

**CITY OF NORWALK
ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 21, 2009**

PRESENT: Jackie Lightfield, Chair; Adam Blank; John Tobin; Larry Bentley; James White; Michael Mushak; Karen Spencer; Bob Keyes

STAFF: Mike Greene; Brenda Hrtanek; Adam Carsen

OTHERS: Atty. Liz Suchy; Kim Morque; Bruce Beinfield; Paul Jobmann; Fred Mascia; Matthew Popp; Mike Galante; Nick Kydes; Judy Starr; Matt Mandel; Fred Bondi; John Flaherty; David Park; Dana Clarke; Rick Giordano; Josephine Pisicano; Cece Lampatelli; Laurel Lindstrom; Lou Garcia; John Lombardi; Winthrop Baum; Marilyn Marino; Jeffrey Hall; Jerry Effren; Carol Ann Curry; Michael Devine; Gail Stevens; Elizabeth Keny; Edward J. Musante, Jr.; Diane Lauricella

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lightfield called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Mr. Greene took the roll call.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. #7-09R - Norden Place, LLC - Proposed amendments to Section 118-711 to permit multifamily and single family dwellings by special permit in Restricted Industrial zone

This item was considered together with Item b).

b. #7-09SP - Norden Place, LLC - 8 Norden Place - 240 unit multifamily development with 4 single family residences (25 units to be designated as workforce housing units) and related recreation facilities

Ms. Lightfield opened the public hearing. She went over the ground rules of a public hearing.

The applicant agreed to have Items a) and b) considered together.

Atty. Suchy gave background about the property, discussing its uses, as well as access to the site. She reiterated that there were two applications before the Commission, one for a zone text amendment and the other for a special permit. She also addressed previous inquiries about first responders to the new site.

Mr. Kim Morque showed photographs from the winter of 2000 and the summer of 2004, pointing out improvements to the site. He discussed adaptive re-use of the property, stating that such use was possible due to the flexibility of zoning regulations. He explained the rationale behind the applicant's proposal of a residential use in the Restricted Industrial zone. Mr. Morque described the benefits of residential use of the site, including a low traffic impact, the provision of moderate and affordable

housing, positive net tax benefits, less use of parking, less impact on the wetland, and an increase in the area devoted to open space. He explained that there was no demand for manufacturing in the current market and also that the uses for which the zone was approved, such as auto storage, warehouses, contractor yards, and golf driving ranges, were not appropriate uses of the property.

Mr. Bruce Beinfield stated that one goal of the project was a sustainable green community. He discussed the picnic space and the community garden, adding that the natural ridge on the property provided a sound buffer, as well as a visual screen. He described the architecture of the site, pointing out that some of New England's grand hotels had similar architecture. He explained how the color and other features of the building helped to reduce its mass and scale. Mr. Beinfield described the floor plans and materials of the building and also addressed the issue of storm water on the site. He added that the design team included a LEED accredited professional.

Ms. Lightfield pointed out that although Westport was indicated as the first emergency responder to the site, access was not available through Hiawatha Lane. She asked what plans were being made concerning first responders. Atty. Suchy agreed to get the complete information confirmed.

Mr. Matthew Popp discussed landscaping plans, including lighting, the community garden, and bus service access. He pointed out the 11-acre conservation easement on the property. Mr. Popp also confirmed that wetland mitigation plans had been submitted.

Mr. Fred Mascia indicated the size of the watershed (160 acres) and discussed drainage and storm water on the site.

Ms. Lightfield inquired about whether the four single-family units were in Westport or in Norwalk. Mr. Mascia clarified that they were in Norwalk, but that a portion of the Hiawatha Lane cul-de-sac was in Westport. He added that all construction was in accordance with regulations.

Ms. Lightfield asked about the catch-basin filters. Mr. Mascia indicated that there were filters only on the non-mechanical catch-basins.

Mr. White asked about a maintenance plan for storm water management. Mr. Mascia described the plan.

Mr. Mike Galante stated that there were two traffic study documents, from May 2009 and July 2009. He discussed traffic peaks and trip generation rates anticipated at the development.

