

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, March 13, 2019 at 6:00 PM
Meeting Location:	98 Washington Street, First Floor Conference Room
SRA Members Present:	Chair Grace Napolitano, David Guarino, Dean Rubin, Russ Vickers (via. telephone)
SRA Members Absent:	Gary Barrett
Others Present:	Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development, Kathryn Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

Chair Napolitano calls the meeting to order. Roll call was taken.

Old Business

1. 5 Broad Street (former Salem Senior Center): Update on developer selection

Mr. Daniel stated that Bill Luster of Charing Cross is continuing to revise his proposal and will submit it to the SRA at the end of the month. 12 units is still their preferred count, although they are exploring other alternatives such as; adding 2-3 units to increase the density which will adjust the purchase price.

2. Superior Court and Crescent Lot: Update and discussion of MOU with MBTA for remnant parcel

Mr. Daniel stated that The City Council transferred the crescent lot property to the SRA in February. He and Ms. Newhall-Smith met with and spoke to DCAMM to discuss the MOU. They also met with MBTA to discuss the tip of the 6,000 SF lot between the crescent lot and their driveway, and whether they want to include it in the disposition process. The MBTA has procurement requirements and hopes to have something in place soon. The MBTA has no operational need for that parcel and are willing to work with a developer in the future. Mr. Rubin asked if the City has closed on the property. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that the process has begun.

Mr. Daniel stated that they are working with the same DCAMM team as with the District Court project. The act that conveys these properties to the SRA had a provision that they still need to work to find a home for the Registry within the Complex. The RFQ process will get them the information they seek from the development world. Their task is to get a defined program from the Registry of Deeds, but the Registry has requested that the SRA define their Registry program and space needs requirements for them. DCAMM can't do that for the Registry, but it needs to be defined before the RFQ process can begin. They are developing the MOU which will be similar to the District Court's MOU. A home is still needed for the Registry but that's for the DCAMM, the Registry and the Registrar to solve. Mr. Daniel stated that he is mildly concerned that this may not allow the SRA to get the program that will allow the SRA to follow the Act. Mr. Vickers asked whether the Registry might eliminate themselves from the equation. Mr. Daniel replied that development community may say that the Registry in the Superior Court is not feasible. The Secretary's office needs to define the programmatic scope, and whether the Registry requires a lease or a condominium, and what amount they would pay. The SRA and DCAMM Commissioner need to agree that it's not feasible, so that can be communicated to the Secretary to move the process along.

Mr. Daniel stated that the MBTA conversation regarding the small triangular area of land adjacent to the crescent lot went well and they raised some legal questions in terms of procurement. He noted that they are following 121B not 30B, so they are seeking creative approaches.

There are issues with Ch. 91 on the Crescent Lot. The DEP encouraged the SRA to be creative to meet the statutory requirements and Ms. Newhall-Smith is trying to come up with ways to help solve the issues.

3. **ULI SAP:** Update

Mr. Daniel stated that there are two clusters being discussed, the parking garage and Witch City Mall. The perspective developer has moved to a new firm and it's unknown whether the same firm has any interest in the property. There is work to be done and he will submit for a Mass Development grant to determine how to relocate the parking garage, financing models they could use, and the other tools they could use to advance the plans for those sites.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. **Derby Square Electrical Box:** Discussion of alternative locations.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that she met the City Electrician on site and looked at the proposed options. The landscaping strip behind the condominium is not option, however; the existing tree pit at the street line along Front Street is. The box can be flush mounted to reduce its height and the City can work to paint it or use it as signage for wayfinding purposes, and the Art Commission will also be involved. Ray Jodoin confirmed that the steps can be repaired, and bollards will be installed to prevent vehicles from hitting the box. Kylie Sullivan from Main Streets agreed that this location helps remove it from the public way and the City can easily tap into the power from the nearby electrical grate. They are hoping for the SRA's blessing, so they can move forward with the installation. Mr. Daniel agreed that this location was the best option.

