

**TOWN OF DUCK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
April 10, 2013**

The Planning Board for the Town of Duck convened at the Duck Meeting Hall on Wednesday, April 10, 2013.

Present were: Chair Joe Blakaitis, Vice-Chair John Fricker, Ron Forlano, and Marc Murray.

Absent: Tim McKeithan.

Also present were: Director of Community Development Andy Garman, Council Liaison Chuck Burdick, and Permit Coordinator Sandy Cross.

Others Present: Mark Copeland, Ashley Copland, Councilor Jon Britt, Doug Styons of Styons Surveying, Inc., and Public Information Officer Denise Walsh.

Absent: None.

Chair Blakaitis called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning Board for April 10, 2013 at 6:36 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

It was *consensus* of the Board to move up New Business on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion/Consideration of SUB 13-01, an Application by Styons Surveying, Inc., on Behalf of Jane K. Terry (Koenig Family) for Approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plat for a Three Lot Subdivision at 1284 Duck Road

Director Garman stated that the subdivision plat for 1284 Duck Road was for one lot at 92,000 square feet owned by Jane K. Terry and the Koenig family. He stated that they wished to subdivide the property into three lots. He noted that the family owns a cottage on the southern portion of the site and they wished to create a new lot for the cottage to sit on to retain it and then create two additional lots next to it. He pointed out that North Carolina General Statutes allows divisions of land to be exempt from subdivision ordinances if the total area of the subdivision is two acres or less and created three or fewer lots. He stated that if the property was a tenth of an acre less, this would have qualified for an exempt subdivision. He explained that it would have meant they would not have to go through the formal subdivision process like they were doing and would just have to submit a plat to Town staff to review and it would be signed as long as the area of the lots met the Town's zoning ordinance and if the lot met the frontage and configuration requirements.

Director Garman stated that because the lot was 2.1 acres, the applicant had to go through the subdivision process. He added that Doug Styons was present to represent the applicant. He stated that the Board was looking to make sure the applicant provided the proper configuration of the lots according to the Town's zoning ordinance, that they have met the specific criteria of the ordinance, they are not creating unusable pieces of land, and they have met all of the area and width requirements. He stated that the applicant was not proposing to create any new streets since all three lots front Duck Road. He stated that the Health Department had reviewed the plat and determined they should be able to issue wastewater permits for any new houses on these sites at the time that building permits are applied for. He felt that the plat met the requirements of the ordinance for a subdivision and would recommend approval with one condition – the encroachment of the septic system from the existing dwelling onto the new lot be addressed prior to recordation of the final plat.

Director Garman noted that the preliminary plat would go before the Town Council should the Planning Board recommend approval. He added that after Town Council approval of the preliminary plat, the applicant would install any required improvements and come back to the Planning Board for final plat approval.

Doug Styons of Styons Surveying, Inc. was recognized to speak. Mr. Styons reviewed the relocation of the septic system and driveways with the Board and audience.

Director Garman stated that staff had suggested a shared easement for the driveways between Lot B and C in order to limit the number of access points on Duck Road. He added that it was a reasonable condition that the applicant agreed to in order to limit the number of driveways.

Member Forlano asked if the intent was to develop Lots B and C and leave Lot A as an existing structure. He further asked if there was any intent to do anything with Lot A. Director Garman stated that there was no guarantee that this would be the case; but staff understood that this was the applicant's intent.

Vice Chair Fricker moved that the Planning Board recommend to Town Council that they approve the preliminary subdivision plat with the condition that the septic system serving the existing dwelling be relocated so that it does not encroach on Lot B prior to approval of the final plat.

Director Garman noted that the preliminary plat would go to Town Council and then the final plat would come before the Planning Board again.

Member Forlano seconded.

Motion carried 4-0.

Discussion/Consideration of CUP 13-01, a Conditional Use Permit Amendment Application by Mr. Mark Copeland on Behalf of Big Momma, LLC, Property Owner at 1193 Duck Road, to Allow an Accessory Bar Service Building and Outdoor Entertainment Area to be

Located on the Property of the Roadside Bar and Grill for the Purpose of Accommodating Special Events

Director Garman stated that staff received an application from Mark Copeland to establish an outdoor customer service entertainment area at the Roadside Bar and Grill. He explained that there was an existing shed in the northeast corner of the property and the applicant had already constructed the outdoor service area as part of the shed. He added that the application showed it to be a 12x18 area and he believed there was some alcohol service facilities there based on staff's inspection. He stated that this was a violation staff discovered because there were no permits issued for the construction. After speaking with Mr. Copeland, he agreed to apply for the Conditional Use permit amendment to see if he could have the structure retroactively approved. From there he would obtain building permits in order to be in compliance with the building code.