Mr. Keyes asked about the level of service at Norden Place and Strawberry Hill. Mr. Galante said that it was level B or better currently. He said that the levels of service were not expected to change at any of the approaches to the site.

Mr. Keyes asked about a dedicated turn lane at Beacon Street. He also asked if there were other traffic-calming measures being explored to contend with speeding in the area. Mr. Galante described the system.

Mr. Tobin asked about the exact dates of the traffic counts. Mr. Galante confirmed that they were taken on April 8 and June 17, both of which were Wednesdays. He added that the information regarding June, July, and August 2005 was gathered from state data.

Mr. Keyes asked how the public would access the nature trail to Hiawatha Lane. Atty. Suchy

discussed the easement, adding that a copy of it had been provided.

Mr. Blank asked how much of the easement was wetland or upland review area. Atty. Suchy said that the site contained 8 ½ to 9 wetland acres. Mr. Popp confirmed that 50 to 60% of the easement was wetland or upland review.

Mr. Mushak asked about invasive species control. Mr. Popp said that the invasive species control plan would remove certain plant species and would be reviewed twice a year.

Ms. Lightfield opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Nick Kydes asked that those members of the audience opposed to the project stand up. A significant majority of the audience stood up. Mr. Kydes gave background about the property, adding that zoning should not be adjusted for the sake of current economic conditions. He said that the purchaser knew upon purchase that the property was for restricted industrial use. He said that the developer was being appeased by being considered for approval.

Ms. Lightfield asked Mr. Kydes if he had voted to approve the Master Plan in 2008. Mr. Kydes said yes, as a total. Ms. Lightfield asked if he had considered the restricted industrial zones at that point and if he had read the Master Plan. Mr. Kydes said yes.

Ms. Lightfield pointed out that Mr. Kydes continued to refer to a 1994 Master Plan, although there was a new one in place.

Mr. Kydes said that the cyclical economic conditions of the present should not be considered as a reason to change zoning regulations. He also stated concern over wastewater treatment at the property.

Mr. White pointed out that it was common knowledge that the City's wastewater treatment facility plan was underway.

Mr. Kydes stated his objection to the debating of the Commissioners. He also criticized the "audacity" of the developer to make such a proposal, considering that its other developments had left a "moonscape" in South Norwalk. Ms. Lightfield stated that the developer's other projects were not part of this application.

Mr. Kydes added that the wastewater treatment would not support the proposed development. Atty. Suchy reiterated that wastewater treatment was not part of this application.

Several audience members interjected comments, as Mr. Kydes and the Commissioners exchanged remarks.

Ms. Lightfield re-established order and emphasized the ground rules of speaking at the hearing. She reiterated that Mr. Kydes had the podium and also that Commissioners could ask questions to the speakers.

Mr. Kydes continued, stating that he objected to a traffic study that was conducted in summer months only. He also said that the education system would be over-stressed by the development and also that the quality of life for area residents would be impacted. Mr. Kydes also addressed the issue of hazardous materials on the site in the past, before the EPA was involved. He asked that subsequent speakers state where they live, if in favor of the plan.

Ms. Judy Starr, District 1 representative of Westport, said that she had no position on approval of the project, but asked that certain conditions be met, if the project were in fact approved. She emphasized the need to restrict access to the work site from the Old Saugatuck neighborhood. She also urged the applicant to ensure that adequate public protection services be provided by Norwalk for the development. Ms. Starr also pointed out the lack of parking at the Westport train station, stating that commuters should use the South Norwalk station as an alternative. She also addressed the issue of a left turn lane at Beacon Street. She also pointed out the concern regarding over-development, as enabled by the addition of sewer service to the four single-family homes on the site.