Mr. Guarino asked if the adjacent property owners had any concerns with this location or if they need to be notified. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that it is unknown whether the property management company and property owners are aware. Mr. Guarino asked which way the box will orient. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that it will be parallel with Front Street. Chair Napolitano asked if the Derby Square sign would remain in its current location or be relocated. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that the street sign will be relocated to another tree pit.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

Chris Silva, Owner of Front Street Coffee House. Requested that the City make sure there is enough room for a City's bobcat to maneuver when removing snow from the sidewalks, and that it's also not too close to the street.

No one else wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

2. **53 Charter Street (Grimshawe House):** Discussion of redevelopment of existing structure.

Mr. Rubin recused himself as an abutter.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that Walter Beebe-Center of Essex Restoration went to DRB who was pleased with the design, but incorporated 3 conditions of approval within their recommendation; 1) the applicant shall return to the DRB prior to making any changes to the approved design/plan, 2) the quoining detail shall be restored on three corners as shown on Sheets A & B, and 3) the applicant shall submit a site plan that includes the proposed fence as shown in the renderings and a planting plan. They did not request a further review, just to have the information on file. The DRB recommended approval.

Mr. Vickers noted that he supports the changes.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

Jessica Herbert, Chair of the Salem Historic Commission. She stated that she sent a letter of support for the recommended changes and noted that Mr. Beebe-Center is very easy to work with.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Guarino: Motion to approve with the stipulations from the DRB.

Seconded by: Chair Napolitano. Passes: 4-0

- 3. 163-189 Washington Street (The Derby Restaurant):** Review and approval of façade paint and patio fencing. *(Review of a portion of a larger project; additional elements are under review by the Design Review Board)*

Attorney Joseph Correnti, of Serafini, Darling & Correnti, L.L.P., Mark Morris, principal and manager of New Derby, and Travis Blake of Sousa Architects were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Correnti stated that they presented signage, patio changes and furniture to the DRB, and they will return to the DRB to present other site details. The DRB did refer them to the SRA for other items. The Derby hopes to open this weekend.

Mr. Morris stated that he spoke with Glenn Kennedy from the DRB and used his advice to tone down the exterior colors by lightening them along the boards and make them one solid color. The fence will open and close saloon style that opens both North & South. The fence will be wood for a nicer finished look that looks outdoorsy and permanent. The color will be “Iron Ore,” a toned-down color suggested by the DRB. Mr. Blake added that the proposed fence color will tie into the exterior color. Mr. Rubin noted the helpfulness of the DRB and the Applicant’s willingness to apply their suggestions.

Mr. Guarino asked if the gate will have a latch and not a lock. Mr. Blake replied yes, it’s an egress, that will be open when the restaurant is not open. Atty. Correnti noted that the DRB requested this change. Mr. Blake added that the fence installer will work on the details. Mr. Rubin noted that a wood fence will require maintenance which means more ongoing costs, and the applicant must be respectful of that.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to approve as recommended by the DRB with the color and fence style as approved by the DRB.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

- 4. 300 Derby Square (Casa Tequila):** Review and approval of Central Street façade modifications *(Review of a portion of a larger project; additional elements are under review by the Design Review Board)*

Attorney Chad Carlorusso, Gilberto Reyes (Owner of Casa Tequila), and Lydia Szydlowska, (Architect) were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Carlorusso stated that they went before the DRB who allowed them to move forward with some edits, although they will need to return to the DRB with details on the patio and signage. The DRB was in favor of their proposed façade and window trim paint choices for the front facing

Central Street, as well as the proposed awning. He noted that his client wants to open in March/April.

Ms. Newhall-Smith asked about sign details. Atty. Carlorusso replied that the applicant will be working with the sign maker to make sure it matches the DRB's recommendations, and that they sent the DRB's comments to the sign maker who now understands the DRB's requests. Mr. Guarino asked if the sign can be approved without details. Mr. Daniel replied no, the review and approval of signage will go directly through him. He requested that sign details be sent to Ms. Newhall-Smith. Mr. Reyes noted the manufacture of the sign will take approximately one month to complete.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that only the proposed colors and awning on the Central Street façade can be approved now. The applicant will return for the patio design.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Guarino: Motion to approve paint color and awning as submitted by the DRB
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 4-0.

