

**SANFORD PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**MEETING – March 16, 2016 – 7:00 P.M.**  
**City Hall Annex Third Floor Chambers**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lenny Horr, Chair  
John McAdam, Vice Chair  
Kelly Tarbox, Secretary  
Dana Peterson  
Dianne Connolly  
Edward Cormier

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Elizabeth Della Valle, AICP, Director of Planning & Development  
Michael Casserly, Asst. City Engineer  
Shirley Sheesley, Codes Enforcement Officer  
Matthew Hill, Public Works Director/City Engineer

**STAFF ABSENT:** None

\*\*\*\*\*

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair McAdam called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

**II. PUBLIC HEARING**

1. **File #01-16-RZ: City of Sanford, c/o Jeff Preble**, Wright-Pierce, 99 Main Street, Topsham.

(Recording started late, project already being presented to the Board).

Board member Peterson asked about drainage flow.

Horr asked if anyone present would like to speak on behalf of this application.

A representative of the Alfred Planning Board was concerned about shoreland zoning and had concerns of pollution flowing from the parking lot into the Mousam River which flows into Estes Lake.

Chair Horr asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of this application; there was no one.

Chair Horr asked if anyone would like to speak against this application; again there was no one.

Chair Horr asked if anyone present neither for nor against this application would like to comment; there was no one.

Chair Horr closed the public hearing.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **File #01-16-RZ: City of Sanford, c/o Jeff Preble**, Wright-Pierce, 99 Main Street, Topsham.

Board member Peterson wanted to know more about the vegetated buffer.

Planner Della Valle told the Board the Site Plan Review Committee, at their meeting earlier in the day, recommended approval of the project with the following conditions:

- That the Planning Board approve the driveway location and find that it will not contribute sediment from the site;
- That the applicant will file and secure its DEP Permit by Rule;
- That the following revisions and additions will be added to the final plans prior to securing a curb cut permit, which is required to construct the project:
  - That the applicant will indicate the number, type, and location of native shade trees to be planted as required by shoreland zoning to the satisfaction of the codes enforcement officer;
  - That the city engineer is satisfied with the revised plans for final grading and the siting of erosion control matting;
  - That the applicant will indicate snow storage areas to the north;
  - That the applicant will add a note to the plans that indicates the site distance is adequate;
  - That the applicant will add spot grades on the ADA parking space;
  - That the location of the public parking sign will be identified;
  - That the applicant will raise the grade of the driveway to direct the flow of stormwater to the satisfaction of the city engineer.

Chair Horr asked if Board members had any questions or comments.

Board member Cormier asked if the fence with barbed wire currently located at the top of the property is going to be upgraded. Planner Della Valle replied she will check to see if there may be extra money in the budget to do so.

Chair Horr asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Board members; there was not at this time.

Chair Horr asked Shirley Sheesley, Codes Enforcement Officer if she had any comments to add.

Staff member Sheesley asked the Planning Board to consider the driveway location in their approval because the location is still within the 75 foot buffer, which does not meet the setback requirements for driveways, and, per the shoreland ordinance, the Planning Board needs to determine the best practical location of the driveway for access to the parking lot.

The Planning Board then went through the Finding of Facts:

**Ordinance Section 272-1-8. Approval criteria and standards:**

A. Utilization of the site.

Board member Tarbox made a motion the standard has been met because it is the best way to use the brownfields site with minimum disturbance and possible contamination.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

B. Access to the site.

Chair Horr made a motion the standard has been met because it is using an existing access while minimizing disturbance.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

C. Access into the site.

Board member Cormier made a motion the standard has been met because the site distance is good.

Board member Peterson added as long as the vegetation on the corner is kept low to maintain the site distance.

A vote was taken and the amended motion passed 6-0.

D. Internal vehicular circulation.

Board member Tarbox made a motion the standard has been met.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

E. Pedestrian circulation.

Board member Tarbox made a motion the standard has been met, and Board member Cormier added that there were sidewalks on the road and visually impaired accommodations have been made.

A vote was taken and the amended motion passed 6-0.

F. Stormwater management.

Board member Peterson made a motion this standard has not been met because he doesn't feel this has been adequately addressed because the lot is accepting runoff from other paved areas and other streets and it is going onto the site and only taken care of by a swale. He would like to see a rain garden or some sort of retention along with a deeded vegetated buffer.

After discussion, a vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0 stating the standard has been met with the following conditions:

- Adding a raingarden if DEP approves this
- Adding uphill treatment
- Adding a deeded vegetated buffer

G. Erosion control.

Board member Cormier made a motion the standard has been met because the vegetated buffer would address erosion concern.

After discussion, a vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0 stating the standard has been met with the following conditions:

- Add riprap along steep areas
- Vegetated buffers
- City responsible to periodically check snow dump area/swale and repair as necessary
- Stone check dams and mattings will be added to the plan

H. Water supply.

Board members Cormier and Tarbox made a motion this standard was not applicable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

I. Sewage disposal.

Board member Tarbox made a motion this standard was not applicable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

J. Utilities.

Board member Cormier made a motion this standard has been met because the electrical covers will be replaced; he also felt the proposal covered this criteria well.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

K. Natural features.

Board member Cormier made a motion this standard has been met because replanting will take place in the areas the trees will be removed; he also believed the remediated site will be better than it is now.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

L. Groundwater protection.

Vice Chair McAdam made a motion this standard was not applicable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

M. Exterior lighting.

Chair Horr made a motion this standard has been met. The Board discussed and they felt that it has been met because they are the same light fixtures as in the Mill Yard and they will have daylight sensors.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

N. Waste disposal.

Board member Tarbox made a motion this standard was not applicable. Planner Della Valle responded this standard does apply since there was hazardous waste material on the property.

After discussion, it was determined this standard has been met because the hazardous material is being remediated per EPA approval.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

O. Landscaping.

Board member Cormier made a motion the standard has been met and Board member Tarbox added it was met because of tree replanting due to trees being removed.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

P. Shoreland relationship.

Board member Peterson made a motion that this standard has not been met because water quality will still be affected even though much is being done to improve the situation.

