

**TOWN OF HOLDERNESS
PLANNING BOARD
Tuesday,
October 16, 2018 6:30PM**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: R. Snelling called the meeting to order at 6:25.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

Members Present: Robert Snelling, Chairman; Carl Lehner, Vice Chairman; Woodie Laverack, Ex-Officio; Donna Bunnell, Secretary; Ronald Huntoon, Member; Angi Francesco, Member; Louis Pare, Member

Members Not Present: None

Staff Present: Linda Levy, Land Use Board Assistant

Others Present: Busaba Tz, Don Latulippe, Sandie Brooks, Brenda Brooks, Will Crawford, Carole Felton, Calvin Huckins, Ken Evans, Robert Tuppinn, Robert Epp, Shawn Flynn, Julie Flynn, Iain MacLeod, Dave Martin, Jack McCormack, Elizabeth King

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The draft of the September 25, 2018 minutes was reviewed. A. Francesco suggested edits to the minutes.

Motion: "To accept the minutes as amended."

Motion: R. Huntoon

Second: D. Bunnell

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 6-yes 0-no 1-absention 0-absent

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Case # 18-09-18: Application submitted by Robert Turpin, Architect, for the Squam Lakes Natural Science Center in Holderness, NH, identified as tax map 236-001-000, to construct a new one-story (~3900 sq.ft.) Education Center, located in the Rural Residential District, in accordance with the Town of Holderness Subdivision Regulations.

Application Discussion:

- I. MacLeod: Squam Lakes Natural Science Center is here with a proposal for a new early childhood education center. As you know, the Science Center has been doing education programs for many, many years. Back about 8 years ago we started our Blue Heron School in repurposed classroom space called the Trailhead Gallery. It was a trial, a pilot project to see how that program worked. It has been incredibly successful. We've been busting at the seams in that space, turning away families and so figured we needed to look into ways to expand that program, so we've been looking at options over the past couple of years of where we could do that to expand that program, double the size of it essentially. Right now we are licensed for 18 in the lower section of the Trailhead Gallery, we're looking to go to 40 children. This year we actually made the step, because we have so many people on the wait list, that we have expanded into the 2nd floor. What is normally an exhibit space has been closed for a period of time while we got licensed to use that space so we are now at a capacity of 32 kids. We have 30 right now, but we are looking to move to the larger space that is dedicated to be used primarily by the Blue Heron School, which is a Montessori space

(pre-school). This will be used for discovery in the summertime, which we have been doing for many years. When we have that space, we'll also use it for teacher training and early childhood education. And so we have a location and a site that we'd like to talk to you about. Rob Turpin will be going through the program to let you know what we are trying to do and we have a bunch of materials related to the septic system that we would like to share with you as well.

- R. Turpin: I'll quickly go through the drawings that we've provided. The first drawing is just a reference plan to outline the boundaries of the Science Center. The entry off Rt. 113 leads to the Welcome Center. The new education center will be relatively close in the existing Welcome Center in the central part of the campus. This drawing is the bubbled part of the drawing in the center part of the campus. The Welcome Center is this building, the existing Trailhead Gallery is this building, where the Blue Heron School is currently residing on the 2 floors. The new building is very close in relationship to the Welcome Center, it is just down slope from it. There is currently an access lane that comes off the main parking area that gets into these 2 utility buildings. That lane would just be expanded a little bit further uphill to it. There is currently a gravel access lane that runs through. This lane will be expanded up to that point for pick up and drop off, and any kind of maintenance or emergency vehicle access. The building is sitting on a relatively clear site right now through several wooded areas that we'll be trimming back, but generally the building is sitting on a nice clean, relatively flat site. Elevations – the building will be a single story building, slab on grade. The center section will contain a small lobby, staff work space and offices, and the 2 wings are the 2 classrooms. Classrooms will be learning space, small cubbies and a storage area for the kids and a small toilet facility.
- R. Snelling: Any questions on the application? If not, I'll entertain a motion to accept the application.

Motion “To accept the application for consideration by the board.”