5. 3 Dodge Street (Seagrass): Review of façade modifications and signage

Chip Tuttle, 26 Winter Street (CEO of Seagrass), Don Weiss (Partner), and Chris Silva (General Manager), were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Tuttle stated that Deschamps Printing has merged with another company and moved to Newburyport. Seagrass has a 10-year lease on the 6,000 square-foot portion of the building, closest to the Washington Street, at the rear of Weiner Brothers Hardware. Their Architect is Dennis Gray of Gray Architects in Salem. The space is switching from an Industrial use to Retail use and they received a Special Permit from the ZBA in the fall of 2018. They've received Host Community Agreement from the City in December 2018, and are awaiting an approval for their provisional license from the Cannabis Control Commission. They submitted the application to the CCC in January and there is a 60-90 days review process and a backlog of applications. They anticipate the review process going well with the DRB.

Mr. Tuttle stated that the additional considerations since the building is subject to the CDC Public Art Project and there are existing paintings on both the Washington and Dodge Street faces of the building. They spoke with the CDC regarding commissioning new artwork as part of the Special Permit from the ZBA requires that the façade remain available for artwork. They have a unique charitable partnership with Salem Sound Coastwatch. The recreational cannabis business requires a lot of packaging, and as an offset for the packaging they hope the Washington Street artwork will reflect a natural marine environment and the Dodge Street mural would be something more appropriately themed to fit their retail use, although there are signage restrictions by the CCC. Barbara Warren of Coastwatch has provided a list of native species grass they can recommend for the Washington Street façade. Chair Napolitano asked if the applicant must return to the SRA for approval of the new art. Mr. Daniel replied no.

Mr. Tuttle stated that the state requires a garage bay door for secure product handling and financial transactions, so a new one will be created to the left of the main entrance. They will reuse the existing garage doorway as the main entrance and install glass window and door system there to create a more retail look. The existing windows that are currently boarded up and painted over will be uncovered.

Mr. Rubin asked if the existing garage door could be reused rather than making major structural changes to the building. Mr. Weiss replied that they want to isolate the delivery door from the

entrance and noted that the existing garage opening was too small for DeChamps who would unload product on the street and wheel it inside.

Mr. Tuttle stated that if the same garage door opening were used for vehicles, the retail space would need to be orientated around it in a U-shape which is not a welcoming experience. Moving it allows for better interior flow and a larger 1,200 square-foot waiting area to verify ages and handle anticipated Halloween foot traffic. They'll also create a secondary entrance that can be used as an exit to improve client/customer circulation. The parking lot on the side of the building is owned by RCG and they can't use it for their business. There is a back door that has a right-of-way but it's not practical for an entrance/exit and will be used for emergencies only.

Mr. Guarino asked if the window openings are all existing. Mr. Weiss replied yes. Mr. Rubin asked if some can be shortened to allow for the door height, and to make fewer changes to the building. Mr. Tuttle replied that they've investigated it and this is the optimal design. They considered using the current opening; however, a new entrance door would still be required. Mr. Weiss added that the current door is not properly sized for deliveries. Mr. Rubin asked if the new right-side egress door can the door be flipped to the left. Mr. Weiss replied that there is existing equipment on that far left corner. Some openings need to be closed but they want to maintain the retail environment.

Ms. Newhall-Smith asked if the center entrance opening is the same dimension. Mr. Tuttle yes, the only new opening is for the new loading door. Mr. Weiss replied that they are filling in the existing opening with glass. With the entire façade painted it's difficult to tell the difference between the façade and the openings.

Ms. Newhall-Smith asked that the public art planner be included in the discussion with the CDC because people will contact her once they see the building façade being altered. Mr. Tuttle and Weiss replied yes.