Chair Horr felt the standard has been met due to the discussion under shoreland standards.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 5-1 that the standard has been met with Board member Peterson voting against due to the wording of this section.

Q. Technical & financial capacity.

Chair Horr made a motion the standard has been met because the city is financially capable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

R. Buffering.

Board member Peterson made a motion this standard was not applicable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

S. Airport encroachment.

Board member Tarbox made a motion this standard is not applicable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

**Ordinance Section 270-15.D Shoreland Zoning.**

(a) Will maintain safe and healthful conditions.

Board member Cormier made a motion the standard has been met because it is a net gain, the area will be better than what is there.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

(b) Will not result in water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation to surface waters.

Board member Tarbox felt this standard was addressed as much possible. Board member Peterson agreed, but didn't feel it was enough.

After discussion, a motion was made that the standard has been met because the impact is minimal and the existing situation has been approved.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 5-1 with Board member Peterson voting against.

- (c) Will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater.

Board member Cormier made a motion that this standard was not applicable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

- (d) Will not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat.

Board member Peterson made a motion that the standard will be met if the applicant receives the Permit by Rule from the DEP; Board member Tarbox agreed.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

- (e) Will conserve shore cover and visual, as well as actual, points of access to inland and coastal waters.

Board member Tarbox made a motion this standard has been met because the applicant is not making any changes.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

- (f) Will protect archaeological and historic resources as designated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Board member Tarbox made a motion this standard is not applicable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

- (g) Will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing activities.

Board member Cormier made a motion this standard is not applicable.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

- (h) Will avoid problems associated with floodplain development and use.

Board member Tarbox made a motion this standard has been met because there will be no fill in the floodplain.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

- (i) Is in conformance with the provisions of §270-13, Land Use Standards.

Planner Della Valle read a suggested motion that the standard has been met because the conformance is based on the code enforcement officer's review.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

Chair Horr called for a motion.

Board member Tarbox made a motion that the Planning Board approve the request for the City of Sanford, c/o Jeff Preble, Wright Pierce, File #01-16-RZ for major site plan approval for constructing a parking lot of approximately 8,600 s.f. on a remediated brownfield site located on Heritage Crossing in Sanford, tax map J29, lot 17E, Industrial Reuse zone with the following conditions:

1. That a waiver to provide a boundary survey with the submission is provided.
2. That the Planning Board has approved the driveway location and finds it will not contribute sediment from the site.
3. That the applicant will file and secure a DEP Permit by Rule which will satisfy the conditions of 270-15-D.(d) as far as not having adverse impact on spawning grounds, etc.
4. That the following revisions and additions will be added to the final plans prior to securing a curb cut permit that is required to construct the project:
  - a. That the applicant will indicate the number, type, and location of native shade trees to be planted as required by Shoreland Zoning and to the satisfaction of the Code Enforcement Officer.
  - b. Additional buffering will be proposed on the uphill-side of the parking lot to help control any runoff coming down off that slope.
  - c. That the City Engineer is satisfied with revised plans for final grading and the siting of erosion control matting.
  - d. That the applicant will indicate snow storage areas to the north of the lot.
  - e. That the applicant will add a note on the plans that indicates that the site distance is adequate and additionally will provide for adequate maintenance of the vegetated buffer to keep it cut down enough so that the sight distance is maintained.
  - f. That the applicant will add spot grades on the ADA parking spaces.
  - g. Location of a public parking sign will be identified.
  - h. That the applicant will raise the grade of the driveway to direct the follow of stormwater to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
5. That the applicant has paid all outstanding review fees.
6. That the applicant meet with the City Engineer and pay any required performance guarantees for roadway impacts and reclamation.
7. That the applicant provide five copies of the approved plan for certification by the Planning Director.
8. A note will be added to the plan for deeded maintenance on vegetated buffer.

Vice Chair McAdam seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

##### **1. File #19-14-RU: Matt Pepin, R. Pepin & Sons, P.O. Box 729, Sanford.**

Chair Horr informed everyone that one of the Board members was going to step down for this application. Board member Cormier said he was not here when the project was first reviewed so he was going to recuse himself from the discussion.

Chair Horr called for a representative to present the project.

Matt Pepin, R. Pepin & Sons briefly discussed the history of the project. He then presented an overview of the project:

- Truck traffic
- Amount of acreage to be processed
- The use of Bernier Road

- Noise
- Pedestrian safety

John Rivard, the property owner of the project explained why he was having gravel removed from the property, future plans for the property, and explained why he didn't use Gorham Sand & Gravel, an abutting mineral extraction operation, to do the project. Mr. Rivard also addressed the noise and pedestrian safety concerns.

Chair Horr asked if anyone present wanted to speak in favor of the project.

Luke Pepin, R. Pepin & Sons said he is in favor of the project. He said his company employs local people and feels this would project would be good for them.

Chair Horr asked if anyone else would like to speak in favor of the project; there was no one.

Chair Horr asked if anyone present would like to speak in opposition of the project.

Bruce Read, attorney from Kennebunk, representing Apache Campground stated their concerns:

- This project was not noticed as a public hearing for tonight's meeting and explained why.
- The applicant referring to the traffic created by the campers

Fred Frodyma, President of the Estes Lake Association and a member of the Alfred Planning Board expressed his concerns of the trucks possibly using the bridge between Sanford and Alfred, noise, and the traffic problem.

Shannon Hebler, resident of Bernier Road expressed her concern of the truck traffic with children having to walk to the intersection of Bernier and New Dam Roads to get the bus.

A resident of Stone Road in Alfred also discussed her concern of the potential noise this project will create and the number of pedestrian injuries on a secondary road.

Steve Jacques, resident at 106 Bernier Road is concerned with the increase of traffic on Bernier Road for cyclist and pedestrian safety; he is also concerned with the noise this project would create.

