000
Public Services	Twin Brook Shelter Building	\$75,000
Public Services	Twin Brook Field Renovations	\$140,000
Public Services	Twin Brook Electrical Hook-up	\$70,000
Public Services	Twin Brook Restrooms	\$30,000
Public Services	Twin Brook Equipment Field House	\$200,000
Public Services	Twin Brook Parking Expansion	\$30,000

The next chart shows the top ten proposed projects; they are not listed in order of priority. They have not yet been funded, that will happen at a later time by the Council...but only projects listed can be funded. Those projects include: the NPDES (Stormwater) Compliance (this is a federal mandate); the Range Road Reconstruction and Water Line Extension, and Foreside Road Drainage and Paved Shoulders. These projects are likely to be funded this year.

2010-2015 CIP PROJECTS

Ranking #	Department	Project	Cost
1	Administration	Range Road Reconstruction & Water Line Extension	\$7 million
2	Rescue	Ambulance Replacement	\$150,000
3	Public Services	Compost Pad	\$75,000
4	Public Services	NPDES (Stormwater) Compliance	\$32,000
5	Administration	Town Hall HVAC	\$150,000
6	Public Services	Paving (on-going)	\$10.3 million
7	Fire	Central Station Renovations	\$1 million
8	Public Services	Forside Rd. Drainage and Paved Shoulders	\$32 million
9	Public Services	Main St. Sewer Extension (Tuttle to Corey rds.)	\$1 million
10	Administration	Doane Development (infrastructure, recreation facilities, community building)	\$5.6 million

The next page lists projects that were accepted by the Town Manager, but didn't make the top ten list.

ALL OTHER (ACCEPTED) CIP PROJECT PROPOSALS

Library	Prince Library Expansion	\$1.6 million
Public Services	Outdoor Community Pool	\$900,000
Public Services	West Cumberland Playground & Ball field Renovations	\$60,000
Public Services	West Cumberland Recreation Hall Renovations	\$75,000
Public Services	3 Twin Brook Field Renovations	\$190,000
Public Services	Synthetic Turf Field & Lights	\$675,000
Public Services	Pedestrian/Bike Path to Twin Brook	\$962,000

Public Services	Crushing Operations: Gravel Pit-Goose Pond Rd.	\$143,000
Public Services	Wood Waste Landfill Closure	\$475,000
Public Services	Drainage Projects (Large/deep pipes)	\$204,500
Information Technology	New S1 Server	\$12,000
Public Services	Road Reconstruction: Rt. 88, Greely, Middle, Blackstrap, Tuttle/Rt.88 intersection.	Revolving Schedule
Public Services	Recreation/Community Center	\$1 million
Fire/EMS	Substation Route One	\$400,000
Police	Dispatch Center Renovation	\$12,000

Ms. Nixon reviewed the Rejected CIP Project Proposals.

2010-2015 Rejected CIP Project Proposals

Public Services	Survey of Town Owned Land	\$215,000
Public Services	Pick-up Truck	\$20,000
Public Services	Town Garage Addition	\$700,00
Public Services	Town Garage Office Addition	\$2000
Public Services	Ocean Front Access	\$700,000
Administration	Windmill @ Public Works Garage	\$250,000

Ms. Nixon also reviewed the list of Completed CIP Projects within the last 5 years.

CIP Completed Projects (Pre-2007)

Department	Project	Cost	Year Completed
Administration	Town Center Sidewalk Reconstruction/Extension	\$250,000	2007
Administration	Town Hall Generator & Fuel Tank	\$40,000	2007
Public Services	Twin Brook Well (drilled and capped)	\$20,000	2007
Public Services	Pick-up Truck	\$20,000	2007

