

From: Lois Laczko July 20, 2011 10:02:44 AM
Subject: Planning Commission Minutes 06/28/2011 ADOPTED
To: SimsburyCT_PlanMin
Cc:

ADOPTED

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
JUNE 28, 2011
REGULAR MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER

Michael R. Paine, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. in the Main Meeting Room of the Simsbury Town Offices. The following members and alternates were present: Ferg Jansen, Charles Houlihan, Alan Needham, Mark Drake, William Rice and Bob Kulakowski. Also in attendance was Hiram Peck, Director of Planning, Janis Prifti, Commission Clerk, and other interested parties.

II. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

Chairman Paine appointed Commissioner Rice to serve for Commissioner Hallenbeck and Commissioner Needham to serve for Commissioner Houlihan.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of June 14, 2011

Chairman Paine stated that if his count was correct the meeting did not have a quorum to approve the June 14, 2011 minutes with at least four members required. He stated that present were Commissioners Jansen, Rice and him. Mr. Peck agreed that was correct. Chairman Paine subsequently asked Commissioner Needham to step down when Commissioner Houlihan entered the meeting providing a quorum. He said Sean is a full member and asked Commissioner Needham to sit in for Commissioner Sachem. Commissioner Jansen moved to approve the Minutes of June 14, 2011. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rice and passed by Commissioners Rice, Houlihan, Jansen and Paine, and Commissioners Kulakowski and Needham abstained.

IV. DISCUSSION

a. Subdivision Regulations

Chairman Paine stated he finished drafting the attached statement of

Authority and Purpose for the Planning Commission this afternoon and provided copies to all meeting attendees. He invited discussion by the Commissioners of the draft which he developed from reviewing existing subdivision regulations for Simsbury and the Towns of Tolland and Windsor. He said he pulled pieces from both and did not modify the definitions as the document is reviewed we will refine those definitions. The Town Counsel will also provide advice on definitions. Mr. Peck added that many definitions will reside in the Zoning Regulations and will be worked out as we go through. Chairman Paine stated one issue was Subdivision Regulations are actually misnumbered, as previously pointed out by Commissioner Jansen, there are two number VI.'s in the current Table of Contents. Commissioners Rice and Needham asked if there are different versions of the regulations. Commissioner Houlihan had the same question and stated the 11/28/95 version is on the Website and said they should all be on the same page. The consensus was the issue with VI. is only in the Table of Contents.

Chairman Paine stated the intention to start with the "Authority" and "Purpose" sections but he has not had time to talk to Tina, who was not present. Commissioner Jansen asked if things like rear lot subdivision should be defined. Mr. Peck said there is a definition of that in the Zoning Regulations and he will talk to the Town Attorney to see whether it should stay there or go into the Subdivision Regulations. Commissioner Houlihan said we should have it in ours as a stand-alone document taking the place of Zoning for subdivisions. Chairman Paine said he is after more consistency and our definition of a rear lot subdivision may not be germane to what they're trying to do. Commissioner Houlihan said a rear lot subdivision would essentially be a re-subdivision. Mr. Peck said in the current regulations it is done as a special permit in the Planning Commission. He said you cannot tell exactly what it is; it might be a re-subdivision, but if the property has never been subdivided in Zoning Regulations, it might be a first cut and simply complies with rear lot requirements. Commissioner Houlihan said you need two rear lots established or three or more because just one lot doesn't fall within our purview. Mr. Peck stated it might if that lot was created as a subdivision and if they are split again, that's a re-subdivision. He said he will talk to the Town Attorney and see what he wants to do as clarifications are needed and those definitions may need to reside in subdivision regulations to make it clear.

