

The Planning Board for the Town of Derry held a public meeting on Wednesday, February 16, 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; John P. Anderson, Town Administrator; Randy Chase, Administrative Representative; Frank Bartkiewicz, Jim MacEachern, Darrell Park, Members; and Anne Arsenault, Alternate

Absent: Brian Chirichiello

Also present: George Sioras, Planning Director; Elizabeth Robidoux, Planning Clerk; Mark L'Heureux, Engineering Coordinator; Frank Childs, Chief Financial Officer

Mr. Granese called the meeting to order at 7:00 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, agendas and material for the evening.

Escrow

None.

Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes of the February 9, 2011, meeting.

Motion by MacEachern seconded by Bartkiewicz to accept the minutes of the February 9, 2011 meeting with the noted amendment. The motion passed in the affirmative.
--

Correspondence

Mrs. Choiniere advised the Board is in receipt of a map that shows the location of the three parcels Arthur Caras has asked the Board to rezone. The Board has also received the new edition of *Town and City*. The Caras rezoning request will be placed on the agenda to be taken up by the Board after the April organizational meeting. Typically, these requests are handled on a case by case basis.

Other BusinessCapital Improvement Plan – Fiscal Years 2012 to 2017

Frank Childs, Chief Financial Officer and Town Administrator John P. Anderson presented the CIP to the Planning Board. Mr. Anderson explained that a reconciliation has been added to the back of the CIP document this year. They felt it was important to look at a comparison of last year's CIP to this year. He stressed this is a "preliminary preliminary" document until the town gets through the department budgets. In order to finalize the CIP, they will need to know what funding is available. He introduced Mr. Childs who compiled this document with the assistance of the Department heads.

Mr. Childs discussed the narrative at the beginning of the report that had been prepared by Mr. Anderson. Last year, the CIP budget was 17.5 million dollars. This year, the preliminary budget is 3.7 million. They have provided the reconciliation to show how they got to that figure, department by department. Many of the decreases came from Water and Waste Water. The Rockingham Road reconstruction project has been moved out to 2014 to coincide with the water and sewer work in that area. Funds are provided this year for the engineering study for the water and sewer extensions planned for Route 28 south towards Ryan's Hill. The cost includes water tank construction which would be necessary for this project. The department has delayed other water and sewer items. The non-water/wastewater items in the preliminary CIP are in the range of 1 million dollars. The remaining 2.7 million is related to Water and Waste Water. The engineering cost item is related to the expansion of water and sewer toward the Windham town line. The second page of Mr. Anderson's memo contains the highlights of the changes from last year to this. Mr. Childs thought items of note include the Sunset Acres sewer expansion, the Route 28 sewer and water main expansion and the Rockingham Road construction which have been moved to 2014 to coincide with each other. This document reflects the requests and needs of the various departments. Each department sees each item as a need to be met; the question is when the items will be funded based on the ability to fund, bond, or service the debt service. Many of the items have been moved to create a logical sequence of projects. Many of the bonds will not be freed up until 2015. The intent is to maintain the same level of debt service; it is important to note that only one million dollars would be available. Moving the water and waste water projects matches the expiring debt in that department. Significant money has been budgeted for the expansion on Route 28 and construction is scheduled to begin in 2014. Phase I would be on Route 28 south, to the top of Ryan's Hill. Phase II would take the expansion further south on Route 28 toward Windham.

Mr. Childs said this document is preliminary and contains department head requests. Over the next few weeks, they will begin to pull the budget together and senior staff will compile a budget that meets the Council request which is to hold the rate level with 2010. He asked if the Planning Board had any questions?

Mr. O'Connor asked given the proposed development in Londonderry in the Woodmont area, has there been any conversation with Londonderry to use our water capacity? How will it affect our future capacity and will it impact the Route 28 expansion? Mr. Anderson said there have been conversations with Londonderry and there are no capacity issues at this time. Mr. Carrier has evaluated the demand. He does not have the figures this evening.

