

**TOWN OF SOUTH BETHANY
TOWN COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 25, 2013**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Mayor Jankowski called the April 25, 2013, Town Council Workshop Meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT: Mayor Kathy Jankowski; Councilpersons Al Rae, Jim Gross, Pat Voveris, Sue Callaway, and George Junkin; Town Manager Melvin Cusick; Code Enforcement Constable Pete Brockstedt; and Administrative Assistant Pam Smith

UNEXCUSED REMOTE ACCESS: Councilman Mark Damato

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no comments from the public.

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

• **Financial Policy Recommendation to Council (Steve Farrow)**

Steve Farrow prefaced his presentation by saying that he is not an investment specialist, but he does have some experience with investment policies as he serves as the investment committee chairman of a private foundation in Salisbury which has an investment policy. Mr. Farrow stated that he also is a fiduciary for the defined benefits plan at his company which has an investment policy. Mr. Farrow thought it would be worth bringing to the Budget and Finance Committee a concept of an investment policy for the Town.

Mr. Farrow presented the following PowerPoint Presentation:

Workshop Objectives

- *Determine if South Bethany needs an investment policy.*
- *Discussion of what types of investments might be acceptable.*
- *Consider matching investment options with the time span of the Reserve Accounts.*

Why Have An Investment Policy?

- *Provide fiduciary protection for Council members?*
- *Set guidelines and policy for investing South Bethany's funds.*
- *Authorize investment of longer term Reserves in products that potentially produce higher returns than CD's*

Why Invest In Other than CD's

- *SB currently has about \$1M invested in CD's with an average return of roughly 1.6%, slightly below recent inflation.*
- *Although current rates are at historic lows, there will always be investments that provide greater return over time than CD's.*
- *Our ARM and Long Term Reserve accounts have multi-year horizons and could tolerate short term market volatility.*

Investment Options

- *Savings Accounts and CD's - Currently used. Low risk/low yield.*
- *Government bonds – Low risk/terrible yield today. 10 year Treasury yields 1.73% today.*
- *Investment grade corporate bonds-Increased risk/higher yield. Vanguard IT Investment Grade Bond Fund 10 year average yield is 5.9%*
- *Stocks – Riskier than bonds/higher return. Vanguard Total Stock Market Index Fund 10 year average return is 9.42%. (Mr. Farrow said he included this more as an example because in the current policy it would not allow investing in equities or stocks.)*

Mr. Farrow reviewed the Town of South Bethany Investment Policy Statement (Draft) dated May 1, 2013. Council commented on the following paragraphs (Council's comments are in red).

Section I.D: *The Committee will review these Policies at least once per year. Changes to the Policies can be made only by affirmation of a majority of the members of the Committee, and written confirmation of the changes will be provided to all Committee members and to any other parties hired on behalf of the Portfolio as soon thereafter as is practical.*

Councilman Gross believes it should be Council that makes these decisions. Councilman Gross thinks that this paragraph overstates the committee and needs some revision. Mr. Farrow stated that he thinks it is up to Council to decide what the investment committee is comprised of.

Section II.B: *The Town Treasurer is designated as Investment Officer of the Town and is responsible for investment decisions and activities.*

Councilman Gross said he thinks the responsibility is overstated. He does not think the responsibility should reside in one person. Mr. Farrow said that is up to Council to decide.

Section III.A: *Operational Assets (Mr. Farrow said Council should think about keeping these funds in what all the Town funds are currently in – CDs, Money Market, or some type of short term vehicle.)*

Section III.A.2: *Liquidity: The Town's investment portfolio (both principal and earnings) shall remain sufficiently liquid to enable it to meet all operating requirements that might be reasonably anticipated.*

Councilman Rae said he thinks it would be helpful to state the specific liquidity objective to help guide the type of investment - 10 days, 30 days, 10 days or less, 30 days or less – something specific that will help guide the type of investment.