Public Services	Dump Trailer	\$5,000	2007
Public Services	Fence Materials for Securing Twin Brook Fields	\$20,000	2008
Town Clerk	Vault Filing System & Records Restoration	\$32,000	2007
Fire	Generator – West Cumb. Station	\$12,000	2007
Fire	Personal Protective Equipment	Equip. Repl.	On-going
Fire	Air Tank Compressor	\$50,000	2006
Fire	Generator – Central Station	\$25,000	2006
Finance	Computer System	\$175,000	2006
Police	Computer System	\$99,630	2006
Library	Air Conditioning (Prince Room & Staff Room)	\$35,000	2007
Library	Air Conditioning	\$37,000	2006
Public Services	Generator -Garage	\$32,000	2006
Administration	Water Line Extension – West Cumberland	\$1.2 million	2005-10
Police	Animal Control Officer Truck	\$25,000	2005
Public Services	Infield Grooming Machine	\$5,000	2005
Public Services	Salt Storage Shed	\$90,000	2004
Public Services	Stone Wharf Reconstruction	\$650,000	2003
Administration	Rines Forest Purchase	\$1.3 million	2003
Fire	SCBA Breathing Apparatus	Equip. Repl.	On-going

Ms. Nixon stated this is the proposed CIP; the Board is asked to hold a public hearing and make a recommendation that the CIP plan is in conformance with the current comprehensive plan. In previous years we have had Bill Shane, Town Manger present to answer questions; if you feel you need more information you can table the request.

Mr. Ward stated the agenda for the Planning Board does not state it is a public hearing.

Ms. Nixon stated that is correct.

Mr. Richards asked if the cost is an estimated cost as opposed to a budgeted amount.

Ms. Nixon stated they are estimated in that with some projects unless we have gone out to bid such as the Range Road project we estimate a per foot cost. These amounts are good estimates.

Mr. Richards stated these are not budgeted at this time.

Ms. Nixon stated they are not with the exception of the three projects outlined; Range Road, Route 88 and NPDES (Stormwater).

Mr. Richards asked for one additional clarification of 39 million for the three projects, is there matching state funding.

Mr. Ferland stated the number for the Foreside Road project may be a misprint, it should be 3.2 million.

Mr. Richards stated so it is 3.9 million for the projects.

Mr. Ward asked about Public Hearing?

Ms. Nixon stated she was not sure if it did require a public hearing...she would need to check the Town Charter. It would probably not hurt to table it and bring it back next month for a public hearing, if that is required.

Ms. Russell stated she understood at the Town Council's next meeting there is something on the agenda for the Greely Road Extension project. It is not listed as completed or on-going; it was started in the fall.

Ms. Nixon stated she didn't know the status of that project.

Ms. Russell wanted to point out the #10 Doane Developments: The Doane Committee was adamant that they recommend to Council that there be no local tax money used.

Ms. Nixon stated that project includes some of the cost for developing the Civic lot, recreation facilities, community building; this is very much a ball park figure. Depending what comes forward we may or may not be able to help with development. We may develop a T.I.F. district for instance with affordable housing. But she agreed that the Doane Committee's report was clear in not wanting the Town to spend tax dollars on the development of the non civic lot area.

Mr. Couillard recommended that we hold a workshop with the Town Council to address these questions.

Mr. Richards asked if there was any action required.

Ms. Nixon stated you are providing a recommendation to the Council stating you have reviewed the projects and they are in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Richards stated what troubles him is he hasn't compared this for compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Vail moved to table the recommendation to the Town Council of the C.I.P. plan.

Mr. Richards seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

Ms. Nixon stated for the next meeting she will e-mail information stating how these items conform with the Comprehensive Plan.

F. Administrative Matters:

1. Vernal Pools - The Town has sent letters to property owners who might have vernal pools on their property. The Federal Government requires that vernal pools be protected, which was delegated to the State DEP and that in turn has delegated it to the municipalities. Volunteers will go out and field verify potential pools that are identified from aerial photos. The volunteers will go out and count egg masses of salamanders, tree frogs, and fairy shrimp.

2. April Planning Board Meeting - Ms. Nixon stated the April meeting is scheduled during the April school vacation week and asked the status for attendance.

Mr. Richards and Ms. Russell will be away.

Ms. Nixon stated the April agenda may have the credit union. The Town Council passed the request for a contract zone, and some citizens have taken out petition papers to bring the decision to referendum.

The Board will plan to meet at its regularly scheduled date of April 21, 2009.

G. Adjournment:

Ms. Russell moved to adjourn at 8:10 p.m.

Mr. Couillard seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

William P. Ward, Board Chair

Pam Bosarge, Board Clerk