Mr. O'Connor asked with regard to the proposed Fire Department training facility, which has a cost of \$350,000.00. Brentwood has a training facility. Is there a way to utilize Brentwood's facility instead? Mr. Anderson advised that project would only go forward if there was grant money available. Mr. Childs noted there are several requests in the Fire Department portion of the CIP that are a regional consideration and would be funded with public, federal and state grants. Mr. O'Connor said he thought it might be wise to look to the county or to Concord given the economic climate. For the driver simulator training, it might be that Concord already has something available at the Fire Academy. Mr. MacEachern noted that item is also grant funded. Derry is used because it is centrally located in the southern New Hampshire region. Mr. Childs said the items are grant/regional. Other items have been placed in the CIP as well, but circumstances may cause them to be removed, or timing will change the request. Mr. O'Connor commented there have been some citizen concerns regarding a new tanker. He has heard that tankers are being brought in from outside the municipality to help fight fires in Derry. Mr. Anderson explained Derry does have mutual aid agreements with surrounding communities. At the last fire in town, several tankers responded; they arrived quickly and there was no danger of running out of water. Mr. Childs further explained that particular item was put out to 2016 and would replace an aging tanker already in inventory. Assuming the budget allows, the goal is to set money aside to phase these items; the Fire Department currently replaces an ambulance every third year.

Mr. O'Connor had questions regarding Exit 4A. He knows it is in the state's Ten Year Highway Plan and there is an estimate that Derry will be responsible for a 5 million dollar bond. Money has been spent over the years on the development of the engineering. How much is left of the 5 million dollars? Mr. Childs advised in the original communications with Londonderry, the agreement was that each town would pay 5 million dollars. There is approximately 3.2 million dollars of the bond remaining. Town Council voted that any expenses to date should reduce the amount of that bond. \$600,000.00 will be converted and bonded with the Route 28 TIF district bond.

Mr. O'Connor asked about the proposed LAN/WAN expansion to install fiber connections from Central Fire Station to the other fire stations. He was under the impression from conversations at the Downtown meetings that Derry has the largest fiber optic capability. Mr. Anderson said this item is for a town dedicated line. Mr. Childs explained the town has expanded the fiber optic line from the Municipal Center to the Police Station and then to Central Fire Station. They will take it from Central to the other three fire stations. They have been doing pieces of the project. It was moved from the Fire Department budget and brought over to Executive/Finance. Mr. Anderson

further explained Fairpoint and Comcast have shared networks; for emergency services, the town needs dedicated bandwidth.

Mr. O'Connor asked about the proposed upgrade of the trail behind the Depot Steakhouse to South Avenue, that adds 50 diagonal parking spaces. Mr. MacEachern said that item has been on the CIP for a while. That is the possible future location of a permanent Farmer's Market. It adds pavement and increases the width of the path that leads from Merchant's Row to the Little League Field. The original idea years ago was to make it a one way street to alleviate some of the traffic on Broadway, but that idea may have evolved. It is being kept as a placeholder.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there would be an increase in water rates to help fund some of the future projects? Mr. Childs said not necessarily. The timing of the projects is set to coincide with debt service. Mr. MacEachern said Tom Carrier does a great job and only takes on projects when they are necessary and only when the bonds come due.

Mr. Granese and Mr. MacEachern complimented Mr. Childs and Mr. Anderson on the preliminary CIP. Mr. Anderson thanked Mr. Childs and his staff for the incredible work putting this and the budget together.

Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission Appointment Requests

Mr. Sioras advised a notice was placed on Channel 17 that expired on February 11th asking for interested residents who would like to be appointed to the Commission and represent Derry. Mr. Park and Mr. Bartkiewicz had previously expressed an interest and been nominated by the Board. A letter has been sent to Town Council. No one from the public has expressed an interest. That would leave one open full member position available. Ms. Arsenault advised she would be interested in being appointed.

Motion by MacEachern to nominate Anne Arsenault as a Commissioner to the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission as a regular member, seconded by O'Connor. The motion passed with all in favor.

A letter will be sent to Town Council advising of the nomination and requesting the three members be appointed as Commissioners. Mr. Anderson advised the general public watching this evening that even though the deadline has passed, there is still a vacancy. If anyone is interested they should let the Board know.

Other

Mr. Sioras advised Walmart is moving forward with its plan and made tremendous progress on Monday with the amendment to the conservation easement. They are tentatively planning to come before the Planning Board for the second meeting in March.