Section III.B. Asset Replacement and Long-term Assets: *These assets may be designated for longer-term uses such as equipment and building replacement and depreciation. As such, consideration may be given to longer-term assets. The objective will be to preserve the real (inflation-adjusted) value of the portfolio over the long-term, net of any distributions from it. While liquidity is a concern, return on investment and growth above the rate of inflation will take precedence over nominal preservation of principle and the avoidance of short-term fluctuations.*

Councilman Rae asked how long is long-term in terms of liquidity. Mr. Farrow said he does not think the Town ever wants to get into the kind of investments that aren't liquid, adding that they have a potentially higher return but a much higher risk.

Section V.A.3: *Fund assets will be managed as portfolios comprised of two major components: a fixed income portion and a cash portion. The actual proportions will be informed by the time horizons and cash flow needs of each of the funds*

Councilman Junkin asked if this should read "formed by" or "informed by". Mr. Farrow said he thinks it should probably be "formed by".

Section V.A.4: *Outlined below are the asset allocation guidelines, determined by the Investment Committee to be the most appropriate, given the Funds' objectives and constraints. Portfolio assets will, under normal circumstances, be allocated across broad asset and sub-asset classes in accordance with the following guidelines:*

Operating Assets

| Asset Class | Sub-Asset Class | Target Allocation |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Fixed Income | Investment-Grade Bonds | 0-70% |
| Cash | Bank accounts, CDs, Money markets, etc. | 30-100% |

Asset Replacement and Long-Term Assets

| Asset Class | Sub-Asset Class | Target Allocation |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Fixed Income | Investment-Grade Bonds | 0-70% |
| Cash | Bank accounts, CDs, Money markets, etc. | 30-100% |

Councilman Rae asked if the committee was going to take a stab at the above percentages. Mr. Farrow said he does not think it is critically important to have a precise figure at this point. It would be more of what is the comfort level of the Town Council. Councilman Gross stated that it could vary over time.

Section V.C.2:

The portfolio will be reviewed at least annually to determine the deviation from target weightings. During each quarterly review, the following parameters will be applied:

- a) *If any asset class (cash or fixed income) within the portfolio is +/-5 percentage points from its target weighting, the portfolio will be rebalanced.*
- b) *If any fund within the portfolio has increased or decreased by greater than 20% of its target weighting, the fund will be rebalanced.*

Section VI.C:

Investment reports shall be provided by the Investment Officer on a (calendar) quarterly basis or as more frequently requested by the Committee. The Investment Officer is expected to be available to meet with the Investment Committee as necessary to review portfolio structure, strategy, and investment performance.

Regarding Section V.C.2 and Section VI.C, Councilman Rae said he would like the investment policy to require quarterly reports on the investments to the Town Council. Mayor Jankowski agreed.

Additional comments made by Council:

Councilman Rae suggested adding to the policy that bonding is a requirement. Councilman Rae also believes the policy should mention insurance. The Town Manager noted that the Town has public officials liability insurance.

Councilwoman Callaway asked if someone would need to be hired to oversee this. Mr. Farrow said the Town would have a couple of options. Vanguard would do this for a fee. Mr. Farrow noted that Vanguard's fees are low compared to other companies because they are a privately owned company. Mr. Farrow stated that once it is set up, the Finance Director could oversee it with the Council directing. Councilwoman Callaway said her question is in regard to somebody that would oversee the performance of the purchase. Councilwoman Callaway believes that is a lot of responsibility for a Town employee. Mr. Farrow said Council would probably be more comfortable having someone who would do that.

Mayor Jankowski asked what the other towns are doing. Councilwoman Voveris said Bethany Beach doesn't do anything but CDs and they don't allow anything beyond a year. Mr. Farrow said the piece that is in this policy that is not in Bethany Beach's policy is the investment grade corporate bonds and so forth. He said Bethany Beach does not invest in any corporate bonds. They only invest in government bonds. Councilman Rae noted that the Friends of the South Coastal Library has an investment policy which is very conservative and that is what is different from their policy too.

Councilwoman Callaway asked Mr. Farrow if he was suggesting investing the money that has been set aside for longer term projects like overall bulkhead replacement, sea level rise, etc. Mr. Farrow said yes his thought would be to take that money and put it in something that has a potentially greater yield than CDs.

Councilwoman Callaway stated that with the Council changing periodically, the public is going to want to be reassured of the oversight of the investment. Mayor Jankowski wondered if there is someone who is a financial advisor that does this for other towns.

