



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Ed Toole (Chair), Lisa Botticelli (Vice chair), Susan McCarthy (Clerk), Michael J. O'Mara, Kerim Koseatac
Alternates: Mark Poor, Geoff Thayer, Jim Mondani

~~ MINUTES ~~

Thursday, January 14, 2016

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Community Room –1:00 p.m.

Called to order at 1:04 p.m.

Staff in attendance: Eleanor Antonietti, Zoning Administrator; Leslie Snell, Planning Director; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
Attending Members: Toole, Botticelli, McCarthy, O'Mara, Koseatac, Poor, Thayer, Mondani
Absent: None
Late Arrivals: Botticelli, 1:08 p.m.
Early Departures: None
Town Consultants: Ilana Quirk, Kopelman and Paige, P.C.; Ed Marchant, 40B Consultant (by remote participation)

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. December 10, 2015: **Motion to Approve.** (made by: O'Mara) (seconded by: Koseatac) Carried 5-0

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. 34-15 NHA Properties, Inc., *d/b/a* Housing Nantucket School View Cottages 7 Surfside Road Kuszpa/Mervis
WITHDRAWAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Sitting Toole, McCarthy, O'Mara, Koseatac
Documentation File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Representing **Anne Kuszpa**, Housing Nantucket Executive Director – It has been determined this is not a viable option at this site. Reviewed the project. Costs began to escalate precluding maintaining an affordable rent. The uncertain timeline made it impossible to commit to owners donating the structures. Have decided to withdraw the permit.
Public None
Discussion None
Motion **Motion to Accept the withdrawal without prejudice.** (made by: O'Mara) (seconded by: Koseatac)
Vote Carried 4-0

2. 32-15 Paul S. Jensen, as Trustee of 23 Sankaty Road Realty Trust 23 Sankaty Road Jensen
Sitting Toole, McCarthy, O'Mara, Koseatac, Poor

Documentation File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Representing **Paul Jensen** – Demolition of non-conforming structure on a non-conforming lot. Was encouraged to transfer this lot into another lot under separate ownership. Have done that and now asking the board to deny with the finding there is a clear definition of ownership and so this application as unnecessary due to the definition of ownership. Prefers a denial with a statement why. The properties are under different trusts owned separately by relatives, not husband and wife.
Public **Cormac Collier**, Executive Director Nantucket Land Council – He is concerned about how a statement that there is a clear delineation of ownership would affect other applications. In his opinion, the owners are the same.
Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law PC – As a general proposition, the bylaw creates a title problem for all these lots where a structure is being demolished for new construction because there is a momentary empty lot next to a lot where there is a question of common ownership. The issue with a merger is both ownership and control. What is important is that the board makes a finding as to whether or not there is common ownership and control. He recommends the board make a positive motion granting the relief.

Discussion (1:10) **Antonietti** – Could make a motion to deny or make a determination that this is unnecessary.
Quirk – In the event the board denies finding that no relief is necessary, the ultimate determination is up to the Zoning Enforcement Officer. If anyone is dissatisfied with that, his determination can be appealed. The board has the ability to grant the relief as requested; if you take negative action, you can't give opinion on the question of ownership and control. Can also accept a withdrawal without prejudice.
Discussion about conditions.

Motion **Motion to Grant the relief as requested.** (made by: O'Mara) (seconded by: Koseatac)
Vote Carried 4-1//Poor opposed

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. 01-16 Anne N. Apgar & Mahlon Apgar, Trustees of 22 Broadway Trust 22 Broadway Jensen

Applicant is requesting Special Permit relief pursuant to Zoning Bylaw Section 139-33.A(1) to allow the alteration of the pre-existing nonconforming dwelling by adding a second story dormer and window within the setback area. The Locus, having double frontage on Center Street and Broadway, is nonconforming as to lot size and frontage and the dwelling is non-conforming with respect to all setbacks. The proposed alteration will result in an upward extension of the pre-existing nonconforming southerly side yard setback. The Locus, an undersized lot situated at 22 Broadway, is shown on Assessor's Map 73.1.3 Parcel 117. Evidence of owner's title is recorded at Book 1503, Page 116 on file at the Nantucket County Registry of Deeds. The site is zoned Sconset Old Historic (SOH).