Commissioner Jansen stated for the "Purpose" one paragraph version he had, he suggested adding after "streets" and before "drainage and sewage" the words "bike paths". He noted these are not discussed in the new version with no mention of drainage and sewage. Chairman Paine said that this version talks about meeting the community needs in section d. regarding "safe water supplies and sanitary facilities; adequate storm drainage systems; adequate and suitable open space and recreation areas; and other

needed public improvements." He said he was trying to start out with Authority and Purpose from a higher viewpoint and then get into more detail. He said while a lot of editorial effort went into this, there is not a lot of editorial ownership with the goal to have a better document. He stated he is not sure regarding "Authority" that it's both Connecticut General Statute and the Town Regulation ordinances. He said he did not have time to go to the Web to get a perfect description of how the Town defines our Regulations. He said other documents are amended and if our documents aren't also amended we are out of compliance. Commissioner Houlihan said the statute is a laundry list with most of it covered but he didn't believe public or open space was covered. Chairman Paine said he mentioned "adequate, suitable open space"; he was trying to cover possibly doing "fee in lieu of" stating the need to look at that but not to require open space. He said he preferred to have it in for discussion purposes. He stated under "Purpose" section a. he went back to the Plan of Conservation and Development how different areas of the Town are talked about, specifically special areas, to tie back to the POCD. He said to Commissioner Houlihan that he would get to Mr. Peck an electronic copy to put on the Web server for editing stating it is better to start with something.

He asked the Commissioners if they would like to go through the document paragraph by paragraph or what their thoughts are. Commissioner Drake stated he was not at the present at the last meeting. Chairman Paine said he would like to wordsmith the draft. Commissioner Rice said he started looking at the regulations and remembered a comment at a prior meeting about how the regulations are not necessarily up-to-date or reflective of how the Town wants to behave. He asked if there is a list of regulations perennially discussed with those coming forward with a plan. He said right now there are two other examples of subdivision regulations and something can be cobbled together, but as a relative newcomer he is not sure where the end game lies or where document weakness are, nor is he sure how to decide whether the examples are better or worse. He added he would like to have some ground rules in order to focus efforts. Mr. Peck said new members of the Commission provide an opportunity to look at regulations with fresh eyes and if regulations are unclear to you that provides the Commission with valuable insight. He said many people come in and want to subdivide property and we go through the regulations with them and how it affects their property. He stated we need to make the regulations as clear as possible so new members provide insight as to what makes sense. He said the regulations are written for two purposes; one is to be a guide to this Commission, and the public has to be able to understand them so they need to be as clear as possible. He said he is willing to go through the Connecticut General Statutes or whatever and say this is where the regulations are unclear or fall short. He added that another valuable part of this process is for the Commission members to tell him what you want the

regulations to do in certain areas. While Mr. Peck mentioned two examples, he stated there may be a hundred across the state and in reviewing what different towns have done; we need to determine how this town will respond to that division of property. He asked do we want particular things like ski slopes, do we want recognition of open space, are wetlands important, whatever is of concern will help him give advice back. Commissioner Jansen suggested folding "fee in lieu" as a whole section. Mr. Peck agreed with providing "fee in lieu of" as an option for a property owner in lieu of open space. He said the coordination and cooperation of the applicant and the Commission's discussion regarding what is important in different situations. He said it depends on the context of an application and that it is very helpful to have fresh eyes and see what makes sense. Commissioner Needham asked what problems the regulations have failed to solve. Mr. Peck said the biggest problem from his point of view is where regulations are vague or unclear and we need to correct that so they are clear with references in all sections matching. Commissioner Houlihan asked if they are commenting on the proposal today. Chairman Paine clarified they are going around the table, commenting on the process with a philosophical discussion at the end with a few minutes spent on the "Authority" and "Purpose" document.

Commissioner Houlihan said he wanted to raise some general areas and he was thinking about definitions as well because one of the critical definitions isn't in the definition section, but is in the General Provisions having to do with open space. He said open space currently talks about parks and playgrounds stating "all such open space, parks or playgrounds shall be adequately, cleared, graded, drained and seeded to serve the intended purpose". He stated in our experience, particularly when it comes to commercial subdivisions, people come in and are not expecting to have children on swings in front of the Hartford so the open space component needs to be dealt with. He said we have in practice allowed conservation easements where the concept of open space is covered but it really doesn't meet the definition because we like to retain our conservation easements in general in natural condition as undisturbed land. He said we don't go in to clear, grade and reseed them with the most recent one when the Hartford property was subdivided where a lot of land along the river was used and we accepted a conservation easement. He said it was not intended to have people and kiddies accessing the area nor was it intended to remove all natural vegetation. He said that is one of the issues the Commission needs to address here, is to give some content to open space as we see it. He stated this set of regulations is directed toward residential subdivisions and works fine, particularly now that we have a "fee in lieu of", but where it doesn't work is with commercial subdivisions and we're applying residential concepts like playgrounds and parks where we have no expectation they'll be used and we use conservation easements that may not be authorized by the regulations. He stated that is one of the conflicts

