

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF TISBURY
P.O. BOX 602
TOWN HALL ANNEX
VINEYARD HAVEN, MASSACHUSETTS 02568
(508) 696-4270
Fax (508) 696-7341
www.tisburyma.gov

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 3, 2016

TIME: 6:00 PM

PLACE: Town Hall Annex, 66 High Point Lane

BILLS:

Postmaster.....	\$ 98.00
Petty Cash (postage).....	\$ 7.45
UPS Store.....	\$ 8.50
P. Harris (Reimbursement).....	\$ 51.45
Realty Publishing	\$150.00

MINUTES: As referred in the January 20, 2016 Meeting Agenda
20 January 2016 - Deferred

APPOINTMENT:

6:00 PM Public Hearing: ZBL Amendment, s. 07.05.01, Height of a principle structure
Attendance: Kenneth Barwick, Melinda Loberg, ME Larsen and Adam Turner

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:04PM. C. Doble, Planning Board Chairman Pro Tem read the hearing notice into the minutes and introduced the members of the Board. Members of the public were acknowledged and H. Stephenson recommended having the board clarify the purpose for the proposed bylaw amendment.

B. Robinson noted that the amendment was requested by the building inspector, who asked that chimneys be included in the measurement of “height” (Sec. 02.00, Definitions), and to clarify the text pertaining to the method for obtaining the “height of a structure” in Sec. 07.05.01. Copies of the modifications were made available. B. Robinson inquired if the proposal included a similar modification in Sec. 06.00. The board secretary replied in the negative, explaining that the Board did not make a decision to pursue the modification. Board members had the option to consider the revision in an upcoming hearing on Sec. 02.00.

K. Barwick, Building Inspector was invited to speak on the revisions. He mentioned that there were presently three somewhat conflicting definitions for the “height of a structure” in the zoning regulations (e.g. sections 02.00, 06.00 and 07.00). He advocated for the more restrictive interpretation, and recommended a maximum height allowance of 33 ft. at the

ridge and 2 ft. for the chimney (to be measured at the highest projection of the roof) to comply with the town wide allowance (with the exception of the overlay districts) of 35 ft. (max.) K. Barwick did not believe they needed the definition in section 02.29 for ' height of a structure', if they amended the regulation in sec. 07.05.01. He was not prepared to comment or recommend a modification for the height restriction within the Waterfront Commercial District. B. Robinson noted that the definition in section 02.29 included language pertaining to the Waterfront Commercial District, so that perhaps they might want to consider adding the text to section 07.05.01, if they deleted the first paragraph.

A. Turner thought the Building Inspector wanted to make the language consistent. He questioned the need or purpose for deleting the definition, if the text in sec. 07.05.01. The latter was a regulation that could be amended from time to time, unlike a definition. B. Robinson acknowledged. He subsequently retracted the recommendation, because of the potential for further confusion. It was noted that the 2nd paragraph of the definition in Sec. 02.29 in Sec. 07.05.01 referred to the Waterfront Commercial District. K. Barwick explained that the proposed revisions resolved the inconsistency he dealt with on a daily basis. B. Robinson did not see any harm in leaving the definition in place with the proposed revision. A. Turner concurred.

D. Holand thought the regulation in sec. 07.05.01 should reference the definition to make it easier for people to navigate the bylaws and should be rephrased to make it more consistent with the text in section 02.29. K. Barwick preferred renaming the section 02.29 "Height of a **Principal** Structure". B. Robinson inquired if there were different height allowances for principal and accessory structures. K. Barwick replied that an accessory structure was not permitted to exceed the cubic footage of the principal structure on the same lot. B. Robinson inquired if it applied to a tall slender tower. K. Barwick replied that the tower was considered a structure, which was subject to the restrictions of the following paragraph in the same regulation (sec. 07.05.01). D. Holand inquired if it was covered under the definition for a structure. Board members noted that there was a proposal to modify the definition for a structure. The proposal read "That which is built or constructed". K. Barwick noted that the proposed definition came from Mass General Law (MGL) and the International Building Code.

