

The Planning Board for the Town of Derry held a public meeting on Wednesday, February 9, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. at the Derry Municipal Center (3rd Floor) located at 14 Manning Street in Derry, New Hampshire.

Members present: David Granese, Chairman; John O'Connor, Vice Chair; Jan Choiniere, Secretary (7:05 p.m.); John Anderson, Town Administrator; Randy Chase, Administrative Representative; Brian Chirichiello, Town Council Liaison; Darrell Park, Jim MacEachern, Frank Bartkiewicz, Members; Anne Arsenault, Alternate

Also present: George Sioras, Planning Director; Elizabeth Robidoux, Planning Clerk; Mark L'Heureux, Engineering Coordinator

Mr. Granese called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. The meeting began with a salute to the flag. He introduced the staff and Board members present, and noted the location of emergency exits, and agendas.

Escrow

#11-07

Project Name: Pennichuck Water Works, Booster Station

Developer: Pennichuck Water Works

Escrow Account: Pennichuck Water Works

Escrow Type: Cash Escrow

Parcel/Location: PID 05038, Bedard Avenue

The request is to approve the final release of escrow held for the above noted project in the amount of \$34,992.00 plus accumulated interest. The amount to retain is zero.

Motion by O'Connor to approve as presented, seconded by MacEachern. The motion passed with all in favor.

#11-08

Project Name: NH Boring (office building)

Developer: TJR West Chestnut Street, LLC

Escrow Account: Thomas Garside

Escrow Type: Cash Escrow

Parcel ID/Location: PID 23005, 40 Fordway

The request is to approve the final release of escrow held for the above noted project in the amount of \$7,633.44 plus accumulated interest. The amount to retain is zero.

Mr. Sioras advised this is the site of the old highway garage. The applicant purchased the property and built an office that looks like a home. He did a great job on the project.

Motion by O'Connor, seconded by MacEachern to approve as presented. The motion passed with all in favor.

Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes of the January 19, 2011, meeting. *Mrs. Choiniere was now seated.*

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Bartkiewicz to accept the minutes of the January 19, 2011, meeting as written. The motion passed in the affirmative with Choiniere abstained.

The Board reviewed the minutes of the February 5, 2011 site walk of the Radford property. Mr. O'Connor asked that the sentence "Wetlands on the property are small" be removed, and that another sentence be amended to read "The mirror is located on the telephone pole in the right of way." The minutes had reflected the mirror was located on a neighbor's property.

Motion by MacEachern to approve the minutes of the site walk as amended, seconded by Bartkiewicz. The motion passed with Chirichiello and Granese abstained.

Correspondence

Mrs. Choiniere reported the Board has received an updated member information sheet. Arthur Caras has sent a request to rezone three of his properties that are zoned Office Research Development. Mr. O'Connor asked that the parcels be shown on a GIS map so that the Board has a more clear idea of where the parcels are located; he would also like the parcel ID numbers noted on the request. Mrs. Choiniere noted the Board is in receipt of a letter from Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission requesting projects for inclusion in the 10 year highway program. Mr. Sioras noted this is an annual request to update the 10 year highway transportation improvement plan. Mr. Fowler is working on a list and will provide the updates to the Planning Commission by March 4.

Other Business

Voluntary Merger of Parcel ID 08275 and 08276, 17 & 19 Manchester Road

Mr. Sioras advised the two parcels were owned by Troy Allen and Dave Allen respectively, and are now owned by Boomer Wolf, LLC. The applicant would like to combine the lots into one for the site plan the Board will see later this evening.

Motion by MacEachern to approve the voluntary merger of Parcel 08275 and Parcel 08276, 17 and 19 Manchester Road, retaining Parcel 08275. Chirichiello seconded the motion.

Chirichiello, Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Bartkiewicz, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese all voted in favor and the motion passed.

