

Unofficial

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, October 6, 2014**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:03 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Rogers (Chairman), Dick Marshall (Vice-Chairman), P. Scarpetti, T. Walsh, Frank Kotowski, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

EXCUSED: T. Prasol, Muamer Durakovic (Alternate), Michael DiBitetto (Alternate)

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 9/15/14

September 15, 2014 Regular Meeting – D. Marshall motioned to approve the September 15, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

APPOINTMENTS

1. COMMUNITY PROFILE

Marc Miville, Chair of Community Profile Committee

Discussion of Community Profile Event November 7 & 8.

Marc Miville: I want to update you on the Community Profile Committee specifically as it relates to the Planning Board as it is a consideration of the Planning Board's functions in the future. With a lot of the ideas, the citizens will be coming to the Planning Board for consideration as part of the future master plans. The Town Council, as part of its community building initiative, has set up an event with the cooperation of UNH Cooperative Extension. It is an event calling on all Hooksett citizens to gather together on Nov. 7 from 5:30pm to 9:00pm and Nov. 8 from 8:00am-1:00pm to share their thoughts and ideas of what they think the future plans of Hooksett should look like and what ideas they have in mind to adopt into the master plan. It is a town wide vision forum with the title of "Our Town, Our Future." We haven't had one these forums since 2001. We thought it was an appropriate time, since the master plan is almost completed, to re-establish new ideas or continue on with the same ideas they have had before. On Nov. 7, the citizens will gather together to express their thoughts, ideas, and opinions and hopefully bring solutions to those opinions. All ideas will be written on large paper using easels and separated into eleven various components as part of planning or governing for various aspects of the town profile. We are soliciting 11 facilitators and 11 scribes to handle the flow of the discussions. There will be break out groups separated into 11 classrooms. Once those small groups have discussed their interests in detail we will meet at 8:00am on Nov. 8, where they will return to the large group in the cafeteria and others can join in if they could not make it on the first day. We will input those

breakout group lists, compile a complete list of the ideas, and prioritize those based on needs and wants. Those ideas would preferably be incorporated into the master plan. The Saturday list would then be on the easels and the citizens would take time to look at the easels and prioritize them by putting dots on the sheets. All of the suggestions will be considered. We have a marginal budget that we are working with. Most of it is printing for community outreach for the town. We are also doing bulk mailers to the school parents in their weekly packets and we will be just in time to send out a newsletter through the tax bills. We will be live-streaming the videos of the meeting itself so people who cannot attend will be able to watch through the town website with the ability to text or twitter into it. There is a banner in front of the town hall. We are also reaching out to businesses for involvement and looking for business opinions. Their ideas would contribute greatly. We are soliciting donations for food, gift certificates, and door prizes to show appreciation to those who attend. We are reaching out for businesses to have road signs to keep up the awareness of the citizens. For publicity purposes, we are writing letters to the editor and a press releases has already been released to The Hooksett Banner and Union Leader. You will see a letter to the editor this week and a feature article will be written just before the event. We are working on putting up fliers and bulletin boards around town. We had a booth at Old Home Day and that was successful. I stood at the September election and passed out fliers and plan do so at the November election. I have an appointment booked at the Richard Girard At-Large radio show at the end of October. Child care will be provided in the room across from the cafeteria sponsored by Key Club. Transportation can be arranged if needed. If anyone is interested in attending, they can RSVP at hooksettsfuture@gmail.com. There is also a facebook page called "Hooksett's Future Through Community Profile". We are asking people to RSVP by November 1 to prepare for food. Walk-in's are also welcome.

DISCUSSION

2. MAURAS SUBDIVISION UPDATE

49 Mammoth Rd., Map 45, Lot 33

Discussion of extension request and subdivision plan.