Director Garman stated that Mr. Copeland had acknowledged that if the permit was denied, he would have to bring the structure into compliance and apply for a revised conditional use permit. He noted that the Board was given copies of all communications prior to this meeting with Mr. Copeland about the matter. He stated that in looking at the ordinance as it applied to this issue, the only thing it could be considered under would be the Village Commercial Development Option since the zoning ordinance normally requires structures such as this to meet a setback of 10 feet on the side yard and 20 feet in the rear yard. He noted that the structure encroached into the side yard and rear yard of the property. He reminded the Board that with the Village Commercial Development Option, an applicant was allowed to have their projects considered on a case by case basis and during that process; Council can consider modifications to the setback standards.

Director Garman stated that when staff communicated with Mr. Copeland, he was asked to provide information to submit with his application. Staff analyzed it and felt that based on prior experiences with other permits, there was no real rational basis for allowing the encroachment into the setbacks as there wasn't enough information provided for staff to take a hard look at the application. He stated that staff was recommending denial of the application. He pointed out that Mark and Ashley Copeland were present to discuss the application as well as answer any questions from the Board.

Director Garman explained that with Conditional Use Permits, letters to adjacent property owners have to be mailed out from Town staff and staff received comments via email from the owner of the Loblolly Pines shopping center. He presented the comments to the Board. He added that Mark Copeland talked with the Health Department about the project and received a letter with their opinion regarding the repair area. He presented that letter to the Board as well.

Chair Blakaitis stated that he wanted Mark Copeland to address the concerns with the adjacent property owner. Mark Copeland was recognized to speak. Mr. Copeland stated that Duck has always had a problem with parking. He noted that most of his business was walk-ins and added that there were times his parking lot was full, so customers would park at the adjacent property. He stated that the delivery trucks he receives all come into his parking lot.

Ashley Copeland was recognized to speak. Ms. Copeland noted that the outside shed was there since 1995 and has evolved since then. She stated that it was non-heated space and was used for

the first time at one of the Jazz Festival parties. Chair Blakaitis asked that Mark Copeland finish speaking.

Chair Blakaitis clarified that Mark Copeland's employees were using the parking lot. Mark Copeland stated that if the parking lot was full, they would have to park elsewhere. He added that his employees had parked at the Town property before the buildings were built, but were told they weren't allowed to. Chair Blakaitis clarified that Mr. Copeland didn't feel that parking was a large concern and was used by people that frequented the restaurant. Mr. Copeland stated that he asks his employees to move their vehicles. Chair Blakaitis asked if the delivery trucks were able to get into his driveway. Mr. Copeland stated that they are since they are done early in the mornings.

Vice Chair Fricker clarified that it was staff's position to recommend denial of the Conditional Use Permit. Director Garman stated he was correct. Vice Chair Fricker asked if anything has changed with respect to the information received from the applicant since Director Garman's email to them on February 6, 2013, where additional information was requested. Director Garman stated that the applicant provided a narrative and did address an encroachment that had existed on the neighboring property. Vice Chair Fricker asked if the roof of the shed was still within the 10 foot side setback. Director Garman stated that it was. Vice Chair Fricker asked if it was a violation of one of the Town's ordinances. Director Garman stated that it was.

Chair Blakaitis noted that the Health Department was the one that concludes that a structure has no negative impact on the wastewater site. He added that the shed was still in violation of the Town's ordinance. Director Garman agreed, adding that the Health Department has their own rules and it was Town staff's understanding that the repair area needed to be reserved in case it had to be used. If the Health Department decides to allow things on the repair area, that would be their business. He stated that the shed roof was in the 10 foot setback and the Town requires a side yard setback of 10 feet. Chair Blakaitis clarified that it was at 2.6 feet. Director Garman stated he was correct. Chair Blakaitis asked if the gravel was still an issue. Director Garman stated that the survey showed that it had dirt and loose stone, but that it would appear to be relatively compacted and he would have a hard time saying that it wasn't lot coverage. Chair Blakaitis asked what would happen if it was considered lot coverage. Director Garman stated that it would count toward the lot coverage. He added that Mr. Copeland would still be under the 60% requirement.