Public Hearing

**Bruce and Jackie Radford
PID 03152, 19 Kilrea Road
Review, 3 lot subdivision
Continued from January 19, 2011**

Mr. Sioras advised the Board held a site walk a few Saturday's ago and looked at the driveway locations. There are two additional waiver requests: one for driveway profiles and another for the common driveway. Mr. L'Heureux is here this evening and can answer any technical questions the Board may have.

Jim Lavelle of James Lavelle Associates represented the applicants. He advised he has not made any changes to the plan since the last meeting. This is the third time this plan is before the Board. After the first meeting, he addressed the comments in the Jones & Beach letter. After the second meeting there was a site walk to address the questions regarding the driveway. The Board will need to decide if the driveway to the existing home shall be removed. Regarding the culvert issues, the applicant has been asked to lengthen the existing culvert; they are providing an easement. The other issue is the shared driveway. The feeling he got from the site walk was that the Board was okay with leaving the existing driveway that has been in existence since the 1700s. The driveway is the existing access to the home and barn. There is a mirror that is used to allow the residents to see what is coming on the road. He believes the general opinion was that the shared driveway was okay.

The proposal is to create three lots of about 16 acres each. One lot has a home, one lot will have the barn, and the other lot will not be developed at this time. They are requesting a waiver from LDCR Section 170-26.A.16 to exclude the driveway profiles from the plan set. The shared driveway exists; the other driveway will be on the straight stretch of road with no issues, and may not be constructed for some time.

The second waiver request is from LDCR 170-24.A.5 to allow a common driveway for parcels 03152 and 03152-008. This driveway leads to the old flea market road. The third waiver is from LDCR Section 170-24.A.22, Department of Public Works signature. DPW has issue with the driveway entrances and wants the owner to extend a culvert on the property. The plan shows 30 foot square easements that will allow DPW to maintain or extend the culverts in the future at their convenience.

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

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

Mr. Chase had comments with regard to the existing driveway between the house and the barn. He is concerned that the Planning Board would consider approving a driveway on one parcel, that leads to another, and then goes back to the original parcel. Mr. Lavelle said the subdivision is intended to settle the estate. There are two sisters and a brother. One sister will live in the existing house; the brother will have the barn and the other sister will have the remaining lot; she will have the option of building a home on that lot. There will be cross easements to share the house and barn access without specific dimensions. Mr. MacEachern asked if the easements will remain in perpetuity? When the lots go out of the family to other people, that may become a problem for future owners. Mr. Lavelle said they would accept as a condition of approval, that they supply the easement documents to the Board. Mr. Chase said the shared driveway would become the same issue. This Board needs to plan for the future. The issue of shared driveways and easements between families has become a big issue the Board deals with often. Lots get sold outside of the original families and then it becomes an issue for the town. Sometimes, it is not until twenty years later, but it happens. Mr. Lavelle responded the shared driveway has specific dimensions and easements. If this was a state road, the state would possibly require a shared driveway for two lots. Generally, they like to limit the number of driveway cuts along a road. Mr. O'Connor asked for clarification. The Department of Public Works has indicated it will not sign off on the plan as prepared; if the waivers are initiated, will DPW then sign off? Mr. Anderson said no. DPW has made specific recommendations. If the Board approves the waiver, it approves the plan without DPW signature. Mr. MacEachern did not think the waiver was necessary. Mr. Sioras noted a vote on the waiver requested to allow the plan without the DPW signature needs to take place. The LDCR states the five Department signatures are required in order for the plan to be complete.

Mr. Anderson said he supports staff on this item. He is not in favor of a waiver to exclude driveway profiles. The applicants state they are willing to give an easement in the event the culvert becomes an issue in the future. There is no reason the town should have to front the bill for the benefit of a subdivision for a family. DPW is seeking the extension of the culvert as a condition of approval and he feels it should be condition.