Public Hearing

**John R. and Edward C. Cooper
03080, 182 Rockingham Road
Acceptance/Review, Site Plan Determination
Addition of Auto Sales (50 vehicles)**

Mr. Sioras provided the following staff report. The property is located at 182 Rockingham Road on Ryan's Hill south, across from Promises to Keep. The proposal is to allow for the sale of 50 automobiles located in the General Commercial district on Route 28. As in the past, the Planning Department and Board has been working to get a more formal representation of the car dealerships in this area of town by requiring a plan to be presented to the Board for approval. Additionally, these types of site plans assist the Code Enforcement Office to better regulate operations of these facilities and to require the owners to adhere to the limit of the display area as shown on the plan. Over the last few years the departments are trying to do a better job of keeping the dealers in line with what is shown on the approved plan. He would recommend approval.

Timothy Peloquin, Promised Land Survey, presented for the applicants. This is a 3.6 acre lot. He provided an overview of the plan and not the entire lot as the building and the impervious area are located to the front of the property. This lot is known as Cooper Properties. They will retain the office for the rentals and sale of homes. They would like to lease out space for the auto dealership. Mr. Peloquin did not feel the site was overbuilt or overused with 50 cars for sale. There are 6 parking spaces reserved for the employees and customers. There are no wetland impacts with this proposal. Previously, another person had sold cars from this site and they may not have had the appropriate approval. The proposed tenant for the 50 cars is a new individual.

Mr. Peloquin advised he added notes to the plan based on the TRC comments. Note 7 is to make sure that it is clear what is to be sold from the site. Note 8 was added at the request of the Fire Department so that in the event of an emergency, they can get to the building. His client has concerns about the wording of Note 9. Currently it reads, "No expansion of autos, buildings, pavement, etc., shall be permitted beyond what is depicted on this plan without proper site plan application." His client would like it to be amended to read, "No expansion of autos shall be permitted beyond what is depicted on this plan without proper site plan application, or Building or DPW approval." The owner wants to be able to add to the rear of the building and expand the paved area without necessitating a site plan application. He would like to reword Note 9 with the Board's approval.

Mr. Granese asked what is there now? Mr. Peloquin explained the existing building is as shown on the plan. There are some cars on the lot. As best he knows, there is no permit to operate as an auto dealer until this plan is approved. Mr. Granese asked Mr. Peloquin what he knew about the expanded pavement area. Has that issue been taken care of? He noticed a few months ago they had backfilled and paved. Mr. Peloquin stated it was attempted to be taken care of with Notes # 7 through 9. The owner feels that he can pave a driveway without a permit, and he should be able to pave the parking lot that used to be gravel, without a permit. He believes the issue was taken care of.

When asked by the Board for his opinion, Mark L'Heureux stated he felt Note 9 should stay as written. The owner should not have created more impervious area on the site without going through this process. He can't comment on the site prior to the paving as he had not seen it. The proposal is to store automobiles and the potential to create sheet flow that has contaminants should be minimized. Property owners should not pave as they please as that is contrary to good stormwater management.

Mr. O'Connor asked if people can pave without a permit? Mr. L'Heureux said that any site modifications for a business should go through the planning process. Mr. Anderson asked Mr. L'Heureux to talk about stormwater mitigation, what has the applicant done, and what could potential runoff do to an abutter? Mr. L'Heureux said the land drains upland and not to a wetland. The applicant added pavement in an area that had been gravel. He does not know what was there. This is the only plan he has seen. Mr. Peloquin said he was asking for the amendment of Note 9 on behalf of his client. The sheet flow drains to the back to a well graveled area. At present, there is no problem with neighbors or on this lot with respect to erosion.

Mr. Anderson confirmed the water flowed to the east and asked Mr. Peloquin, what is the difference on the lot from the time he first went out four years ago to today? How much additional pavement is there? Mr. Peloquin said pavement was added to the south side of the building in the area that is marked on the plan "Automotive Display Area Parking". Mr. Anderson thought that was an addition of about 40% more pavement. He noted the line demarking the remaining gravel area.

Mr. O'Connor commented on the amount of acreage shown versus what is depicted on the plan. He requests that since the applicant has indicated they may expand the building later, he would like to see the whole lot. If the land slopes to the east, that leads to a major wetland. Mr. Peloquin said there were no wetlands within 200 or more feet of the building. It would be more than a few hundred feet before you hit a known wetland. There is a large gravel area to the rear and no trees. The applicant used to store equipment there for years. It was used by Cooper Properties. Mr. O'Connor said he had noted a stream on the GIS system. Is the stream on this lot? It is hard to tell without the topography.