Charles D'Agnese, resident of Tall Pines Road requested the following:

- The Board visit the project site and envision they are residents of this road when considering the approval of the project
- The Board see two dump trucks pass each other to confirm width of road will accommodate this activity
- The Board to verify the number of truck trips this project will generate

David Houle, Apache Campground felt the applicant did not address pedestrian safety well enough. He also was concerned with who would be responsible for maintenance of Bernier Road. Mr. Houle would also like there to be some flexibility in the operations manual if concerns/complaints arise. He also has concerns with the noise and dust a pit creates.

Linda Renaud, resident of Old Mill Road said she lives near a different Pepin pit and has to deal with the trucks driving by every day and says it is not pleasant.

Charles Kasinowicz, 298 Bernier Road said he lives near this proposal. His primary concerns are the noise and dust, especially since his house will be in very close proximity to the pit area. Safety is also one of Mr. Kasinowicz's concerns.

Chair Horr asked if anyone else would like to speak in opposition.

A longtime resident of Bernier Road said there are not many RVs that travel the road in a week as Mr. Pepin has said. He also stated that Mr. Rivard can build house lots without having a gravel pit.

Chair Horr asked if anyone else would like to speak in opposition; there was no one.

Chair Horr asked if anyone present would like to comment on the application; there is no one.

Rita Bernier, an owner of Apache Campground and a resident of Bernier Road, wanted to know why she was not notified for the public hearing in August 2015. Planner Della Valle explained the abutter noticing requirements of the city's ordinance.

Another resident of Bernier Road wanted to know why the residents of Bernier Road would have to change their way of life in order to allow the project to happen.

A resident of Alfred didn't feel \$90,000 would cover the cost of road repair.

Another resident of Alfred is concerned with the increase of truck noise this project will create.

Chair Horr asked if anyone else would like to comment; there was no one.

Planner Della Valle read emails received (attached) concerning this project from:

- Stephanie Jacques
- Chad Barron
- Aaron Pudlo
- Al & Yvette Berard
- Rich Whicker
- Scott Pelchat
- Angela Bancroft
- Shepherd & Read, Bruce Read, Esq.

Planner Della Valle then explained the process of Planning Board discussion as outlined in the city's ordinance. She asked the audience to allow the Board their discussion time. Discussion then took place on what options the Board has on making a decision on this application tonight, along with discussing Board participation issues that will be coming up in the next couple of months.

Board member Peterson agreed with Vice Chair McAdam about scheduling a site visit.

Board member Connolly made a motion that the Planning Board do a site walk.

Chair Horr seconded the motion.

Board member Tarbox asked about availability in the month of March to hear this application. Discussion took place on Board member availability and whether or not Board member Cormier could get updated enough to participate in discussion of this application.

Both Matt Pepin and John Rivard had no issue allowing Board member Cormier time to get up to speed on the application so he could be a participating member.

One of the Board members asked Mr. Pepin about their truck size. Discussion followed.

Board member Peterson made a motion to allow Board member Cormier to get up to speed on this application.

Board member Connolly seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

A vote was then taken on performing a site walk and the motion passed 6-0.

Board discussion then took place on whether or not to hold another formal public hearing. It was decided there would be no need to hold a public hearing.

The Board decided on holding the site walk on Friday, March 18 at 5:30 p.m.

The Board also decided to hold a special meeting on Wednesday, March 30 at 7:00 p.m.

Board member Connolly asked for information on New Dam Road regarding when it was last paved and the condition of the road.

Staff member Casserly asked for an estimate on the anticipated number of trips going right/left onto New Dam Road. Discussion followed.

Chair Horr asked if there were any other questions.

A member of the Alfred Planning Board explained how they process and approve and application and wanted to know if Sanford had the same format. Planner Della Valle briefly explained Sanford's approval process.

Matt Hill, City Engineer/Public Works Director updated the Board on where the City was headed to address road repair throughout the City.

Chair Horr asked if there were any other questions; there were none.

Chair Horr called for a motion.

Chair Horr made a motion to table this application to the next meeting on March 30, 2016.

Board member Connolly seconded the motion.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed 6-0.

## **2. Approve Planning Board By-Laws**

This discussion was tabled to a later date.

## **V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 19, 2015**

All sets of minutes were tabled until next meeting.

**VI. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

1. Request for Delegated Review: Sweetser, c/o John Mistos.

Planner Della Valle explained the proposal, which is to replace the space that was the atrium with 13-14 parking spaces. She was asking the Board to delegate the review to staff level and explained why.

Discussion took place on whether or not there would be no significant increase in impervious area.

It was decided that this would be discussed after the site walk on Friday, March 18, 2016.

The meeting adjourned at 10:24 P.M. (approximately)

**ATTACHMENT TO MINUTES BELOW**

## Beth Della Valle

---

**From:** Tom Cote  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 1:53 PM  
**To:** Msrgkhebler  
**Cc:** Beth Della Valle  
**Subject:** RE: Bernier road resident

Hello,

Thank you for the e-mail. I have copied our Planning Director, Beth Della Valle, on this e-mail and she will relay your comments to the Planning Board during tonight's meeting.

Best Regards,

Tom Cote  
Mayor, City of Sanford  
(207)467-1155

---

**From:** Msrgkhebler [msrgkhebler@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 1:23 PM  
**To:** Tom Cote  
**Subject:** Bernier road resident