Mr. MacEachern asked when was work last done on this road? It appeared that it had been paved not too long ago. Mr. L'Heureux thought it happened in the past year. Mr. MacEachern asked why the town did not address the culvert at the time it paved the road? Mr. L'Heureux explained the culvert had been extended previously, but it ends close to the edge of the road, so there was no space to extend the culvert when they did the road work. Mr. MacEachern wondered why the town did not approach the homeowner at that time and do the work then? It seems arbitrary to ask for it now. Mr. L'Heureux said these types of improvements are asked for at the time of application for development. When the town is performing routine road maintenance, sometimes they are limited as to the amount of right of way space in relation to property lines. The distances to the edge of the right of way from centerline are not always the same on these older roads. Mr. MacEachern said he would be okay with the DPW request if this

was a request for 20 to 30 homes and the topography would be changed. This is a case of an existing lot with about 45 acres and existing structures. They may get one more house on the third lot. He does not understand why the applicant needs to extend the culvert now when this is only three lots. It seems arbitrary to handle a problem in this manner.

Mr. L'Heureux explained the town requires off site improvements for all subdivisions, even two lot subdivisions. In some cases it is only adding shoulder, extending ditch lines, adding plunge pools, or rip rap aprons. In this instance, it is a minor improvement that is very localized. They are not asking for improvements along the full frontage of the lots. DPW stands by its request that applicants submit plans that meet the town's regulations unless there is extreme hardship.

Mr. Anderson asked if this is a 45 acre lot, how many homes could be put on the property if it was further subdivided? From his perspective, this type of improvement should not be the burden of the taxpayer when the landowner is asking for subdivision approval. Mr. MacEachern felt if there was further development of any of the lots, the town could ask for the extension of the culvert at that time. Mr. Anderson did not think it was a good idea to have an easement that required the town to pay to fix the culvert. Mr. Lavelle said the third lot is intended for a sister who does not live in the area. If she develops the lot, there will be a 500 foot driveway and the house would sit back on the hill to take advantage of the views. This is a unique, three lot subdivision. Mr. Sioras confirmed this area has three acre zoning.

Motion by MacEachern to grant a waiver from LDCR Section 170-24.A.22, Department Signatures, seconded by O'Connor.

Park, MacEachern, Chase, Anderson, Bartkiewicz, Choiniere and Granese voted no. Granese stated all department signatures are required for the plan. O'Connor voted yes. The waiver was denied.

Motion by MacEachern to grant a waiver from LDCR Section 170-25.A.5 to allow a common driveway access to Parcels 03152 and 03152-008, seconded by Park. Discussion followed.

Mr. MacEachern asked if the common driveway could be turned into a street in the future. Mr. Anderson and Mr. Chase thought that a good question. If one of the lots is further subdivided in the future it is a possibility. Mr. Lavelle said that would need to come back before the Board.

Park, MacEachern, O'Connor and Bartkiewicz voted in favor; Chase, Anderson, Choiniere and Granese voted no, stating there is no hardship shown. The waiver was denied.

Motion by MacEachern to grant a waiver from LDCR Section 170-26.A.16 to allow the exclusion of driveway profiles from the plan, seconded by Park.

Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Anderson, Bartkiewicz, Choiniere and Granese voted no, stating profiles should be on the plan and not excluded. The waiver was denied.

Mr. Lavelle asked for the Board to continue this hearing so that he could revise the plan to address the non-granted waivers.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Choiniere to continue the public hearing to March 2, 2011. Discussion followed.

John Cooper, an abutter, asked for a moment to speak. He is an abutter to the south and lives next to this property. The Radfords have subdivided this property to create 3 open spaces, unless they come back to the Board to recombine them. There would be three large lots that would remain open based on the configuration and topography. He feels it is in the best interest of the town to approve this plan, once the easements are in place.

Park, MacEachern, O'Connor, Chase, Anderson, Bartkiewicz, Choiniere and Granese voted in favor of the continuance.

**John R. and Edward C. Cooper
PID 03080, 182 Rockingham Road
Review, Site Plan Determination
Addition of auto sales (50 vehicles)
Continued from February 9, 2011**

Mr. Sioras advised this application was before the Board last week. The Board continued the application to obtain a memo from Mr. Mackey as to what code enforcement has taken place regarding the addition of pavement to the lot. Mr. Sioras read the memo into the record. A copy is in the file. The memo states that once it was discovered the existing gravel parking area had been paved, the owner and tenant were advised a site plan submittal was required and that licensing would not be granted until the requirement was met. No enforcement action took place as no permit was required to pave and it was determined a site plan was being prepared. Any issues involving drainage would have to be addressed to the satisfaction of the Planning Board. Mr. Sioras advised he spoke with Mr. Peloquin and Mr. John Cooper. The applicant is willing to prepare a future site plan with drainage for an expansion plan. Mr. Peloquin can discuss the paving.

