



Planning Board

January 9, 2013 – 6:00 PM - **Minutes**
City Hall, 133 William Street, Room 314

****View Agenda****

Members Present:

Arthur Glassman, Chair
Janine DaSilva, Vice Chair
Colleen Dawicki
Peter Cruz
Kathryn Duff, Clerk

Note: For the purposes of these minutes, a motion that is made and seconded, will be transcribed as shown in the following example-KD/JD, where the first two letters represent the member initials making the motion; and the second set of initials are those of the member seconding the same motion. Tally of the vote appears numerically as 5-0 or the actual vote. This meeting was filmed by New Bedford Cable Access.

Chairman Glassman called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M., called the Roll, and introduced the Board Members and the Acting City Planner. Next, he asked for a motion to accept minutes for the meeting held on December 12, 2012. The minutes were accepted KD/JD 5-0.

Public Hearings:

Case # 1-13 Site Plan Review Application

Mr. Glassman asked the applicant to approach and to give his name and address. Mr. Daniel Campbell, Level Design Group, LLC 60 Man Mar Drive, Plainville, Ma approached the podium. He stated that what they have is an existing warehouse building on the corner of Cape & Conway St. and it is basically situated on Conway St. with loading off of Cape St. through two driveways. Along Conway St. there is a newer loading area as well as employee parking up front. The proposed project is a building addition which builds in a portion in the back removing a small existing building. The plan also consists of reconstructing a parking lot and loading area adjacent to Conway St. and enclosing all the Cape St. entrances. Since the initial application, they have submitted revised plans for the project which he turned into the Board to review. A motion was made to accept material and place on file by JD/PC.

He continued to say that the initial plan that they submitted though they've reduced the overall pavement on the site consists of a fairly simplistic drainage system which discharges to Cape St. similar to the way the water discharges today. They received comments in early December from the City Engineering Dept. and D.P.I. requesting some minor modifications to the plans. Those modifications included modifying the drainage system which they did on this plan. Mr. Campbell explained what they've done is place a subsurface drainage system under the new parking lot with an overflow discharge to the existing drainage system on Conway St. The system is designed to maintain up to a 100 year storm with no additional outflow to Conway St. The overall flow reduction is in the range of 2-4 CFS depending on which storm event in discussion. The drainage system takes place of one of the comments but the remainder of the comments from the Engineering Dept. consists of closing off the driveway openings on Cape St. And some of the labeling on the plans, but in addition; they requested that the sidewalks be replaced in its entirety along Cape St. until the new driveway opened.

What they have done, as shown on the plan, is a new sidewalk from their property line along Cape St. turning into the new driveway opening adjacent to Conway St. They've provided the new sidewalk at the requested width, as well as, handicapped ramps to traverse Cape St. and to traverse Conway St. should any other handicapped ramps be put in place. In conjunction with that, they are increasing the green space along Cape St. on their property, as well as, within the right of way. The D.P.I. also requested that they take out the remainder of the sidewalk between the property line and the new sidewalk which is approximately 3 feet. The project does remove approximately 2 – 2 1/2% of the total pavements on the property even with the building addition, as well as, remove some pavement of the property.

Mr. Cruz inquired about the accessible ramps at the corner as he believed that in an architectural plan if a corner has any improvement then it needs an extra ramp across the street. Mr. Campbell responded that if it was a public project then absolutely but in this case it's a privately funded project and that doesn't need to get done. Then, Mr. Cruz asked about the location on the accessible spots as to why they were located farther from the door than from where they are today. Mr. Campbell pointed to the plan showing the primary entrance door and said at the front of the building is the entrance door itself and there are no legally striped spaces today. The door in the lower left hand corner is a drive-in door; he pointed out that there are several pedestrian doors on the existing building but the spaces are meant to be closest to the accessible door. There is also a pathway along the front should they change that door location for any reason and there is a wide enough pathway. All they would have to do is stripe that accessible path to the new door.

Mr. Cruz wanted to discuss the issue with parking and they are shown to have 26 spaces and Mr. Cruz believed they needed 148 parking spaces and thought they'd need to apply for a special permit. Mr. Campbell said that they only need 26 as they spoke to the Building Inspector and submitted his paperwork with their original application. The Building Inspector specifically stated that the plans submitted to his office would only require Site Plan Review. Ms. Maclean stated to make it a condition. Mr. Cruz had a concern over the loading docks and stated that they have only 12 and by code they should have 18. Mr. Campbell stated that they have denoted all the loading docks with plans submitted to the Building Inspector's office.