Sitting Toole, Botticelli, McCarthy, O'Mara, Koseatac
 Documentation File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
 Representing **Paul Jensen** – A permit to allow addition of a flush 2nd-floor dormer just inside the setback. It is an increase in volume in the setback but not the footprint. Asked that relief be granted.

Public None
 Concerns **Toole** – An abutter submitted a letter of support.
 Discussion about conditions.

Motion **Motion to Grant relief as requested.** (made by: Botticelli) (seconded by: McCarthy)
 Vote Carried unanimously
2. 02-16 Daniel G. Counihan 11 Swain Street Jensen

Applicant is requesting Special Permit relief pursuant to Zoning By-law Section 139-33.A(1) to allow the alteration of a pre-existing nonconforming dwelling by relocating the building eleven (11) feet closer to the front yard lot line, placing the building on a new higher foundation, and building a small addition to the northwest corner of the dwelling. The dwelling, as so altered, will not increase the pre-existing nonconformities. In addition, a pre-existing nonconforming shed which is currently sited over the westerly lot line will be removed, thus eliminating said nonconformity. The Locus is nonconforming as to lot size and frontage and the dwelling is non-conforming with respect to side yard setbacks. The Locus, an undersized lot of record created pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 41 Section 81L, is situated at 11 Swain Street (portion), is shown on Assessor's Map 42.4.1 as Parcel 77 (portion), and as Lot A on Plan No. 2015-90. Evidence of owner's title is recorded at Book 1186, Page 296 on file at the Nantucket County Registry of Deeds. The site is zoned Residential 1 (R-1).

Sitting Toole, McCarthy, Koseatac, Poor, Thayer
 Documentation File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
 Representing **Paul Jensen** – For a Special Permit to pick up the house and move forward onto a new foundation above the flood plain and extend off the back; will maintain the existing side setbacks; no other changes to the structure. The shed will be removed.

Public None
 Concerns (1:29) None
 Motion **Motion to Approve the application as requested taking into consideration no construction in the summer.**
 (made by: Koseatac) (seconded by: Thayer)
 Vote Carried unanimously
3. 03-16 Brandt C. Gould & Gabrielle M. Gould 15 Margaret's Way Cohen

Applicant is requesting Special Permit relief pursuant Zoning Bylaw Section 139-16.C(2) to validate an unintentional westerly side yard setback intrusion. The siting of a pool and associated equipment, installed in 2015, was reasonably based on a licensed survey. The pool is sited as close as 18.4 feet from the side yard lot line and the pool equipment as close as 17.7 feet, where a twenty (20) foot setback is required. In the alternative, and to the extent necessary, Applicant requests relief by Variance pursuant to Section 139-32 to allow said setback intrusions. A thirty-four (34) square foot shed, currently sited within the southerly rear yard setback, will be moved out of the twenty (20) foot required setback. The Locus is situated at 15 Margaret's Way, is shown on Assessor's Map 20 as Parcel 64, and as Lot 86 upon Land Court Plan No. 6283-8. Evidence of owner's title is registered at Certificate of Title 21420 on file at the Nantucket County District of the Land Court. The site is zoned Limited Use General 3 (LUG-3).

Sitting Toole, McCarthy, Koseatac, Poor, Thayer
 Documentation File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
 Representing **Steven Cohen**, Cohen & Cohen Law PC – A corner of the pool and equipment is located inside the 20-foot setback. Asking for relief for an unintentional encroachment. The cost of moving the pool and equipment would be astronomical.
Gabrielle Gould – They thought everything was measured correctly.

Public None
 Concerns (1:32) **Koseatac** – Asked if the pool construction company messed up, they should be liable.
 Discussion about how the encroachment happened.
Poor – There was a similar issue several years ago; at that time, this board asked the homeowner to attempt a land swap with the neighbor.
Koseatac – Is willing to overlook it but doesn't want to see others coming in using the same excuse; surveyors should be used to mark the location for the pool.
Thayer – Asked if there is a site plan showing the approved location of the pool. It looks like the pool fence is over the property line.