Mr. Matt Mandel, a District 1 Westport representative, referred to a previous hearing on involving a "more egregious" development, which was not approved by the Conservation Commission. He emphasized the importance of saving residential areas from over-development. He also clarified that the Westport fire department would be the first responders for the homes on Hiawatha Lane, but that follow-up would be conducted by Norwalk authorities. Mr. Mandel also discussed the notion of a conservation easement around the four houses on Hiawatha Lane. He urged that the Commission have a clear understanding of bus transportation issues, before voting on the item. He pointed out the level-of-service F intersections near the train station. Mr. Mandel added that he did not oppose construction access at Hiawatha Lane, but that remediation would be expected if the road were used by construction vehicles. He stated that he was pleased with the notion of open space on the property, but emphasized the importance of it being held by a responsible land-trust entity. Mr. Mandel added that the septic system should be inspected, before putting in a sewer line. He submitted into the record an easement involving the sewer line for Summit. He described the Hiawatha Lane area as middle-income, with mostly capes and ranches. He pointed out that getting to 10% affordable housing was not possible for Westport. Mr. Mandel asked that certain conditions be put in writing with regard to the Hiawatha Lane homes: the feasibility of installing septic systems at the four homes; the installation of a one-inch or 1.5-inch sewer line to protect Westport from overdevelopment; and use of language specifically prohibiting a sewer line, if not necessary for the site.

Mr. Fred Bondi stated that he opposed the project, which would have a negative impact on schools, sewers, roads, and traffic. He pointed out that the traffic counts could not have been conducted during a school day, adding that traffic problems had not been rectified. Mr. Bondi also discussed the need to bring in more jobs to the area, before expecting to bring in residents to the development. He also addressed the issue of senior housing, noting its lack of impact on traffic and schools.

Mr. John Flaherty said that as a resident of Myrtle Street, he had witnessed major traffic problems in the area, adding that even the use of speed bumps had not solved the problem. He asked that the Commission, as stewards of the City, consider the traffic impact carefully.

Mr. David Park, 66 Strawberry Hill Avenue, said that he had submitted written comments in September. He called traffic a quality-of-life issue, pointing out how common accidents were in the area. He submitted a photograph of a car accident at the site.

Ms. Dana Clarke, 74 Myrtle Street, stated her opposition to the project. She said that she had purchased her property in 1994 and that Norden used to test a contaminated well on the property every three months. She said that the school buses were over-burdened and that her own children were unable to take the buses any longer. She discussed dangerous pedestrian conditions in the area.

Mr. Rick Giordano, Williams Street, said that he was opposed to the project and that he felt that the Mayor had approved too much residential development. He submitted a petition of residents opposed

to the project and asked that the public hearing be extended for additional evenings. Mr. Giordano also pointed out that initially, it had been 15%, rather than 10%, affordable housing proposed. He discussed the contaminated land and the plumes on a map of the area. He described a resident who had died suddenly due to an auto-immune disease. Mr. Giordano submitted a letter to the Health Department, as well as photos detailing the effects of contaminated water on plants and animals. He discussed a letter from the DEP, stating that the property should never be residential, because of the health risks and contamination. He also discussed traffic at the site, calling the gravel path an attractive nuisance and suggesting that lighting and video surveillance be installed. He emphasized that residential units did not belong on the property and were actually a liability.

Ms. Josephine Pisicano, Williams Street, described her family's health problems, pointing out the need for ambulance use and medical aids. She said that the traffic problems in the area, which would be exacerbated by the project, threatened her ability to access these services. She urged the Commission to prevent over-development in the area.

Ms. Cece Lampatelli, Williams Street, explained that she had researched the development extensively and had also investigated what fell under the jurisdiction of Zoning. She read from the Connecticut General Statutes concerning conditions to protect public health and safety. She pointed out that the purchaser knew that this was a restricted industrial zone and also that a depressed market did not support this development. She said that it was likely that a large percentage of the units would be vacant. Ms. Lampatelli questioned the likelihood that any residents would want to plant anything in the community garden, due to the contaminated soil. She alluded to her conversation with Ms. Dori Wilson of Zoning. Ms. Lampatelli discussed the traffic counts, pointing out that there had been a 300% increase since 2005, rather than the 2% increase cited by the traffic consultant earlier in the hearing. She said that if the project were approved, the Zoning Commission would have failed its fiduciary responsibility to Norwalk. She submitted the citations from the Connecticut General Statutes, a petition, and a copy of her remarks.

