

1 **TOWN OF SUNAPEE**

2 **PLANNING BOARD**

3 **JULY 7, 2016**

4 **PRESENT:** Peter White, Chair; Donna Davis Larrow, Vice Chair; Richard Osborne; Joseph Furlong; Kurt  
5 Markarian; Shane Hastings, ex-officio member; Joseph Butler, Alternate; Randy Clark, Alternate; Michael  
6 Marquise, Planner

7 **ABSENT:**

8 **See attached sign in sheet**

9 Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

10 Chairman White appointed Mr. Clark to sit in for Mr. Markarian.

11 **REVISION TO AGENDA**

12 Mr. Marquise said that there is a revision to the agenda. Chairman White said that Item 6 on the  
13 agenda, the Revegetation and Restoration Plan for Parcel ID: 0126-0028-0000, 84 Garnet Hill Rd will not  
14 be presented at the meeting. However, they will be discussing some of the issues related to the case.

15 **CONTINUATION: PARCEL ID: 0148-0025-0000: SUBDIVISION / ANNEXATION; LANCE & CHRISTINA**  
16 **HARBOUR, HAMEL RD.**

17 Mr. Marquise said that the case was extended to September's meeting and he has not received an  
18 update so the case should be continued to the August meeting.

19 Vice Chair Larrow made a motion to continue the case to the next meeting. Mr. Furlong seconded the  
20 motion. The motion passed unanimously.

21 Mr. Markarian arrived and Chairman White appointed Mr. Clark to sit for Mr. Osborne.

22 **PARCEL ID: 0210-0061-0000: MINOR SUBDIVISION: LYNNE BELL TRUST, TROW HILL RD.**

23 Robert Bell explained that the minor subdivision would be for 10.2 acres on Trow Hill Rd; one of their  
24 neighbor's son's asked if they had 10 acres that they could sell them.

25 Mr. Marquise said that the application falls under Section 6.04 of the Subdivision Regulations and it is a  
26 minor subdivision so it is applicable for waivers under 6.05-b. The application was filed in advance, fees  
27 were paid, notices were posted, and abutters were notified. Mr. Marquise continued that under the  
28 6.04 Regulations, all the requirements are there for review and the items that are eligible for waivers  
29 are utility lines, storm water drainage, and water supply facilities. Mr. Marquise said that with those  
30 waivers he believes that the application is complete.

31 Vice Chair Larrow made a motion to accept the application as complete for Parcel ID: 0210-0061-0000,  
32 minor subdivision, Lynne Bell Trust, Trow Hill Rd. Mr. Clark seconded the motion. The motion passed  
33 unanimously.

34 Mr. Bell presented the merits of the case.

35 Mr. Bell was asked about an easement for the road and explained that it is a driveway. The easement  
36 for the driveway will be in the deed.

37 Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that the lot has the necessary road frontage and the  
38 minimum lot size for the Zoning District is three acres so it meets those requirements.

39 Vice Chair Larrow asked Mr. Bell if he knows what the potential owner will do with the lot. Mr. Bell said  
40 that he plans on building a house.

41 Chairman White asked if the land could be further subdivided. Mr. Marquise said that it could not  
42 without more road frontage.

43 Chairman White asked and Mr. Bell confirmed that the lot will be accessed off the existing gravel drive.  
44 Mr. Bell was asked who would maintain the road and said that it would be shared maintenance.

45 Lynda Tallarico, an abutter of the proposed lot, asked about the driveway as Mr. Bell said that it would  
46 be shared maintenance but it has not been as her father mowed the land and now she has been mowing  
47 and maintaining it. The road has been severely eroded and they had spoken with Mr. Bell about helping  
48 fix it but it has not been done and she wanted to know if it was going to be. Chairman White asked and  
49 Mr. Bell confirmed that the driveway is on Mr. Bell's property and Ms. Tallarico has the deeded right to  
50 use the driveway. Mr. Bell said that he has not maintained it as Ms. Tallarico was the only one who used  
51 it. Chairman White asked what the deed says about maintenance. Ms. Tallarico asked if the deed does  
52 not have that the maintenance is split what happens with this proposal. Chairman White said that,  
53 typically, it is the person who has been given the easement or right of way who has to maintain it unless  
54 it says otherwise in the deed. Rick Bates, Ms. Tallarico's husband, said that if the driveway will go up  
55 past their house for this new lot and if the house will be used full time the new owners would use it  
56 more than they do. The road is erosion prone and he is not interested in paying half of the maintenance  
57 if someone else is going to be using it more. If the new owner's driveway branches off earlier and they  
58 have to maintain their piece of it, it is fine. Chairman White said that these issues are more related to  
59 the owners talking to an attorney about their deeds than what the Planning Board can address. Ms.  
60 Tallarico said that she does not believe that it is written in the deed that it is shared. Chairman White  
61 said that deeded access has been given to Ms. Tallarico and he'd question if Mr. Bell has the right to  
62 grant someone else to use that driveway, however, it is not something that the Board can handle as they  
63 do not get into the legalities of right of ways and deed restrictions. There was further discussion  
64 regarding this issue.