Good afternoon,

I'm writing to you with many concerns I have with the thought of a gravel pit on Bernier road. My family built our home on Bernier road 6 years ago we love it here. We have 3 children and 2 are hearing impaired ages 11,8, and 3. Being on a quiet road with not much traffic is a huge plus. We have no worries with bringing our children for nice long walks or bike rides and most of all going to visit the cows. If there are huge trucks carrying gravel back and forth up our road would cost us all the reasons we chose to build here. My daughter and son a year before last had issues with the bus not stopping in front of our driveway to pick up and drop off our kids. They had to walk on the side of the road around many blind corners and along a electric fence. I couldn't believe this was allowed my husband contacted the superintendent and explained how this is so unsafe. He sent someone out to review the area and got right back to us stating no child should have to walk on our road to a bus stop and especially with the disability my children have. So bus started to pickup at our driveway again this year same thing now they want all of Bernier road children to walk to the end of Bernier road/new dam road. How can our children be safe walking to and from the bus stop on a windy unsafe road to now add these trucks daily with loads of gravel coming back and forth from the pit. This is so not ok or safe. This road alone being there are many sharp turns is tough now add these huge trucks. The superintendent stated there is not even a side walk for these kids to walk on and the road is so extremely narrow leaves these kids not able to get two and from the bus stop. Also another concern is there is and has always been a weight limit on this road I understand our taxes which are already way high would go up for a new road to just be destroyed by these trucks. What about Bernier road just becoming where the Sanford town water is provided. What if these trucks hit these fire hydrants that are placed on this road or contaminate the town water. There is no way these trucks can stop say there is a child walking home and another vehicle is coming these trucks can take out a hydrant easily. I want to know my children will be safe and under these circumstances this puts my children at risk and everyone that child that goes to school and rides the bus. I don't want my rights taken away when there are many other places a pit can be and not affect residents. Ask yourself do you want to be responsible for a child being injured I don't even want to think about it. Please say not to this gravel pit on Bernier road and not allow this beautiful peaceful road be turned into a work zone. Thanks for your time and listening to the residents of Bernier road.

Shannon Hebler

## Beth Della Valle

---

**To:** stephiejacques@gmail.com  
**Subject:** FW: Bernier Road gravel pit proposal

Ms. Jacques, thank you for your comments.

I will read them into the Planning Board record at the meeting this evening.

Beth Della Valle, Director of Planning & Development

---

**From:** Maura A. Herlihy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 1:28 PM  
**To:** Beth Della Valle  
**Subject:** FW: Bernier Road gravel pit proposal

Beth-

I am forwarding because I am not sure you received this one. I will respond to the person that I have forwarded on her comments.

Maura

---

**From:** Steph Jacques [stephiejacques@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 1:08 PM  
**To:** Maura A. Herlihy  
**Subject:** Bernier Road gravel pit proposal

Dear Deputy Mayor Herlihy,

I am a resident of 106 Bernier Road in Sanford. I am writing to let you know I strongly oppose the gravel pit proposal. My husband and I just purchased this house in August of 2015 and it is our first home. We love the quiet and peaceful setting that we moved into. We are avid cyclists and love to walk this road. I was really upset to hear about the possibility of a gravel pit with a large amount of noisy truck traffic potentially impacting the road we live on. One of the main reasons we decided to move here was because it is so quiet and we could ride our bikes right from our house and explore this beautiful area. We can even go kayaking across the street, there's a trail we can use to wheel our kayaks down there to the water. I see a lot of people and children riding bikes, walking, running and enjoying this road - not just us. There's wildlife and birds around that inhabit this quiet area, too. It's a shame to see some short term gain in a small quiet neighborhood - for people like us that love the peace and harmony and have worked so hard to buy this house. It has not been an easy few years for me and my husband. I just celebrated my one year anniversary of surviving breast cancer and am really just getting back into exercising and cycling of which I love to do and plan to do on this road! In addition I love being outside with our three cats and gardening and was hoping to enjoy that without the roaring noise of trucks that would bother me and scare our cats.

Think about it - would you want this on the road you live on?

Thank you so much for listening to my viewpoints on this matter.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Jacques

## Beth Della Valle

---

**To:** Maura A. Herlihy; Baron, Chad; Tom Cote  
**Cc:** Joseph R. Hanslip; Fred W. Smith; [captjack@hotmail.com](mailto:captjack@hotmail.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Bernier Rd Concerned Citizen

Mr. Baron.

Thank you for your comments.

As Maura Herlihy noted, I will read them into the record this evening at the Planning Board meeting.

Beth

---

**From:** Maura A. Herlihy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 1:33 PM  
**To:** Baron, Chad; Tom Cote; Beth Della Valle  
**Cc:** Joseph R. Hanslip; Fred W. Smith; [captjack@hotmail.com](mailto:captjack@hotmail.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Bernier Rd Concerned Citizen

Mr. Baron,

Thank you for your e-mail. I have corrected the contact information so that this e-mail reaches the right parties. Ms. Della Valle, our City Planner, will read your comments in to the minutes but if you are able to attend the meeting that is always a help.

Maura A. Herlihy

---

**From:** Baron, Chad [[cbaron@Husseyseating.com](mailto:cbaron@Husseyseating.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 1:32 PM  
**To:** Tom Cote  
**Cc:** Maura A. Herlihy; Joseph R. Hanslip; [arwalsh@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:arwalsh@sanfordmaine.org); [rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org); Fred W. Smith; Dianne Connolly  
**Subject:** Bernier Rd Concerned Citizen

To Whom it may concern,

At tonight's city meeting please consider denying R. Pepin and sons access to destroy the area off of Bernier Rd. I live in the area with my family off of Bernier Rd and pay very good tax money to live out in the quite peace of the country. As it is now we hear Gorham Sand and Gravel's operation all day long minus the traffic, And with this operation will double the noise plus add the dangerous dump truck and equipment traffic. This area is one of the last true country side acres in Sanford. If this passes the local community will surely suffer. My sons and I hunt and fish in those woods as I did when I was there age with my family. My wife and I walk and ride bikes on Bernier Rd as well. Please consider this and don't let these traditions as well as many other family's traditions be ruined so some business man can keep lining his pockets. Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

Chad Baron

## Beth Della Valle

---

**From:** Beth Della Valle  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 8:42 AM  
**To:** 'Aaron D. Pudlo'  
**Cc:** dparent@sanfordwater.org; PW; Shirley E. Sheesley; rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org; Tom Cote; Maura A. Herlihy; Steven R. Buck; coleen.pudlo@me.com  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed Rivard/Pepin Bernier Road Pit

Mr. and Mrs. Pudlo, thank you for your comments. I will read them into the record at this evening's Planning Board meeting.