B. Robinson inquired about the significance of the reference to a "**principal**" structure in the regulation. He asked if the distinction was important, and if there were other types of structures in the regulation that were allowed to be a different height. K. Barwick replied in the negative. B. Robinson inquired if there was any objection to removing the term "**principal**" from the regulation. K. Barwick replied in the negative, except to advise him that the term was interspersed throughout the regulation. They'd have to remove it from the entire bylaw to be consistent. H. Stephenson noted that sec. 07.05.01 clearly stated that no structure was allowed to exceed 35 ft. in height. B. Robinson reiterated that the section began with the description "**Principal**" structure. K. Barwick indicated that he had always interpreted the regulation to imply "any" structure. This did not include the restrictions placed on properties within the Island Road District, Coastal District and Waterfront Commercial District.

A. Turner thought the standard they set in section 07.05.01 was sufficient for the intended purpose. He did not see the need to include the methodology for the measurement if it was included in section 02.29. H. Stephenson recommended adding the definition to section 07.05.01 to make it much more straightforward for people. B. Robinson and C. Doble did not see a benefit to incorporating the definition into the regulation. H. Stephenson thought it may be premature to eliminate the term “**principal**” from the language, since they were not prepared to do so for the entire bylaw.

There being no further comment, B. Robinson moved to close the public hearing and to enter into deliberations. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 4/0/0 The hearing closed at 6:35 PM

6:35 PM Deliberations: ZBL Amendment, s. 07.05.01, Height of a principle structure
Attendance: Kenneth Barwick, Melinda Loberg, ME Larsen and Adam Turner

B. Robinson questioned the significance in retaining the term “**principal**”, but did not want to delete the term if it had a bearing on other sections of the bylaw. H. Stephenson advised the Board against the suggestion, noting that the omission would have an impact on the third paragraph and create an inconsistency in other sections of the bylaw. B. Robinson agreed.

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson moved to approve the revisions in section 07.05.01 as presented. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried m/s/c 4/0/0

B. Robinson moved to close deliberations. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried m/s/c 4/0/0 The deliberations were duly closed at 6:37 PM.

6:15 PM Public Hearing: ZBL Amendment, s. 09.05, Floodplain District
Attendance: Kenneth Barwick, Melinda Loberg, ME Larsen and Adam Turner

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:04PM. C. Doble, Planning Board Chairman Pro Tem read the hearing notice into the minutes and introduced the members of the Board. Members of the public were acknowledged. C. Doble explained that the proposed bylaw amendment was recommended by the DCR Flood Hazard Management Program’s Engineer, Eric Carlson. Mr. Carlson has been communicating with the board secretary to make sure the town complied with the National Flood Insurance Program’s standards. Communities within the Commonwealth were expected to adopt the flood insurance study and maps that were prepared by FEMA.

B. Robinson inquired if they had the ability to make any edits. The board secretary replied that the edits would have to be reviewed and accepted by E. Carlson. The proposed bylaw amendment followed a model provided by E. Carlson. C. Doble noted that the amendment was lengthy, and asked the Board and members of the public if they wanted to read the entire bylaw into the record or to focus solely on the revisions.

K. Barwick explained that he was involved in the adoption of the initial regulation, and had one recommendation to make for the record. He did not wish to comment on C. Doble's question, but questioned whether anyone present at the meeting wanted to have the proposed bylaw read to them. D. Holand had an inquiry. C. Doble deferred to D. Holand.

D. Holand requested a clarification of the applicable zones. All of the zones were stricken in section 09.05.01.02 on the first page of the document, except for zone VE. Further into the document, she noticed Zone AE appeared in other sections of the proposed bylaw. Board members noted that the zone was referenced in 09.05.03, omitted in 09.05.05 and added in 09.05.06. B. Robinson inquired if the regulation implied that the other zones were omitted from their new flood maps. Board members reviewed the new flood maps.

D. Holand noticed an error in the last paragraph of section 09.05.05. The bold print was identical to the language being stricken. She also inquired about the minimum requirements for the subsurface disposal of sanitary sewage. Not being familiar with the regulation, she questioned if the standard was acceptable or sufficient for the intended purpose. The board secretary explained that subsurface disposal systems were within the Board of Health's scope of address. E. Carlson did have a suggestion for the Board of Health Commissioner's consideration. A copy of the modification the state was suggesting for the town was given to Maura Valley, the Health Agent.