Mr. Vickers stated that the proposed changes make the building much more attractive and it will be a great addition to downtown Salem. Mr. Tuttle replied that they want to connect and activate this area of downtown Salem and once customers have been age verified, they will offer an order-ahead option to help manage their customers.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Guarino: Motion to refer to the DRB.

Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 4-0.

6. 2 East India Square (Downtown Mall): Discussion of proposed signage

Ken McTague of Concept Signs, 57 Bridge Street Salem, was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that she did not receive the signage package Mr. McTague submitted. Mr. McTague noted that the second floor of the mall belongs to the City where the signage is now located, and they will need permission to change that signage which will also mean presentation to another Board. Rather than a new upper level sign they will add signage to the portico on the first floor, 13" high raised lettering on the Church and Essex Street sides, where it can easily be seen at street level. All of the Museum Place Signage would need to be removed from the City Façade. Mr. Daniel noted that it is the mall owner's responsibility to remove the signage not the City.

Mr. Guarino asked if Mr. Marley was present. Mr. McTague replied no. Mr. Guarino added that if Mr. Marley can't be present he should send a representative to speak on his behalf, to help the SRA

understand why these changes are occurring. Particularly, how the changes fit within the character of the pedestrian mall.

Mr. Guarino stated that the proposed work needs to be provided in a more meaningful way, when all Board members have had time to review the package, therefore the Board should wait to review it. The handling of the signage on City property can also be determined.

Chair Napolitano asked if the mall's name had been formally changed. Mr. McTague believed it had but it's unknown to him as to why. He added that the previously installed signage wasn't approved and the existing bronze plaques on the walls will also be removed. Chair Napolitano asked who will remove the signage on the City's façade. Mr. McTague replied that Mr. Marley determined that the City should remove it. Mr. Daniel replied that it's mall signage on City property not City signage on mall property, so Mr. Marley needs to provide documentation as to why removing the signage wouldn't be his responsibility.

Mr. McTague stated that he will re-send the complete photo and rendering package to Ms. Newhall-Smith. Mr. Guarino requested that the applicant also provide clarification on if they will remove the signage on the Museum Place Garage.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Guarino: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 4-0

7. 25 Lynde Street: Discussion of residential redevelopment of existing structure

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, Architect Tom Mayo, of Thomas Mayo Associates Architects, and Michael Becker and his associate Carissa Vedus (Principals) were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Grover stated that they've made the changes were requested to the submission package and they've made additional changes. Mr. Becker noted that they are working with HSI and Jessica Herbert of the Historic Commission to make this fit the historic guidelines.

Mr. Mayo stated that the previous plan had the addition in-line with the front facade, but it has now been stepped back 2-feet. The existing third-floor with a 6'-2" head height was previously raised but has been lowered so the new dormers match the existing dormers. A front facing planter is also proposed. The garage door along the West façade has been reduced from 3 bays wide down to 2 and the accent trim on both garage doors will be painted to match the façade to help conceal the garage doors. The existing first and second floor windows on the original building aren't original and will be replaced with Pella aluminum clad windows. Some of the dormer windows are original; however, due to egress requirements they must be replaced with Pella casement windows to provide a larger exit area. The third-floor will house the smallest windows and is a similar size to a double-hung. All of the paint colors are from the Benjamin Moore historic collection, the body will be "New London Burgundy", the trim "Sand Dune," and the front door will be tan. The trim color on the addition will match the body color to disguise the garage doors.

Mr. Mayo stated that regarding parking, the original plan called for two parking spaces on the right side of the building, that has been reduced to one space, with one large garage door for one parallel parking spot. On the left side of the building where there are three parking spaces below the addition, rather than having one double door and one single door, there will be 1 large door for all 3 cars, which will provide a better turning radius. Atty. Grover noted that one parking space will be off-site at the Museum Place Garage and will use a parking pass, to comply with zoning and provide

one space per unit. Mr. Becker noted that there is a perpetual easement for a 17'-8" x 9' parking space at the property's edge, but because it's not on their site it can't be included in their parking count. Mr. Daniel stated his belief that the Museum Place Garage parking spot is over 1,000 feet from the site. If the parking requirement can't be met, a variance is required, or parking can be secured elsewhere within 1,000 feet of the property.