Ms. Duff asked about the access into the parking area off of Conway St. She felt it was close to the corner. Mr. Campbell stated that primarily they cut back the corner for access for the trucks not for access for the vehicles. He stated that it is closer to the corner and that Cape St. is not a highly travelled road. They were surveying the manholes on Cape St. and found 1 vehicle in 3 hours comes down Cape St. He felt that the egress and access is safe. Ms. Duff finds that the traffic in this area can be deceiving at different times of the day. Mr. Campbell explained that they have 3 truck spaces and what they do currently at the existing loading dock is they come off of Conway St. and backup to the doors. Off of Cape St. they do a similar maneuver. Ms. Duff concluded that by pulling that curbing back; they are giving the trucks that entire space from the building to the proposed curb line is paved for backing in to the docks hence the striped island. Ms. Duff would have liked to see more green space in the area. Mr. Campbell said it's a food facility and they shouldn't put plants directly along the side of the building to not attract animals and such. Ms. Duff stated that she would have to do more research based on this comment.

Mr. Cruz asked about his email to James on the parking on the proposed building that it is 43,796 sq.ft. The total building area now with the proposed addition is 92,150 sq.ft. Mr. Campbell said no because the lot is 77,000 sq. ft. total. The existing building is not on the plan. Mr. Campbell said that the existing building is 31,550 sq.ft. thus adding another 14,875 sq. ft. to that. Mr. Campbell's email showed sq. footage for the warehouse and sq. footage for the entire plan. Mr. Cruz also asked about a location for a dumpster whether existing or proposed. Mr. Campbell stated that it's currently at the loading area and it's not fenced in. Ms. DaSilva asked about lighting and Mr. Campbell stated that the only lighting for the site is at the wall packs at each individual door and no additional lighting is proposed.

Mr. Glassman requested a motion to open to public hearing. A motion was made by PC/JD to open to public hearing. Mr. Glassman asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of this project or be recorded in favor. No favorable testimony heard. Then, Mr. Glassman asked if anyone would like to speak opposed or be recorded opposed. No oppositions heard. Mr. Glassman requested a motion to close the public hearing. A motion was made by JD/CD to close the public hearing. Mr. Cruz asked about how wide the opening is. Mr. Campbell stated that the opening is approximately 50 ft. to be safe.

A motion was made by JD/CD to approve the Site Plan Application for a proposed 14,875 sq.ft. building addition to the existing Continental Plastics Premises located at 63-65 Conway Street Assessors Plot 37-2 Lot 298 with the following conditions:

- (1) That the applicant confirms with the Building Commissioner that 26 parking spots are adequate for the size of the building.
- (2) That the applicant seeks approval for the number of loading docks and confirm that the numbers of loading docks are adequate for the building.
- (3) That the applicant also incorporates any comments from the Traffic Commission, adjustments into the application.
- (4) That all D.P.I. comments be incorporated to modifications to the Site Plan.

Roll Call Vote:

Colleen Dawicki – yes

Peter Cruz – yes

Kathryn Duff – yes

Janine DaSilva – yes

Arthur Glassman – yes

Tally 5-0, motion passed

Case #2-13 Special Permit Application under Section 3120

The Chair started with stating that a Special Permit needs 4 out of 5 votes in the affirmative for this to pass. Then, he asked for the applicant to approach and state his name and address and to present his case. Attorney Richard Manning, 167 William Street, New Bedford, MA approached to present the case. He had also with him Mr. Jay Bovano, one of the family members of the Estate, and also with him was Mr. Tony DeMello, the proposed contractor for the renovations needed. Atty. Manning said that in the package submitted is a copy showing the present conditions of the parking at the location. At that time, Atty. Manning submitted to the Board members a copy of the plan with some highlights. A motion was made by JD/PC to accept materials and place on file.

Atty. Manning said that this property is the Walgreens located on Pleasant St. at the base of the bridge next to the Fire Station. Approximately 8-9 years ago, it used to be a Slade's Ferry Bank located at the South West corner of the building; Atty. Manning referred to the copy submitted showing a little red box around the building referencing the former and vacant Slade's Ferry Bank location. Now there's a potential tenant who is a franchisee of the Subway Restaurants.