The Board asked the board secretary to confer with E. Carlson's about the zones. B. Robinson suggested continuing the hearing. C. Doble wanted to continue the hearing to allow further comment. K. Barwick indicated that the recommendation he alluded to at the beginning of the hearing pertained to the removal of the requirement for a Coastal Elevation and Data Plan (CEDP) in sec. 06, because E. Carlson had suggested that the requirement was somewhat excessive. He explained that the requirement for a CEDP was adopted in the 1980s to establish a review process for projects within the 20 ft. contour prior to the delineation and adoption of the Coastal District. At the time, the town had to rely on the MV Commission to regulate them. K. Barwick agreed with E. Carlson's assessment, and believed that the original intent for adopting the requirement was no longer valid. Given that it was a local requirement above the state's minimum requirement, he thought it should be "stricken" from the bylaw. D. Holand noticed that the information on the CEDP was being referred to other town departments. She inquired if the other department's review process would be hampered without the information. K. Barwick could not recall the last time they received such a plan, but it had been many years. He did however find the plans submitted by RM Packer, the Tisbury Marketplace and Maciel Marine to be invaluable and pertinent to this today. B. Robinson inquired if they had any CEDPs for the West Chop area and north shore. K. Barwick replied that they were sketchy, but a couple was submitted for properties in Pilot Hill and Makoniky. B. Robinson noted that the engineers had to refer to the FEMA maps that were approximates and not as detailed. K. Barwick noted that the FEMA maps determined the zones and the elevations above sea level. B. Robinson noted that they were not drawn at the same scale. K. Barwick agreed, and noted that they included data on a variety of elements, such as velocity, wave action and their impact on the properties along

West Chop and East Chop. It captured a much larger area so that the details would not be included. He reiterated that the requirement for CEDPs was a “political” response to the Board’s distrust of the MV Commission’s review process. D. Holand inquired if there were instances where the town did not support the MV Commission’s decisions. K. Barwick replied in the affirmative, and recalled when the town voted out of the MV Commission because of the decisions.

B. Robinson questioned the recommendation. He was concerned that they would lose the ability to obtain the details if they needed the information. FEMA’s maps were drawn at a very large scale (1:10,000) that it would not provide sufficient information on the smaller properties. It obligated them to rely on the surveyor’s interpretation of the data. He preferred leaving the requirement intact, so that they could request a plan if they felt it was necessary. C. Doble read an excerpt of E. Carlson’s email, in which he recommended “building in an exception for the small scale projects”. B. Robinson noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals has not requested a plan in years as part of their review process, even though the regulation was in place. K. Barwick did not see anything that would prohibit any permit granting authority from asking for additional information, because the regulation is in place. He also cautioned about limiting the need for a plan on the scope of the project, because they’d have to set parameters, which may prove much more difficult. C. Doble agreed, because the location of a project may also have an equal bearing on a proposal and need for additional information.

C. Doble recommended continuing the hearing to give the board secretary the opportunity to verify the information about the zones. B. Robinson wanted the opportunity to look at the flood maps and at the zones. K. Barwick noted that the maps had been corrected. B. Robinson noted that the other zones appear on the flood maps. D. Holand recommended asking E. Carlson to confirm if AE & VE were the applicable zones to the Vineyard. B. Robinson wanted to address CEDP requirement. He was concerned that no one had been asking for the information, even though it was required. Re-instituting the requirement could be difficult, when so many applicants have been exempted from the requirement for years. B. Robinson thought they could change the language in sec. 09.05.06 to read “may be required” so that they could require the plan for certain projects. A. Turner recommended setting forth conditions explaining why they need the plan. K. Barwick agreed with B. Robinson’s suggestion. D. Holand concurred. B. Robinson added that Chapter 93 required a CEDP for all projects regardless of scope or size.

C. Doble recommended continuing the hearing until their next meeting on February 17, 2016 at 6:30 PM. B. Robinson so moved. D. Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0 The discussions were closed at 7:16 PM

7:16 PM Public Hearing: ZBL Amendment, s. 02.00, Definitions
 Attendance: Kenneth Barwick, Melinda Loberg, ME Larsen and Adam Turner

Hearing commenced in due form at 7:16 PM. C. Doble, Planning Board Pro Chairman Tem read the hearing notice into the minutes and introduced the members of the Board. Members of the public were acknowledged.