Member Forlano asked if any portion of the shed was on the repair area. Director Garman stated that it was. He added that the Health Department regulated what was allowed on the repair area.

Vice Chair Fricker asked about technical violations without practical impact. He thought that the roof remaining within Mr. Copeland's side yard setback along the property line that bordered the vegetable stand would be considered a technical violation. Director Garman stated that it was a technical violation because it was in the 10 foot side yard setback and did not meet the requirements of the Town's ordinance. He explained that the Village Commercial Development Option is the only procedure the Town has to allow a deviation from this. Vice Chair Fricker asked if there was a lack of communication or if Mr. Copeland did not understand that the building could remain, but it should be filed under the proper ordinance. Director Garman stated that if staff looked at it under the Village Commercial Development Option, he wasn't sure if it

would be allowed because the Town has never permitted a building to be within two feet of the setback for any of the Village Commercial Development Option projects. Vice Chair Fricker clarified that there were no other commercial establishments within the Village business district that were in violation of the setbacks. Director Garman stated that there have been quite a few that were allowed to have some sort of impact on the setback but they were always things that were looked at up front and not after the fact; and he didn't think the Town ever permitted anything to be so close to the property line.

Chair Blakaitis asked if the core of the problem was the shed. Director Garman stated that it was and added that the rear setback encroachment may be looked at more favorably since there is a significant vertical separation between the properties. He pointed out that Mr. Copeland holds oyster roasts and shows movies. He wondered if the activities would cause problems for the adjacent residential uses and if staff had enough information to evaluate it at this point and time.

Member Murray thought there were two issues – one was with the structure and the other was with the use. He asked if they could be discussed separately. Chair Blakaitis stated that he was more concerned that there wasn't enough information provided for the entire use for the Board to even evaluate. He asked if the Board should have more information regarding the use and a more adequate description of it. Director Garman didn't think enough information had been received and added that it was hard to get the information during the meeting and then try to make a decision. Chair Blakaitis asked what additional information was needed and further asked if Mr. Copeland was told about the additional information. Director Garman stated that he had stated in the email what was needed.

Vice Chair Fricker stated that he got the sense that Mr. Copeland thought that what he was doing was no big deal. He wasn't sure if Mr. Copeland had been adequately educated as to how the Town liked to have things done. He thought Director Garman and Mr. Copeland could sit down and work things out instead of having the Board decide. Mark Copeland stated that he was ready to do whatever the Board wanted him to do. He added that he submitted an application for a bulkhead for the hill that was 20 feet high. He asked if he bulkheaded in the rear of the property, why he couldn't have the shed where it currently existed. Vice Chair Fricker didn't think Mr. Copeland understood. He added that he was told that he had two options – tear the shed down or submit something that the Board could evaluate. He noted that Mr. Copeland had not done either. He stated that the Board could vote the project up or down or Mr. Copeland could withdraw and resubmit.

Ashley Copeland felt there had been a lack of communication. Vice Chair Fricker suggested that she read the letter from Director Garman. Chair Blakaitis thought Director Garman had provided his concerns as well as what should be provided to the Town – addressing the use of the building, the frequency, the patrons anticipated and the parking demand. He added that the plan Mr. Copeland had mentioned was not on paper. Ms. Copeland asked if the response letter they had written to the Town was not detailed enough. Director Garman thought that the Copelands have as many seats as they were allowed. He added that in order to add additional seats to the restaurant, they may have to come up with more parking or more septic. Mark Copeland stated that he was not adding seats. Director Garman stated that if the Copelands were to apply for a permit to add to the restaurant, they would have a hard time getting approved based on septic and parking. He stated that the second issue was whether they were just doing special events and not

something that was considered a regular use. He added that any business in Town could have special events.

Chair Blakaitis noted that it did not fall under outdoor eating but was in between. Director Garman stated that outdoor eating would be considered part of a regular business use and if this was not part of the regular business use and something that was a special event, the Town's ordinance defined how many times a special event could be held. He stated that if the Copelands were to operate consistent with the special events ordinance, staff would have less of an issue with the overall parking situation because they would have few enough events that would be considered special events and not part of the regular business use. He stated that they would have to offer up a limit on how many special events they could have.