Beth

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Aaron D. Pudlo [mailto:[apudlo@coactivetech.net](mailto:apudlo@coactivetech.net)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 2:26 AM  
**To:** Beth Della Valle  
**Cc:** dparent@sanfordwater.org; PW; Shirley E. Sheesley; rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org; Tom Cote; Maura A. Herlihy; Steven R. Buck; coleen.pudlo@me.com  
**Subject:** Proposed Rivard/Pepin Bernier Road Pit

Good Morning Beth

Due to work-related conflicts we are unable to attend the Planning Board Meeting on Wednesday March 16th & wanted to share our comments on the proposed matter.

Our Family (2 adults 2 children) lives at 136 Bernier Road & will be directly impacted by the Proposed Rivard/Pepin Bernier Road Pit in the following ways:

1) Safety

- a) traveling on Bernier Road by vehicle, foot, bicycle & encountering Loaded Trucks that are Larger than what the Road was Designed for
- b) entering Bernier Road from our BLIND driveway with Large Loaded Trucks traveling Downgrade

2) Destruction of City Owned Road

- a) Bernier Road NOT designed for Loads of this size/frequency
- b) Bernier Road is NOT on the Posted Roads List during Mudseason

3) Redirection of Transportation Infrastructure Funds

Instead of money being spent on a Higher Priority Bernier Road Infrastructure Project: REPLACEMENT of Hay Brook Bridge,  
money will be spent on repairing damage to Bernier Road from the Excessive Loads & Traffic generated by the Proposed Pit.

All that being said we are in favor of Conditional Approval for the Proposed Rivard/Pepin Bernier Road Pit with the Condition that ALL Truck Traffic Must Use the EXISTING Private Haul Road to Rt 4 located in the "Gorham Sand & Gravel" Pit as this Private Road was designed for this type of Traffic & has close to Zero impact on the Bernier Road Neighborhood. If the Respective Parties are unable to reach a mutually acceptable Agreement for use of the EXISTING Private Haul Road by the Proposed Rivard/Pepin Bernier Road Pit then we would ask the City of Sanford to take the

necessary steps to make the PRIVATE Road an Unpaved PUBLIC Road as this would be in the Best Interests of ALL parties (City of Sanford, Residents/Visitors of Bernier Road, the Respective Owners/Operators of the GSG Pit & the Rivard/Pepin Pit).

Feel free to contact us directly if you would like elaboration on the above comments & suggestions.

Thank-you for your time & consideration of our views,

Aaron & Coleen Pudlo  
207-432-1000

136 Bernier Road  
Sanford, ME  
04073

## Beth Della Valle

---

**From:** Beth Della Valle  
**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 1:39 PM  
**To:** 'beradal@hotmail.com'; Lenny Horr; Dana Peterson; Dianne Connolly; John McAdam; Kelly Tarbox; Edward P. Cormier  
**Cc:** Tom Cote; Steven R. Buck  
**Subject:** FW: March 16th town Meeting Support

Good afternoon, Mr. and Mrs. Berard.

I have forwarded your email below to members of the Planning Board, although technically they cannot respond to your comments outside of a formally announced Planning Board meeting.

The Pepin Bernier Road Gravel Pit application is scheduled for review at this Wednesday's Planning Board meeting in Council Chambers on the third floor of City Hall. The meeting starts at 7pm, though the Pepin application is the second item on the agenda.

I will read your email into the record at the Board meeting.

In the meantime, if you have any questions, please, feel free to contact me.

Thank you.

Beth

---

**From:** Tom Cote  
**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 1:11 PM  
**To:** al b; Joseph R. Hanslip; Fred W. Smith; Steven R. Buck; Beth Della Valle  
**Cc:** Maura A. Herlihy; Victor E. DiGregorio; Luke J. Lanigan  
**Subject:** RE: March 16th town Meeting Support

Hello Al,

Thank you for the e-mail. This is not a response to the subject, but rather a clarification of who is responsible for what. Your e-mail has several Budget Committee members on it and it's important to know that they have nothing to do with the decision making as it relates to this project.

Beth Della Valle,

Can you please reply to Al with the appropriate Planning Board Members that should be receiving this public feedback.

Thanks, Tom

---

**From:** al b [berardal@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 12:40 PM  
**To:** Tom Cote; Joseph R. Hanslip; [arwalsh@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:arwalsh@sanfordmaine.org); [rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org); Fred W. Smith; Dianne Connolly; Steven R. Buck; [wesley.davie@gmail.com](mailto:wesley.davie@gmail.com); [james.drummet@gmail.com](mailto:james.drummet@gmail.com); [ldhoenig@gmail.com](mailto:ldhoenig@gmail.com);

[nodmik@hotmail.com](mailto:nodmik@hotmail.com)

**Subject:** March 16th town Meeting Support

March 16 at 6:30 pm a town meeting will be held to discuss providing a permit to Pepins to allow trucking gravel from a proposed gravel pit on the north end of Bernier road in Sanford . We are not in favor of this hauling of gravel by way of Bernier road as besides my wife and I often walking the distance of Bernier road from New Dam Rd to the Alfred bridge we witness other people parking cars and enjoying the same .

One of the few aspects we enjoy of living on the outskirts of town is the quiet setting .

We are sure you all are aware of the existing gravel road that travels from Rt 4 into the Libby pit which is located just to the south of the new gravel pit in question . We would rather see those two land owners work out an agreement .

Thank you for your support in opposing using Bernier road for this venture plus anything you can do to lower our property taxes .

Regards , Al & Yvette Berard

Bernier & New Dam Rd

## Beth Della Valle

---

**From:** Beth Della Valle  
**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 9:48 AM  
**To:** Tom Cote; Rich Whicker  
**Cc:** Maura A. Herlihy; Joseph R. Hanslip; Fred W. Smith; Dianne Connolly; Steven R. Buck; Luke J. Lanigan; John L. Tuttle; Victor E. DiGregorio; Matthew E. Hill  
**Subject:** RE: Pepin Concrete- John Rivard -Gravel Pit

Mayor Cote and Mr. Whicker.