Mr. Becker stated that in the latest revision they took 18-inches off the front addition of the building to make it subservient to the original house, they moved the West side garage door behind the living area where it is not as visible from Lynde street, and the East side garage door will be even less visible. The window will move from the 4th to the 3rd panel on the garage door, and they're also considering removing gables, but the addition will not have gables. Mr. Mayo noted that the rooms in middle require natural light and air, so removing them will leave only two end windows, therefore he recommends keeping the dormers.

Mr. Rubin asked how much the roof would be raised. Mr. Mayo replied 8-inches. Mr. Becker noted that the additional height would barely be noticeable from Lynde Street.

Mr. Becker noted that the garage door placed on the back of the East elevation would be obscured by the YMCA parking lot, which is also elevated 1-2 feet. The East side garage door will be even less visible from Lynde. Mr. Rubin asked if the front dormers were new. Mr. Mayo replied yes, and they will match the existing dormers.

Mr. Daniel stated that significant changes should not be brought to the meeting. The Planning staff spends time evaluating these changes and they can't do the internal review they would normally do in advance of the meetings. The recent historic building inventory states that this structure is eligible for listing because it's unique which elevates the look the staff would give it. Mr. Mayo noted that they are working with the Salem Historic Commission to meet their requirements as well as the SRA's submission schedule. Atty. Grover stated that there will be more opportunity for the staff to provide their comments to the DRB. Mr. Rubin noted that the Planning Department has other considerations, it could waste the time of the DRB which could affect the entire projects; but they want all the issues resolved.

Atty. Grover stated that other than parking, the zoning enforcement officer has established this to be considered an existing building. Mr. Daniel replied that deferring staff review warrants their time now, notwithstanding the parking element. He wants the box they work in to be defined. Mr. Rubin asked if there was a process to accelerate the review. Mr. Daniels replied no, it will either require a special meeting or it will have to continue to the next regular meeting, so the staff can review the plans. Mr. Guarino agreed because he wants to see how the changes relate to the revised plans. Mr. Vickers added that he too needs more time to review the plans and would abstain on the vote if the Board were to make a motion at this meeting.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

Jessica Herbert, Chair of the Salem Historic Commission, stated that they've reviewed the plans, the volume, details, etc., and met with them to discuss several of their properties. The results of the meeting were fruitful, although she had comments on many of the details. Their morning meeting resolved issues that haven't been reflected in plan and Ms. Newhall-Smith needs to see those changes too. Ms. Herbert opined that this is a good project and the details on a project with this level of renovation are important. She further noted that adding units is a concern, but the applicant needs additional units in this market due to building price, whether you like it or not, and that in the end this building will be back in use and with a substantial investment made that will last for years. She is excited to see this move forward and Mr. Becker wants to learn from them and is coming to them for advice despite not having to. The Salem Historic Commission will have some control over it.

Tim Jenkins, Historic Salem Inc. (HSI) thanked Emily Udy for her contribution and although their organization has no authority, they were happy to discuss the issues with the applicant. The

applicant's method of combining the old gambrel with the new gambrel roof is innovative. This adds to the restoration process for these buildings and these houses would have developed over time with numerous additions. He is not in favor of garages and the applicable standards and guidelines do not address how to include parking, although the reduction of garage spaces and hiding it from street view work well. It's possible to install a garage that isn't noticeable and can be hidden and attractive. The Guidelines should address garages for future developers.

Mr. Daniel requested all final documents be compiled and sent to Ms. Newhall-Smith for review. Mr. Becker noted that comments have been included in the many iterations and they will return to the Salem Historic Commission in 2 weeks.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to continue and wait for comments from the planning staff.
Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

8. 65 Federal Street: Discussion of residential redevelopment of existing structure

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, was present to discuss the project. Tom Mayo, of Thomas Mayo Associates Architects, and Michael Becker were also present. Dan Botwinick and Mike Becker are co-owners of this property.