Vice Chair Fricker suggested telling the Copelands what the limit was and see if they would provide something in writing. Ashley Copeland stated that the only times they have events were during the shoulder seasons. Chair Blakaitis noted that there were guidelines for special events that have to be met.

Member Murray thought that for any special event, approval from the Health Department was needed. Mark Copeland stated that it was, if any outside cooking was done. Member Murray stated that the Town had a special events ordinance that required notification and details of the event. Director Garman stated that the ordinance did indicate how many events that could be held in a year. Member Murray thought the Board needed to see things in writing before they could evaluate the issue. Director Garman thought if the Copelands agreed to look at it that way; it would need to be packaged up and presented to the Board.

Vice Chair Fricker asked if the application was withdrawn and then resubmitted; what the criteria under which the existing location of the building could remain would be. Director Garman stated that the criteria the Board could look at was under the Village Commercial Development Option. He noted that Mr. Copeland had indicated that he could cut the roof off the shed on the east side to minimize the side yard encroachment. Mark Copeland stated that the rear setback had him concerned.

Member Murray asked if there were any considerations of not increasing a non-conformity when staff evaluates a Conditional Use Permit application. Director Garman stated that there was a provision regarding not increasing the non-conformity. He added that if the shed encroached into the rear yard setback, it could stay as long as it was not taken down or rebuilt. He stated that the front of the shed could be removed as long as the portion that was new met the setback requirements.

Member Forlano asked if the Board were to approve the Conditional Use Permit, Mr. Copeland would still need to get a permit and have inspections done. Director Garman stated that he would as it would have to meet the North Carolina Building Code.

Chair Blakaitis wondered if the Board could take any action at this point. He thought they couldn't until all of the items have been addressed. Vice Chair Fricker thought if it came to a vote, he would recommend against approval for the reasons stated. He felt that Mr. Copeland

should withdraw and resubmit. Ashley Copeland stated that they wished to withdraw their application.

OLD BUSINESS

Review/Discussion of Low-Impact Development Workshop and Further Planning Efforts

Director Garman stated that he wanted to get the Board's thoughts and opinions of the workshop they had attended as well as having a brief discussion on how they wished to move forward. He noted that, as mentioned in the meeting, they were still working on the things they were doing at the state level to revise the stormwater manual to incorporate LID as well as working on the spreadsheet tool that would be valuable for the local engineering community in order to successfully submit projects to the state to meet the LID requirements. He stated that his initial reaction was to develop an ordinance once the state has updated their LID manual and didn't feel the need to get something in place prior to them completing their process.

Director Garman stated that he received a telephone call from a representative of the Coastal Federation and she indicated that they were going to hold another workshop in May to focus mainly on the local government community. He stated that he would be attending and added that members of the Board could attend as well, but were not required to. He stated that the Board could have a discussion at a later meeting as to what was learned from the workshop and then start the process with drafting an ordinance.

Member Forlano thought that after Director Garman attends the workshop, the Board should put their heads together to start working on an ordinance. He felt that after the May workshop, the Board needed to move forward to come up with something.

Vice Chair Fricker clarified that the process would not be completed until mid-2014, but the presenter at the workshop hoped to have his work within a couple of months. Director Garman stated he was correct, adding that the spreadsheet would be done this summer and the manual would be updated next spring. Vice Chair Fricker asked if the spreadsheet would have sufficient data in it that the Board could use as a guide while drafting the ordinance. Chair Blakaitis thought it was the intent. Director Garman thought it was possible. He added that the stormwater manual would be updated and all the BMPs for the stormwater would be added for all of the LID techniques, but he wasn't sure what it would look like and would be hard to say what the relationship would be between the spreadsheet and the stormwater manual itself.

NEW BUSINESS - CONTINUED

Discussion of Regulating Beach Push Activities

Director Garman noted that beach pushing ends for the season in approximately two weeks and would not start up again until November 15, 2013.