encountered. Commissioner Houlihan stated the other conflict is to discuss commercial subdivisions in the definitions because there are different considerations for commercial subdivisions than there are for residential subdivisions; and we should tailor something so the Commission's expectations are known and communicated and we're not contorting things that make good policy sense and important development sense, but do not fit well within our subdivision regulations. Chairman Paine asked if Commissioner Houlihan envisioned in General Provisions discussion of "Consideration for Residential Subdivisions" with bullet points and separate discussion of "Nonresidential Subdivisions" with pertinent bullet points expanding on those concepts through the definitions and procedures. Commissioner Houlihan agreed and said the easiest way to handle it is to back into it as we go through various provisions and whether they work well for residential, but not for nonresidential, allows us to set those points aside under a commercial section so there is more clarity. He said the biggest issue of clarity and objections from the public have generally evolved around open space and why isn't the Hartford allowing a park here, where is the public access, when can I walk around the building that is otherwise secure and guarded. Mr. Peck stated this is a good point to take off from and see what other towns have done, perhaps swings in front of the Hartford are inappropriate, and there may be other examples as well. Chairman Paine added that the Hartford especially moved out here for a secure site and while they don't want to exclude people they don't want to be overly welcoming, and obviously they're a great neighbor. Commissioner Houlihan stated in looking at their plans our focus is not so much on public access but on protection of the ridge line and streetscape appearance and a lot of other issues that don't come into play for two-story residential subdivisions.

Chairman Paine asked Commissioner Jansen for any thoughts. Commissioner Jansen suggested cleaning up the document, including 10.b. and perhaps using "chief executive officer" and things like that and he suggested definitely including the three options: 20%, fee in lieu of, or conservation easement; he suggested presenting this information to applicants head on so they start thinking the Commission's way instead of fighting over whether a park is needed; let's look at the other options. Commissioner Houlihan said historically, the main reason he ran for Planning is when Blue Ridge Insurance was turned down over an open space issue by applying residential standards to what would have been a fine commercial development. He said there would never have been a Target store controversy if that had gone through and it all comes back to that definition.

Chairman Paine asked for further comments from Commissioner Drake who responded that speculating where we should start and the ground rules as discussed are all reasonable approaches. He said he would like some idea

of where the pitfalls lie as a start point. He stated he has never done a subdivision in Simsbury; he did them in Manchester and East Granby in the '80's. Chairman Paine asked if there were any instructive lessons and Commissioner Drake said he never brought it through the process but ended up with a pre-approved ordeal, mostly it was running through the gamut for a change of zoning ordeal, and not really a subdivision situation. Chairman Paine asked Commissioner Kulakowski for comments and he concurred with Commissioner Houlihan on the need to have discussion because he reads the document as all residential with a smattering of commercial, which is very confusing if you are doing a commercial development. Commissioner Rice had no further comment. Commissioner Needham stated the need to get the process started. Chairman Paine said there are many different ways to start and he and Tina came up with a process that is probably as good as any other way; he said the Commission will progress through the process with all the smart people at the table and Mr. Peck to help with direction and get to a good place. Commissioner Jansen said if Mr. Peck and Howard from their memory could state the things that keep coming up that waste time and we could slice through. Mr. Peck said the average person coming through the door has no idea what's involved and generally has a piece of property that's not subdividable that they want to subdivide, but that's not always the case with people who do it for a living having a much better idea. He said the bulk of time is spent explaining to people, sometimes at length, what the problem is, how they can fix it, or that it can't be fixed. He said a person came in today who has been in three or four times and asks the same questions every couple of months. He told them they are working on the regulations and they can check back but it's not subdividable. He agreed that to some extent that can be rectified with the clarifications and definitions talked about earlier and figuring out what the Town wants regarding commercial subdivisions or nonresidential. He said he will get something together for the Commission to think about whether to reference certain drainage standards in subdivision regulations, as they are not currently in the regulations. He said they are working on low impact lighting from Town Center and a lot of information they will get from the study will be transferable to other land development processes in town and will be very helpful.