The Planning Board is scheduled to continue its review of the Pepin Bernier Road gravel pit application this Wednesday evening.

Notices about the review were sent out to abutters within 250' of the property, which is the standard established in the City's ordinance. According to the City's GIS data base, Mr. Whicker's property is 4,474 feet and 100 Tall Pines Road is 3,867 feet from the Pepin project, well beyond the standard requiring notification.

Planning Board review of the Pepin application was begun last summer before I was hired by the City. The Planning Board's review was tabled after it held and closed a legally noticed public hearing on August 5th. Notice for that public hearing was provided by advertisement in the Journal Tribune in addition to mailed notices to property owners within 250 feet. The Board tabled its review to allow time for City staff to prepare a cost estimate for the anticipated impact of trucks transporting excavated gravel on Bernier Road.

While staff was preparing the cost estimate, I asked the Planning Board Chair (then Jack McAdams) whether he would be reopening the public hearing and he indicated that was not his intent, but that it has been the Board's practice to allow interested parties who show up a meeting to speak as long as they are brief and not redundant. I have relayed this information to everyone, interested parties and applicant, and encouraged the interested parties to identify a couple individuals to speak on their behalf in the interest of preserving as much time as possible at the meeting for the Board to focus on review and discussion of various aspects of the application, including the concerns expressed by neighbors at the August public hearing. I did suggest that if other individuals want to go on record opposing the project and supporting the statements made by their representative, they consider limiting their testimony to indicating that they agree with the previous statements to avoid repetition, adding only new information.

So, as you can see, the public has been and will likely continue to be allowed to offer comment on this project.

I do have to take exception with Mr. Whicker's suggestion that the process to date has "only the interest of Pepin Concrete in mind." The process to date and certainly as it continues under my watch has been open and fair. Staff have weighed in on technical aspects of the application and my latest report to the Planning Board carefully lays out the standards and criteria by which the Board is obligated to conduct its review. I have no reason to expect that the Board will do anything other than what it is charged to do under the terms of the Site Plan Review provisions and standards.

If I can provide more information to either Mr. Whicker, I encourage him to contact me directly as other interested parties have over the last few weeks. In fact, I am ending this email now in order to meet with one of the neighbors who set up an appointment last week to discuss the project with me.

Beth

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Cote

Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 3:16 PM  
To: Rich WHicker; Beth Della Valle  
Cc: Maura A. Herlihy; Joseph R. Hanslip; Fred W. Smith; Dianne Connolly; Steven R. Buck; Luke J. Lanigan; John L. Tuttle; Victor E. DiGregorio; Matthew E. Hill  
Subject: RE: Pepin Concrete- John Rivard -Gravel Pit

Hello Mr. Wicker,

Thank you for your e-mail. It appears you were attempting to copy the members of the City Council, so I have added the current Council members on this response.

As I understand it, the proposal is still with the Planning Board for review, and I do not believe any conclusions have been drawn to this point. The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for this Wednesday (3/16) at 7pm.

Beth Della Valle,

Can you detail how/when the public can comment on this proposal? I assume there is a public participation portion of the Planning meetings that would allow for a better input.

Please confirm.

Best Regards,

Tom Cote  
Mayor, City of Sanford  
(207) 467-1155

---

From: Rich WHicker [grsfldflyer@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 11:01 AM  
To: Tom Cote  
Cc: Maura A. Herlihy; Joseph R. Hanslip; arwalsh@sanfordmaine.org; rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org; Fred W. Smith; Dianne Connolly; Steven R. Buck; Beth Della Valle  
Subject: Pepin Concrete- John Rivard -Gravel Pit

Mayor Cote,

The previous communication on the matter was a draft and was sent out by mistake.

As the president of the Tall Pines Association I represent the association. Tall Pines Association consists of six full time residents and 14 summer residents. We represent a large tax base in Sanford. The only outlet to Tall Pines Rd. is Bernier Rd. The dump truck traffic that John Rivard of Pepin Concrete & Son's is proposing for servicing the gravel pit on Bernier Rd. is unacceptable.

It is also unacceptable and not in accordance with democratic process that the property owners affected by this proposal have not been allowed to voice concerns. Sanford residents pay one of largest property taxes in the state of Maine and we should be given the opportunity to participate in this proposal. The process to date appears to have only the interest of Pepin Concrete in mind.

At a town meeting in the early fall of 2015 that I and others attended, we were told the proposal had been tabled pending further review by Council. Elizabeth Dellavalle /Planning Director approached us and took our names and said she would let us know when the proposal would go before the board again. I have not received any notice.

Imagine having this traffic on Hanson's Ridge Rd. in front of your home six days a week dawn to dusk. In the summer months Bernier Rd. is busy with bikers, walkers and campers. This proposal would have a limiting affect on these activities and possible safety issues.

It is my hope that the outcome of this proposal can be arrived at in an open and honest manner with all affected property owners on Bernier Road. I look forward to an invitation to an open public forum on the Pepin Concrete proposal. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Respectfully,

Richard Whicker / President  
Tall Pine Association  
100 Tall Pines, Rd.  
Sanford, Maine 04073  
207-608-5378  
grsfdlyer@yahoo.com

## Beth Della Valle

---

**From:** Scott Pelchat <spelchat@amcad-design.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 15, 2016 8:45 AM  
**To:** Tom Cote  
**Cc:** Maura A. Herlihy; Joseph R. Hanslip; Fred W. Smith; Steven R. Buck; Lenny Horr; Dana Peterson; Dianne Connolly; John McAdam; Kelly Tarbox; Edward P. Cormier; Beth Della Valle; Luke J. Lanigan; Victor E. DiGregorio; John L. Tuttle  
**Subject:** RE: Rivard / Pepin Gravel Pit

Hi Tom,

Thank you, and sorry for the confusion.