The Town Manager suggested sending the policy to the Town Solicitor once Council has the policy the way they want it to see if it is in sync with the Town's Charter and State law. The Town Manager noted that he is the Town Solicitor for 17 other towns and he would know if any of the towns he represents has a policy.

Mr. Farrow will make revisions to the draft investment policy suggested by Council.

Mr. Farrow will contact the Vanguard representative to see if he can give a presentation at a Council meeting.

Council thanked Mr. Farrow for his work.

- **Review of Fee Schedule and Budget and Finance Committee Recommendation to Council**

The Budget and Finance Committee's recommendation is to change the Town's current permit calculation for New Construction and Renovation to an index, and putting the ICC formulation in place. The Budget and Finance Committee's consensus is to use 3%, and not less than 2.5%.

Motion: A motion was made by Councilman Junkin, seconded by Councilman Gross, that the Town tie its "New Construction" fee and its "Renovation" fee to the ICC Index. This would apply to anything where the building permit cost is based on the square foot area. Currently the Town charges \$2.30 per square foot for "New Construction" and \$0.50 per square foot for "Renovation".

Amended Motion: Councilman Junkin amended his motion to say that wherever the building permit fee is based on square foot area that the fee be tied to the ICC Index. Councilman Gross seconded it.

After discussion, Mayor Jankowski asked for a roll call. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Jankowski and Councilpersons Rae, Gross, Voveris, Junkin, Callaway, and Damato

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 7-0 vote.

Motion: A motion was made by Councilman Junkin that Council make everything on the current fee schedule be 2.2 percent times the ICC. Councilman Junkin stated that this will equate to \$2.35 which is slightly higher than the \$2.30 that the Town charges now. Councilman Junkin said he is only applying this to the Living Area that has a current rate of 2.3. Councilman Junkin calculated that 2.2 percent times 107 equals \$2.35. Councilman Junkin said his motion is that the Town apply 2.2 percent of the ICC index to every line item in the fee schedule that is currently at \$2.30 per square foot.

Discussion: During discussion Councilman Gross stated that he wants the change to be revenue neutral. He believes the ICC Index will go up next year.

Second: Councilman Junkin's motion was not seconded.

Motion: A motion was made by Councilman Gross, seconded by Councilman Junkin, to establish the rate at 2.15.

Discussion: During discussion Councilman Junkin stated that 2.15 percent times the ICC Index will yield just a little less than \$2.30 per square foot.

Councilwoman Callaway stated that she does not see any point in going backwards.

Councilman Junkin calculated that 2.15 percent times 107.08 equals \$2.302 which is slightly more than the current rate of \$2.30.

Vote: Mayor Jankowski asked for a roll call. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Councilpersons Gross and Junkin

AGAINST THE MOTION: Mayor Jankowski and Councilpersons Callaway, Rae, Voveris and Damato

The voting result was 2 in favor and 5 against. The motion was defeated.

Councilman Junkin asked if Council was going to be able to determine a percent tonight. Councilwoman Voveris said that she does not expect to have 3 percent but she did not expect revenue neutral.

Motion: A motion was made by Councilman Junkin that Council not tie permit fees relative to square feet to the ICC index. (Administrative Assistant's Note: This motion was never voted on.)

Councilman Junkin explained that the fee cannot be tied to the ICC Index if Council cannot agree on a percent. Councilwoman Callaway asked if this means the Town would go back to the way it calculates the fees now. Councilman Junkin said the Town would go back to the way it is doing business now.

Second: Councilwoman Callaway seconded the motion.

Discussion: Councilwoman Voveris suggested working something out. Councilman Rae said he is not opposed to the concept. He believes Council is in agreement with the concept, but it is a matter of coming up with something that everyone feels comfortable with.

Motion: A motion was made by Councilwoman Voveris, seconded by Councilman Junkin, to tie the fee to the ICC Index (as approved earlier) and apply 2.15 as the percentage to everything on the fee schedule that currently has a rate of \$2.30 per square foot for a one year period where at which time it will be reviewed again.