Motion: D. Bunnell

Second: A. Francesco

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no

Proposal Discussion:

- R. Snelling: I'll open the hearing. I have one question. That is the septic. Will you pick up on one of the existing septic systems or will the new school have its own septic system?
- R. Turpin: Let me point out where the existing septic system is. The existing leaching field is in this location. The Trailhead Gallery had its own system, but when the Welcome Center was done, the new building was designed for it, Iain has some additional information on that. The new building will be tied into this area and the leaching field will support this building.
- R. Snelling: I'm interested in the capacity of the existing field. Is it adequate to pick up the additional 18+ users?
- R. Turpin: It is.
- I. MacLeod: This is the as-built that we have for the septic system, so there is various notations about the original size and when the Welcome Center was added, they expanded the leach field and it was expanded to the capacity of 2118 gpd. The reason it was expanded, it was required to be oversized even though we put in composting toilets. In the Welcome Center there is really only 3 sinks and 1 toilet, but I think they assumed that we would decide to not to use the composting toilets or they would fail. It was early technology and they didn't trust it. This leach field was significantly oversized. The composters have worked just

fine. We have no reason after 15 years to do anything different. So the capacity is there. This sheet that I will pass out to you is what we anticipate and what we do currently. (The chart outlines gpd uses in the Welcome Center office, Welcome Center Composting Toilets, Trailhead Gallery, and the Early Childhood Learning Center.) Assumed that every single visitor that came through and every single student would use that restroom, we came up with an average per day based on our 60,000 trail visitors and 12 students at a 5 gpd rate. That's just using sinks, that doesn't assume they're using toilets except the composters. The existing Trailhead Gallery where the school is, calculating it for 35 – employees and students – 30 kids now and 5 staff, and then what the other childhood learning center would look like with the 45, so 40 students and 5 staff. We basically removed the other gallery. Those bathrooms would come off use, what we used when we moved the school into the new building. We calculated only about 100 gpd difference in total, so we seem to have the capacity with the 2118 gpd that they tell us we have.

- R. Huntoon: It doesn't say how much the Welcome Center enters into that same leach field does it?
- I. MacLeod: Yup, it does.
- C. Lehner: What would the Gallery be used for?
- I. MacLeod: We're not quite sure. We would probably use it to some extent in the summertime for some of the programs. It used to be part of the trailhead system and people would go downstairs to use the bathrooms. We don't anticipate that continuing. We've added additional bathrooms on the trail, so we're not going to put those back on line for general visitors. It may get some summer camp use, but we're not quite sure yet. This new building will pick up the guided discovery use in the summertime.
- C. Lehner: You have an extra capacity if you do use the Gallery.
- I. MacLeod: Correct
- C. Lehner: You still have extras.
- R. Snelling: The composting systems still working?
- I. MacLeod: Still working well!
- R. Snelling: Is there going to be increased parking required for this? The drop off area is "No Parking" as I understand.
- I. MacLeod: The drop off area is strictly drop off, so the parents would use it if they needed, or the teachers on Friday afternoons to release the students. The staff will continue to park in the main parking lot.
- R. Snelling: Any other questions from the Board? Any questions/comments from the peanut gallery here?
- W. Crawford: It is built as 1 story. Would it make sense to use the upstairs for storage so down the road you'd have it for storage?
- R. Turpin: The central section is designed for some storage. It would potentially be built out in the future.
- R. Snelling: If there are no other comments, I would entertain a motion:

Motion "To accept the proposal for consideration by the board."

Motion: D. Bunnell

Second: R. Snelling

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no

Case # 18-09-09: Application submitted by Don Latulippe who owns property at 799 NH Rt. 175., identified as tax map 227-011-000, to adjust the property lines (~54 acres) between lots 227-011-000

and two adjoining lots that he also own (227-011-001 and 227-011-002) located in the General Residential District, in accordance with the Town of Holderness Subdivision Regulations.

