

Conway Planning Board (PB)

March 21, 2019

Minutes – Meeting & Public Hearing

Members Present: Beth Girshman, Joseph Strzegowski, Mary McClintock, Dave Barten (associate member), Bill Moebius

Other attendees: Alexis Fedorjaczenko (Administrative Assistant), Tom Gajewski, Ethan Gyles (NexAmp), Michael Scott (WDA Design Group), Jean Christy (Tighe & Bond), Sarah Newman, Gerry LeBlanc

Location: Conway Town Hall

Meeting called to order at 6:00 pm

1. Minutes from the meeting and hearing on February 21, 2019, were re-voted due to a technical error. Motion by Beth to approve minutes as presented; second by Joe. Motion passes, 3-0-1 with Bill abstaining due to absence on Feb 21. Minutes from the meeting on March 7, 2019, were reviewed. Motion by Beth to approve minutes as presented; seconded by Bill. Motion passes 4-0-0.
2. Review NexAmp revised SBR Application
 - a. The PB reviewed the T&B report comments and the PB letter to applicants to decide which items still are outstanding and should be addressed at the hearing.
3. Public Hearing, NexAmp
 - a. Motion by Joe to open the hearing; Beth seconds. Motion passes, 4-0-0.
 - b. Mike Scott provided an update about the Con Com meeting and the resulting changes to the plan. Starting on the east side, the access road for poles has been flipped; on the east side there is a larger no cut area, the tree clearing and fence moved up the hill away from the abutters; there is a 50 foot no cut to the northern wetland and 50 foot no cut to the eastern wetland; and a 25 no cut to the western and southern wetland. The northern wetland would be affected most by shading effects. Also created a longer stumped area; the driveway is now completely out of the buffer zone on the north; some of the road and equipment pad is reconfigured; the storm water basin is enlarged; and turnarounds were added where feasible with regard to the PB's comment.
 - c. Joe asked how much capacity they would lose. Ethan answered that the project has gone 6.4 megawatt to 6.2 megawatt DC.
 - d. Jean reviewed the highlights of the Tighe & Bond report:
 - i. 5f – No poles will be added on town property.

- ii. 5g – The Applicants identified the septic on the residential property; there is no concern.
- iii. Joe mentioned that the PB invited the Board of Health to review the plans.
- iv. 7 – Jean provided an example and the Applicant made a suggestion of \$130,000 with a 2% escalator; Jean would love to see it backed out into the different components of decommissioning. Discussion: nothing is specified in the lease about decommissioning but the PB could include the new decommissioning amount as a condition.
- v. 8 – Storm water management standards. Jean agreed with using LID credits and thinks the original plan is all set. The grass area outside of the impervious areas is a storm water feature.
- vi. 10ai – What’s been provided satisfies the storm water requirements from the state’s perspective. After discussion, the PB did not need anything further.
- vii. 10c – erosion and storm water control was identified by Jean as her main concern. She recommended requiring sharing of SWPPP reports as condition of approval and third party monitor during construction to create a way for the PB to know what’s going on during construction.
 - 1. Joe asked if Sarah Newman has any objection to a third party on-site? Ethan explained it’s pretty standard. Sarah said as long as the family was notified. It was clarified that it would only be when others were working on site.
 - 2. Joe asked who typically bears the cost of that. Ethan deferred to Jean. Jean said that communities with funding have been able to cover it; have also seen collaborative efforts; have also seen all on applicant. Ethan said NexAmp is open to the condition as long as the frequency is agreed upon. Joe proposed 50-50 cost sharing and this was discussed and generally agreed. Ethan asked if there could be a pre-construction meeting to determine the details. There was discussion about the nature of what can be agreed upon after the hearing is closed.
- e. There was discussion of the PB comment about turnoffs and pullouts in the driveway. Mike explained some of the constraints of the site and also that there are improvements proposed to the driveway to remove a kink with a few trees coming down in the driveway will make a spot where there could be a passing point (not a turnaround). Joe also asked about the maintenance agreement for the driveway. The Applicants are responsible for maintaining as a passable driveway all the way from the road; there was discussion.

- f. There was discussion of the PB comment about water testing; the PB cannot require this but strongly recommends it. Ethan said they have not done this prior and there was extensive discussion. Ethan stated that he was not in a position to say yes to water testing at that time since it is not part of the bylaw requirement. Discussion continued and Gerry added that he could pay for his own water test.
- g. Mary asked if there were any more questions or comments. Gerry says he appreciates what the applicant did to accommodate his concerns. Sarah Newman also said they've been working with NexAmp for a year and NexAmp has really worked hard to accommodate landowner concerns.
- h. Joe asked if the Applicant knew the capacity of the feeder substation. Ethan indicated that there is plenty of capacity.
- i. Ethan asked how long before the deliberation meeting is scheduled. Joe replied April 4th ideally but it's a busy meeting and it might be the 18th. There was discussion about the Applicant's participation as needed and Mary suggested a call-in option; also discussion about the town sharing draft set of conditions so that everyone knows they're proceeding on the same page.
- j. Ethan said that if there are additional changes with the Con Com they would be minor and the Applicants could send an update.

Beth motion to close hearing; Bill seconds. Motion passes: 4-0-0.

- 4. Tiny houses discussion Beth (IBC Appendix Q) <https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/IRC2018/appendix-q-tiny-houses> - Beth willing to wait and see if anything comes from people in town and look at it then.
- 5. Comment from Deane Scranton for Moore Marijuana establishment application – the email was shared.
- 6. SP/SBR Application pending for Phillip Bowden, Main Poland Road Adult Marijuana
 - a. Discussion about the meeting on April 4 and Phillip Bowden's request to have both applicants come in together.
 - b. Discussion about the Select Board minutes from March 11 and Lisa Gustavson's statement regarding the PB/fencing which is not accurate. It was agreed that Joe would follow up.
- 7. CPTC Conference – March 16, 2019 (Beth & Joe) – no discussion
- 8. Pine Hill Solar informal meeting April 4th 6:30 PM Jeremy Omni – no discussion
- 9. Pre-Town Meeting Date – May 6 ATM – May 13 – no discussion
- 10. Planning projects discussion for FY 2019, items below (due March 11 for ATM) - no discussion
- 11. Commercial signage (Greenfield Bank) - no discussion

12. Zoning use table revision - no discussion
13. 2013 Master Plan Review & Update - no discussion
14. Small scale solar bylaw - no discussion
15. South River Erosion Zoning - tabled
16. Mail/email - none
17. Old Business - none
18. New Business - none
19. Next scheduled meetings:
 - a. April 18 & May 2 and 16, 2019

Motion by Beth to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Bill. Motion passes, 4-0-0.

Adjourned at 8:32

Respectfully submitted,
Alexis Fedorjaczenko