- Motion **Motion to Approve the relief as requested with the fence relocated within the property line and moving the 34 SF shed out of the setback.** (made by: Thayer) (seconded by: Koseatac)
- Vote Carried 4-1//Poor opposed
- 4. 04-16 Donald J. Mackinnon, Trustee of Nantucket 106 Surfside Realty Trust – *a/k/a* SURFSIDE COMMONS 40B
106 Surfside Road Mackinnon

The Applicant is seeking a Comprehensive Permit in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 40B, as approved by Massachusetts Housing Partnership, in order to allow a multi-family project consisting of 56 rental apartments with fourteen (14) to be designated as affordable units. The apartments will be arranged in two 2½ story buildings with thirteen units each and two 3½ story buildings with fifteen (15) units each. There will be a total of two 1-bedroom units, forty two 2-bedroom units, and twelve 3-bedroom units. The project will also include a clubhouse and pool. If approved, the property will be permanently deed-restricted for the purpose of providing affordable year-round housing. The file with a copy of the complete list of requested waivers is available at the Zoning Board of Appeals office at 2 Fairgrounds Road between the hours of 7:30 A.M. and 4:30 P.M., Monday through Friday or via link to posting on Town of Nantucket website below: <http://www.nantucket-ma.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/10990>. The Locus, situated at 106 Surfside Road, is shown on Assessor’s Map 67 as Parcel 80. Locus is also shown as Block 22 on Plan File 3-D and as Parcels 7 -11 (inclusive) on Plan No. 2014-52. Evidence of owner’s title is recorded in Book 1410, Page 205 and Book 1488 Page 213, both on file at the Nantucket County Registry of Deeds. The site is zoned Limited Use General 2 (LUG-2) and Limited Use General 3 (LUG-3).

- Sitting Toole, Botticelli, McCarthy, O’Mara, Koseatac
- Documentation File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
- Representing **Donald J. MacKinnon**, Atlantic Development – Provided an overview of how this development meets the 40B conditions and the architectural treatment of the buildings and layout of the project.
Steve Schwartz, Goulston and Storrs – Described the 40B process from the developer’s perspective. One issue is the question of waivers: in his opinion, waivers follow the plan. Under regulations, they are not required to obtain waivers for special permit.
Joshua Swerling, Bohler Engineering – Reviewed the design of the project: 4 buildings, 2 with 15 units and 2 with 13 units; clubhouse and pool with amenities; 92 surface parking and 8 garaged spaces; drainage report is included which was determined as adequate; Town water and sewer tied in at Fairgrounds Road; underwent a coordinated review; and details on erosion and sediment control.

- Margret Murphy
- Public Arthur Reade, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, & Gifford LLP
Deborah Timmermann, Surfside resident
Peter Fenn, counsel for Nantucket Land Council
Linda Williams, Historic District Commission (HDC) Chair; Affordable Housing Trust Fund Chair; Housing Quality Vice Chair; Planning Board Vice Chair
Joseph Guay, Brian & Linda Davis at 108 Surfside Road and Mary Beth Ferro, 104 Surfside Road
Linda Davis, 108 Surfside Road
Doug Bryans, 105 Surfside Road
Steve Calabrese, 2 Morgan Square
Dave LaFleur, 104 Surfside Road

- Concerns (1:47) **Koseatac** – There is a letter from the Board of Selectmen (BOS) dated 11/5/2015 to Massachusetts Housing Partnership (MHP).
Toole – In the letter, the BOS noted that there are some issues and asked MHP not to issue the project eligibility letter. MHP issued the letter. A traffic study was included in the application. This board is interested in a peer review by its own consultants. There is a question about whether or not this board can provide the right to tie into the sewer; it is not in the sewer district. There is a long list of requested waivers which might or might not end up being germane.
Timmermann – She feels that Surfside is the only area that has received all 40B and affordable housing and that is putting an unfair burden on the area. According to the master plan, Surfside is considered country with 2-acre lots and the density will totally change the feel of the island. At Town Meeting it was hammered out where sewer could be added onto and this is beyond the sewer district. In her opinion, \$2,000 a month is not affordable.
Fenn – He believes the question to extend the sewer will have to go to Town Meeting. The site is small and tight in an area that is rural in character. The Land Council has been involved in protection of the Boy Scout Camp property, which abuts this site. This is in the wellhead protection district and merits ZBA concern. Disagrees that site control has been determined; this site was been augmented by the acquisition of paper roads from the Town; deeds with the Town maintain controls. Do not think the stormwater runoff plan is adequate. Urges the ZBA to hire a stenographer and obtain a peer review to be paid for by the developer. They will submit a list of consultants they believe will be useful to the ZBA through process.
Toole – Asked if the audio and video recordings are adequate. The board will be asking for a peer review.
Quirk – Yes. A transcript is necessary only if there is no audio or video.
Schwartz – On the issue of site control, the regulations are clear that the issue is conclusively determined. He has never seen a peer review for title and a peer review by a legal expert is not a reviewer the applicant can be asked to pay for.