- R. Snelling: I open the hearing on 18-09-09.
- D. Latulippe: Last year I subdivided the 2 lots on the property across the street from the Huckins farm. What I really should have done is extend the back line of the property. The reason is to give me more room to build something on either lot and still have a 35' set back. There is a power line that runs down through the middle of the property. I'm just trying to create enough room to build on either property back into the wood line just to get it away from the road and away from the power line.
- R. Snelling: I'm having a little trouble following – from what to what.
- D. Bunnell: I don't see any adjustment lines or anything.
- D. Latulippe: It should be on that plan.
- R. Snelling: Maybe we're just not seeing it.
- D. Latulippe: It's on the 2nd page. All I'm doing is extending the line back on this furthest property and down the embankment. The original line is here and I'm just bringing it down further.
- R. Snelling/D. Bunnell: It's a steep slope.
- D. Latulippe: Yes it is. It's actually not buildable land down there, but it gives me set back to move any building on either property.
- R. Snelling: Back 35' from the top of the steep slope.
- D. Latulippe: Exactly
- C. Lehner: The set back is in the steep slope so it is unusable for 2 reasons. Can you tell us what this dotted line is?
- A. Francesco: It is the power line.
- D. Latulippe: The second page shows this is the existing property line right here as opposed to the rest of my land.
- R. Snelling: You own this piece.
- D. Latulippe: You can see the power line running right through the middle of that property, so basically, I'm just shoving the line back into the woods.

Motion "To accept the application for consideration by the board."

Motion: A. Francesco

Second: C. Lehner

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no

- R. Snelling: Any concerns, comments, questions from the Board? Any questions from the audience?
- C. Felton: How are you going to not build any closer to my house when you build?
- D. Latulippe: Buildings will be built closer to North Ashland Rd.
- C. Felton: How many feet is it from the new house you're going to put in to me?
- D. Latulippe: It really doesn't affect you at all.
- C. Felton: So there's not going to be any change?
- D. Latulippe: No
- C. Felton: How many feet is the line closer to me?
- D. Latulippe: It is really no closer to you. Until something gets built, I have to stay within the set backs, so 35' from the side lines. That's not saying I'm going to go within 35, it might be

100' from the side lines. It won't affect your property at all. If I put something on the first lot, it will actually be further from you.

- C. Felton: That would be wonderful. Thank you.
- S. Brooks: I had a question. On my property, is that anywhere near me, Don?
- D. Latulippe: No, you're up past North Ashland Rd., it will be nowhere near you?
- R. Snelling: Any other comments?

Motion "To accept the proposal for consideration by the board."

Motion: R. Snelling

Second: C. Lehner

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS: None

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Conceptual design discussion with Don Latulippe (227-011) re: potential housing construction
 - D. Latulippe: I just wanted to ask about the rest of the property. I'm not really sure what I want to do with it at this point. It's a pretty nice piece of property. It's probably an unusual question for the Planning Board, but I just wanted to know is there something the town would rather see in that area – 55+ housing, first time home owner housing? Any recommendations or ideas? I'd rather do what the town would like.
 - R. Snelling: It's in the Rural Residential district, isn't it?
 - D. Bunnell: General Residential
 - G. Huckins – Because of the neighborhood, it would be best for working housing, because everything down the road is kind of high end.
 - R. Snelling: Right
 - G. Huckins: If you put things in that are high end, the property values are not going to be what they would be because of the neighborhood. I'd like to put that in for consideration.
 - A. Francesco: To that end, you might want to get in touch with Lakes Region Community Developers. They have some stuff in Ashland, but they just started for single family development in Wolfeboro. Their goal in Wolfeboro is to try to have single family homes in a range of \$170-200,000. Wolfeboro is like Holderness.
 - D. Latulippe: Is that something the town would like in Holderness?
 - A. Francesco: I think if you looked around the town to try to find a home for someone who is looking for a starter home, the starter home in Holderness start at \$275. So, our options are what are being called "ender homes" because there people are downsizing and it is getting competitive. I can't speak for the town, but I can say that we have a school that was built for 250-300 students and we are at 148 there.
 - J. McCormack: I work with developers in Tilton and he has discovered that he was going to add workforce-type homes in Tilton about 1500 sq ft with a garage. The problem is that the market right now for people our age are looking for first floor living, bedroom suite, a good size kitchen, attached garage. Those people tend to not have kids in schools. It's people who are disabled, need wider doors, high end. In the market \$275-340. Retirement home or for later life.
 - R. Snelling: I don't think the town takes the position to tell you what type of development we'd like to see. There is a general need contrary to that for lower cost housing. The other factor might be the university and the kind of housing that might satisfy staff that

come here for 2-3 years. The town itself, we don't try to impact, but there is a general need in the region for lower cost housing.