Discussion: During discussion it was noted that the Schedule of Fees has to be changed by resolution. The Town Manager suggested having the resolution for the May 10 Town Council Regular Meeting.

Vote: Mayor Jankowski asked for a roll call. The voting on Councilwoman Voveris' motion was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Jankowski and Councilpersons Rae, Gross, Voveris, Junkin, Callaway, and Damato

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 7-0 vote.

Motion: A motion was made by Councilman Junkin, seconded by Councilman Gross, that the current item that is at 50 cents per square foot be changed to .47 percent times the ICC Index for a one year period to be revisited next year.

Vote: Mayor Jankowski asked for a roll call. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Jankowski and Councilpersons Rae, Gross, Voveris, Junkin, Callaway, and Damato

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 7-0 vote.

Mayor Jankowski thanked the Budget and Finance Committee. Council agreed to bring forth a resolution to revise South Bethany's Schedule of Fees at the May 10 Town Council Regular Meeting.

The Code Enforcement Constable stated that as Council debates this further there are other items Council should consider from which there really is no permit other than simply charging \$50. During discussion Mayor Jankowski asked the Code Enforcement Constable if he could make a list of those items. The Code Enforcement Constable referred to South Bethany's Schedule of Fees under Building Permits Item 11 in which a \$50 permit fee is charged for fences, paved driveways, flagpoles, towers, paved sidewalks, paved patios, the installation of permeable interlocking pavers, and the installation of impervious surfaces. The Code Enforcement Constable also suggested that the Town could make the fee schedule a little bit more equitable where the Town currently charges \$2.30 a square foot for renovations.

Councilwoman Voveris said that might be use of percentage of contract pricing rather than square footage. The Code Enforcement Constable agreed. Mr. Stephan said he hears property owners asking why the Town charges so much for building permits to improve their properties. Mr. Stephan believes that if the Town took a vote people would say to up the building permit fee on new construction. Mr. Cestone stated that most of the \$50 permit fees were established in the early 2000s when property owners weren't required to have a permit to put in a paved driveway. In order for the Town to control things like putting a paved driveway the whole way to the street the Town started a permit requirement and the \$50 was to cover the cost of the permit.

Mayor Jankowski stated that at a future meeting she would like to revisit the Town's Schedule of Fees. Mayor Jankowski stated that she has the same concerns as Councilwoman Callaway where there are houses that are deteriorating and the Town is encouraging the property owners to fix them up and then the Town penalizes the property owner when they try to fix them up.

Mayor Jankowski thanked the Code Enforcement Constable.

AWARD BID NO. 13-02 ALL TERRAIN-VEHICLE

The Town Manager stated that \$13,500 was put in the FY 2014 Budget for the replacement of the old ATV that the Maintenance Department uses. The Town Manager advertised for bids and the low bid is \$13,208. The Town Manager recommended awarding the Supply of New 2013 Polaris ATV Bid No. 13-02 to Harley-Davidson of Seaford, Del., Inc. for the low bid of \$13,208.00

A motion was made by Councilman Junkin, seconded by Councilman Rae, that Council accept the Town Manager's recommendation. Mayor Jankowski asked for a roll call. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Jankowski and Councilpersons Rae, Gross, Voveris, Junkin, Callaway, and Damato

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 7-0 vote.

At this time Mayor Jankowski modified the sequence of the agenda items. These minutes reflect the order in which agenda items were discussed.

DISCUSSION OF ORDINANCE 168-13 TO AMEND CHAPTER 104, PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

Councilman Gross thanked the Administrative Assistant and Bob Cestone for their help this past week. Councilman Gross stated that Mr. Cestone's review was thorough and very helpful. The ordinance was also reviewed by John Fields and the Code Enforcement Constable.

Council had a copy of Ordinance 168-13 which included suggested changes Councilman Gross had made to Ordinance 168-13 since the second reading on March 8, 2013. Council agreed to the following changes to this document:

§ 104-17: Add mailboxes after walkways.

§ 104-19A: Delete "10 business" and replace with "a reasonable time limit not to exceed 30 calendar".

§ 104-19A: Last sentence: Change "owners" to "owner" in both places.