Ms. Laurel Lindstrom, a Councilwoman for District C, stated that there needed to be a compelling reason for a Zoning amendment and that she could not see one in this application. She said that it was not a walkable area and that residents would rely on cars. She asked that the Commission consider the application as carefully as it would one involving the urban core. She reiterated her opposition to both the text amendment and the special permit.

Mr. Lou Garcia, 15 Bond Street, spoke in favor of the project. He described the area and gave background about the property. He said that he was grateful to Spinnaker for cleaning up and enhancing the property. He added that the project consultants, while boring, were high-quality experts who could carry out the project with due diligence. He emphasized that the project represented the best use of the property at this time, pointing out that it was unrealistic to expect the area to remain an open space park or to expect manufacturing to come to the area. Mr. Garcia added that this new, smaller proposal was an improvement over the previous proposal for the site.

Mr. John Lombardi, Strawberry Hill and Williams Street, asked why the City believed it needed more residential property. He discussed the costs to the City for teachers and schoolchildren and also pointed out problems with school buses and regular buses speeding in the area.

Mr. Winthrop Baum, speaking on behalf of the Fairfield County Commercial Brokers Network, discussed the benefits of the project, as far as bringing much-needed housing to the area. Several audience members interjected questions about where Mr. Baum resided; he indicated that he lived in Fairfield. Mr. Baum explained that the zone had long outdated itself and also that the City was facing

difficulty in keeping its credit ratings. He said that the lack of housing stock made it difficult to bring people to Fairfield County. He addressed the problem of people being unable to live where they work.

Responding to interjections from the audience, Mr. Mushak stated that the lack of courtesy would not help anyone's case.

Ms. Marilyn Marino stated that she had submitted a letter to the Commission, describing articles attesting to the changing nature of industry and manufacturing. She addressed traffic concerns in the area, pointing out that even a traffic light would not solve the problem. She enumerated several myths regarding the Norden Place project; that residential uses were allowed in the restricted industrial zone; that traffic conditions could support the development; that the project would have little impact on schools; that this plan was better than the condo plan proposed in 2006; that the developer had owned the property for a long time; that there were no rental units in East Norwalk; that this was a good project from an urban planning perspective; that there would be no negative economic impact on the City; that there was no more industry coming to Norwalk; and that Norwalk needed more housing.

Ms. Marino stated that while she liked a lot of Spinnaker developments, she opposed this project, because it was much too dense and would take away industrial opportunities.

Mr. Jeffrey Hall presented questions for the developer. He asked about plans for sewage, about verification of the number of traffic accidents on Strawberry Hill Road, and about plans for addressing inadequate parking in the area.

Mr. Jerry Effren, 85 Old Saugatuck Road, spoke in favor of the project. He acknowledged the Commission's difficult task of balancing the community's needs. He pointed out that residents generally want less development, but that the needs of the overall community needed to be considered as well. He emphasized that if there needed to be an excess of one type of development, residential development would be preferable, largely because it serves to drive costs down.

Ms. Carol Ann Curry, 29 Hiawatha Lane, described the neighborhood, saying that it was predominantly moderate homes in a humble and family-oriented area. She said that the neighborhood association did not have a lot of funds and that she was concerned about excess traffic if her street was used as an access lane. She addressed flooding conditions in the area, emphasizing that conditions should be put in place for remediation, if the street were used as an access road.

Mr. Michael Devine, a Westport resident, described his family's dairy farm that was eliminated by eminent domain when I-95 was constructed. He said that I-95 was a positive addition to the area and that it had been simply unfortunate for the dairy farm. He encouraged the public to consider whether this proposed change to the area might also have a positive impact.

Ms. Gail Stevens, Howard Avenue, stated that she had a lot of sympathy for those who came from Westport to speak at the hearing. She discussed the problem of traffic in the area.

Ms. Elizabeth Keny stated that the 244 residences expected at the development would impact traffic all day and evening, not just at the peak times mentioned by the traffic consultant. She added that the impact on schools would be significant. Ms. Keny emphasized that industrial sites ought to remain industrial sites.