In order to locate a Subway Restaurant in this building, the building is to be converted. Nothing is changing to the footprint of the building with some minor exterior changes but all the renovations will be done to the interior of the former bank location. Because they are converting it, they have to comply with Section 3120 of the Code regarding parking as implied by Danny Romanowicz, Building Commissioner, when they applied for the permit. As such presently they would need 89 parking spaces on the location. Walgreens requires 1 space per every 200 sq. ft. They have 12,813 sq. ft. so they would require 64 spaces. Subway is considered a fast food establishment under the Code which requires 1 space per employee or a minimum of five and then 1 space for every 100 sq. ft. There's 901 sq. ft. in the former bank location and there will be 5 employees so they require 25 spaces for the Subway for a total of 89. Showing on the plans submitted, there are 44 spaces located on the lot.

Atty. Manning continued to say that there isn't any room to increase the parking on the lot. The plan showed on the Southern side of the building was a former drive-thru for the Bank which is the means to get to the drive-thru for Walgreens located on the Easterly side of the building.

The Southern side is the off-ramp for Rte. 18 and the bridge and Pleasant St. is the intersection at the base of the bridge. On the other side, adjacent to the Fire Station is an entrance way. There's no where else to go in terms of access to the parking lot or availability of spaces. Under the Special Permit Requirement of the Code, a Special Permit can be granted reducing the number of parking spaces required as long it is not inconsistent with public health and safety; and as long it promotes a public benefit. He finds that in their position it does meet both criteria. The number of spaces provided at the location were sufficient for the use of the property when they were true tenants as a Bank location and Walgreens. On an average day, there's about 10-15 open spaces in the parking lot area. Much of the business for Subway is targeted to foot traffic. They are really seeking traffic from the residents from the Towers, the Fire Dept., the Third District Court, etc. They are looking for people in the downtown area who live and work here to go there.

Subway experiences their peak hours between their lunch and dinner hours. Walgreens doesn't really have peak hours but have a steady traffic pattern throughout the day. Therefore, they are not proposing having two tenants in there that have clashing peak hours. Subway customers are considered short term customers whom the majority of the business will be take out with a few tables and chairs located at the Eat-In. In terms of promoting public benefit, he would submit a couple of things. First, they would provide a low cost meal alternative to the neighborhood. Secondly, it's going to convert vacant and inactive space into an income producing location which is a benefit for the City. It would also provide part-time employment. They are asking the Board to waive the requirements and allow them to go forward with the 44 spaces that are available.

Ms. Dawicki complimented Atty. Manning for all the information in the packet. Mr. Cruz agreed with Ms. Dawicki but asked about the handicapped spots since they are only being utilized by Walgreens and not Subway. He stated that they might want to relocate one towards the Subway side for accessibility purposes. After a brief discussion, they found that there is a grading issue whereas the lot slants downward from the building; it wouldn't benefit relocating a handicapped accessible spot. Ms. Duff stated that area of Walgreens is busy especially at the intersection's rush hours.

Mr. Glassman requested a motion to open to public hearing. A motion was made to open the public hearing by KD/JD. Then, Mr. Glassman asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of this project or would like to be recorded in favor. No favorable testimony heard.

Mr. Glassman asked if anyone would like to speak opposed or would like to be recorded opposed. No oppositions heard. Mr. Glassman requested a motion to close the public hearing. A motion was made to close the public hearing by JD/CD.

A motion was made by JD/PC to approve the Special Permit Application under Section 3120 to reduce off-street parking requirements for 836 Pleasant Street, Assessors Plot 59 Lot 8, New Bedford, MA reducing it from 89 spaces to 44 with the reduction of 45 spaces.

Roll Call Vote:

Colleen Dawicki – yes

Peter Cruz – yes

Kathryn Duff – yes

Janine DaSilva – yes

Arthur Glassman – yes

Tally 5-0, motion passed

Continued Hearings:

Case # 20-12 Modification of a Previously Granted Site Plan Decision

Mr. Steven Carvalho, Thompson Farland Engineering, approached the podium to represent his client, Acorn Management. At that time, Mr. Carvalho submitted to the Board large scale copies of the revised plans, as well as, reduced scale copies. A motion was made by JD/PC to accept and place on file. Mr. Carvalho started with a quick review as to what was originally approved.