Tim Peloquin, Promised Land Survey, advised he represented the applicant, Mr. Cooper who was in the audience this evening. The tenant, Gerry Silva, is present as well. At the last meeting, the Board wrestled with Note 9. He would like to further

discuss that this evening. He had a conversation with Mr. L'Heureux regarding the pavement. If the pavement fails over the next year or shows signs of improper erosion, the owner will remove it and correct the situation. He did not pave it maliciously and is willing to make it right going forward. Mr. Anderson had asked about vehicles that did not exceed one ton. They are asking for that condition to be removed. The operation is for auto and light truck sales. Mr. Silva would like to restrict the trucks to three axles. He may have something come in on trade and would like the ability to be able to resell it. Other dealers operate similar in the area. This is a General Commercial zone and the range of uses is large. Mr. Silva was looking for the opportunity to be able to have a Winnebago on site for sale, but would then decrease the number of cars to say 47 or 48 to compensate for that. They are also requesting that Note 9 be amended to add "and/or appropriate staff approval". This would allow the applicant to make small on site changes, such as the addition of a shed. There should be some room to allow Mr. Mackey or Mr. Sioras some leeway.

Mr. Granese said he had no issue with the amendment to Note 9. He felt the note was speaking to permanent structures; a shed is temporary. Regarding Note 7, he would want to keep some sort of tonnage condition. A three axle could be a 10 ton or a dump truck. Mr. Silva said a one ton is a small pickup truck. He would like to strike Note 7 or say "defined as automobiles or small trucks". He would like to come to some agreement. Mr. Anderson said he would be comfortable with up to an equivalent of 50 automobiles with a percent of the site to be used for larger vehicles. He understands if Mr. Silva wants the ability to sell vehicles he has taken in trade. He does not want to limit Mr. Silva's ability to do business. There should be a limit as to the capacity of 50 vehicles. Perhaps it could be "not to exceed an area of 50 automobiles". He does not want to put Mr. Silva at a disadvantage to his competition.

Mr. Granese opened the floor to the public. There was no public comment and the plan came back to the Board.

Mrs. Choiniere asked where would the Board put the condition the site is limited to 50 vehicles? Mr. MacEachern thought it could be in a new Note 7. Mr. Granese asked how many cars are on the lot now? There are 22 cars on the lot presently. They are not being sold, just being stored in anticipation of the state inspection for Mr. Silva's license. He has to have the site ready to open with stock and an office in order for the state to inspect it and approve him for a license. Mr. Silva stated he did not want to fill up the yard with trucks. He wants the site to look good.

It was noted one of the six reserved spaces in front of the building will need to be a handicap space.

Mr. MacEachern commented that in Mr. Mackey's memo, it states there is no regulation to obtain a permit to pave [expand] a parking lot for a business. He understands not needing a paving permit for a driveway, but this could potentially affect runoff. Mr. Sioras said that is one of the things that needs to be addressed in the regulations as the

Board reviews them. Mr. MacEachern agreed, stating this is an item that clearly should be taken up in a future workshop.

Mr. L'Heureux advised the driveways can be gravel. This was an expansion of an existing parking lot that was widened. Mr. MacEachern said was looking at potential run off issues. The applicant should have known to come to the Board. Mr. Sioras commented the applicant has already stated he would come back with a drainage study and address run off if it becomes an issue. Mr. Cooper admitted the work was performed in order to get it done before winter.

Motion by MacEachern to approve the application for John and Edward Cooper, 182 Rockingham Road, PID 03080 pursuant to LDCR Section 170-51, Site Plan Determination subject to the following conditions: subject to receipt of applicable state or federal permits relating to the project; no on site repair of vehicles; no on site storage of hazardous materials; that the above conditions be met within six months; Note 7 be removed and replaced with the following language: "this plan is intended to be approved for an amount of vehicles that will cover the space of no more than 50 parking spaces"; and the failure or erosion of the pavement will be repaired within one year. Anderson seconded the motion and discussion followed.