Doug MacGuire (Dubay Group): I did the original sub-division plans that we are requesting an extension on and am giving an update to where we stand. This was a two-lot sub-division with 500' of town roadway proposed. The purpose of it was to create frontage to the larger parcel to the rear. As it stood, there was only a 50' access point which was a private drive and not a town right-of-way. There was no official frontage for a couple lots and there was no frontage for the substantial development to the back of the property. The applicant has been actively marketing the rear of the property over the last year. He has had a decent amount of interest but no one has come in for a follow-up plan with this Board for the rear of the parcel. Recently, the applicant was able to purchase an additional property along Mammoth Rd. which also fronts along this proposed sub-division road. That changes things because there was not a lot of benefit to building that 500' of road besides getting the access to the rear because it was only going to gain one buildable lot. With the purchase of Lot 45-32, that opens up additional frontage on that sub-division roadway. Now, the applicant is actively marketing that as well, because we would be allowed to do a lot-line adjustment with the property to the rear and make that more economically feasible. We are here to ask the Board for a one-year extension to be able to pursue that because the sale was only recently acquired.

D. Marshall: Which property?

D. MacGuire: It was Mr. Fraser's property.

D. Marshall: Is that the one immediately south?

D. MacGuire: Yes. It is a bit of a double lot. It abuts Mammoth Rd. and the rear of the property, so there could be some lot-line adjustments done which we did not have available to us initially.

D. Rogers: Would it cause any changes to the sub-division that has already been approved? Would you have to re-submit a sub-division plan?

D. MacGuire: Potentially. If we were going to modify the lot lines we would amend the sub-division plan. The goal was to work off of an amendment rather than a new application.

D. Rogers: Has this newly acquired lot been primarily for access purposes rather than development?

D. MacGuire: It opens up a lot of doors. There is a potential for gaining an additional lot for development purposes. There are also possibilities because now the overall parcel has a lot of frontage. Before it only had the 50'. Now it has the 50' plus the frontage of that acquired lot. The applicant has been taking feedback from multiple developers on this parcel and trying to get it more economically viable to be able to move forward. The biggest items were the up front cost associated with doing the sub-division road and acquiring that frontage for the rear of the property. This new acquisition makes that potentially more viable. That is what they are exploring now. I believe our approval is up in November, so we wanted to come in now to give us more time depending on the Board's feedback. I think a one-year would give them ample time to explore this new acquisition and make a decision as to how they are going to pursue this property.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, is this a public hearing?

J. Duffy: This is scheduled for a public hearing for the next meeting. He is here for discussion. You cannot vote on this until the October 20th meeting.

D. Rogers: Thank you for your input and we will take this up at the next meeting.

D. MacGuire: Is there any direction I can informally get from the Board to be able to advise my applicant. If the Board was not implying to grant an additional extension, he may want to pursue recording this as is. I was hoping to get feedback as of the thoughts of the Board.

F. Kotowski: Having not seen the lots involved and because this will be scheduled for two weeks from now, I would not want to make a comment at this time.

D. Marshall: If we express opinions we could be accused of pre-determining the results.

D. Rogers: I think there are too many variables. I am interested to hear public input.

D. MacGuire: Okay. I will bring in some additional materials as well.

J. Duffy: Regardless of whether or not he makes any changes, his approval for this sub-division to meet those conditions will expire in November. He is explaining what his future plans are but he is asking for an extension of the current conditionally approved plan.

D. Rogers: At a minimum, we will act on that at the next meeting, regardless about what we feel about the additional acquired lot.

D. Winterton: JoAnn, when we grant an extension do we always have a public hearing?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. MacGuire: We did not notify abutters at this point?

J. Duffy: They are notified for October 20.

D. MacGuire: I was not fully aware of that. I thought we were notified for today.

J. Duffy: That was a miscommunication. Carolyn thought that you wanted to come in and discuss it first.

D. Rogers: There is also a 14-day notice requirement so there was not enough time to make it in on time for this meeting. We will see you in two weeks.

COMMENTS TO ZBA

3. CHRIS MASTRIANO

1135 Hooksett Rd., Map 41, Lot 10

Variance requested from Article 10-A, Section E of the Zoning Ordinance to permit construction of 8 townhouse style multi-family housing units in the Performance Zone.