Initially the proposal was for a 140 2-bedroom units in conversion of the old mill building. With the 140 units, the required parking spaces were 280 parking spaces. Because of the many parking spaces, they had to locate parking spaces across the street. The plan for the mill building has since changed. The number of units has been reduced to 126. Because of the reduction of units, the number of parking spaces across the street is no longer required. In addition to the reduction of units, the Chapter 91 Waterways issue came up in which they had to allocate some space for the waterfront used for walking and recreation which also reduced the number of parking spaces. The Board did grant the relief for the required 252 parking spaces to 232 parking spaces. What they failed to mention at the last meeting is the plans for the parking spots across the street. They no longer need those parking spaces so they didn't feel it necessary or benefit to the neighborhood to build a parking lot. Instead, what they're proposing to do is turn the entire area for now into a green space to just mow and seed allowing people to do recreational activities, i.e., walk, play, etc. It is the owner's future intent to develop the property and to put some sort of business there and that would benefit the City and the neighborhood thus increasing tax base and adding jobs to the area. That is what they're seeking is approval for that minor modification instead of developing the parking lot. Mr. Carvalho continued to say that at the last meeting there were some concerns regarding the lighting in front of the building. They do intend to maintain the lighting and landscaping in front of the existing mill building. They will provide those lamp posts.

Ms. Dawicki had asked about the placement of the pedestrian crosswalks. Mr. Carvalho stated that he wasn't sure as to where they would like the crosswalks placed. Ms. Dawicki suggested placing a crosswalk at the Northwest corner as entering the parking lot, across from there, and then another crosswalk right across from the pedestrian walkway. Mr. Carvalho stated that they wouldn't have a problem with the recommendation of placing those 2 crosswalks. Then, she asked about the street lights. Mr. Carvalho referred to Page 5 on the plan set which consisted of 9 light posts that continued with the length of the street.

Mr. Cruz questioned the existing plan as it showed smaller retention basin versus the plan now showing a larger retention basin. Mr. Carvalho said they had to decrease the amount of impervious area and had to reconfigure the Easterly portion along the Acushnet River. By having to do that, they were able to increase the retention area which possesses a benefit with storm run off, infiltration, and water quality. Then, Mr. Cruz asked about curb cuts.

Mr. Carvalho stated that they are leaving curb cuts where they are because of the future development of the area so they find it counterproductive to tear up curb cuts and do it again later. Mr. Cruz asked about ADA handicapped ramp. Mr. Carvalho said he didn't know where it would be in the future development of the lot but they can put an ADA ramp in front of their emergency access into the building.

Ms. Duff suggested for the proposed area for mow and seed to see that as a transition space. She felt it was important to create a buffer between Belleville Avenue and the proposed development for Residential. She suggested some Commonwealth Greenway Plantings along there or some sort of shrubbery that could be acting as both the buffer to Belleville Avenue and as a beautiful perimeter to that garden area. She concurs with her colleagues as to having access from the lawn area to the proposed building and an accessible route would be preferred. She also suggested lighting for the green space for it not to be a dark spot. Mr. Carvalho exclaimed the concern with that being does not know the future development of that parcel. Ms. Duff had a few questions relative to the walkway in reference to the intentions of use of the walkway, where the lighting for the walkway is, and where the seating and the benching along that walkway is, and why that walkway does not go all the way across the property. Mr. Carvalho stated that he wasn't exactly sure why it doesn't connect but the owners would be willing to grant easements across that area if in the future it were to connect to a portion of the Riverwalk in the South.

Attorney Mark Deshaies approached representing also his client, Acorn Management, also present were Mr. Ricciardi, as well as, Allen Collwell, the Project Manager. Atty. Deshaies suggested that Mr. Collwell could address some issues regarding the walkway. He also said before that he had spoken to Mr. Ricciardi; and he would gladly install, if it's the Board's pleasure, perimeter lighting along the Easterly side of this Westerly parcel to provide symmetry on both sides. Mr. Allen Collwell, 20 Trailey Road, Stoughton, MA approached and pointed to a curb cut on the plan and suggested that they will restore that area. As far as the walkway goes, the Committee within the City of N.B. is going before all the Boards as they go along. In the future as they come across, Mr. Collwell said they will give the City an easement to connect the property lines. He then pointed out on the plan the placement of the benches along the public access and referenced C5 on the plan for the lighting plan. He said that Matt Morrissey, NBEDC, had asked to store some power for future use. Ms. Maclean suggested that Environmental Stewardship is the Project Manager but didn't know for what reason it's not showing from property line to property line. After a brief discussion, the conversation went to public comment. Mr. Glassman requested a motion to open to public hearing. A motion was made to open to public hearing by JD/CD.