Vice Chair Fricker asked if a homeowner could do a beach push after the season ended. Permit Coordinator Sandy Cross was recognized to speak. Permit Coordinator Cross stated that there would have to be serious, extenuating circumstances as to why it needed to be done. Vice Chair

Fricker asked if something was deemed an emergency, such as the water being within 20 feet of the footprint of the house, it would qualify as an emergency. Permit Coordinator Cross stated that since it has never happened, she couldn't say. She stated that the one time it did happen, she had to call the Division of Marine Fisheries, Wildlife Resources and the Corps of Engineers to make sure they approved of it before she would allow it. Member Murray asked if it was considered a CAMA decision. Permit Coordinator Cross stated that it was; however, if it happened after May 1st, it became an issue requiring the involvement of several state agencies. Vice Chair Fricker asked what the considerations were. Permit Coordinator Cross stated it was due to the turtle nests.

Council Liaison Burdick noted that the Town of Nags Head did their beach nourishment project during the off season and thought it was more of a question of how serious the push was as well as the impact on the turtle nests. Permit Coordinator Cross noted that the nourishment project would have required major CAMA permits. She added that a simple beach push would require her to contact three state agencies to obtain their approval. Director Garman stated that beach pushes in the off season were very rare.

Vice Chair Fricker stated that he wanted Council Liaison Burdick and Councilor Jon Britt to tell the Board where Council was coming from and the substance of the conversation regarding regulating beach push activities. Council Liaison Burdick stated that it came up as part of the overall beach nourishment discussion. He added that there was a question in people's minds that allowing beach pushes would be to the detriment or benefit of maintaining the dune system. He stated that one of the concerns was that as the Town moved forward with some kind of beach project, changing the beach profile by allowing beach pushes aggravates the overall impact of storms because the beach was flatter. He added that with a flatter beach, the velocity of waves against the dunes was higher causing more dune erosion. He stated that the question was if the Town had in place a mechanism that would maximize the long-term health of the dune system assuming the Town decided to do a beach nourishment project.

Chair Blakaitis asked if the issue came up during the Council discussion or if it was due to outside input. Councilor Britt stated that it came from Council discussion. He thought another way to look at it was that the Town was investing a lot of time and effort into the beach and Council wanted to make sure the activities that were occurring would not negatively impact the beach.

Ed Sadler of 161 Buffell Head Road was recognized to speak. Mr. Sadler stated that the beach has never been flatter. He added that the beach has been nourished by the dune. He stated that doing beach pushes did not hurt the beach. He wasn't sure if it helped the dune but reiterated that it did not hurt the beach. He stated that he had spent a lot of money because of erosion and added that what one single homeowner does did not make a difference. He thought that if the Town didn't do something to take care of the beach, 30-40 houses would be lost. He didn't think anything would be accomplished by banning beach pushes.

Member Murray thought a restriction should be put in place once the nourishment occurred. Director Garman stated that the question was whether the Town would put something in place before the nourishment occurred because it would be considered an engineered beach. Member

Murray wondered if it was for the Board to say whether it was or was not helpful. He wasn't sure but felt it wasn't for the Board to say until the beach became a community property.

Chair Blakaitis asked if there was any sense of urgency at the Council level to do something sooner rather than later. Councilor Britt stated that there was a huge sense of urgency but with everything going on, it was understandable that it would take time. Director Garman stated that there was another issue that would be coming to the Board in the future. He stated that the issue was pools being allowed back on the beach. He stated that there were concerns about that activity and staff was asked to provide alternatives to limiting how close pools could be constructed to the first line of stable natural vegetation. He added that it would be brought to the Council where they would provide guidance and then it would probably come to the Board.

Vice Chair Fricker felt that everyone from elected officials to Town staff should be educating themselves. He added that the information he was provided was very disturbing regarding beach pushes. He stated that if he was asked today if there were detrimental effects, he would agree and vote against the pushes but if he were to vote as a property owner, he would vote not to prohibit because the homeowners need to have options. He stated that if Council was not going to act quickly on the issue, then they needed to allow homeowners the option of beach pushes.

Member Murray thought that owners do the beach pushes for differing reasons, but were all doing it as an act of good faith as a stop gap measure for something more comprehensive. He agreed with Vice Chair Fricker that the Town needed to do something. Council Liaison Burdick stated that the Board needed guidance for the long-term. He noted that the Town has a short-term problem and everyone recognized that, adding that there was no blanket answer on how to deal with it yet. He stated that Council needed to make a decision and thought it would be done in the next month or so.