Peter Holden (Holden Engineering): Chris Mastriano is present. Chris owns property across from Mr. Bee's. It is where "Animal Crackers" had a building. Chris bought the property. He is in the used car business. He develops dealerships and then leases the site to someone and they can run a business. He thought it would be a good addition to the used car business to have a place where someone could repair cars they buy at auction so they could bring it to their site to sell. Chris bought this property and we put together a site plan. He got this approved from the Planning Board and he was going to build and lease it. He tried to lease it and sell it. He has been doing this for over 10 years and there is no interest. Some history on the zoning when Chris bought this property is the zoning line went through the middle of this. It was part Performance Zone and part residential. Chris was going to build a duplex but the town rezoned it so he did not build the duplex and continued to market it. We went to ZBA to see if we could get some relief so he could do something with this property. We put together a plan to propose two groups of four attached residential homes. He has a strip of land that goes out to Mammoth Rd. It is 36' wide of frontage along Mammoth Rd. After quite a bit of discussion and public

input at the ZBA meeting, it was stated that they would like input from the Planning Board. I think what they were talking about was we had proposed not to have any access onto Rt. 3. The driveway is pretty steep and we did a profile of a 10% driveway. We thought the residential use was compatible to the neighbors' property. The neighbors came and spoke about their concern about more traffic than if it were a duplex. When Chris got his original site plan approval for the repair shop the lady next door pointed out that she has a well and was concerned that, because we were excavating so much into the embankment, we would undermine her well. Chris agreed that if he develops the property he would provide the ability for a way to get water to her and try to work something out with Manchester Water Works with some kind of easement across his property. We talked with Bruce Kudrick about making a sewer connection and there is a connection for the Animal Cracker building. He said if we wanted we could connect onto that sewer service. I am not sure if he is going to let us connect two buildings onto that service. He said that if he makes us put a sewer extension, he would would not mind extending it. Chris is trying to be accommodating and use this property. I think the question the ZBA had was if this is a reasonable place to put a driveway. I looked at the site distance and there is a lot in both directions. We are going to have to get a driveway permit from the State of New Hampshire. We had a driveway permit for the duplex but it expired. We are expecting we would be able to get a driveway permit. I am not sure what the ZBA was thinking the Planning Board would do. Maybe give comment on the location of the driveway. I think they were trying to get some help.

D. Marshall: Where is the driveway for the property immediately north and south?

P. Holden: (*pointed out the driveway's on his presentation.*) We talked to both of these people and they said they plow their snow on part of that property. As a result, Chris told them they would work something out. Chris gave them some land with a boundary line adjustment because they were occupying some of his land.

D. Marshall: JoAnn, this is the Performance Zone. Residential properties are not supposed to be in the Performance Zone. In this case, isn't this issue a waiver and not a variance?

J. Duffy: No. For a residential use in the Performance Zone it has been determined by our attorney it requires a variance. As far as the location of the driveway's, that would require a waiver because our ordinance says you can't have a driveway 50' within another driveway. That would be a Planning Board waiver if it got that far. I also think the abutters had an issue with frontage. In my notes I put the definition of frontage for you. It does not say anything about being only on one road. Typically they have always included any frontage that you have on a town road. If you use the 30', you still have the frontage on Hooksett Rd. to meet the requirement.

D. Rogers: So it is a combined number?

J. Duffy: Yes.

T. Walsh: When did the Planning Board give the approval for the car lot?

P. Holden: In 2003.

T. Walsh: So during our recession.

P. Scarpetti: Because it is such a steep lot, if they grant them the eight units what if they can't physically get those eight units in there? What would happen?

J. Duffy: Did you apply your variance for eight or just for the use?

P. Holden: Just for the use.

J. Duffy: They would have to meet the requirements for site plan.

D. Rogers: So the Zoning Board would either approve or not approve the residential aspect of it, and it would be up to us to determine the number of units up to eight, potentially.

J. Duffy: There are two properties on Hooksett Rd. that have approval for residential, Park Place and Peterbrook, with the condition they also build some commercial out front. We have been talking to another developer, close to this property, who is looking into the possibility of doing apartments and that is another property that is very steep and has been vacant. I think they came in for a site plan to do a shopping center in the early 1990's and nothing has come in since then. They are trying to come up with ways to work with the land on some of these more difficult properties. This site is currently an eye sore and it is quite steep. I know the abutters have concerns and I don't know if you are planning on meeting with them to satisfy those concerns.