Mr. Glassman asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of this project. Mr. Derek Santos, NBEDC, 1213 Purchase St., N.B., approached and said that they wanted to continue to support not only the project but the people and the Ricciardi family and acknowledges that the Planning Board are experts in review of the details. He just wanted to bring up a couple of points but feels that the first one has been worked out by the Board and the flexibility of Acorn Management. He continued to say that there are developed plans for that parcel but those plans are not ready to be presented to the Board so he asked for some flexibility in this particular parcel because as it moves forward that will come before the same Site Plan Review process. Specific to the Riverwalk component which the NBEDC has been directly involved in and along with all the other City departments from concept one from the first community planning meeting where the Riverwalk was simply just a series of red dots on a vision map for that area.

The Riverwalk team on the City side involves the City Planning Office, the NBEDC office, Conservation, Solicitors' Office, Mayor's Office, DPI, and Environmental Stewardship. There's a bunch of us working on this project he exclaimed. The project is being funded with Harbor Trustee Council funds and they now also given the settlement with EPA in how the remediation with the accelerated remediation of the River from 40 years to a time frame that is closer to 5-7 years, that also impacts the Riverwalk project all in a positive way. DEP, the state EP office, wants to see as much access as possible and is encouraged by the Riverwalk. To provide that access, not just for Cliftex North but for all of the other mills along that area. EPA is a partner at the table as well.

Aside from this particular Site Plan, the Riverwalk is going to get extended literally it starts on Coggeshall St. around Sawyer St., where the Market Basket site is up through to the Aerovox site and then up again through some extended paths to rivers and parks at the end as you get to Acushnet. The details of all that on how it's going to be worked out have not been nailed down yet so they are asking for some flexibility in exactly where a bench is going to be placed for example; and they are still looking at options for the constructability for the path itself. Their only comment is that not only for this parcel but for other parcels going forward certainly the Planning Board will be a part of that review process but at this point that cake just isn't baked enough in detail in terms of what those specifics are. He said that they all work in partnership and they see each other. The other thing that he wanted to point out is in terms of what has changed on this back parcel is because they have been directly involved in negotiations with DEP is the large concrete coal bins that are part of that project get cut down substantially as part of the negotiations with DEP. The view that you have when you go back there now is going to be substantially increased. DPI is working with the developers in terms of disposal of that material so the views from now to what it will be will be substantially increased. This will be an ongoing process as we move forward so they support the project; and they're excited about the jobs that are on the site now, the increase in the investment in the neighborhood for just these two mill projects, Cliftex North & South which is close to \$15 million. It's more than \$150 million when they group in all the mill projects together. He is thankful for the Planning Board support and attention to detail and thankful for the flexibility when needed

and ask that because of other complexities with pushing things along with the project in terms of financing and some other details that if its possible for the Planning Board to approve a project with whatever specific conditions that they feel appropriate would be extraordinarily helpful for the entire team to move that forward.

Mr. Glassman asked if anyone else would like to speak in favor of this project or be recorded in favor. No other favorable testimony heard. Then, Mr. Glassman asked if anyone would like to speak opposed or be recorded opposed. No oppositions heard. Mr. Glassman requested a motion to close the public hearing. A motion was made to close the public hearing by JD/CD.

A motion was made by JD/CD to modify a previously granted Site Plan Review for the proposed rehabilitation of Cliftex North Mill Building located at ES Riverside Avenue and ES Belleville Avenue, New Bedford, Massachusetts, Assessor's Map 105 and 111, Lots 170 and 155 and that the approval be done with the following conditions: That the plan be revised to add a note that the outline of the proposed Riverwalk be included from property line to property line, that the plan be submitted to the Planning Staff for approval and that the planting plan for the Westerly parcel on Riverside Ave. contain shrubbery based on the Commonwealth Greenway palate of shrubs, that the applicant work with the Riverwalk Board which is a combination of all the committees working on the Riverwalk on selection and placement of lighting and benching for the Riverwalk, that the four crosswalks at Belleville and Riverside, the side entrance, the crosswalk crossing to the public walkway and the one adjacent between Riverside to the green space be incorporated and improved, that the applicant restore the City lot curbing and grass if damaged during construction process, that the lighting on the West side and Riverside Ave. adjacent to the Westerly parcel be included in the development of the green space on the parcel and should match the lighting to the building across the street.