Scott Pelchat

*A&M Design, Inc.*

*Licensed Construction Supervisor*

*Mass, CS-098312*

*spelchat@amcad-design.com*

*P.O. Box 169*

*40 Haybrook Drive*

*Alfred, Maine 04002*

*(207) 651-9771*

---

**From:** Tom Cote [mailto:tcote@sanfordmaine.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 8:55 PM  
**To:** Scott Pelchat <spelchat@amcad-design.com>  
**Cc:** Maura A. Herlihy <mherlihy@sanfordmaine.org>; Joseph R. Hanslip <jhanslip@sanfordmaine.org>; Fred W. Smith <fwsmith@sanfordmaine.org>; Steven R. Buck <srbuck@sanfordmaine.org>; Lenny Horr <lhorr@sanfordmaine.org>; Dana Peterson <maniacs24@metrocaster.net>; Dianne Connolly <drconnolly@metrocaster.net>; John McAdam <captjack@gwi.net>; Kelly Tarbox <kellyatarbox@gmail.com>; Edward P. Cormier <epcormier@sanfordmaine.org>; Beth Della Valle <bdellavalle@sanfordmaine.org>; Luke J. Lanigan <jlanigan@sanfordmaine.org>; Victor E. DiGregorio <vedigregorio@sanfordmaine.org>; John L. Tuttle <jltuttle@sanfordmaine.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Rivard / Pepin Gravel Pit

Hello Scott,

Thank you for the e-mail. FYI, I have received similar e-mails today and you all seem to be using the same e-mail list. Most of the folks you have addressed this to are not involved in any way with the subject project. In fact, one is deceased.

Please connect with whoever suggested you use the original e-mail list and let them know it is not accurate.

I have copied the City Council and the Planning Board on this e-mail. This is the right list.

We will take your comments into consideration.

Best Regards,

Tom Cote  
Mayor, City of Sanford

(207) 467-1155

---

**From:** Scott Pelchat [spelchat@amcad-design.com]

**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 7:10 PM

**To:** Tom Cote

**Cc:** Maura A. Herlihy; Joseph R. Hanslip; [arwalsh@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:arwalsh@sanfordmaine.org); [rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:rlwilkins@sanfordmaine.org); Fred W. Smith; Dianne Connolly; Steven R. Buck; [wesley.davie@gmail.com](mailto:wesley.davie@gmail.com); [james.drummey@gmail.com](mailto:james.drummey@gmail.com); [ldhoenig@gmail.com](mailto:ldhoenig@gmail.com); [nodmik@hotmail.com](mailto:nodmik@hotmail.com)

**Subject:** Rivard / Pepin Gravel Pit

Hi Tom,

I have just recently heard that there is to be new gravel pit off from Bernier road. I know I am not a resident of Sanford, but this proposed gravel pit would be close enough to Shaker Woods development in Alfred to negatively effect our tranquil environment, not to mention our property values as well. There is already one gravel pit that abuts Bernier road, I don't believe we really need another one.

I personally know David Houle and Charlie Kasinowicz who both have a different stake in this venture. However, both I believe will be too adversely affected by this new gravel pit if it is approved. Apache Campground would most likely not survive this drastic change to their peaceful camping environment that so many locals and tourists enjoy during the summer, and I am sure if John Rivard would have told Charlie Kasinowics that he was planning on developing a gravel pit adjacent the land he was purchasing for his retirement home, the sale would not have happened.

Please consider not approving this venture proposed to you by John Rivard & Mathew Pepin.

Thank you,

Scott Pelchat

*A&M Design, Inc.*

Licensed Construction Supervisor

Mass. CS-098312

spelchat@amcad-design.com

*P.O. Box 169*

*40 Haybrook Drive*

*Alfred, Maine 04002*

(207) 651-9771

# Shepard & Read

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

93 MAIN STREET ♦ KENNEBUNK, MAINE 04043

ALAN E. SHEPARD  
BRUCE M. READ

Tel: (207) 985-2291  
Fax: (207) 985-2326  
E-Mail: [bruce@shepardandreadlaw.com](mailto:bruce@shepardandreadlaw.com)

March 16, 2016

***Via Hand Delivery and***  
***Emailed to: [bdellavalle@sandfordmaine.org](mailto:bdellavalle@sandfordmaine.org)***

Sanford Planning Board  
c/o Ms. Beth Della Valle  
Director of Planning  
158 School Street  
Sanford, ME 04073



RE: Your File #19-14-RU/R. Pepin & Sons/Bernier Road Gravel Pit

Dear Members of the Planning Board:

I am writing in my capacity as legal counsel to David Houle and the owners of the Apache Campground located on Bernier Road, a short distance from the above-referenced proposed gravel pit/mineral extraction operation. Mr. Houle is the manager of the campground and his operation has 130 repeat seasonal campers on a site that has a total of 150 available spaces. The seasonal campers will occupy his facility beginning May 1st and stay throughout the summer season into the fall. This proposed gravel pit operation will have a direct and unique impact on the Apache Campground and on Mr. Houle and his family directly, who live on site.

First, I trust that the Board is aware of the history of gravel pit operations generally on Bernier Road. Gorham Sand and Gravel (previously Libby) has an active pit on Bernier Road directly adjacent to the Pepin/Rivard proposed pit and Mr. Libby also operated another pit opposite the Gorham Sand and Gravel pit which is now owned by the Sanford Water Department. Suffice it to say that Mr. Houle and the other residents and property owners on Bernier Road have a long history of dealing with gravel pit operations and know well their negative impacts.