P. Holden: We are going to do everything we can to accommodate people and I think Chris has demonstrated that by giving them some of his property. All we are getting from the ZBA is the ability to build residential. If we come back and can only have four units that is what we will do. We will do whatever we need to do to comply with zoning.

F. Kotowski: You had mentioned you spoke with Bruce Kudrick. Please go back and revisit that before you get to far because we don't want to have any mistakes made.

D. Marshall: I have some reluctance to granting it for residential purposes for two reasons: 1) This is zoning by variance, and 2) it is going to set a precedent that the Planning Board is going to have to live with for anything within the Performance Zone.

T. Walsh: I agree with Mr. Marshall. I have a hard time recommending a variance to changing the zoning on something that may not have been marketable through a recession.

P. Holden: I think what the ZBA was asking the Planning Board about was the driveway and whether they should require us to go out onto Rt. 3, which I don't think the neighbors would object to, because they felt the Planning Board was more knowledgeable about driveways.

P. Scarpetti: It is a tough piece of land, and the speed in that area is fast. Trying to force a driveway coming off the main road or Mammoth Rd., it makes sense to come off of Mammoth Rd. I respect your ideas as far as the Performance Zone, but I think this is one of those cases where I would rather have

them come off of Mammoth Rd., and have something on the flatter part, than force something that is up on a hill. For a commercial piece of property you want something as flat as possible. He won't be able to do anything constructive with the property.

T. Walsh: Did anyone look at a plan that would return it's use to before the Performance Zone which would have been residential in the rear and commercial on Rt. 3?

P. Holden: When you have a commercial side you have to have a driveway and parking area that is pretty flat. One corner of the parking lot is 18' lower than the ground at the property line. We ended up with this canyon with a building in it. We had the building acting as a retaining wall to hold up the earth on one side of the property. It appeared that people did not want to be involved with that. I am sure there are some economics involved, but I don't think it is something people want to own. We created a 10% driveway and a building you would not be able to see from the street. We have tried a lot of things.

J. Duffy: The comments in the minutes, as far as Planning Board, focuses around the driveway and if it should come out Rt. 3 or Mammoth Rd..

D. Rogers: Is what they are they looking for from us? An indication that we prefer Mammoth Rd. over Rt. 3 or the other way around?

J. Duffy: They were not clear. They made a motion to have a presentation made to the Planning Board on the variance request. However, if you read through the minutes, it looked like they were struggling with how the Planning Board interprets frontage and whether it was better to come out on Rt. 3 or Mammoth Rd.

P. Holden: I think that is what they were looking for because they were talking about a traffic study and they were saying that was the Planning Board not the ZBA.

D. Marshall: It isn't often the ZBA asks for our opinion. If you limit yourself to the driveway issue, then we have no complaints when it comes back to us and we have to approve housing in a Performance Zone. It doesn't make sense to me. If you are going to comment to the ZBA you should comment on three things: 1) The frontage along both Route 3 and Mammoth Road represents the combined frontage for the entire parcel, 2) The proximity of the driveways on Mammoth Road is in conflict with the requirements of the Development Regulations. All three parties (applicant and two abutters) would need to sign off on an agreement concerning snow removal, 3) There was a reluctance to allow residential housing in the Performance Zone since it is not a permitted use. After we send those comments it is up to the ZBA what they want to do.

D. Marshall motioned to send a letter to the Zoning Board of Administration stating: 1) The frontage along both Route 3 and Mammoth Road represents the combined frontage for the entire parcel, 2) The proximity of the driveways on Mammoth Road is in conflict with the requirements of the Development Regulations. All three parties (applicant and two abutters) would need to sign off on an agreement concerning snow removal, 3) There was a reluctance to allow residential housing in the Performance Zone since it is not a permitted use. Seconded by T. Walsh. Opposed by P. Scarpetti.

Motion carried.

D. Rogers: Are you scheduled again with the ZBA?

P. Holden: On October 14.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. PALMHILL INVESTMENTS, LLC (plan #14-13)

5 Eastpoint Drive, Map 49, Lot 11-2

Condo conversion to convert the existing 28-bay building(s) and site into a 17-unit condominium. The intent of the plan is to change the form of ownership on the units. No new improvements are proposed.