Mr. Peck stated another section that probably should be referenced in addition to drainage are things like road standards. He believes you need to make sure roads created for subdivisions aren't over-constructed for a couple of reasons, one is that it's expensive and we don't need to overbuild them and it is not necessary to build subdivision roads that could replace Rte. 10. He added if it's a small road just serving the abutting property, why create something that looks like an arterial road or interstate highway, so something about road standards is needed. He stated some of this is done by Rich now, and some the Fire Marshall requires, but his sense is the Commission should decide as much as possible what is

appropriate for a particular area based on how it functions - as an arterial or collector or local road - that's the kind of road to design. He understands that fire trucks need to turn around, but at another meeting he learned that if a hose only squirts 200', how close they can get doesn't matter; so he would like to see common sense applied and pavement should be designed to go with the houses in the area. He suggested looking at the most well-developed and attractive areas and they don't usually include a tremendously wide swath of asphalt, but rather have a nice house with a narrower road and some nice trees with a house nicely set on the property. He asked the Commission to think about what that context means because the Subdivision Regulations were designed back in the days when subdivisions were created and a local playground was needed because kids didn't go to crowd other playgrounds. Commissioner Jansen said it was when we had a lot of land. Mr. Peck said that clearing and seeding the land and making parks out of it was in a different time and should be put in the proper context.

Commissioner Drake asked if any town has ever had subdivision regulations specifically for commercial space and residential space because it seems most subdivisions are 80% residential. He asked if it makes sense to have a separate set of regulations for commercial space. Mr. Peck said some towns he has talked with have separate commercial standards. Commissioner Drake asked if that would be appropriate here because the regulations in general do well for residential settings, but where there are problems is trying to apply them to commercial or industrial space which we know is going to stay that way. He said if it's going into a zone change, that will take care of itself, but if it's subdividing commercial property like the Hartford, in trying to apply playground standards or access to it was just inappropriate - so is that a possible way of going? Mr. Peck responded that before the next meeting he would take a look at some towns that have done that and see what makes sense as appropriate. Commissioner Drake said especially around the Rte. 10 corridor. Mr. Peck added also the north end. Commissioner Jansen asked if the airport is a subdivision or a one-owner property and they just put up buildings. Mr. Peck said that the airport is separate. Commissioner Jansen clarified he was asking if the buildings across the street are a subdivision. Commissioner Drake responded that Culbro owned it all and sold it off as a large parcel which had several buildings on it which he wanted to actually segment or have as separate entities; in other words, it would have gone into a subdivision just to get the boundary lines in line so each structure had its own piece of property that was inherent to it. Chairman Paine asked the Commissioners to think about whether items are residential, commercial or nonresidential. He said he can see a value to having two lists with different considerations appropriate to the type of development. Commissioner Drake said that taking a commercial or industrial parcel and changing it to mixed use and/or strict residential, it would go through a zone change anyway and would fall into the new category in which they

belong to change to Zone 2, but if you had two separate regulations for each variety that one would apply and you wouldn't have to try to apply a residential setting. Commissioner Houlihan stated that except if they ended up with subdivisions they would go there for the zone change and they'd have to come here for the subdivision. Chairman Paine stated that we would not be able to comment on what that zoning change was until it was done and then we would look at that and approve that or act on that. Mr. Peck said that this Commission would see a proposed zone change as a referral and would get two shots – the first on conservation development to say the sub change is a great idea or not, and the other is if someone actually proposes a zone change and it comes in as a subdivision. He said you get at least one look and maybe two and that it is a good idea to see if different standards apply and are helpful. He said it is true that most of the subdivisions are residential and most of the property in Town is already subdivided with not a lot that will be subdivided. He said it will be interesting to see what happens at Meadowood and whether it goes forward. Commissioner Houlihan asked if there are any lapsed subdivisions approved and nothing happened in the five years. Mr. Peck said there is one of about 16-20 lots with only one lot sold and nothing else; if it ever came back, today's standards would have to be applied. He said there are some little things like that.