Mr. Edward J. Musante, Jr., of the Chamber of Commerce, said that there had been a lot of anecdotes about traffic tonight, many of which dated from 1994 and 1996. He encouraged the public and the

Commission to examine the hard facts presented by the traffic study. Mr. Musante added that the Master Plan called for projects like this one, in order to provide affordable housing opportunities. He explained how manufacturing had struggled in a high-cost area. He said that while it was good to see residents passionate about Norwalk, the Commission needed to look at the facts surrounding the project.

Ms. Diane Lauricella, 16 Marlboro Road, pointed out that residents who live on a street with traffic accidents are considered expert witnesses. She said that there was considerable case law surrounding this issue, adding that the residents' descriptions of traffic were not merely anecdotal. Ms. Lauricella said that she was in favor of many Spinnaker developments, but that this project had not met the standard of highest and best use of the property. She also stated that there were unused stimulus funds available for industry and that clean industry should be considered for the area, as well.

Mr. Bentley read aloud the referrals from the Planning Commission, Coastal Area Management, and SWRPA.

There was a five-minute recess called at 12:00 am.

Atty. Suchy stated that the applicant's rebuttal would focus on traffic, environmental issues, and the overall impact of the project.

Mr. Paul Jobmann discussed the environmental condition of the property, indicating the areas of concern on a map. He said that soil remediation was complete and that residential criteria had been met on that side of the property.

Ms. Lightfield asked about the completion of Stage 2. Mr. Jobmann described what was meant by "closing out" that stage.

Mr. Mushak asked about the plume on the other side of the property. Mr. Jobmann clarified that that plume was not closed out.

Atty. Suchy provided a letter from the Conservation Commission addressing jurisdiction on the site. She pointed out the DEP's jurisdiction, providing a Corporation Counsel document attesting to the jurisdiction.

Mr. Fred Mascia addressed the topic of septic and sewer systems on the site. He said that the Health Department and the DEP opposed a community system, when there was an alternative available.

Ms. Lightfield asked if the four Hiawatha Lane residences would need to be on septic, if the project were approved. Mr. Masica said that septic would not work there and would also need to be approved by another agency.

There was a discussion of the sewer system's capacity.

Mr. Mike Galante confirmed that the traffic counts were conducted when school was in session. He clarified the numbers, pointing out that different uses of the property would generate different traffic rates. He also discussed parking comparisons from other developments in the City.

Mr. Mushak asked how many parking spaces were required. Atty. Suchy stated that the applicant was proposing 86 more parking spaces than were required.

Mr. Blank addressed the issue of parking at Rolling Ridge Condos. Mr. Galante confirmed that the parking counts were based on actual counts, not estimates.

Mr. Kim Morque addressed the market need for more apartments in the area. He pointed out that he had owned the property since 2000 and had received 80 inquiries about development, the vast majority of which were for office use. He discussed demographics and the demand for multi-family housing. Mr. Morque said that housing was the highest and best use of the site. He also stated that senior housing had been considered at the site, but the potential purchaser had not been satisfied with the location. Mr. Morque added that the project involved a net tax positive and also that there were 30 to 40 easements on the property.

Ms. Spencer asked how many total residents were anticipated. Mr. Morque said 1.4 per unit. Ms. Spencer asked if the developer would continue to manage the property. Mr. Morque said that it was not certain, but that it would be managed by a party with high standards.

Atty. Suchy said that the Master Plan supported this project, pointing out that the manufacturing backbone of the area was gone. She emphasized that this project did not involve a change in zone, but rather the addition of a new use. She addressed the RTM members' pleas to refrain from using Hiawatha Lane. She stated that it was unrealistic to ask commuters to use a particular train station, adding that commuters would simply use the most convenient station for themselves. Atty. Suchy said that any use of the site would generate some traffic impact, but that this use was thoughtful and sensitive. She pointed out that some residents did not support any use proposed for the property, including college use and office use. She added that even uses such as senior housing would too require a special permit. She also stated that the Commission was acting in a legislative capacity in its vote on the text amendment.

Ms. Spencer asked about the time frame for construction. Atty. Suchy said that it was expected to be the second half of 2010.

Ms. Lightfield closed the public hearing.