Mr. Granese asked for clarification on the pavement. To the best of Mr. Peloquin's knowledge the new pavement is to the right side of the lot? It is.

Mr. Granese opened the meeting to the public. There were no public comments.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by O'Connor to close the public hearing. The motion passed in the affirmative and the plan came back to the Board.

Mr. MacEachern said with regard to Note #9, his opinion is to keep it as written. It is important for the parcel and that area of town. Parcel 03083-007 is an empty lot. This is an area that can be developed. He feels an eye should be kept on the area. The note is not meant to be intrusive to the owner and he feels it is well written. The level of site plan review is at the discretion of the Planning Director. If they are adding a shed or minor addition it is one thing and can go to TRC; if they are adding a second story, it should come back to the Board. He would leave that to the determination of the staff. If the applicant wanted to add 30 more parking spaces that may need site plan review and he has a concern for water runoff. Mr. Sioras stated staff has made recommendations regarding this site. It was made clear to the applicant that he would need to come back to the Planning Board if he expanded the lot. Tonight, the proposal is to allow the existing dealership and the Coopers can come back to the board based on any future expansion of the site. He would recommend not changing Note 9.

Mr. Anderson said he concurred with Mr. Sioras and Mr. MacEachern. He has an issue with Note 7. He believed that "small truck" should be defined specifically as nothing greater than a one ton truck. Mr. Chase asked if there were to be any on site repairs? If the building is expanded to the rear, he would anticipate that type of additional use. He does not believe there should be any on site repair of vehicles nor should there be any storage of flammable liquids on site. That should be a condition of approval.

O'Connor motioned in favor of the applicants, John and Edward Cooper, Parcel 03080, 182 Rockingham Road, to accept jurisdiction of the plan. Choiniere seconded the motion and the motion passed in favor.

Motion by O'Connor to approve subject to Section 170-51, Site Plan Determination, subject to the following conditions: Address any outstanding comments as indicated in the TRC notes dated January 14, 2011; subject to receipt of applicable state or federal

permits relating to the project; the above conditions be met within 6 months; there will be no onsite repair of vehicles; there will be no storage of flammable material on the property and no vehicle greater than a 1 ton shall be allowed. Bartkiewicz seconded the motion and discussion followed.

Mr. Anderson noted the applicant did pave the lot before going to the Planning Board. Is there a penalty to that or is the applicant just allowed to do it? Mr. O'Connor felt Code Enforcement could take up that issue as the Code Enforcement Officer has that authority delegated in the LDCR. Mr. Sioras said the code enforcement issue triggered this application. Mrs. Robidoux believed that the Assistant Building Inspector, Bob Wentworth, sent a letter to the applicant with regard to the addition of pavement which led to this application. Mr. Granese asked staff to check with Code Enforcement in the morning to see what action had been taken. Mr. Anderson asked if conditions could be added to the approval that this is conditioned upon compliance with the LDCR? Mr. MacEachern felt the application could be suspended to the next meeting until the Board receives a response from Code regarding actions taken. It does not have to approve the plan tonight.

Mr. Peloquin advised the lessee is in the audience and has been anxious to get started and patient with the process. He is tied to this. He did not pave the lot. His business depends on this. If there is clear wording added to the plan would it help?

Mr. MacEachern said this is a one week delay; it could be addressed next week. Mr. Granese said he did not want to tie up the client. He brought up the issue that it had been paved because he saw it. He did not believe the town could let it slide if someone does not follow the regulations. Mr. Peloquin stated this is a gray area, even in the town's regulations.

Mr. MacEachern felt this application should be continued to next week to allow the Town Administrator and Planning Director to seek a remedy to code enforcement. It was noted there was still a motion on the table.

Motion by O'Connor to withdraw his motion, seconded by Bartkiewicz. The motion was withdrawn with Board approval.

Motion by MacEachern to continue the hearing to February 16, 2011 to allow the Town Administrator and Planning Director to answer the questions regarding the site plan and what appears to be paving without proper authority. The motion was seconded by Bartkiewicz.

Chirichiello, Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Bartkiewicz, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese all voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Granese apologized to Mr. Silva for the delay. Mr. Peloquin advised he had a conflict with next Wednesday evening, but would try to work that out.