Board members were advised that the additions and revisions to the section of the bylaw were highlighted in bold print, whereas the text, they were proposing to delete was marked with a "strikethrough". In addition to the aforementioned revisions, C. Doble added that the order of sequence was revised to reflect the modifications.

C. Doble advised the Board that the modifications included the addition of the following definitions: accessory apartment, Aquifer, Flood Insurance Study, Groundwater Protection District, Impervious Surface, Mining, Potential Drinking Water, Recharge Areas, Special Flood Hazard Area, Toxic or Hazardous Material, Well Site Reference Line and Wireless Communication Facility. Some of the definitions pertained to the floodplain district, and other were simply being relocated to the section for consistency. The one oversight noted during the brief overview was that the definition for 'mining' was not numbered.

C. Doble mentioned that section 02.79 (Structure) was being stricken and replaced with new language. B. Robinson questioned whether they wanted to delete the reference to the fence and wall. He inquired if the language existed elsewhere in the bylaw. The board secretary replied that the existing and proposed language mirrored the state's building code definition, and did not believe that the height restriction for the fence and wall were included elsewhere in the regulation. D. Holand thought they might be creating more confusion without the language, given that a flag pole was considered a slender structure. B. Robinson did not think they should eliminate the exemption from the definition, without introducing the language into the bylaw as part of the pertinent regulation. A. Turner suggested retaining the language if they had reservations, and moving forward on the amendments. Board members agreed to pursue the amendment in the following year.

D. Holand recommended adding "air" to the definition for "Toxic or Hazardous Material". Board members accepted the recommendation. C. Doble suggested continuing the hearing and combining the discussions with the upcoming hearings on February 17, 2016 at 6:30 PM. B. Robinson so moved. D. Holand seconded the motion. The motion carried 4/0/0
The discussions closed at 7:30 PM

7:31 PM Public Hearing: ZBL Amendment, s. 05.23.05 BII District
Attendance: Kenneth Barwick, Melinda Loberg, ME Larsen and Adam Turner

Hearing commenced in due form at 7:31 PM. C. Doble, Planning Board Chairman Pro Tem read the hearing notice into the minutes and introduced the members of the Board. Members of the public were acknowledged.

C. Doble did not recommend reading the entire proposal (bylaw amendment) because the Planning Board members had several discussions on the need to add a review process within the BII District and on the specifics of the regulation. She explained that the Board believed

it was important for the Town to have some oversight on a project within the district.

A. Turner commended the Planning Board for creating a forum where they could discuss the specifics of an application with the applicant that would allow them to deliberate on an application together with the MV Commission. It allowed them to convey the town's sensibilities and recommendations to the MV Commission so that they were either addressed or incorporated as findings in their decision.

C. Doble asked D. Holand and H. Stephenson if they had any questions or comments on the proposed regulation. Both replied in the negative. B. Robinson asked C. Doble if she thought they should continue the hearing. C. Doble inquired if he felt there was a reason to continue the hearing. B. Robinson did not. C. Doble was comfortable moving forward on the bylaw amendment, unless D. Holand or H. Stephenson had any questions or objections. Both replied in the negative.

C. Doble entertained a motion to close the public hearing. B. Robinson moved to close the deliberations and to enter into deliberations. D. Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried. The hearing was duly closed at 7:38 PM

7:38 PM Deliberations: ZBL Amendment, s. 05.23.05 BII District

C. Doble opened the deliberations at 7:38 PM and asked the Board for their impressions. B. Robinson inquired if the Board felt they could vote on the regulation. D. Holand and H. Stephenson did not have any objections.

C. Doble entertained a motion. B. Robinson moved to approved the adoption of the proposed regulation in section 05.23.00 requiring a Special Permit from the Planning Board to regulate "uses set forth in Section 05.21 having 3,000 or more square feet of gross floor area, which shall include any new structure, or group of structures under the same ownership on the same lot or contiguous lots, or any improvement or alteration or change in use of an existing structure or group of structures" as presented. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 4/0/0

There being no further discussion, D. Holand moved to close the deliberations. B. Robinson seconded the motion. The motion carried. 4/0/0. The deliberations were duly closed at 7:40 PM.