IV. REPORT OF PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE, JAMES WHITE, CHAIR

a. #10-08SP – STJL,LLC & 100 Westport Av LLC – Westport Ave – 16,000 sq ft addition (Stew Leonard's)--Request for extension of approval time – Report & recommendation

**** MR. WHITE MOVED: RESOLVED that the one year extension request of the approval on application #10-08 SP, submitted by STLJ, LLC, 100 Westport Avenue, Norwalk, CT and 100 Westport Avenue LLC, 100 Westport Avenue, Norwalk, CT, for a two-story addition for a new main entrance, retail space and office and support space above, as shown on plans by Rotondo Engineering, LLC, Shelton, CT, entitled “Proposed Building Addition, Stew Leonard’s, 100 Westport Avenue, dated 09/10/08, revised to 10/01/08 and by The Sullivan Architectural Group, Norwalk, CT, dated 09/10/08 be APPROVED; and**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the new deadline is November 28, 2010.

**** MS. SPENCER SECONDED.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

b. #7-06SPR/#16-06CAM – North Water Street Tarragon, LLC – 20 North Water St/Washington St – 185,000 sq ft mixed use development – Request for extension of approval time – Report & recommendation

**** MR. WHITE MOVED: RESOLVED that the request for a one year extension of time for site plan application #7-06SPR and coastal site plan application #16-06CAM; North Water St, Tarragon LLC (formerly North Water, LLC) – 20 North Water St/Washington St - ±185,000 sq ft mixed use development with 128 multifamily dwelling units, including 13 affordable units, and 26,882 square feet retail in 3 new buildings with 10 public parking spaces and a public plaza with water feature as shown on a set of plans entitled "Norwalk Company Redevelopment, North Water Street, Norwalk, CT." by Beinfield Architecture, PC; Studio ABK Architects LLC; Rotondo Engineering, LLC and other related plans dated March 27, 2006 as revised to October 24, 2006 be approved, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. That the original conditions of approval remain in effect; and**
- 2. That the new approval deadline for obtaining permits will be November 24, 2010; and**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action be October 30, 2009.

**** MR. BENTLEY SECONDED.
** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

c. #12-07SP – Winston Prep & Clover Hill Schools & Tutor Time (NAC Equities) – 57 West Rocks Rd – Establish school & day care uses - Request for return of bond – Report & recommendation

MR. WHITE MOVED: RESOLVED that the request to release the surety held on Special Permit SP #12-07—Winston Prep & Clover Hill Schools & Tutor Time—57 West Rocks Rd—Establish schools & day care uses—Request release of surety be APPROVED as the required improvements have been properly executed; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a one (1) year, 15% maintenance surety be submitted/retained to guarantee satisfactory performance of the required improvements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this approval shall be October 30, 2009.

**** MR. BENTLEY SECONDED.
** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

V. REPORT OF ZONING COMMITTEE, ROBERT KEYES, CHAIR

- a. Action on Items III. a. and b.

**** MR. KEYES MADE A MOTION TO SEND THE ITEM BACK TO COMMITTEE FOR FURTHER REVIEW.
** MR. WHITE SECONDED.
** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 16, 2009

Mr. Blank pointed out an error concerning his attendance at the meeting. Staff agreed to correct the error.

- ** MS. LIGHTFIELD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, WITH THE CORRECTIONS DISCUSSED.**
- ** MS. SPENCER SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VII. REPORT OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE: Election of Officers

The Committee agreed to maintain the same officers, with Ms. Lightfield as Chair, Mr. Keyes as Vice-Chair, Mr. White as Chair of the Plan Review Committee, and Ms. Light as Secretary.

- ** MR. WHITE MOVED TO APPROVE THE ELECTION OF THE OFFICERS AS DISCUSSED.**
- ** MS. LIGHTFIELD SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VIII. ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE: Adoption of 2010 Meeting schedule

- ** MR. BENTLEY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE SCHEDULE AS PRESENTED.**
- ** MR. WHITE SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

IX. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR

There were none tonight.

X. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

There were none tonight.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

- ** MS. LIGHTFIELD MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN.**
- ** MS. SPENCER SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:02 am.

Respectfully submitted by Charlene Smith.