Chairman Paine asked the Commissioners if they wanted to go through the document and work on wordcrafting. He asked if the Authority and Purpose work for what we are trying to do. He explained to Commissioner Drake that he pulled comments he thought were good from Tolland and Windsor documents regarding subdivision regulations that seemed to fit with Simsbury. He invited Mr. Peck to jump in if they are off base as they go line by line. Commissioner Needham suggested citing where the Authority comes from. Mr. Peck stated they would put that section in. Commissioner Needham added that it should say what gives us the right to do that and why it resides here. Commissioner Rice asked if the organization and numbering changes from time to time. Mr. Peck said that the numbering stays the same and the wording "as amended from time to time" covers it. Commissioner Houlihan stated he was not sure about putting in "Town regulations" because these are the regulations. Chairman Paine said he is not sure if there is anything in the Town Charter or the Commission's operating document that applies, but we can pull it out if so. Mr. Peck said he would check that in the morning. Commissioner Houlihan said he was not sure, but that the Commission has the statutory delegation allowing us to do these things and handle these fourteen purposes. He said that even when you get to things like conservation issues and we make a referral to the Inland Wetlands Conservation Commission and they come back, we don't have to accept their report or recommendation because we're the sole arbiter of those issues and our authority cannot be delegated to them. He said there are some funky ways this works and the Commissions roadmap is set out independent of

almost everything, except for statute.

Chairman Paine asked for any further comments on the first paragraph; there were none and the Commissioners moved on to paragraph 2. Chairman Paine wanted an effective date. Mr. Peck thought it should be by October 30, 2011 and the Commissioners agreed.

Chairman Paine asked for comments on "Purpose". Commissioner Jansen suggested adding "a" to the second line following "in". Commissioner Houlihan said he was not sure "regulations" fits in there. Chairman Paine asked Mr. Peck to check on whether that is the appropriate term. Commissioner Houlihan said in referring to character maybe the terms "special areas" should be added as a modifier, or something similar because there is not a consistent character, e.g. West Simsbury is different from Tariffville. Chairman Paine stated that is why he used in section a. "semi-rural" and "special areas". Commissioner Jansen asked if in the first paragraph of "Purpose" whether "man" should be "man-made", it's natural. Commissioner Drake stated we are probably not going to protect and conserve man-made areas. The Commissioners agreed the statement was conflicting. Commissioner Houlihan said that in addition to protecting the natural areas, we need consistency for the built environment. Commissioner Jansen pointed out that a covered bridge would be a thing; he explained that when Joan was head of this Commission it was always about historic and to not mess with our history. Commissioner Drake suggested "areas made for people" as opposed to a natural area which implies the absence of human involvement. Commissioner Jansen suggested "habitated". Commissioner Drake said "habitated" or something to convey its people space. Chairman Paine asked Mr. Peck if he was familiar with whether the term "man-made resource area" is a planning term. Mr. Peck responded he was not sure of the meaning and has noted the wording is a bit awkward and will see what he can figure out. Commissioner Kulakowski suggested putting in the term "historical" as we have the Flower Bridge which is historical. Commissioner Drake commented it is a little on the narrow side because these are two designations which should be very broad despite the connotation of "people oriented", "historical" narrows it. Commissioner Houlihan stated it's the sense of place in different areas. Chairman Paine stated we are trying to balance the natural areas, historic areas and people areas while realizing this isn't the POCD, this is for subdivisions. Mr. Peck stated we are talking about natural and built environments. Commissioner Houlihan stated any subdivision is going to have an assault on the natural environment. Commissioner Drake asked about "developed areas" because natural has its own connotation of untouched, but "developed" gives you the wide range of people oriented exposure. Chairman Paine confirmed that Mr. Peck will work on this.

Chairman Paine asked for comments on section a. Commissioner Needham suggested "historic". Commissioner Jansen asked about "special areas".

Commissioner Rice suggested referring to "special areas as defined in the POCD" and the consensus was for "special areas as described in the POCD".

Chairman Paine asked for comments on section b. Commissioner Jansen suggested changing "constructions" to "construction" and the Commissioners agreed inlaw should be hyphenated. Commissioner Houlihan stated multi-family may be a commercial use, as in the apartment complex on West Street. Chairman Paine suggested adding "mixed use" to the sentence after "housing opportunities". Commissioner Houlihan said it doesn't reach the Hartford development. Mr. Peck suggested he could add a section that talks about nonresidential use. Chairman Paine said a new section c. could be added and that he tried to prioritize the order of a. through e. Mr. Peck suggested and the Commissioners agreed to three categories: residential, non-residential and mixed use. Chairman Paine stated each section would become clearer.