7:40 PM Adam Turner re: Christopher Dias, AP 22A13.11 (Lots 1 & 4)
Attendance: M. Loberg, Selectmen; ME Larsen, FinCom,

A. Turner introduced himself to the new board members and town officials present at the meeting and explained his visiting schedule with the Planning Board was part of a pledge he had made to the members to keep them abreast of applications impacting the town. Their comments and recommendations were being solicited for the MV Commissioner's consideration during the review process of an application that may have a bearing on town issues.

He advised the Board that Chris Dias was in the process of submitting an application to modify his original proposal. He explained that the original proposal was for a wholesale business (lumber materials) that was to be operated from a warehouse with access through a 20 ft. wide easement (and miniature golf course parking lot) on State Road. Mr. Dias was proposing to expand the warehouse to include the retailing of lumber materials and to add a second structure on a development that spanned across two lots (1 & 4).

B. Robinson inquired about the use of the new building, because he noticed that the applicant was adding two apartments to the offices. D. Holand asked if the living units were connected to the offices. C. Doble asked H. Stephenson if she was familiar with the project. A clarification was requested about the difference(s) between the two proposals. A. Turner clarified that the applicant was expanding the lumber supply business to include retail, which would require a larger warehouse. He was developing two lots (Lot 1 & 4) to accommodate an additional structure, which included apartments and access on High Point Lane. He could not speak to any further on the specifics of the proposal until the day of the public hearing, which was on February 17, 2016. He wanted to share what information the MV Commission had received with the Board to give them the opportunity to prepare their initial comments for the public hearing. He advised the Board that the Commission was setting a date for a site visit, and offered to notify the Planning Board members, in case they wished to participate. H. Stephenson wanted to participate in the site visit and asked for a reminder.

ME Larsen inquired about the uses on the second floor. A. Turner replied that the second floor consisted of apartments and offices. D. Holand inquired about the access. A. Turner replied that the applicant currently had approval for access off State Road. The proposal appeared to reflect additional access on High Point Lane. C. Doble thought they could use a site plan to show the grades. A. Turner did not believe the applicant had provided the Commission a site plan, at this time. A. Turner suspected that the hearing may be continued, if the applicant did not provide all of the information he had been asked to submit with his application.

C. Doble was concerned about the proximity of the two additional egresses on High Point Lane to DeBettencourt's recently approved mechanic shop. B. Robinson was concerned about the increase in the volume of traffic resulting from the retail portion. H. Stephenson was concerned about the use of the easement within the miniature golf's parking lot. The increase in traffic would have a negative impact on the children's safety. H. Stephenson questioned whether the applicant had to use the easement.

B. Robinson thought they should ask the MV Commission if they were considering the possibility of allowing the applicant the use of the access easement for the retail use (traffic generator) with conditions and restrictions. Board members had other questions, and A. Turner suggested that they come prepared with their questions to the hearing. B. Robinson agreed. He thought they had sufficient time to formulate their questions for the hearing, at their next meeting on February 17, 2016.

H. Stephenson inquired if the Town's representative on the MV Commission had an obligation to report to the appointing board about the latest applications, issues, etc. She thought important to make it a requirement. A. Turner advised the Board that Harold Chapdelaine had recently resigned. M. Loberg was 'painfully aware' of the vacancy. She reported that the Board of Selectmen was actively soliciting potential candidates for the

post. H. Stephenson thought it was disappointing to see former appointees, including a former Planning Board member fail to understand the importance in keeping the town informed about the Commission's projects, and their implications or impacts to the towns they represent. M. Loberg assured H. Stephenson that all of their appointees were going to be informed of the Board of Selectmen's expectations.

BOARD DISCUSSIONS:

1. CPC

RE: Fin Com's proposed reduction in funding

C. Doble advised the Board that she was interested in attending the Community Preservation Committee's appointment with FinCom on February 17, 2016 at 6:30 PM to discuss the latter's recent proposal to decrease the annual real estate tax assessment from 3% to 1%.

Discussions ensued and ME Larsen explained that FinCom had placed a space holder on the warrant for an article because the benefits they obtained in the past were longer being realized.