Roll Call Vote:

Colleen Dawicki – yes

Peter Cruz – yes

Kathryn Duff – yes

Janine DaSilva – yes

Arthur Glassman – yes

Tally 5-0, motion passed

New Business:

A request for a partial release of Covenant in the Zuckerman's Farm Subdivision. Owner wishes to have released Lot 15 Assessors' Lot 149 (73 Joy Road). Remaining under Covenant would be Lot 16 (Assessors' Lot 150 (65 Joy Road) which has a newly constructed home. Requested by Jose T. DeSousa on behalf of J&T Home Builders LLC.

Joe DeSousa, J&T Home Builders, approached and said that they would like to release Lot 15 Assessors' Lot 149 (73 Joy Road) the house has sold and they're planning to close the following week. The remaining Covenant would be Lot 16 Assessors' Lot 150 (65 Joy Road) which is on the market now. This home is considered to be their model home. Ms. Maclean stated that DPI stated that there's about \$70,000 worth of work remaining basically the road and some street lights and a couple of trees, minor work and if they are comfortable releasing this lot considering that the other lot has a home built on it. It's more than adequate to cover what's remaining. There was a brief discussion amongst the board members.

A motion was made by JD/CD to accept the partial release of Covenant in the Zuckerman's Farm Subdivision releasing Lot 15 Assessors' Lot 149 (73 Joy Road) retaining the Covenant on the Subdivision Lot 16 Assessors' Lot 150.

Roll Call Vote:

Colleen Dawicki – yes

Peter Cruz – yes

Kathryn Duff – yes

Janine DaSilva – yes

Arthur Glassman – yes
Tally 5-0, motion passed

Site Plan Review for a modification of an existing ground sign located at 4326 Acushnet Avenue. Plans submitted by Poyant Signs, 125 Samuel Barnett Boulevard New Bedford, MA 02745 on behalf of the owners Aristidis Dimitriadis 4326 Acushnet Avenue New Bedford, MA 02745

Ms. Maclean stated that in a prior meeting, the board members discussed that all lit signs had to come before the Planning Board. In this case, this isn't Site Plan Review but the applicant asked that this be put before the Board if they have to actually file. She and the Building Commissioner discussed this case and decided to present it to the Board for their opinion and then the Board may choose whether the applicant may or may not have to file. Currently, the sign is not lit. It's almost the exact same sign except for the bottom left where there's a design but now they are also proposing for it to be lit.

The owner said that the existing sign is ground lit and is not lit within. The sign will be about half a foot higher but the square footage is smaller than what there is currently. Currently, the sign is 35.5sq. ft. and they're proposing 35 sq. ft.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Glassman said that the real problem is how they set precedent as they discussed it before. Mr. Glassman said as a Board do they make it easier for the small business or do they stick to the plan that all lit signs come go to public hearing. They agreed to come up with some standards and for now the Board chooses to go to public hearing for this case. The owner said that if they reverted to external lighting if he would still need to come before the Board. Ms. Maclean stated that if he went to ground lighting without any internal lighting then he would just have to see the Building Commissioner and have that signed off. There was no further action taken.

Ms. Maclean proposed for the new calendar dates for 2013 to be approved. A motion was made by PC/JD to approve the 2013 calendar for the Planning Board. With all in favor, the motion passed.

Yearly election of officers. Mr. Glassman said that he is fine with staying as Chair but if someone else would like to make another nomination that would be perfectly okay. Ms. DaSilva is happy with being as Vice Chair and Ms. Duff is fine with being the Clerk. KD/JD made a motion that Arthur Glassman remain as Chair and Janine DaSilva remain as Vice Chair. With all in favor, the motion passed. A motion was made by JD/CD to keep Kathryn Duff as Clerk. With all in favor, the motion passed.

Old Business

The Board members discussed amongst themselves possible future working sessions.

Date of next meeting: February 20, 2013

Adjourn: A motion to adjourn was made by CD/KD at 8:06 p.m.