**Boomer Wolf, LLC
08275/08276, 17 & 19 Manchester Road
Determination of Regional Impact
Acceptance/Review, Site Plan
Proposed redevelopment creating 49,000 SF of retail space**

Mr. Sioras provided the following staff report. The applicant has been before the Board for two Design Review hearings and this is the final site plan review. The proposal is for the redevelopment of the former Troy and Dave Allen car dealerships, creating 49,000 SF of new retail space. The Board has voted to merge the two lots. One building will be retrofitted, one building will be razed, and three new buildings will be constructed on site. All town departments have reviewed and signed the plan. There are waiver requests attached to the member packets. Staff supports approval of the waiver requests. The applicant has applied for a NH DES Alteration of Terrain (AoT) permit which is close to approval. Mr. Sioras advised he would recommend approval of both the waiver requests and this site plan application. This is an excellent project which will transform this area of Manchester Road into an attractive retail center with its architectural design, landscaping and green space with parking and walking connectivity. Patrick Crimmins, Appledore Engineering and Randy LaClaire were present to represent the applicant. It has been a pleasure to work with this firm.

Mr. Crimmins thanked Mr. Sioras, Mr. L'Heureux and Mrs. Robidoux for their assistance in getting the plan to this point. There was a lot of open communication throughout the entire process. Tonight, they are seeking approval for the redevelopment of parcels located at the corner of Manchester Road and Ashleigh Drive. They have applied for a NH DES AoT permit and a permit for the sewer connections. The redevelopment consists of 49,000 SF of new retail space, made up of one retrofitted 19,000 SF building, and the construction of one 16,000, one 9,000 and one 5,000 SF building. They will renovate the existing dealership located on the corner of Manchester Road and Ashleigh Drive. The site will have 245 parking spaces, pedestrian friendly sidewalks, and no wetland impacts. It meets all dimensional and zoning requirements. They have coordinated the project with the roadway widening proposed for Manchester and Ashleigh Drive. The plans now show the detail on Ashleigh Drive. They have removed the proposed 50 x 50 lawn area. The entire top area will be lawn and will also accommodate the snow storage. They are proposing a 5% reduction in stormwater. There will be two vegetated treatment swales on site; stormwater will eventually discharge to the wetland. They have coordinated the utility installation with Mark L'Heureux and are proposing water and sewer improvements. They will address the comments in the Keach Nordstrom letter dated January 28, 2011. There will also be gas and underground electric and telephone on the site.

Regarding the landscaping, they have supplied a comprehensive enhanced landscaping plan. Lighting will be 20' high, full cut off fixtures; information on the lighting is included in the package. Since the last meeting with the Board on December 1, 2010, they have met with the Conservation Commission on December 13; DPW on December 16; a

Conservation Commission site walk on December 18; met again with TRC on January 14, 2011; Conservation Commission on January 24th, and with DPW again on January 31st to review the KNA comments. They have no issues with the KNA comments. Many of them are technical and housekeeping issues that will be addressed in the final site plans. Mr. Crimmins advised they are requesting three waivers and he will address those for the Board.

They will re-grade to achieve the 3 feet of cover so will not need a waiver as suggested in Mr. Keach's comment number 12. Per the suggestion in comment #13, they are requesting a waiver from LDCR Section 170-66.A.2.C.i, to construct the 8-inch sewer pipe at a slope of 0.004 feet per foot in lieu of the required 0.005 feet per foot. They have coordinated this with Mr. L'Heureux. 0.004 feet meets the state requirement. In order to meet gravity flow, they need to minimize the pitch on the pipe. If they did not receive the waiver, they would have to add a pump station and incur additional long term maintenance. They don't anticipate issues with the design. They will add a note to the plan as requested by DPW with regard to the backups.

They are requesting a second waiver from LDCR Section 170-66.A.2.C.ii to construct the 6-inch sewer pipe from the proposed 16,000 SF building to PSMH 2 at a slope of 0.007 feet per foot in lieu of the required 0.010 feet per foot. This is a grade issue so that they can get gravity flow out to Ashleigh.