§ 104-19C: First sentence: Delete "10 business" and replace with "a reasonable time limit not to exceed 30 calendar". Also delete "receipt" and replace with "date".

§ 104-19C: Second sentence: Delete "10 business" and replace with "30 calendar". Also delete "penalty and".

§ 104-19C: Last sentence: Do not delete "that the violator has the right to a hearing before a court".

§ 104-19D: First sentence: Delete "10 business" and replace with "30 calendar"

§ 104-19D: Fourth sentence: Delete "30" and replace with "20".

§ 104-19D: Last sentence: Delete "10 business" and replace with "a reasonable time limit not to exceed 30 calendar".

DISCUSSION OF TOWN CODE § 145-14.3 GROUND COVERING ALLOWED IN SETBACK AREA

Councilman Gross gave the following background information on this topic:

For many years no paving in the Town right-of-way was permitted. This was not consistently enforced. On May 14, 2010, an ordinance sponsored by Mayor Headman and Councilman Fields was passed explicitly prohibiting paving in the Town right-of-way. The Board of Adjustment had several requests for variances to facilitate handicap and elderly people. In 2011 the Board of Adjustment Chairman sent a letter to Mayor Headman requesting Council to consider changes permitting paving under some conditions. The Code Constable at the time also said that he received a number of requests to permit paving in driveways. This resulted in consideration of the Council to a revision to the earlier ordinance. Objections to permeable pavers included: They would limit the water absorption (although permeable pavers are good they are not as good as sand in absorbing the water), it would take up needed parking space (if you get the driveway all across the front it eliminates parking spaces), it would make it difficult for utilities to pull cable (particularly TV and telephone), and another objection came from adjacent owners saying that it infringed on the appearance of their property and they didn't like the way it looked. The compromise that resulted was to permit permeable pavers within the Town right-of-way along the front of the property, no wider than 50% of the lot width and no closer than five feet to any side boundary line (Town Code § 145-14.3C). Councilman Gross stated that on February 10, 2012, the Council passed the ordinance unanimously with no public objection.

Mayor Jankowski asked the Code Enforcement Constable for his input. The Code Enforcement Constable stated that a concern he has is that permitting pavers across the entire front of the lot does affect drainage. He added that pervious pavers will not percolate as well as if there is something such as gravel there. Over time, unless somebody is maintaining the pervious pavers with a power washer, silt gets into the joints between the pavers and begins to seal it and the permeable pavers become less permeable. The Code Enforcement Constable said the distinction he is trying to make is that the ponding of water along the edge of the paving is going to increase substantially wherever permeable pavers are used versus stone.

Councilman Rae stated that there is a big impact on parking on the east side of Rt. 1. The Code Enforcement Constable stated that it would impact parking everywhere.

Mayor Jankowski stated that what she is asking is to change § 145-14.3C to say "permeable pavers may be used within the Town right-of-way along the front of the property but no wider than the width of an existing driveway or for a new driveway no closer than five feet to any side boundary line."

Councilwoman Voveris said that is contrary to what the ordinance is trying to do. Councilman Junkin said that is not enough space to park a car. Councilman Gross said on the ocean side this would allow 60 feet of permeable paving where the front of the lot is 70 feet.

Mayor Jankowski said what she struggles with are driveways in town that are butted up against each other and there is no space there. Councilman Junkin said that is because the code was not enforced.

Councilwoman Callaway stated that she thinks the issue of parking on the east side is very different than the issue of parking on the west side. She does not see any advantage to not fitting five cars on a driveway on the west side if you have five guests.

Councilman Gross said the ordinance was not passed for one single reason. It was passed for a number of reasons and a compromise was reached.