It was only yesterday that Beth Della Valle was able to provide me with copies of all the recent materials that will be considered at tonight's meeting. She emailed me some 119 pages of materials, which my client and I have tried our best to digest. The last public hearing on this matter was August 5, 2015 at which time the board unanimously voted (on Board Member Lanigan's motion) to "table the project until a later date." Recognizing that there will probably not be adequate time for the Board to review a

lengthy letter listing in detail the various concerns and objections that my clients and others have, I will keep this submittal brief, making the following points:

**I. This matter is not ready for a final decision by the Planning Board and should be set for another public hearing at a later date.** Even a casual review of the voluminous materials that Ms. Della Valle provided makes it obvious that a lot of new information has been presented by the applicant to the planning staff over the last 6 weeks (and even as recently as several days ago). As a neighbor to this project, my client (not to mention other members of the general public) has the right to be able to review this material and meaningfully respond to it. Moreover, the planning board members should not be placed in a position of having to react to such a great volume of detailed material on short notice either. It is unclear what is driving the push to have this project approved so quickly, but it is a disservice to the City to act on this application without allowing full and meaningful feedback in the context of the public hearing process. The memos from Michael Casserly, Assistant City Engineer, and Matthew Hill on behalf of the Public Works Department are both dated *March 11, 2016*. Mr. Hill's memo refers to "end of day" materials received from the applicant and Mr. Casserly's memo similarly references "revised submissions that may be needed after the Board's review of the project."

If approved, this project will have a significant impact on a large number of Sanford residents and seasonal visitors, ranging from those living on adjacent Estes Lake and patrons of the Apache Campground to a number of families living on Bernier Road itself. It is imperative that all members of the public have an opportunity to examine and comment on the final details of the proposal being put forth by the applicant and this will only be known tonight. While it may be the Board's practice to allow public comment at all meetings, this item has *not* been advertised as a public hearing. The applicant is looking to provide new and additional information to the Board as is evident from the list of materials in Ms. Della Valle's packet. The public should have a chance to review these submissions and respond in the context of an officially noticed public hearing.

**II. Traffic generated by this proposed operation is very significant both in terms of its impact on pedestrians and all vehicles using Bernier Road.** In item 4 of his March 11, 2016 Memo, Mr. Casserly states as follows: "At this rate, with the pit open from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., that would mean a resident living on Bernier Road would see up to 60 one-way truck trips going by their house in the 10 hour day, or *one truck passing every 10 minutes* (emphasis added). The applicant also proposes that during a significant project, up to 8 trucks could be used per day, with more frequent truck trips passing by a resident on Bernier Road." Given this prediction by your own City engineer, it is imperative that the board weigh the facts carefully. The safety issues that will be created by tri-axle trucks for pedestrians and also vehicles passing each other on this relatively narrow road are significant. It is completely within the Board's authority to analyze this project in context, that is to say the neighborhood in which it is proposed, and issue an outright denial. There are 5 single family residences, all with school age children, on Bernier Road and the Apache Campground has many seasonal residents who will be severely impacted.

**III. The condition of Bernier Road is marginal and any approval of this project should require the applicant to shoulder the costs of all upgrades required by its proposed use.** It is our strong opinion that this is the wrong use at the wrong location and that even stringent conditions of approval would not satisfy the safety and other legitimate concerns of neighboring parties, but clearly any approval of this project must assure that the applicant pay the costs of upgrading Bernier Road to accommodate its uses. There has been much discussion in the record to date about the condition of the road and to what degree the applicant should be responsible for upgrading, but at the end of the day, safety should be the board's primary focus and the applicant must shoulder that burden.

**IV. Noise, dust and related environmental issues have not been properly addressed.** The applicant's Operation Manual is extremely vague with regard to the extent and degree to which crushing and screening will be occurring. Mr. Houle and patrons of his campground are well familiar with the effects of noise not only from crushing and screening operations but also the banging of the heavy 400 lb. dump truck doors against the truck frames. These are very significant issues to my client and others in this neighborhood including those along the shores of Estes Lake over which sound travels dramatically. If, in addition to the significant truck traffic referenced above we must be subjected to the noise of crushing and screening, (to include the latest favorite for pit operators, crushing "glacier rock") this pit will have an enormous adverse impact. Patrons of the campground and those living along the lake, not to mention the residents of Bernier Road will all be subjected to the noise effects of not only truck traffic itself, but gate slamming, rock crushing and screening beginning (if the applicant's request is granted) very early every morning.

### Conclusion

First and foremost, we are asking this board to take a step back and require the applicant to present all the recently submitted information to the public in a properly advertised and noticed public hearing. Of course, that public hearing process would also afford the opportunity to discuss and comment upon the recent memos and letters generated by City staff members. If the board refuses to adopt this approach, any approval of this project must be conditioned upon reasonable hours of operation compatible with the existing uses in the neighborhood, enforceable restrictions on noise levels, and safety upgrades and guarantees regarding the condition of Bernier Road.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

**SHEPARD & READ**

Bruce M. Read, Esquire

---

From: Bancroft, Angela  
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 3:41 PM  
To: [mherlihy@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:mherlihy@sanfordmaine.org)  
Cc: [jhanslip@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:jhanslip@sanfordmaine.org)  
Subject: FW: Gravel pit

Angela Bancroft

NorDx Laboratory-Lab Assistant SMHC Goodall Campus

June Street

Sanford, ME 04073

Tel#207-490-8044

[Abancroft@mmc.org](mailto:Abancroft@mmc.org)<<mailto:Abancroft@mmc.org>>

---

From: Bancroft, Angela  
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 3:40 PM  
To: [tcote@sanfordmaine.org](mailto:tcote@sanfordmaine.org)  
Subject: Gravel pit

→ To Whom it May Concern,

Please know, that as a resident and homeowner on Bernier Road, I am very much against the proposed mining of gravel by R. Pepin & Sons. I can attest to the number of people, my children included, who enjoy walking and riding their bikes on this stretch of road. Also, my daughter is expected to walk quite a ways with no sidewalks on Bernier Road to catch the bus.

I also agree that the campers from Apache campground would definitely be impacted by the noise and traffic. People go camping to enjoy the peace, quiet and nature.

I am unable to attend tonights meeting but would appreciate your consideration of my fears and concerns.

Thank you.

Angela Bancroft

NorDx Laboratory-Lab Assistant SMHC Goodall Campus

June Street

Sanford, ME 04073

Tel#207-490-7310 ext 8044

[Abancroft@mmc.org](mailto:Abancroft@mmc.org)<mailto:Abancroft@mmc.org>

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, is for the use of the intended recipient(s) only and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and prohibited from unauthorized disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message and attachments.