There is a third waiver from LDCR Section 170-64.B.1, for landscaping which was suggested under comment #15 for street trees. The site is heavily landscaped along the frontage. There are three curb cuts on Manchester Road and it would be difficult to achieve 22 street trees. The site will be well landscaped with shrubs, ornamentals, ground cover and lawn area.

Mr. Granese opened the floor to the public. There was no public comment.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by O'Connor to close the public hearing. The motion passed with all in favor.

Mr. Granese stated the plans look good. He likes the green space. What will be on the corner of the existing Allen Motors property? The rendering the Board saw last time had an animal paw on it. Mr. LaClaire said he was not certain as to what the final design will be; the dog paw was a place holder for a sign. Mr. Granese suggested a clock in that spot. Mr. LaClaire said he would take that under advisement; a clock would look nice. Mr. Granese asked if benches would be added along the walkway (near the entrance to the store)? Mr. LaClaire said that area would be a covered walkway and left for displays and special events. There is no intent to add benches to any of the walkways.

Mr. O'Connor questioned Mr. L'Heureux with regard to the state requirements for slope on the sewer pipe. Did the town adopt the state standards, or is this a DPW regulation? Mr. L'Heureux said the actual state standard for sewer slope for an 8" pipe is 0.004. In

some instances, the town has stricter standards than the state; that is why the town has a requirement for 0.005 to achieve good flow and to reduce the potential for obstructions. It is in the town specs and the sewer ordinance.

Mr. Anderson asked if the waivers are granted and something went wrong at the site, will the applicant fix it at their expense? Mr. L'Heureux stated they discussed that and have required a statement of indemnity. This is a difficult site to meet cover on the slope. He is confident with the applicant's design.

Mr. Granese said at the last hearing, there had been architectural renderings of the site. Mr. LaClaire advised he did not bring them tonight; they have not changed from the last meeting. Mrs. Choiniere asked Mr. L'Heureux about his confidence level on the design. Mr. L'Heureux explained he felt confident with the design, but there are no sure things. He would like more than 0.005; there is always a chance for obstruction. Mr. Anderson noted the lines will be on the applicant's property and will be maintained by the applicant.

Mr. MacEachern had no issues with the three waiver requests. He thought these were great plans. He noted there is no detail for the other three buildings. Are there plans in place and is the applicant asking for approval tonight for those buildings as well?

He clarified with Mr. Crimmins that each building will come back to the Board for full site plan approval and go through the architectural review process. The concept is fantastic and a good use of the space. He just wants to make clear that the water, sewer and parking are in place for the entire site, but the specific building on the table tonight is the Allen Motors building and that what will be done on the site is what is depicted in this plan set. What will be the extent of Phase I?

Mr. Crimmins noted there is a phasing plan in the plan set (Sheet C16). There will be a Phase IA and Phase IB. They hope to build the two Phases at one time. The remainder will come on board later. They will stub the utilities on site and will have a lawn area if they don't have the tenant secured. They will leave the area where the slope is and will re-grade when they remove the pavement. Mr. MacEachern confirmed that the parking lot will not be constructed for the 9000 SF building, but utilities will be stubbed in. He asked what will happen with the 5000 SF retail area? How will that be handled? Mr. Crimmins said it would be a loam and seed area; the pavement will come out when they re-grade the area. When asked how people will access the 19,000 SF building, Mr. Crimmins advised the main entrance faces Ashleigh Drive.

Mr. Anderson said he had a concern with the entrance/exit on Manchester Road and referenced Sheet C5. The first driveway to the north on Manchester Road shows a left turn in and a right turn out. He is concerned that people will try to turn left out of that exit and attempt to cross the lanes of traffic on Manchester Road. He does not believe there is an island in the middle of the road at that section to prevent that. The concern is for safety. Mr. L'Heureux thought that had been discussed at Highway Safety. Mr. Crimmins advised they had made a more acute angle for the second entrance into the

site off Manchester Road to prevent people exiting at that location. Mr. MacEachern wondered if the island shown on the plan for the first entrance/exit would force people to the right? Mr. Anderson reiterated his concern is for safety and potential accidents at that location. Mr. Crimmins said that issue had not been brought up before, but he will look at it. It might be that a more acute angle in the island will take care of it. He will address it in the final plan set and work on an alignment that will work for the town.