2. Planning Board Projects 2016/2107

RE: C. Doble's updated list

A. Parking Study Committee

M. Loberg explained that the Board of Selectmen was interested in developing a comprehensive study of the town's parking facilities and needs. H. Stephenson inquired if the purpose for the committee was to develop a list and to recommend potential sites, etc. M. Loberg replied in the affirmative. C. Doble noted that it may require traffic counts and a study with recommendations. M. Loberg thought that the project would eventually require the use of consultants. B. Robinson thought they should coordinate the project with the MV Commission's professional staff before they hired consultants.

B. Sewer Review Board

C. Doble advised the Board that M. Loberg had asked the Planning Board to fill the vacancy on the Board created by L. Anthony Peak's resignation. The Sewer Review Board (study of nitrogen loading and mitigation in the Lagoon and Tashmoo) was separate and distinct committee from the Sewer Flow Review Board (allocation of sewer flow per application) and the Wastewater Planning Committee (evaluates wastewater needs of town, treatment plant, sewer collection). D. Seidman was the Board of Selectmen's appointee on the latter. B. Robinson inquired if it made sense that the one person serving on the Wastewater Planning Committee should also serve on the Sewer Review Board. The term would ordinarily expired in June, but if any of the new members wished to serve on the committee, the term would expire during elections or April 16, 2016.

D. Holand expressed an interest in volunteering on a committee and was open to serving on the Site Plan Review. B. Robinson moved to appoint D. Holand as the Planning Board's representative to the Sewer Review Board until April 30, 2016. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0

C. Harbor Management Committee

Board members were advised that the Planning Board was removed from the committee when the Board of Selectmen reconstituted the committee a couple of years ago, so that

D. Holand's appointment was unnecessary.

C. Doble asked the Board to review the project list and to consider the topics they would be interested in and working on for the Board.

3. Accessory Structure

RE: H. Stephenson's recommendation(s)

H. Stephenson explained that the draft was by no means a bylaw amendment. It was an outline reflecting her personal opinion about possible alternatives. Board members were asked to review the information for further discussion. C. Doble did not think they had the time to prepare a bylaw amendment or to hold a hearing in time to meet the Board of Selectmen's deadline for the warrant, and thought the Board could continue the discussions so that they would have language for next year.

4. Heikki Soikkeli's Form A

RE: Adequacy of Short Hill Road

5. Tisbury School Building Committee

RE: Planning Board Representative

M. Loberg understood J. Custer was inviting past committee members to participate in the process if they were interested in serving again. She thought it was important for the Board's representative to report to their respective Boards any issues that may be of great importance to them. C. Doble was concerned that the Board relied heavily on D. Seidman to represent them on many committees, and thought it would benefit the Board if there was broader representation and participation. C. Doble inquired if the School Committee would consider the possibility of allowing two members of the Planning Board serve on the committee.

Board members agreed it was a subject they should discuss at their meeting on 2/17/16. H. Stephenson thought it was important to know what the Board's policy was on appointments. B. Robinson advised her that the appointments were made annually, at which time members voiced their preferences and the Board voted accordingly. C. Doble's issue was that they could not have one person serving on several committees. They needed the feedback on important projects and the opportunity to discuss them so that the Board's perspective was being conveyed to the various committees. H. Stephenson was interested in serving on a committee, and hoped to have the opportunity to serve on a committee that addressed affordable housing in the future.

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:

1. Tisbury Conservation Commission

- A. Public Hearing Notice – G&B Marine Railway, AP 09C04 (Pier repair & marine sewage pump-out station)
- B. MV Shipyard, AP 09B33 (two concrete boat ramps)

2. Tisbury Zoning Board of Appeals

- A. Public Hearing Notice – Oyster Nominee Trust, AP 29B14 (conversion of basement to living quarters)
- B. Case# 2241 – Roni DeLuz, AP 06A12 (lodging house)
- C. Case#2242 – Joseph DeBettencourt, AP 22A13.11 (Automotive Repair Shop)

3. Jay Grande, Town Administrator

RE: Announcement - Contract Specialist/Purchasing Agent (Marie Maciel's promotion)

4. John Custer

RE: Tisbury's application was accepted for the MSBA grant process

5. MV Commission

A. 04 February 2016 Agenda

B 29 January 2016 extended agenda

PRO FORM

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at
9:30 P.M. (m/s/c 4/0/0)
Respectfully submitted;

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

APPROVAL:

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

Date

Cheryl Doble
Chairman Pro Tem