Referring to existing driveways that go across the front of the property, Mayor Jankowski questioned what the reason is for not putting the pavers all the way over to the side. Councilman Junkin said because there is better drainage if there aren't pavers. Mayor Jankowski stated that it is only maybe another two feet on either side. Councilman Junkin stated that the Council already compromised when they allowed permeable pavers within the Town right-of-way along the front of the property no wider than 50% of the lot width. Before that it was zero for pavers. Councilman Rae noted that a lot of the compromise was initiated by handicap people who were asking for waivers. Councilman Gross said that is what started it. Mayor Jankowski stated that she does not understand it because it looks stupid. Councilman Junkin said it would not look stupid if the property owner put gravel the whole way in the Town right-of-way. Mayor Jankowski said she is looking at it from the perspective of appearance. Councilman Junkin said he is looking at it from the perspective of water quality. Mayor Jankowski questioned if that much is really going to affect water quality. Councilman Junkin said every little bit adds up. Mayor Jankowski said then the Town should be making property owners take up the ones that are too far over. Councilman Junkin said he would agree with that but he thinks Council would have a hard time getting that passed. Councilman Gross added that the "grandfather" clause is difficult to deal with.

A motion was made by Mayor Jankowski, seconded by Councilwoman Callaway, that Council create an ordinance to amend Town Code § 145-14.3 (Ground covering allowed in the setback area) to allow permeable pavers no wider than the width of an existing driveway. Mayor Jankowski asked for a roll call. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Jankowski and Councilperson Callaway

AGAINST THE MOTION: Councilpersons Junkin, Gross, Rae, Voveris, and Damato

The voting result was 2 in favor and 5 against. The motion was defeated.

Mayor Jankowski thanked Council for listening. Mayor Jankowski thanked Councilman Gross for giving the information on the history of the ordinance.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE REGARDING UDEL SOUTH BETHANY MACROALGAE STUDY

Councilman Junkin explained that Alyson Myers, a member of a University of Delaware scientific team, would like to place a small floating mesh bag at the end of several canals to explore growth rates and harvesting techniques. This study has no cost to South Bethany and would be only for the growing season. The materials are dark (blend in with the water) and will be out of the path of boaters. Councilman Junkin said she would like to learn more about algae in South Bethany's canals with the goal of helping to learn how to eliminate it.

A motion was made by Councilman Junkin to give Alyson Myers permission to do the study in South Bethany. After discussion Mayor Jankowski asked for a roll call. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Jankowski and Councilpersons Rae, Gross, Voveris, Junkin, Callaway, and Damato

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 7-0 vote.

REVIEW OF PERSONNEL POLICIES IN PLACE

Councilwoman Voveris had given Council a handout with detailed information on the employee benefits policy. Councilwoman Voveris would like to be able to show the liability regarding various benefits as a line item in the budget.

The Town Manager clarified the following:

- Separation pay only pertains to full-time employees who have had continuous service with the Town and who retire in good standing. The Town Manager clarified that the employee only receives it if the employee retires. The Town Manager stated that the Town has never had anyone that has received the payout.
- The Town did not join the State pension system until 2003. At that time the Town did buy back five years for the Town employees. The Police Department did not join the State pension system until 2005. At that time the Town bought back seven years for the Police Department to make it equal. The Town Manager stated that the most any town employee has in the State pension system is 15 years.

Councilwoman Callaway asked the Town Manager how he proposes that Council looks at this. The Town Manager stated that he does not have a problem with Council putting aside a reserve amount for separation pay if four or five people retire at one time. Councilman Junkin said he thinks it makes sense to have a reserve account identified to handle employee benefits withdrawals.

Mayor Jankowski suggested that Council look at the whole Personnel Policy in October. Councilman Rae said Council just passed the FY 2014 Budget so the FY 2015 Budget would be the time to address this.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

- **Code Enforcement Constable**

The Town Manager announced that the Code Enforcement Constable had turned in his letter of resignation. Council had a copy of the letter of resignation. The Town has started advertising the position on Career Builder. The Town has already received 15 applications. Applications close May 17.

- **Beach Patrol**

The Town Manager announced that Ben Chandlee is not coming back this year. The Town Manager has promoted one of the lieutenants, Ryan Dacey, to the Beach Patrol Captain position. Ryan has 10 years of experience – four years on Rehoboth Beach's Patrol and six years on South Bethany's Beach Patrol. Ryan is here now and can start the hiring process for lifeguards.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no comments from the public.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Councilwoman Voveris, seconded by Councilman Junkin to adjourn the April 25, 2013, Town Council Workshop Meeting at 8:05 p.m.

phs:Workshop Minutes.4.25.13 Amended and Adopted 5.30.13