Joe Wichert: I am here on behalf of Palmhill Investments and in the audience is Tracy Palmeri. The street address is 5 Eastpoint Drive. It is a 4.4 acre lot with approximately 432' of frontage on Eastpoint. The building is already developed, occupied and serviced by municipal water and on-site septic. When we were here on September 15, we went through the application, and one of the abutters, Mr. Dunican, who owns a parcel that is in Auburn and a small parcel in Hooksett, said there was a drainage or an erosion problem that was impacting his property. Since the 15th, we met with Mr. Dunican, we looked at the issue, they did some regrading and some rip-rap. I believe there was a letter that was received by the town today where Mr. Dunican was agreeable and removed his objections. We have also received state sub-division approval.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

D. Marshall: JoAnn, is the review by the town attorney satisfactory?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. Marshall motioned to approve the condo conversion to convert the existing 28-bay building(s) and site into a 17-unit condominium. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

5. BRIDGE BAY, LLC (plan #13-19)

99 Mammoth Rd, Map 41, Lot 36

Addition of a 21-unit, three story residential building to a site that already contains a separate, existing 12-unit, 3 story building.

Jennifer McCourt (McCourt Engineering): We were granted conditional approval in April. You should have a letter from Stantec stating he reviewed the plans and has no further comments. As part of doing the Geotec we ended up with the worst possible condition. We had between 9' to 12' of over-burden before we hit ledge. To be able to get the building and the parking in, we have reduced this from 21 units down to 18 units so that reduces the parking from 53 spaces down to 45 spaces. We also

shortened the building by 12' but it is the same elevation as before. Where we have the ledge cut out back is a 10' area for the ledge buffer and at most a 16' ledge cut, a 2:1 or 1:1, depending on the sides north and south is a 1:1 with a rip-rap top, and we will put a pedestrian safety fence on the top of that to keep people off of it.

D. Rogers read a letter from Alan Handley c/o Gerard A. Handley Trust, dated September 30, 2014, addressed to Carolyn Cronin, Assistant Planner, into the record.

J. McCourt: As far as the slope and constitution of the ledge cut, it was designed by a professional engineer geotech, Harry Wetherbee. It is standard practice in this field. Stantec also reviewed this. There was a previous letter where they had some comments regarding that which we addressed. There are notes on the last sheet regarding the build-ability of it to make sure this is done properly so there isn't a concern regarding that. We will meet all of Hooksett's standards and state requirements as far as blasting. This label was changed before we came to the Planning Board and after we went to the Zoning Board. The original 21 units had the correct location of his property on it when we came to Planning. The other concern he had was regarding access around the building. Part of my September submittal was showing that a fire truck could, per your regulations, make is completely around the building so that the overhang would have a foot and a half clearance on both sides. We meet all of your regulations as far as that is concerned.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, is there any input from staff?

J. Duffy: I am wondering if, when Mr. Handley wrote that, he was looking at the old plan with the retaining wall because he mentioned the construction of a retaining wall.

D. Rogers: He acknowledged in his letter it is now 18 units instead of 21, but he doesn't state which set of plans he reviewed.

D. Marshall: Was that letter sent to Stantec?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. Rogers: There has been no further input form Stantec?

J. Duffy: No.

Open public hearing.

Levi Akana (95 Mammoth Road): I have concerns with the traffic. I have seasonal drainage in my back yard that has been saturated. I am concerned with the footprint of the building and the driveway going up next to my property with the big retaining wall and what kind of run-off that will create. I am on the lower side of the elevation of that property. My property abuts the whole side. That road is getting saturated with traffic just as my yard is getting saturated with seasonal run-off. I am wondering what this is going to create.

J. McCourt: This plan not only was reviewed by Stantec and all of the exhaustive requirements for the Town of Hooksett drainage, but it also was amended for site specific Alteration of Terrain. We received that permit regarding the drainage. In both regulations, we are required to go through different large and small storm events to make sure we don't increase the flow off-site. The drainage pattern from this site through the wetlands exits to the north. There is drainage that comes down closer to where the existing abutters house is and existing condominiums are. We are collecting all of the drainage and putting it though a detention infiltration basin to infiltrate water into the ground, then it comes down the road and exits into wetlands and exits the site. All of the road water is collected and put through a detention area and exits to the north. The water is then collected again and put through another small detention pond and then it outlets down to a ditch that goes directly into the roadway. This has been looked at by DOT because we have our DOT driveway permit for this project. Per the current standards and regulations, we have met all of them for not having adverse impact to any off-site drainage.