- J. McCormack: All the people buying for the first time couldn't qualify for finance.
- R. Snelling: That's a good point.
- D. Latulippe: That's good feedback. I appreciate all the help.

2. Jack McCormack discussion of Howe Rd and Rt. 175 premises.

- I'm here on behalf of an old property. If you look at the tax map that I gave you, the yellow shaded parcel, 12.1, is taxed to Willie and Debbie Holland. The other parcel, 12, is taxed to Angie Gaudette and Wayne Green. The Gaudette-Green parcel has a 48' wide driveway on Rt. 175 that has been there since the last 1970's. Parcel 12 is on Rt. 175 with a mobile home. Parcel 12.1 has 285' on Howe Rd. with no structure at all. In 1985, Amelia Howe subdivided her properties into several lots, 1, 1A and 1B. The sub-division was interesting because it was a very, very faded, hard to read plan showing those lots. There is a small notation in the corner that lot 1A is to be merged with the other Howe properties. No one saw this apparently. 1A is the piece that Holland now owns. In 1985, Ed Kelly, who is currently the Chief Justice of the District Court deeded lot 1A, the one that you're not supposed to sell separately (1A is supposed to be linked to remain a parcel of Robert Howe). It's odd because the surveyor, when that happens, you show them the plan that has no common boundary between them, he didn't do that. For some reason, Ed Kelly made the notation in his deed (lots 1, 1A, and 1B), all contiguous parcels, he sold 1A. Again, contrary to what the language in the plan says. Property in those days, they wanted to keep the frontage which was afforded by the other parcel. The yellow piece has been taxed as a separate parcel, notwithstanding that language, since 1985. The other piece has been too. In 2010, Robert Howe deeded the Gaudette piece to Gaudette and Green. The Holland piece was deeded 2011. In 2011 the town notified the parties that they were supposed to have been merged in 1985 and taxes pending. The parties weren't happy about that. In order to avoid a problem in 2011, Willie Holland called the Gaudette-Green's to deed the properties to own everything. That never works. So the problem is that, the town still to this very day, despite the 2011 redeeding, taxes these as 2 lots. They never planned on owning this together. It was supposed to be 2 lots. They are 2 separate tax lots. What is the solution? The solution would be a sub-division to recreate this boundary. The regulations allow the GR zone to have a lot with little or no frontage served by a driveway. So, one solution would be to have a driveway come across the Holland piece to the Gaudette-Green piece. The problem is a stream crossing, it is very wet. The alternative may be to go before the ZBA, recite the same history and ask for a variance to have allow for a lot with less frontage on 175 because of the unique location and dimensions of the lot and the history. I'm here to ask the Board for a sense or feeling. Do you think it is appropriate to file a sub-divide with a 50' right-of-way to sub-divide to cross the Holland piece to serve to the Gaudette piece despite the fact that it may never get built, because A, it is not necessary, or B, it is pretty expensive, or do you think it is better to go before the ZBA to try to get a variance to allow for the creation of 2 lots with one being less than 150'? I'm asking for the Board's preference or guidance.
- R. Snelling: I see lot 1A meets the 150' frontage.
- J. McCormack: The other piece, Gaudette-Green, has 48'.
- A. Francesco: Lot 12 currently accesses the house via a driveway that is 48' wide?
- J. McCormack: Yes. Since 1975.
- A. Francesco: Is the history that lot 12.1 has been accessed from Howe Rd.?
- J. McCormack: Yes.

- A. Francesco: When was it decided that they should have been merged?
- J. McCormack: 1985, by Amelia Howe's mother to him and his wife. She kept this other parcel, later on he inherited that and conveyed that to Gaudette & Green. Howe, he didn't get it, the assessors didn't get it, no one got it, so Willie bought the property.
- A. Francesco: Was the intention that it was one complete lot?
- J. McCormack: That's right. Back in those days, there was an ordinance that a provision you could have a lot with just a driveway.
- R. Snelling: Where would this driveway go from? Howe Rd.?
- J. McCormack: From Howe Rd., through the wetlands/stream onto the parcel.
- A. Francesco: We would require a single driveway.
- R. Snelling: That still leaves lot 12 with non-conforming frontage. So, it doesn't change that. We can't speak for the ZBA, but given the history here, common sense would say to give them a variance on the 150' frontage.
- J. McCormack: That's the logical approach.
- R. Huntoon: I would go to the ZBA.
- A. Francesco: It makes sense to me to not use Howe Rd. and use the driveway that they've always used.
- R. Snelling: Understand, we are not the ZBA.
- J. McCormack: I understand that, appears to be logical, I understand it is not binding.
- A. Francesco: They should hear the initial intention of why they were going to be put together.