Council Liaison Burdick asked the Board if there was anything they thought that Council should be doing in the short term or if it should be left as part of the long term decision. Vice Chair Fricker didn't think it was the official question before the Board if he was looking for global guidance from the Board. Councilor Britt wondered if Council did not have a plan yet, how the Planning Board could plan. Member Murray thought that if beach nourishment was going to be done, the Board could consider an ordinance to prohibit beach pushes. Council Liaison Burdick asked the Board if they had any guidance that they wished to offer in the short term. Vice Chair Fricker stated that he would not allow people to put pools back between their home and the dune. Member Murray agreed. Vice Chair Fricker thought the pool issue should have come before the Board before the beach push one. Director Garman agreed, adding that it was a complicated issue.

Council Liaison Burdick didn't think the pool issue should be held off at this point. Director Garman agreed. Chair Blakaitis stated that the Board would be happy to move forward on the issue. Director Garman stated that staff would be bringing something to Council at their May 1, 2013 meeting and would go from there. Councilor Britt thought Council would be discussing the issue in-depth. Director Garman stated that if Council decided to send it to the Planning Board, he would make sure it would be put on the May 8, 2013 agenda.

Chair Blakaitis felt that the issue would be a hot one but thought the Board had received some good information from Director Garman that could be reviewed and blended in with whatever Council sends back. Vice Chair Fricker asked if the Board had accomplished what Director Garman and Council wanted the Board to do. Chair Blakaitis thought the Board did. Director Garman suggested that he let Council know that the Planning Board felt it was premature to adopt regulations regarding beach pushes without additional guidance. Council Liaison Burdick thought the Board didn't see a reason to adopt a resolution on beach pushes because the information presented to them was not helpful. He added that the option needed to be left open pending a resolution and decision on beach nourishment. Vice Chair Fricker and Chair Blakaitis agreed. Vice Chair Fricker stated that if Council initiates a short term stop gap, the Planning Board could discuss restrictions at that time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning Board Meeting – February 13, 2013

Member Murray had corrections on Page 2 and Page 4.

Chair Blakaitis moved to approve the minutes from February 13, 2013 as amended. Vice Chair Fricker seconded.

Motion carried 4-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion of Schedule and Public Involvement Efforts to Incorporate the 2022 Town of Duck Vision Statement and Guiding Principles into the Town's CAMA Land Use Plan

Director Garman stated that the Board had discussed the new Vision Statement that the Council had adopted and thought most of the Board members were at the Council Retreat to listen to the discussions on how to move forward. He stated that Council allowed the Board to move forward with incorporating the Vision Statement into the Land Use Plan and concurrently, they asked the Board to start reviewing the urban waterfront designation. He reminded the Board that both items were discussed at their February meeting.

Director Garman stated that he wished to have a brief discussion on how the Board may move forward with the issue and which should be discussed first – the Land Use Plan or the urban waterfront designation. He thought the changes to the Land Use Plan from the Vision Statement could be a simple process and further thought that the Board could go through the Land Use Plan and see where goals and objectives could be incorporated.

Director Garman felt he could come back to the Board within the next two months and take a first cut at suggestions for changes and let the Board review them. He thought it would be a simple process which could then move forward on the urban waterfront discussion. He noted that this would not be a rewrite of the Land Use Plan.

Vice Chair Fricker clarified that objectives would be substituted in and out along with the goals and the policies. Director Garman stated he was correct. Member Forlano asked if there would be public involvement from the various stakeholders in Town. Director Garman stated that there could be, but Town Manager Layton had made a point that the Vision Statement had already entailed a great deal of public involvement with the surveys that were received at the Town Council Retreat. He added that the normal public involvement had been completed and now the language needed to be incorporated into the Land Use Plan. Chair Blakaitis asked if the Town was close to forming another Land Use Plan committee. Director Garman didn't believe so. He added that CAMA was in the process of rewriting the Land Use Plan guidelines. He stated that he would come back with suggestions for review at the next two meetings.

STAFF COMMENTS

None.

BOARD COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chair Blakaitis adjourned the meeting. There was no vote.

The time was 8:28 p.m.

Approved: _____
/s/ Joe Blakaitis, Chairman