65 Ms. Tallarico said that another question that she has is regarding the closeness of the new building to  
66 the stone wall and their property. Chairman White said that there are Zoning setbacks that must be  
67 complied with.

68 Ms. Tallarico asked if the utility lines would come across their property as they are currently utility line  
69 free. Mr. Bell said that is a power company decision. The new owner will be building right up at the top  
70 of the proposed lot and after the driveway is in the power company will typically go up the driveway.  
71 Chairman White asked and Ms. Tallarico explained that the existing power goes along the driveway.

72 Ms. Tallarico said that another issue is that Giovanni Tallarico, her grandfather, is buried at the top of  
73 the proposed lot under a pine tree. She didn't know if there was anything to be done about that tree.  
74 Chairman White said that there is a Cemetery Commission and he thinks that they may want to let them  
75 and the new owner know about that.

76 Chairman White asked and it was confirmed that, currently, Mr. Bell's property surrounds Ms. Tallario's  
77 property on two sides and a driveway right of way was granted to Ms. Tallarico's property. The  
78 subdivision of the property includes part of the right of way. Mr. Bell said that the new owners will have  
79 to grant Ms. Tallarico use of the right of way as it goes with the land. Chairman White said that he  
80 questions that as the right of way is in the deed, how can the land under it be sold. Mr. Bell said that  
81 the wording for the right of way will be put into the new deed.

82 Ms. Tallarico said that another concern that she had is that someone went onto their property and put  
83 stakes on their lawn and they are not in the same place that the other surveyor's big pipes with orange  
84 on them are located. Mr. Bell said that he needs to look at it as it is probably a monument that Clayton  
85 Platt, the surveyor, put in and are temporary. Mr. Marquise said that surveyor's usually establish a  
86 traverse, which is where they put their instruments and are what they use in case they need to go back  
87 to check something and are never on the lines, just usually close to them.

88 Chairman White asked Mr. Marquise if he saw any other issues with the application. Mr. Marquise said  
89 that his first concern is that the current driveway will need some upgrades to it, especially out near the  
90 Town road. He thinks that an updated driveway permit should be requested by the Board.

91 Mr. Marquise said that his second issue was discussed in the peer review as the overall property has an  
92 Alteration of Terrain (AoT) Permit and the permit does show this property as a lot. The concern was if  
93 the creation of this lot alters the AoT permit but it appears that everything that is going on now was part  
94 of the permit and should not effect it. Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that the AoT  
95 permit was for the entire lot and showed the existing and proposed roads and storm water and this lot  
96 was part of the original layout as a lot and nothing has changed as it was understood it was going to be  
97 developed.

98 Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that he does think that a new driveway permit is  
99 needed as the driveway will need some work done to it. Mr. Bell said that it should be moved a little bit  
100 also. Mr. Marquise said that if it was changed it might give a better site distance.

101 Mike Hogan of Keyes Road said that the driveway should not be considered a driveway any longer as it  
102 will serve three properties so it should be considered a road. Chairman White asked and Mr. Hogan  
103 explained that it will be serving the main lot, the new lot, and the Tallarico lot. Mr. Hogan said that the  
104 line on the plan supports that and he thinks that it is clear that it will be an access road to the  
105 development. Mr. Marquise said that he thinks that it would be a road once further development  
106 happens. Mr. Hogan said that further development has already happened. Mr. Marquise said that the  
107 Board has not approved anything and their definition of development is when lots are approved. Mr.  
108 Marquise said that the balance of the land has access from Route 11 and the driveway would not be a  
109 third driveway unless there was a building permit that showed the intent that this would be a driveway.  
110 There was further discussion regarding this matter.