Atty. Grover stated that on this existing historic building they will remove the old rear addition and add a new similarly styled addition. There will be an increase from three residential units to five units. There will be four on-site parking spaces with a fifth parking spot in a municipal facility.

Mr. Mayo stated that the site plan will not change. Pervious pavers will be used for the parking area. The flat-roofed box additions will be removed, and two gable ended dormers are proposed on the new addition to reflect the front facade. There will be new shed roof entries on both sides, with new clapboards to match in "Newburyport Blue" from the Benjamin Moore historic color palette. The main entrance will remain, and the two-story additions will house entrances to the side units. The two new doghouse dormers would be installed and the head height at that level raised by the construction of two Nantucket-style dormers; the new addition would also have shed dormers on the front to match the existing. Along the rear elevation the wood windows are in good shape, the storms will be replaced but the existing sashes rehabbed. Pella aluminum clad windows will be used on the new addition.

Mr. Becker stated that there are multiple layers on the façade, so the existing clapboards below should be in good shape to reuse. New corbels and brackets will be copied onto the new addition.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that what's changing and remaining needs to be reviewed. Existing and new elevations are needed. Mr. Daniel noted that there are staff level concerns with this project. On a five-bay house with a center entrance, the proposed addition is obscuring one of the bays and covers more than 1 existing window. The height of addition is also higher than existing structure. The Nantucket-style dormer also isn't a character design element typically seen in Salem. Mr. Mayo replied that the 1-foot height increase won't be easily noticed.

Ms. Newhall-Smith noted that she met with Mr. Mayo to discuss two of the three projects, which are similar but aren't consistent with the guidelines they are asked to follow. Historic buildings need respectful renovation and additions, not large, out-of-scale additions. Mr. Vickers added that he has the same difficulty with the orientation of the site, it's hard to visualize, and if there was a vote tonight, he would abstain. Atty. Grover noted that the DRB was comfortable with varying from the guidelines.

Mr. Daniel stated that Board members must be comfortable with the deviation. Staff has reservations with the project; staff believes that the entrance proposed to be obscured by the fourth bay is needed. If the Board is comfortable with the design as is, they can they provide some

direction and allow the DRB to review it. These projects are unique in that they are solely residential redevelopment, which the SRA isn't used to reviewing, since it's usually the Historic Commission that reviews them. It was good of Mr. Becker to review this with the Historic Commission and their Chair, Jessica Herbert's, feedback was good. The SRA needs to decide whether they want to see more before they move it along.

Mr. Rubin stated that he has no issue with a modest increase from the North; however, the DRB should provide the opinion on the additions. Mr. Becker noted that he has also reached out to a member of the DRB.

The Board discussed the timing of the next Historic Commission and Design Review Board meetings. Atty. Grover stated that the applicant can be ready for the April DRB meeting and staff can review it. Mr. Rubin noted that the SRA can provide comments prior to the April DRB deadline. Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that existing elevations are requested. Ms. Herbert added that existing elevations will be wanted for the Historic Commissions records too.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to continue to the next meeting to get feedback from both the Planning Department and Historic Commission. (Can be extended to the following week if there is additional feedback.)
Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

Executive Session (if needed)

1. To consider the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property located at 5 Broad Street, Salem, MA because an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.

Rubin: Motion to request an Executive Session to discuss considering the revised proposal options for 5 Broad Street.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0 to enter executive session.

Chair Napolitano, Dave Guarino, Dean Rubin, Russ Vickers. Passes: 4-0.

The SRA entered executive session at 8:05PM.

Roll call to reconvene to open session at 8:45PM.

Chair Napolitano, Dave Guarino, Dean Rubin, Russ Vickers. Passes: 4-0.

Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes from the regular January 9, 2019 meeting were reviewed.

Guarino: Motion to approve the January 9, 2019 regular meeting minutes.

Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 4-0

Adjournment

Guarino: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Rubin. Passes 4-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:50PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-2033.