- Quirk** – Agrees that site control is determined by the project eligibility letter. The subsidizing agency is aware of the issue. Agrees with Attorney Schwartz that site control is not under ZBA jurisdiction.
- Toole** – Asked about what if after discussion, ZBA felt there wasn't site control.
- Quirk** – *Per se* it is not in ZBA jurisdiction; if there's new information, the board can gather it and have Town Counsel send it to the subsidizing agency. It has happened that the subsidizing agency has rescinded the eligibility.
- Toole** – If someone in the audience feels there is a site control issue, the board is willing to hear the argument. Asked the board if this issue should be flushed out today in the event there might be site control issues.
- Quirk** – Recommended that the board encourage each individual to issue all concerns in writing so that the board can study the specific information in order to determine whether or not to send a letter to the subsidizing agency.
- Marchant** – This board will want to determine which concerns might be critical issues; this should be addressed as well as the sewer district extension. If they aren't addressed in a timely manner, they will cause delays later in the process.
- Botticelli** – Asked if there is a plan that shows the three paper roads in question.
- MacKinnon** – Reviewed the location of the paper roads and their status in regards to this parcel.
- Snell** – Explained the yard-sale program.
- Reade** – Without regard to bidding process, the parcels in question were made available through the yard sale process and the applicant acquired the parcels. Site control should not be an issue; he will provide any necessary certification of title.
- MacKinnon** – Stated that 106 Nantucket Surfside Realty Trust owns the entire property; Surfside Commons LLC is the applicant.
- O'Mara** – Wants to hear more about other issues.
- Toole** – Suggested everyone submit their site control concerns in writing through ZBA staff to be reviewed prior to the next meeting.
- McCarthy** – Asked what happens to the process if a private property owner brings a lawsuit against Nantucket 106 over the proposed work.
- Quirk** – That would be separate to this process. If there is new information in regards to site control, the letter would be sent but the process continues.
- Williams** – There were other agencies that sent letters of concern to the state; she will ensure those are included in the file. As has been the case in the past, there should a PowerPoint® presentation of the plans so that the audience can see what the board sees. In the past, an escrow was required for peer review and that should be done. Planning Board voted to make a comment at this hearing prior to a formal review on concerns: parking, failed intersection at Surfside and Fairgrounds, density, infrastructure improvements, and impact on the area.
- Guay** – His clients have submitted letters of opposition to the project; it is important for the board to familiarize itself to all the letters submitted to MHP. Asked that all those letters be made part of the record. This 40B project is not for free-standing residents; apartment buildings are not in character with other projects on this Island in regards to density, massing, height and traffic. This board should give careful scrutiny on any requests for waivers and whether or not they are appropriate. He believes that the applicant should explain why they should receive the waivers and that it is appropriate for the applicant to pay for further studies going forward. Asked the board to consider this as unique and separate from other 40B projects on the island.
- Antonietti** – In regards to payment of peer reviews, an engineering escrow account has been established.
- Koseatac** – Asked how long a typical traffic study lasts to be thorough.
- Burns** – A traffic study is a sampling; time of year is important. He verified the date and times for the study.
- McCarthy** – In regards to letters about this project, those should all go through Ms Antonietti.
- Toole** – If the density were to change, some of the data points; the traffic study should be done.
- Botticelli** – She realizes that the summer traffic is heaviest but she anticipates this to be a year-round development. The traffic study should include a time when school is in session and other year-round activities are taking place.
- O'Mara** – Two days in the summer won't be sufficient.
- Marchant** – That is why a professional traffic engineer should do the traffic impact analysis study to ensure it complies with the accepted methodology.
- Toole** – Sewer is a large issue and whether or not the ZBA has the right to grant a waiver. If the ZBA were to decide they can't grant the waiver without going to Town meeting, would that be reason to cease.
- Quirk** – No, the relief could be granted with the condition that that be obtained. Recommends the attorneys write their opinions and submit them to be provided to the public and applicant.
- Toole** – There is a question as to whether or not tying into water is an expense to be paid for by the applicant.
- MacKinnon** – The physical cost of installing the pipe is included and along with some level of connection fees although we are seeking a waiver from fees.
- Toole** – The density issue has a large impact on design, parking, and the site plan. There doesn't appear to be enough parking to meet zoning.
- Botticelli** – This design is totally incongruous and out of character with Nantucket. She has a lot of concerns about the scale and therefore the density of the buildings. The 3 bedroom apartments are basically the den of a 2-bedroom being called a bedroom.