Close public hearing.

*P. Scarpetti motioned to approve. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: We had a request from Steve Gagnon to sell Christmas trees at two sites in town, Pizza Man, 254 West River Road, Map 17, lot 36, and R&R Wholesalers, 1371 Hooksett Road, Map 18, lot 36. 1371 Hooksett Road was approved. 254 West River Road was denied. Pizza Man has an approved site plan, however, the site plan stated they would have 50 seats and, I believe, that was from his old project. When they did the renovation, they never said anything about increasing the number of seats, so he is in violation of his site plan. I spoke with him today. He had some problems with his septic system so the state came down and closed half of the restaurant. Doug MacGuire is working with him. The septic is up and running again and they are still going through paperwork with the state. I believe he has to provide the design if the septic were to fail, but for right now it is okay for the number of seats he has. However, his site plan shows that other pad site and the septic he has will not be sufficient for that pad site. The number of parking spaces also came up. For his 50 seats he is okay, but with 90 seats he needs 32. I asked him if he had that number and he said he does. In order for him to bring his site plan into compliance he needs to come here and modify his site plan for the 90+ seat restaurant vs. the 50. We could not give him approval for the person to sell the Christmas trees until that gets fixed.

D. Marshall: Are you suggesting that if we approve the modified site plan this becomes an issue?

J. Duffy: The trees are not a problem.

D. Rogers: The trees just brought it to a head.

J. Duffy: The other question is, if the other pad site gets built in the future, will he have enough parking? He may have to modify the site plan to show some additional parking in the future. Employees are parking on that pad site which is gravel, and he has been told he cannot use that unless he paves it or gets a variance. We are trying to work it out with his engineer.

D. Rogers: Is this the same person that has been selling trees at R&R in the past?

J. Duffy: Yes.

BOARD DISCUSSION

D. Marshall: JoAnn, who established the Community Profile Committee?

J. Duffy: The Town Council. It is a Council initiative.

D. Marshall: It's purpose was to gather information to bring to the Planning Board?

J. Duffy: I think Marc is bringing the Planning Board into it because it will have an effect on you when you go to work on the master plan. For now it is just the community profile event.

D. Marshall: Is staff going to take an active role?

J. Duffy: Yes. Carolyn and I attend their meetings and Carolyn has been doing a lot of the office work. Carolyn and Evelyn marched in the parade and held the banner. They were also in the field passing out fliers.

D. Marshall: If they need volunteers, I would be willing to volunteer for November 7 for whatever is needed.

F. Kotowski: Is is being done with the same format as the last time?

J. Duffy: Yes. There is also a training scheduled for the facilitators on October 27.

F. Kotowski: It is a fun time. I remember one of the things people said at the last one, more than anything else, were passive recreational opportunities. Looking now at what the Conservation Commission is doing and what Kiwanis has done, has brought some of that to light, and maybe that would not have happened had it not been for the event.

P. Scarpetti: I am planning on attending.

F. Kotowski: Do we need to post that as a meeting if there is a quorum?

J. Duffy: We can. It will be posted as a Community Profile event.

D. Rogers: I won't be able to be there.

T. Walsh: Was there a decision on a sub-committee to go over the conservation sub-division ordinance?

J. Duffy: Yes. You and Paul had volunteered to serve on it. Staff just needs to start to pull things

together.

T. Walsh: Has anyone noticed these shoe and clothing dumpsters closer and closer to state roads?

J. Duffy: I don't know who they belong to. I will ask Matt to take a look at them.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Approval of Stantec Invoices

*D. Marshall motioned to approve the Stantec invoices. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

J. Duffy: You should also have an email from Don Ingalls for your information.

D. Rogers: Is there anything pending with my comment?

J. Duffy: No.

ADJOURNMENT

*F. Kotowski motioned to adjourn. Seconded by D. Marshall. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**