Mr. O'Connor indicated Sheet C2. Does this plan show what had been discussed with Conservation? Mr. Crimmins advised this plan reflects that discussion. He will add dimensions to the plan for better clarification. They had been 12 feet off the wetland. They have added a radius and pulled back from it. Mr. O'Connor noted the applicant had been asked not to mow or to reduce the mowing of the drainage area. Mr. Crimmins clarified that in order to meet state requirements, they will have to mow the area. It is in the Operations Manual for the AoT submitted to the state. He referred the Board to Sheet C3 which notes the Site Operations and Maintenance Plan.

Motion by MacEachern to accept jurisdiction of the plan, seconded by Choiniere.

Chirichiello, Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Bartkiewicz, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese all voted in favor.

Motion by MacEachern to approve a waiver from LDCR Section 170-66.A.2.(c),i to construct the 8-inch sewer pipe at a slope of 0.004 feet per foot in lieu of the required 0.005 feet per foot. O'Connor seconded the motion.

Chirichiello, Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Bartkiewicz, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese all voted in favor.

Motion by MacEachern to approve a waiver from LDCR Section 170-66.A.2.(c),ii to construct the 6-inch sewer pipe from the proposed 16,000 square foot building to PSMH 2 at a slope of 0.007 feet per foot in lieu of the required 0.010 feet per foot. Park seconded the motion.

Chirichiello, Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Bartkiewicz, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese all voted in favor.

Motion by MacEachern to approve a waiver from LDCR 170-64.B.1 in order to construct 14 proposed street trees in lieu of the required 22 street trees. Bartkiewicz seconded the motion.

Chirichiello, Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Bartkiewicz, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese all voted in favor.

Motion by MacEachern pursuant to RSA 36:56, the Derry Planning Board moves that the site plan application for Boomer Wolf, LLC, 17 Manchester Road, does not have Regional Impact. Chirichiello seconded the motion.

Chirichiello, Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Bartkiewicz, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese all voted in favor.

Motion by MacEachern to approve the site plan application for Boomer Wolf, LLC, Parcel ID 08275, 17 Manchester Road pursuant to RSA 676:4, I, Completed application, subject to the following conditions: comply with the KNA report dated January 28, 2011; subject to owner's signature; subject to on site inspection by the town's engineer; establish escrow for the setting of bounds or certify the bounds are set; establish appropriate escrow as required to complete the project; obtain written approval from Doug Rathburn that the GIS disk is received and is operable; subject to receipt of state/federal/local permits relating to the project (AoT, driveway, water/sewer); note approved waivers on the plan; add a note to the plan that the sewer design does not comply with the Town of Derry regulations and the Town of Derry is not liable for future issues that may arise on the site as a result of same; all sewer lines, including 6" size, shall be installed with a laser beam; submit interim access plans along Ashleigh Drive and Manchester Road prior to beginning construction if widenings have not been completed by the Town or the Walmart proposal; sidewalks will need to show a cutoff between the site limits and road widening by others; obtain addresses for each of the buildings from Fire Administration; the above conditions are to be met in 6 months; improvements for Phase I shall be completed by December of 2011; ~~note the approved waivers on the plan,~~ and a \$25.00 check, payable to the RCRD should be submitted with the mylar in accordance with LCHIP requirements along with the appropriate recording fees. Bartkiewicz seconded the motion.

Mr. O'Connor added a friendly amendment that signage shall come before the Board prior to installation; the amendment was seconded by Bartkiewicz.

Chirichiello, Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Bartkiewicz, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese all voted in favor.

Other business

Mr. Anderson advised he had spoken briefly to Mr. Granese with regard to the meeting dates. For several of the Board members, there are back to back meetings during the week. Is it possible to move the Planning Board meetings to the alternate weeks? Mr. Sioras suggested the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of the month. This could be discussed when the Board reviews its Policies and Procedures in April. Mr. Granese wanted to make sure it would not conflict with other meetings. He agreed this can be discussed at the first meeting in April and voted upon then.

There was no further business before the Board.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Choiniere to adjourn. The motion passed with all in favor and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:22 p.m.