Chairman Paine asked for comments on section c. Commissioner Houlihan suggested deleting "to the best of our ability" and "ensure", rather "promote harmony between the subdivisions surrounding areas". Commissioner Drake said that is our task to ensure harmony so probably just "ensure" seems more like protecting and "promote" more like pushing; he said we are here to judge, not promote. Commissioner Houlihan said we do that anyway, but if something is disharmonious, they're not going to be happy with that. Commissioner Jansen suggested changing "with the surrounding" to "of the surrounding". Chairman Paine said that c. as a separate thought flies in the face of mixed use because it is different than the surrounding area. Commissioner Houlihan said that during the downtown Charrette design criteria were set up that somewhat mirrored immediately adjacent buildings.

Chairman Paine asked for comments on section d. Commissioner Jansen suggested adding a "/" after "open". Commissioner Houlihan suggested adding "conservation easement". Commissioner Kulakowski suggested using "fee in lieu of" be added. Commissioner Houlihan said we are talking about some type of conservation on- or off-site, or by easement. Chairman Paine said he was after "adequate and suitable", because four parks are not needed in a neighborhood, rather two parks and a conservation area somewhere else might be a bigger benefit to the Town. Mr. Peck suggested adding "whether on the subject site or elsewhere in Town" will cover it. Commissioner Houlihan stated that soil erosion is mentioned in the statute and we may need to add something about a low-impact development. He asked what is the low impact beyond soil conservation to perhaps run-off management. Mr. Peck said that it is lower than normal and is a relative and evolving term in most state documents. He said the newer term is light impact development and means doing the least amount of damage possible and still controlling storm water quality and quantity on the site. Commissioner Houlihan asked if it was broader than storm water management.

Mr. Peck said that's what it is in the largest sense, but how it's done is getting more focused, e.g. chemical composition of driveway sealers, and the list goes on. He said we are talking about erosion environmental control to protect water quality. With regard to cut and pull, Mr. Peck said it was part of it and when you see a subdivision with huge cuts that are not necessary you probably should say we can do a better job; he said hopefully something like that would never get here and we would prevent it. Mr. Peck said he views c. as more of a use section and e. is more the environmental, sedimentation, erosion control water quality thing. Chairman Paine said it was more of a philosophical goal and the other more of an engineering thing. Commissioner Drake said we need to call out there LID/LIN. The Commissioners agreed to take "needed" out.

Commissioner Paine asked for comments on section e. He said "building" should be removed and "danger" should be changed to "detriment" and "those" changed to "these proposed" purposes. The Commissioners also agreed to change "historical" to "historic" in a.

Commissioner Houlihan asked what the plan is for definitions and general purpose. Chairman Paine said Mr. Peck will speak with Bob to get his feedback and we should come up with words that need to be defined that are currently not defined in regulations. He sees the Commission developing residential, nonresidential and possibly mixed use listed under definitions. Commissioner Jansen asked if the same definitions are in the Zoning Code. Mr. Peck said terms may be defined differently and they can assure there is no improper overlap. Chairman Paine said there might be different viewpoints but not radically different definitions. Commissioner Rice said that since we may be rewriting quite a bit of the other sections, we could wait to see if we introduce any other terms and do the definitions toward the end. Mr. Peck agreed that was a good approach with a list to be developed.

V. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Peck reported that last night the Steering Committee met and the draft report of the Committee is coming together. He said the First Selectman wanted to make sure it got out to the general public as soon as possible and the date set for the draft report coming to the public is July 5th. Probably next Wednesday or Thursday the Steering Committee will meet again to look at the document before it goes out. There will be a link on the CRCOG Website to take a look at, but the files are very big and downloading is not recommended; however, he will have a hard copy available in the office.

Mr. Peck said that the LID lighting study he spoke about a couple of weeks ago is coming together well. He said the Design Review Board is talking

with a consultant who is considering upgrading the Design Guidelines for Town Center. He said there is no firm agreement yet, but they are working to get it done as soon as possible. He said the Guidelines, Code and Drainage will all come together at the same time and it's very exciting. Regarding funding, Mr. Peck believes it is put together for July even finance personnel changes.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Jansen moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:39 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rice and passed unanimously.

Michael Paine, Chairman