Mr. Cooper advised that on site repair at this site was originally approved in 1992 when the Board approved the sale of automobiles from the lot. From 2007 through 2010, there was a repair garage in the basement. Mr. Silva needs a place to perform some repairs, similar to the last tenant's use. If it is determined the building needs to be modified to accommodate a lift, they will come back to the Planning Board with a site plan. Mr. Silva is currently asking to perform small repairs such as detailing and brakes for the vehicles he takes in. The state will review that 1200 SF space when they come to inspect for the license. Mr. MacEachern recalled there had been discussion at the last meeting with regard to restricting on site repairs. Mr. Peloquin advised there will be some detailing and other smaller repairs, such as brake repair. It was noted the suggested conditions came from discussions at the last meeting. Mr. Cooper noted it is an allowed use in the area and it would not be fair for the Board to prohibit it at this location.

Mr. Chase suggested amending Note 7 to "no more than 50 standard parking spaces." Mr. Silva was asked what would he do for repair on site? Mr. Silva said there would be no major repairs and he does not want to perform oil changes. He would like to do small repairs such as windshield wipers, brakes, batteries and things of that nature. He would be satisfied if the Board restricted it to no repairs in the front of the building. He wants to keep that type of activity to the rear. He wants the ability to perform minor repairs up to and including brakes. He will not be working on transmissions or engines.

Mrs. Choiniere asked that the motion be amended to add a handicap parking space to the plan. Mr. Anderson commented that Mr. Cooper has pointed out that as late as 2010, there was an existing dealership on site. There are no changes requested from the 2010 operations of the facility. It might be appropriate to say no changes in

operation based on the previous dealership in 2010. Mr. Silva said he needs to be able to fix the vehicles in order for them to qualify for a plate and license. Mr. Granese felt the condition had been intended to mean no retail repair on site. Mr. MacEachern offered to re-read the motion to include the amendments and that it was understood Mr. Silva would be able to get his trades in a saleable condition.

MacEachern removed his motion, Anderson agreed to remove his second and the motion dies.

Motion by MacEachern to approve the application for John and Edward Cooper, 182 Rockingham Road, PID 03080 pursuant to LDCR Section 170-51, Site Plan Determination subject to the following conditions: subject to receipt of applicable state or federal permits relating to the project; no on site storage of hazardous materials; amend Note 7 as follows: "this plan is intended to be approved for an amount of vehicles that will cover the space of no more than 50 standard parking spaces"; that the plans include the addition of a handicap parking spot; the operation of the repairs at the facility will be consistent with prior approval; that the above conditions be met within six months; and failure or erosion of the pavement within one year will be repaired by the applicant. Bartkiewicz seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Peloquin thanked the Board for its willingness to work with the applicant. The Board wished Mr. Silva luck with his business.

Proposed revision to the Town of Derry, Land Development Control Regulations, Sections 170-17 and 170-56, Fees and Costs, as well as the associated application forms and procedures, and to adopt a fee for the processing of the Change in Use and Technical Review Committee Applications.

Mr. Sioras provided the following staff report. The Board discussed the proposed fee increases at a workshop in January when it discussed the changes to the escrow procedure and the workbook. The intent is to change the fees in the LDCR to be consistent with and reflect staff and engineering time spent on plan review. The Board has been presented with some proposals and comparisons. This will balance the fees and revenues and assist with the Planning budget. The Board granted its blessing in January and scheduled the public hearing. The handouts show the current fees and proposed increases. Finance worked with the department on this. The department would ask for approval of the new fees and amended application form. Mr. Granese noted the new recently revised application form provided for the Board.

Motion by Anderson to open the public hearing for the proposed revisions to LDCR Sections 170-17 and 170-56, seconded by Choiniere. The motion passed. There was no public comment.

Motion by O'Connor to close the public hearing, seconded by Choiniere. The motion passed.

Motion by Anderson to approve, seconded by O'Connor.

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

Mr. Granese advised it looked good and he thanked the department for the hard work. Mr. Sioras thanked the Board for approving the increases and forms, and the Finance Department for its help.

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 8:30 p.m.