3. Zoning Ordinance Sub-Committee

- R. Snelling: You will remember that you all received a 22 page document with a bunch of things – inconsistencies, definitions, in some cases conflict with state regulations. We have a sub-committee meeting once a week to power our way through these and we've reached agreement on 3 of the issues. One, we have a district which is the Waukegan Watershed District. It was created when Waukegan put together their master plan for Waukegan Lake, which is a public water supply. We are in that watershed. The Planning Board identified a district only for the purpose of awareness that part of our town is in the watershed of a drinking water supply in the town of Meredith. But since we have no unique requirements for that district, the Committee felt should not have a district. The district infers there is something unique in the zoning for that and there isn't. It is Rural Residential. They had wanted to make sure that we had a 2 acre minimum, but we have a 2 acre minimum because it is Rural Residential.
- R. Huntoon: Is there a district commissioner or something who is trying to do something for the district?
- R. Snelling: No, nothing. We are recommending to make the zoning as simple as possible to do away with that district that has no meaning in terms of our current zoning. However, the idea of identifying the watersheds that this town impacts, to have an overlay in our masterplan maps that identify the Waukegan Watershed, the Pemigewasset Watershed and the Squam Lakes Watershed to make sure we have an overlay of all those available. So the awareness would be met through that map. That's what the sub-committee is recommending to this committee. The process that I am going to follow is that as the sub-committee comes up with recommendations, we will present them to you as homework to think about them for a month and then we'll have a discussion at our next meeting. It is not a hearing, just an open discussion. Then at some point in time, we would have a public hearing on these and maybe a few more and proceed in that kind of sequence. The sub-committee will make recommendation, the

Board will take a look at it, have a discussion and finalize the recommendations and have a public hearing on it. Any questions on Waukegan? The second was kind of clerical in a way. The section 300.4.1.2 and similarly in 300.4.2.2 and 300.4.3.2 where it discusses Special Exceptions, it references that they have to meet all of the requirements of sections 400, 600 and 700. But there is also section 900, so the recommendation is to add section 900 to the reference of sections 400, 600 and 700 as the requirements that have to be met. It should have been included all along. Section 900 outlines all of the requirements under Special Exceptions. That's just a housekeeping change. The third one has to do with Shoreland Frontage. We used the term Waterbody in the ordinance. It reads, when the boundary of a lot is the shore of a waterbody, it has to meet the minimum of 200 feet. The question was, what is a waterbody? Is it a creek, a pond, a wetland? The sub-committee recommends that the intent was Squam Lake (meaning the big lake and the little lake), White Oak Pond and the Pemigewasset River, not streams and that kind of thing. We were recommending to explicitly identify the shoreland requirement applies to the shores of Squam Lake, White Oak Pond and the Pemigewasset River. There was a requirement that was in the flood zones, an additional 20' of frontage is required for each dwelling unit. So if you had a duplex, you would have to have 220' of frontage. The sub-committee felt that that should have applied to all the districts not just the flood zone district.