Toole – He has concern about the grading; he would like to see site sections that show what is happening. This doesn't seem to have any sensitivity to the neighborhood or Nantucket in general. Design aesthetics are at the forefront of every project.

O'Mara – He can't remember any 40B that didn't end up at the HDC or at least seek out their advice.

Toole – The ZBA is able to not grant the waiver or ask them to seek an opinion from HDC.

Schwartz – Legally they are not required to go before any board. They can choose to take the suggestion; their waiver request was over inclusive. As the process proceeds, they are happy to speak with Town Counsel about the waiver requests. They are requesting a waiver from the local bylaws.

Marchant – If the project is approved, the building inspector will need to be comfortable with the project proceeding; there would be a condition in the comprehensive permit that states the applicant must comply with all local rules except for those specifically waived in this decision. He feels discussion of waivers at this time is premature; they evolve throughout the hearing. The Building Inspector would review compliance with the building code and compliance with terms of the comprehensive permit. The ZBA in this case fill the role of all the boards. Right now you should focus on issues that are perceived to be critical; design is an important issue. Waivers are discussed toward the middle or end of the process.

Quirk – There are two issues here: what permits are necessary and what waivers have been requested. She concurs this board doesn't have the jurisdiction to compel them to go to the HDC but can ask them to and come back with a memo about the revised design. Could also have a joint meeting with the HDC to go over the design. Granting the waiver would mean there is no Certificate of Appropriateness.

Schwartz – If there is a requirement to appear before a separate local board to get a separate approval for the project, it is within the purview of this board to request that. If there are performance specific requirements in a local bylaw, they need to comply or request a waiver. If the HDC doesn't have specific requirements, just general requirements, we are not subject to that process.

Further discussion about the developer meeting with the standards of the HDC and how that might be accomplished.

Toole – Everything all boils down to the density. Asked Mr. MacKinnon if he's willing to look at the density issue.

MacKinnon – There was a bit of a density analysis included in the PEL application but not included in the comprehensive permit. They looked at Island neighborhoods with square footage that could be compared to this site; those were mostly in downtown and 'Sconset; they all have density in excess of 30,000 square feet per acre. That level of density doesn't exist in Surfside.

Fenn – There is a lot of work to be done. This is a very rural area of the island with 2-acre zoning. He doesn't know of any residential structure that is 55 feet tall on the Island. 40B are designed to be of higher density but it needs to be explored by this board.

Toole – Do have that density study. He feels this proposal is a little "heavy handed" and hopes before the next meeting there will be some reduction in the project made.

Botticelli – This would need thicker buffering between the lawn and the proposed new bike path. The plan as shown doesn't have enough room. The structures are too tall and too vertical.

Toole – He has a problem with cutting up the land and grading just to put in two basement apartments.

Davis – A group of Surfside-area residents are in opposition to this project. There is an apparent disregard by the developer for the uniqueness of Nantucket, the Surfside Area Plan, the Master Plan, the Wellhead Recharge District, and the HDC. There is no other development like this and there should not be. This is a precedent for the future of the island.

Toole – One building shows basement storage; asked if that is for the residents.