111 Mr. Bell said that he and Mr. Marquise spoke about eventually upgrading the entrance of the driveway  
112 off Trow Hill Rd.

113 Mr. Butler asked about the grade issues with the road that was discussed at a Board meeting last year.  
114 Mr. Bell said that he would discuss that after this hearing.

115 Mr. Osborne arrived but Mr. Clark remained a voting member for the case as Mr. Osborne had not  
116 heard all the merits.

117 Chairman White was asked about the Board getting an update on the remaining acreage as it is not on  
118 the agenda. Chairman White said that he thinks that it is just a consultation. Mr. Bell said that he will  
119 be addressing issues that came up during the last conceptual meeting. The three issues were Keyes Rd,  
120 DOT, and the stone wall. Chairman White said that this is a consultation, which does not need to be  
121 noticed. Mr. Marquise said that Mr. Bell has had a consultation and a design review so the discussion  
122 has to be limited to just an update. Chairman White said that there will not be a vote or anything like  
123 that during the consultation.

124 Mr. Butler asked and Ms. Tallarico confirmed that her grandfather's ashes are buried on the proposed  
125 lot at the base of the large pine tree.

126 Mr. Hogan said that he would like to note that the facts on the ground do matter and if the driveway  
127 was not going to be a planned access to the development he believes that the property line would be  
128 drawn so that incorporated the entrance to the driveway. When you take all the other facts such as  
129 huge roads going through the property and lots being cleared, he believes it should be noted. Mr.  
130 Marquise said that he believes that there is a forum for that, but it needs to be a hearing.

131 Mr. Clark asked what is said on the deed regarding the road. Mr. Bell said that it is currently a right of  
132 way for a driveway. Mr. Bell said that it will be a shared driveway and they will need to discuss the  
133 maintenance.

134 Mr. Butler asked if the driveway currently serves three lots or two. The Board said that the driveway  
135 only serves one lot as there is not a house on the other lot and they can't presume what Mr. Bell's  
136 development strategy will be.

137 Chairman White said that the plan meets the current requirements and what Mr. Bell does in the future  
138 must meet the requirements. However, the Board cannot say that they know what he is going to do in  
139 the future.

140 Vice Chair Larrow suggested putting into the motion that this will be a driveway for the two parcels and  
141 any further development will require a future application. Mr. Marquise said that it states the obvious  
142 but at least it would be laid out in the motion. Vice Chair Larrow said that if it is in the motion then it is  
143 part of the record.

144 Vice Chair Larrow made a motion to approve the minor subdivision of Parcel ID: 0210-0061-0000 for the  
145 Lynne Bell Trust on Trow Hill Rd, with the requirement of an updated driveway permit and that the  
146 driveway is acknowledged to be a driveway for the two parcels, the new lot and the existing lot owned  
147 by Lynda Tallarico, and any upgrade or further use of the driveway toward a road will require Planning

148 approval; further, the Board will need an updated map including the correct spelling and the utility lines  
149 corrected. Mr. Markarian seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

150 **OTHER BUSINESS**

151 **PARCEL ID: 0210-0061-0000, LYNNE BELL TRUST, TROW HILL RD.**

152 Mr. Bell said that when he was last before the Board there were three issues: the use of Keyes Rd as a  
153 second exit for emergency vehicles; a DOT issue with trying to buy a small piece of land from them; and,  
154 the stone wall that they built.

155 Mr. Bell said that he spoke with Mr. Landry about the stone wall and they decided that the Zoning Board  
156 might be where they start but they do not own the land, the State does. This issue will have to wait  
157 until they clear up the right of way. Mr. Bell continued that they submitted a request a year ago this  
158 month for doing that and they were told it would take about a year. The State's last response to them  
159 was that they might get to it this summer. They are, therefore, on hold with that as well as the stone  
160 wall.

161 Mr. Bell said that on the Keyes Rd issue they have failed to reach an agreement with the property  
162 owners on Keyes Rd to use it for the occasional use for emergency vehicles. Mr. Bell explained to the  
163 Board what they are proposing with the plan provided to them. Chairman White asked and Mr. Bell  
164 confirmed that he will probably not make the indicated changes until he gets permission from the State  
165 for the Route 11 issues. Mr. Bell said that the State said that they have done all the things that they  
166 needed to do but the last step is getting a value and the Appraisal Department is backed up.

167 Vice Chair Larrow asked and Mr. Bell confirmed that the stone wall is on State land. Ms. Tallarico asked  
168 and Mr. Bell explained that the stone wall is the retaining wall holding up the road that you see from  
169 Route 11. It is 70 ft from the centerline and the regulation says that any structure over 42 inches has to  
170 be 75 ft from the centerline. Ms. Tallarico asked if Mr. Bell will need to move the stone wall for 5 ft.  
171 Chairman White explained that it will be up to the Zoning Board to decide.

172 Ms. Tallarico asked and Mr. Bell confirmed that the proposed road will still egress as it does now.

173 Mr. Butler asked if Mr. Bell discussed the grade of the road with the State. Mr. Bell said that part of the  
174 road had trouble with water and he rebuilt and raised that section so that it lessened the pitch. He has  
175 not had Mr. Platt check to see if it meets the Town's grade requirements.

176 Mr. Butler asked if the proposed emergency road would be gravel. Mr. Bell said that is what he is  
177 proposing and if he would be maintaining the road and Ms. Tallarico would be granted an additional  
178 easement on the new road.

179 Chairman White asked about the red dot indicated on the plan. Mr. Bell explained that it is temporary  
180 power to the communication tower in a pine tree on the top of Trow Hill for the Fire and Police. There  
181 was further discussion regarding this tower.

182 Robert Philbrick of 94 Trow Hill Rd said that he was surprised to hear that the driveway being discussed  
183 will be moved 60 ft, which is further away from the lot that was just created. Mr. Bell said that it would  
184 be close to the stone wall.

185 **OTHER BUSINESS**

186 **PARCEL ID: 0126-0028-0000: REVEGETATION & RESTORATION PLAN. 84 GARNET HILL RD, DOUG**  
187 **SANDERS.**

188 Chairman White said that there was a meeting with the owner of the property and other  
189 representatives of the owner, himself, Mr. Landry, and Selectman Gottling before this hearing to discuss  
190 this matter and it was determined that it does not need to be heard by the Board.

191 Mr. Marquise said that there was a building permit taken out for this property which was approved as  
192 well as a DES Shoreland Permit, and a Land Disturbance Permit. The work was done and there was  
193 cutting, clearing, and excavation. At some point there was a concern about the number of trees taken  
194 out and Mr. Landry and DES have looked at it. DES' recommendation were just a few minor  
195 adjustments. Mr. Landry had more serious concerns with local regulations and suggested that they  
196 come before the Board as it fell under the Cutting and Clearing Regulations, which talks about cutting  
197 within the Natural Woodland Buffer of more than five (5) trees having a diameter of six (6) inches or  
198 more at a point 4.5 feet above existing ground and removal of large areas of vegetation over one  
199 thousand (1,000) square feet within the Natural Woodland Buffer. Mr. Marquise continued that at the  
200 meeting it was determined that there were more than five (5) trees removed, but when it came down to  
201 dates and permits given, none had happened within a calendar year. There were six (6) to ten (10) trees  
202 that came down during a storm last September. Permits were given at the end of 2015 for four (4) more  
203 trees, and permits were given at the end of 2016 for five (5) more trees. Mr. Marquise said that it did  
204 not seem to trigger anything with the Planning Board based on those permits. Also, in the rules there  
205 are fairly generous exemption of clearing allowed around the house up to 20 ft and that threshold was  
206 met. They did discuss this further and they may not have met the Town's basal area requirements and  
207 they will need to go before Mr. Landry and the Selectmen to show how they will get back to the nine (9)  
208 square feet of basal area and how they will have a well distributed stand.

209 Chairman White asked and Mr. Osborne confirmed that there were quite a few trees that were knocked  
210 down on the lot during the microburst last year. It seems like they were sheared off and laying down on  
211 the lot for quite a while. Mr. Marquise said that there were nine (9) other trees that were permitted to  
212 be taken down since then.

213 Chairman White asked if when they got the permit in 2015 to take down the four (4) trees if they did it  
214 then or if they waited until 2016 to remove them. Mr. Marquise said that they did it all in December of  
215 last year and then cut five (5) more trees when they did the construction.

216 Chairman White asked if all the tree cutting meets the State requirements. Mr. Marquise said that what  
217 he understands is that the State has a points system and there are still trees on the property, they just  
218 have to meet the number of points that the State requires. There is an area up by the house that the  
219 State has asked them to revegetate. Mr. Marquise continued that the State was not concerned as they  
220 meet the 50% basal area with the exemptions for clearing around the house. They may not meet the  
221 Town's requirement for nine (9) square feet of basal area and that will require some replanting; they  
222 also may not meet the Town's well distributed requirement so they will need to revegetate. Mr.  
223 Marquise said that the land owner was at the meeting and he is doesn't seem to have any qualms about  
224 doing the work.

225 Chairman White asked if revegetation will be blueberry bushes. Mr. Marquise said that it can be that,  
226 however, they do need to meet the basal area of trees so they need to have at least two (2) inch or  
227 greater diameter trees planted to get back up to the nine (9) square feet. They can fill holes with bushes  
228 and shrubs but they still need to plant some trees.

229 Chairman White said that he deals with a lot of Shoreland development and what he was shown is  
230 something that he never imagined that they would try, nor get away with if they wanted to try. He was  
231 very taken back by the amount of work and the amount of cutting that went on. Mr. Marquise said that  
232 it was all permissible. There needs to be a Board conversation about the five (5) trees in a calendar year  
233 as what that means is in a thirteen (13) month period of time fifteen (15) trees can be cut. Chairman  
234 White said that there is a caveat that owners are supposed to leave a well distributed stand of trees.  
235 Mr. Marquise said that there needs to be a well distributed basal area of nine (9) square feet. The well  
236 distributed stand applies to vegetation. Chairman White asked how the nine (9) square feet of basal  
237 area can be regulated. Mr. Marquise explained that a two (2) foot diameter tree equates to three (3)  
238 square feet of basal area; two (2) inch diameter trees does not add up fast.

239 Mr. Butler asked and Mr. Marquise explained that there were concerns about the lot based on the  
240 visible nature of losing that many trees; there are still some trees and vegetation on the lot. Mr.  
241 Osborne said that there is a big dead tree and he doesn't know why they left that tree. Mr. Butler asked  
242 and Mr. Marquise said that they did not pull the stumps.

243 Chairman White said that Mr. Landry was quite concerned about this and when they spoke it did not  
244 seem as though they complied with the Shoreland Permit. Mr. Marquise said that it is his understanding  
245 that there were only minor deviations from the Shoreland Permit application. Chairman White asked  
246 and Mr. Marquise confirmed that they needed to submit a revegetation plan to DES for a small area.  
247 Chairman White asked if Mr. Marquise is talking about the 50 ft buffer zone or the unaltered area. Mr.  
248 Marquise said that it is the unaltered area; within the 50 ft buffer zone they have kept the 50 points.  
249 Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that they have 100 ft of Shoreland. Chairman  
250 White explained how the points are calculated. There was further discussion regarding this matter.

251 Mr. Furlong asked and Mr. Marquise explained that none of the trees that were taken down in the  
252 microburst were counted against them, the same way that putting the building in and getting 20 ft  
253 around that adds to the number that can be cut as well as 20 ft around the driveway. There was further  
254 discussion regarding this issue as well as allowances for cutting.

255 There was a discussion about the required basal area and how it is calculated.

256 Daniel Schneider asked who approves the revegetation plan if the Planning Board does not. Mr.  
257 Marquise said that the Board of Selectmen do. Selectman Gottling asked if when the plan goes to the  
258 Board of Selectmen if anyone from the Planning Board would go to the meeting to explain it to them.  
259 Mr. Marquise said that he thinks Mr. Landry would be the person to make the recommendation to the  
260 Board as it is going through Zoning. Mr. Butler asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that Mr. Landry  
261 would oversee the work until it was completed.

262 June Fichter of LSPA asked who will design the revegetation plan. One reason for the regulations is to  
263 protect the Lake and stop runoff so if this home owner is in arrears relative to the Town's regulations,

264 would they need to hire an arborist or a forester to design the system for replacement vegetation that  
265 would take up the same function as the trees and vegetation that were removed. Chairman White said  
266 that it would probably be done by a landscape architect. Mr. Marquise said that there was a landscape  
267 architect at the meeting with the owner. Selectman Gottling asked if there is a Town arborist. Mr.  
268 Marquise said that he believes that Anita Blakeman only does the tree stumpage but the Selectman  
269 could have someone that they could use as a resource to look at the plan. Mr. Landry will be looking at  
270 the plan as well to see if it meets the basal area. Selectman Gottling said that it would be nice to be sure  
271 that there is sufficient information that the correction happens.

272 Chairman White asked if there was any determination at the meeting that there is a violation. Mr.  
273 Marquise said that the landscape architect is going to do the calculations and bring it to Mr. Landry  
274 along with a plan as to how to get the basal area back to the nine (9) square feet if needed.

275 Chairman White asked if there was a survey done for the Shoreland Permit. Mr. Marquise said that the  
276 survey that was done in October showed all the trees that were in place at the time. He did not see the  
277 permit to see what was going to be taken out. There was further discussion regarding this issue.

278 Chairman White said that it sounds as though they also violated the State's unaltered requirement  
279 within the 150 ft buffer. Mr. Marquise said that the State did say that they needed to make some minor  
280 changes within that buffer.

281 Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise said that there was no timeline given, though he will keep  
282 talking to Mr. Landry about it as it is an outstanding violation. Chairman White said that it sounds like  
283 other than the nine (9) square foot basal area, what was done is permissible. Mr. Marquise said that it  
284 met the State regulations for the 50 points, though they did need to fix the unaltered area; it may not  
285 meet all the Town regulations. Mr. Landry could issue a cease and desist for the construction if they do  
286 not comply with the Zoning.

287 Mr. Butler asked about the Zoning Regulations and Mr. Marquise said that the Planning Board creates  
288 the Zoning Regulations. There was further discussion regarding this matter.

289 Selectman Gottling said that she thinks that the regulation should be changed so that a certain number  
290 of trees can only be cut within a twelve (12) month period, not a calendar year. Another thing she  
291 things should be added is that if there is a blow down of big trees those should be counted towards the  
292 trees that can be removed.

293 Vice Chair Larrow asked how many trees were lost during the storm. Mr. Marquise said that between  
294 six (6) and ten (10) and then the ten (10) more. Mr. Marquise said that Mr. Landry said there were  
295 nineteen (19) fresh stumps. Mr. Butler asked the average size trees that were lost. Mr. Osborne said  
296 that there were some big trees that blew down as a year or two before the lot had been cleaned up so it  
297 was more open than it was before.

298 Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise said that the Board should probably talk about the tree cutting  
299 regulations again at the September meeting to discuss Zoning amendments. The Board also needs to  
300 discuss the new accessory dwelling unit law.



301 Chairman White said that he would like to get an update on this situation at the August Board meeting.  
302 Mr. Marquise said that they will discuss the situation at the peer review meeting and he will get an  
303 update for the Board.

304 Nancy Marashio of the Lake Sunapee Protective Association commended the seriousness of which the  
305 Board is taking restoration as they are setting a nice precedence for the watershed. The Town may want  
306 to look at the regulations in terms of restoration as well. There was further discussion regarding this  
307 matter.

308 **MISCELLANEOUS**

309 Chairman White said that at the next Zoning Board meeting there is a property owner who is looking for  
310 four (4) variances on a property.

311 There was a discussion regarding a property on Mary's Rd that is being renovated that never had to go  
312 to the Planning Board and the trees that have been removed.

313 There was a brief discussion regarding the Master Plan proposed traffic common for Route 11.

314 **Changes to the Minutes from the June 2, 2016 meeting:**

315 Vice Chair Larrow made a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion  
316 passed with six in favor and one abstention.

317 The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

318 Respectfully submitted,

319 Melissa Pollari

320

321

322 Planning Board

323 \_\_\_\_\_

324 Peter White, Chairman

325 \_\_\_\_\_

326 Kurt Markarian

327 \_\_\_\_\_

328 Joseph Furlong

329 \_\_\_\_\_

330 Shane Hastings, ex-officio member

\_\_\_\_\_

Donna Davis Larrow, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_

Richard Osborne

\_\_\_\_\_

Joseph Butler

\_\_\_\_\_

Randy Clark, Alternate Member