- R. Huntoon: Let me ask about the 20'. Would that mean that somebody would have to have 200' frontage and could never put in another building or apartment no matter how big the lot was?
- R. Snelling: That's correct. If they wanted to change a single dwelling into a duplex, they could not do it without going to the ZBA with that language already in one the River Overlay districts.
- A. Francesco: It was written specifically pertaining to flooding, so it wouldn't pertain to the lake and ponds.
- R. Snelling: It could be.
- A. Francesco: So, why are we going to arbitrarily make that decision without knowing the backstory of that reasoning?
- R. Snelling: The sub-committee felt that the concept of requiring additional frontage for additional dwellings was reasonable. If you require 200' for 1 family, that it is not unreasonable to require a little bit more for 2 families or a little bit more for 3 families. So, if someone was going to put in a sub-division, for example.
- A. Francesco: Is there a state regulation on this?
- R. Snelling: The state regulation is 150', period.
- R. Huntoon: Regardless of how many houses are on it?
- R. Snelling: The shoreline lot has a min. of 150'. We are more restrictive since we require more frontage to have a dwelling on it. That's what the discussion will be about. I'm just saying we discussed it as a sub-committee and came down on the side of, we ought to be consistent.
- A. Francesco: I think we're talking about flood zoning, which is very different.
- R. Snelling: I'm not arguing it tonight. I'm just saying there are 2 issues, what is a waterbody and we're going to explicitly define it, and secondly, do we want to impose the 20' additional frontage that we have in the flood overlay to the other districts as well. The flood overlay is an overlay, it is not a district. It comes under the list of districts, but overlays other districts. Those are the 3 issues. You don't have to agree with the sub-committee's analysis. We have more complex ones coming down the pipe. These were rather simple. What I'd like to ask you to do is chew on this for a bit, look up our current

zoning regulations and make sure you understand what we're saying and what we're recommending here and then we'll come to a consensus in this committee as step 2 and then we'll have a public hearing as step 3. Then it goes to the town in a Warrant.

- R. Huntoon: Does anybody remember why we have 200' in the first place. What were we intending to do with that?
- R. Snelling: All of that kind of stuff to a degree is arbitrary.
- A. Francesco: It made it so you just couldn't have 100' and a house and then 100' and a house.
- R. Snelling: Yeah
- A. Francesco: To spread it out.
- R. Huntoon: I guess what I'm getting at is, ok we have this 200' shoreline requirement and I wanted to know what is the hardcore reason for 200'? If I wanted to put in a duplex, I'd need 20 more feet. I want to know if that is really cut in stone or if that 200' was a number kind of to dampen things down but really not keep people from growth.
- R. Snelling: The underlying reason I think was to avoid shoreline congestion, a series of 100' things, one right after the other. When you get to, should it be 100', 150', 200', sometimes that's 250', in other towns lot size varies. It is judgement as to what is reasonable. Holderness came up with 200'. The state requires 150', so we couldn't go below 150'. I think we ought to stay at 200', the question is do you want to stay at the expansion of 220'? That is something we'd need to decide. Right now, the way it is written, it is not required except in the flood overlay district, which you can't build in anyway. It becomes a bit meaningless in that district. As we roll these out, I'm asking you to spend some time with this stuff. These are pretty simple, some of the ones we have coming down are going to be more complex. It will require some changes in the way we look at these things. I'm asking you to put in the time to understand what this is and we'll have a discussion on it. I'm giving you your homework
- L. Levy: I have one more piece of homework for you. I'm giving you something that is going to be on next month's agenda. What I'm going to ask you to do is turn to the inside back page. There is a chart. The rest of the document explains the chart. Next month, Kevin Coburn is going to come before the group and ask for your opinion about adopting that chart, which is essentially the whole document, which is from the Town of Gilford. So, he is asking me to ask you to read through the inside back page. As you go through the document, you'll be able to understand everything that is not really clear to you. So again, homework for the next meeting.
- R. Snelling: This also relates to another thing that will probably be coming up in a month or two, and that is something we just talked about, and that is frontage on roads. Our current zoning talks about streets, roads, right-of-ways, and what is public vs. private. We recognized earlier this year that we really need to get our act together on roads and standards for even private roads if there are multiple houses. Should the roads meet certain standards? This is tying into other issues that we are going to have to deal with. So, add this to your homework.
- R. Snelling: The next meeting is during Thanksgiving week, I'd like to move that meeting to the 27th.
- A. Francesco: That's Giving Tuesday. It is easier for me on the 20th, but I should be able to get here by 6:30 on the 27th.
- R. Snelling: What is Giving Tuesday?
- A. Francesco: It is a day when organizations ask for donations to support their purpose.
- R. Snelling: Let's move the meeting to the 27th.

- L Levy: Do you want me to move the date that people have to submit applications to 2 weeks from tomorrow.
- R. Snelling: Yes, why not.

4. Next Meeting –Tuesday, November 27, 2018 at 6:30PM

CORRESPONDENCE: None

ADJOURNMENT: At 7:28 the following motion was made:

Motion “To adjourn.”

Motion: R. Huntoon

Second: D. Bunnell

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no