MacKinnon – There is an elevator for handicapped (H/C) access for the residents.

Toole – Another design issue is the clubhouse and the pool.

Timmermann – This is not an RC zone and doesn't think the "health" club is appropriate in the area; that is a business. This is a residential area and the proposed density is beyond reason.

MacKinnon – The clubhouse is for the residents and their guests only. Another element included in the *pro forma* is that out of the 56 units, 14 are affordable and one market-rate unit is for a live-in manager to have someone on site 24-7.

McCarthy – Asked about mail delivery.

Toole – The scale of this seems inappropriate; the main mass is 2 ½ stories; more sensitivity should be shown for the area.

Bryans – Questions who benefits financially from this project; he doesn't feel it benefits Nantucket or Surfside. He asks the board to think about whether or not this is good for the environment and the area and who will benefit. He gets the feeling that it is accepted this is going to happen and the project can't be stopped.

Toole – Nothing is a foregone conclusion. Asked Town Counsel to explain the 40B process and the limitations and constraints.

Quirk – This is a comprehensive permit application under 40B; the 40B statute provides that unless there is not a safe harbor available to the Town, the board is faced with an application it is required to evaluate. It is up to the board to decide if there are concerns that outweigh the need for affordable housing. The board would then have to show how the local concerns outweigh that regional need and there is no reasonable mitigation to address those concerns.

Marchant – At the current time, the percentage of qualified affordable units is less than 3%, which doesn't put the ZBA in a strong position. The financial review for 40B projects is now done at the end of the process; the technical measure of

economics is that if a condition required by the board causes the return of the project to be less than the 10-year treasury rate plus 450 basis points; that could be considered to make the project uneconomical. The project can be denied, approved, or approved with conditions. Denying puts the Town in a difficult position if the applicant appeals to MHP. He recommends there is a need to negotiate a project everyone will be happy with. Reiterated how difficult a position the ZBA members are in; this isn't like the planning board which can deny a project for not complying with the bylaws. Here the board has to balance whether it is better to negotiate a deal or go to the Housing Appeals Committee (HAC). Noted that the HAC very often decides in favor of the applicant unless there is a clear health or safety or other local issue that overrides the need for affordable housing.

Quirk – Reiterated that there needs to be a local concern that outweighs the need. The burden of proof is on the ZBA.

Calabrese – The impact of this on the future economic well-being of the island. It is so out of keeping, asked if it would be possible to have a peer review of the economic impact this could have.

Quirk – That is an excellent point; the reason local decisions are made by local members is because you are familiar with the local conditions. It would be worthwhile for the board to gather information and have a record about welfare of the island in terms of the life blood of tourism industry and the impact this could have on that given the location.

LaFleur – Well water is a concern. Encourages the board to review the hydrology report and engineer run-off report. Cited a case where a 40B was overturned because of water safety.

Quirk – That said where there was a local regulation and there are specific performance standards for that watershed area. In that case the local concern to protect the well water outweighs the need for affordable housing. You would look at every local requirement and if there is a local concern that outweighs the need.

Toole – Asked for a site visit to be arranged with the lot line staked and building locations and height poles or balloons, better graphical representation of what's being proposed.

Discussion about a site visit to which the public might be invited to attend with the caveat that there would be no discussion or comments.

Williams – Asked that the HDC be informed when it will take place so that they might also attend.

Toole – Will need a motion to get comments from the various departments. Would want those comments at least a week before the next meeting to allow time to review it.

Discussion on the motion.

Motion **Motion to Request information and comments from all other applicable boards and departments by February 22.** (made by: Koseatac) (seconded by: O'Mara)

Vote Carried unanimously

Discussion about dates for the site visit and alternative meetings. Continued to the next regular meeting.

Reade – This won't actually go forward at the meeting but a date would be set for the next hearing.

Toole – Comments should be submitted by February 22. The site visit scheduled for Feb. 2 at 12:30 p.m.

Motion **Motion to Continue to February 11.** (made by: Botticelli) (seconded by: O'Mara)

Vote Carried unanimously

Motion **Motion to Accept the 30-day extension.** (made by: McCarthy) (seconded by: Koseatac)

Vote Carried unanimously

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to Adjourn: 4:42 p.m.

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton