

CORNWALL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (DRB)

Regular Meeting May 1, 2024 7:00 -10:13pm

In Person (Town Hall) & Virtually (via ZOOM)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barbara Greenwood, Shari Johnson, Molly Daly, Douglas Black

ALTERNATES: Adam Eckhardt (serving as Regular Board Member), Joan Lynch

ATTENDEES: Gail Isenberg, Angela Landsberg, Stan Grzyb, Meg Harris, CORA; Bruce MacIntire (ACSD); John Dehn, Alex Carver, Lisa Calitri, Ronald Calitri, Klara Calitri (Dehn/ Boeckman); Gale Synnott; Marge Drexler; Brian Gill; Ian Gill; Brian Kemp; Tanya Byker; Robert Gill; Lynn Coale (ZA);

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 pm Barbara Greenwood, Chair
2. **QUORUM:** Established
3. **AGENDA APPROVAL:** Shari MOVED, Joan SECONDED, to approve the Agenda as presented.
Motion passed.
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**
 - Shari MOVED, Molly SECONDED, to approve the **Minutes of March 6, 2024** as amended.
Motion passed.
 - Shari MOVED, Molly SECONDED, to approve the **Minutes of April 3, 2024** as presented.
Motion passed.

Board Agenda paused, recording begun

5. **SIGN-INS for members of the public:** Members of the public attending this evening and planning to testify were asked to sign-in and swear an oath. People attending in person were asked to add their name and mailing address to the attendance sheet that was circulating. Douglas and Robin will take the same information from those attending via Zoom. Douglas swore-in those who plan to present testimony.
 - *Gail Isenberg, CORA Committee Chair*—in-person
 - *Angela Landsberg*—in-person
 - *Lynn Coale*—in-person
 - *Brian Gill*—in-person
 - *Alex Carver*—in-person
 - *Tanya Byker*—in-person
 - *Meg Harris*—via Zoom
 - *John Dehn*—via Zoom
 - *Bruce MacIntire*—via Zoom
 - *Stan Grzyb*—in-person
 - *Marge Drexler*—in-person
 - *Ian Gill*—in-person
 - *Lisa Calitri*—in-person
 - *Brian Kemp*—in-person
 - *Robert Gill*—via Zoom
 - *Ronald & Klara Calitri*—via Zoom
 - *Gale Synnott*—via Zoom

6. **HEARING: Application brought by Cornwall Outdoor Recreation Area (CORA) for a Site Plan Review of a proposed outdoor recreation space.**

This hearing is a continuation of the initial hearing held March 6, involving an application brought by the CORA Committee for Site Plan Review of their proposed outdoor recreation area to be located just off School Road across from the Cornwall elementary school parking lot. The proposed recreation area is located on town land and is planned to be community-owned and -operated. The proposed project thus falls under the “Special Public Use Exception” provision of the *Zoning Regulations*.

The DRB is required to conduct a Site Plan Review of Special Public Use Exceptions to ensure proper development within the site. The first hearing was adjourned so that CORA could obtain a survey, prepare a site plan, and submit certain additional information to the Board.

A. Introduction—Barbara explained how the hearing will be conducted, and that it will follow an orderly manner, in accordance with the DRB’s rules of procedure.

- First, some housekeeping matters,
- then, the Committee will present their additional information, materials, and waiver requests;
- the presentation will be followed by Board questions and an opportunity for public comment, then a further opportunity for Board questions.
- the Applicants will have opportunities to respond in each of those stages.
- when all questions and comments are done, the Board will confer to determine if they are ready to close the hearing and begin deliberations, or if there is a reason to recess the hearing and reschedule.

B. Housekeeping: Conflicts of Interest—Board members to disclose any conflict of interest, ex parte communications, or visits to the property:

- **Barbara** noted that she and Andrea talked on April 15 about a couple of questions Andrea had about setbacks for interior lots—as this parcel turns out to be—and about how to mark setbacks on the plat. On April 17 there was an email exchange with Andrea to clarify measurements DRB will need in connection with requested setback waivers. Barbara, via email to Stan and Andrea, asked that easement documents be filed.
- **Douglas** visited the site on April 27.

C. Housekeeping:

Exhibits submitted for March 6 hearing:

- **Exhibit 1**—Warning, posted in a timely fashion at 3 locations in town and on website
- **Exhibit 2**—Certified mail receipts for warnings sent to abutting property owners
- **Exhibit 3**—Application materials. The original application was filed on February 8
- **Exhibit 3A**—CORA site plan of proposed outdoor recreation area
- **Exhibit 4**—Copy of Engineering map, filed February 26
- **Exhibit 5**—Copy of Survey of School parcel prepared by Ronald LaRose dated 1/28/81
- **Exhibit 6**—Additional materials filed by Stan Grzyb
- **Exhibit 7**—CCC review of the CORA project; submitted March 6.

Exhibits submitted for May 1 hearing:

- **Exhibit 8**—Notice of this Hearing (posted in a timely fashion at the Town Hall and Town Garage, on the Town website, and on the property).
- **Exhibit 9**—Certificate of Mailing for warnings sent to abutting property owners.
- **Exhibit 10**—A 4-page document submitted by the applicant and containing follow up to questions from the hearing on March 6, along with waiver requests; filed April 17.
- **Exhibit 11**—Quit-Claim Deed from The Town of Cornwall to the Addison County Central School District, dated February 28, 2018; filed April 17.
- **Exhibit 12**—Survey referenced in the Quit-Claim Deed, being a survey of the Anna Stowell Sunderland Bingham Memorial School, prepared by Ronald L LaRose January 28, 1981. [*obtained from Town Clerk*]
- **Exhibit 13**—Draft Boundary Retracement Survey Plat, prepared by Bernard & Gervais

- **Exhibit 14**—*Draft Site Plan—Existing Site Conditions*, prepared by Bernard & Gervais, undated; filed April 17
- **Exhibit 15**—*Draft Site Plan—Proposed Conditions*, prepared by Bernard & Gervais, undated; filed April 17
- **Exhibit 16**—Email exchange between Stan Grzyb and Mike Gaines at Barnard & Gervais about the Town of Cornwall’s right to access the parcel over the town road right-of-way and the perpetual easement.
- **Exhibit 17**—Road Access permit issued to CORA/Town of Cornwall, April 18, 2024
- **Exhibit 18**—April 26, 2024 email from Andrea Landsberg attaching two documents: a list of the actual setbacks of those elements of the proposed Rec Park for which setback waivers are requested; and a map with the measurement locations noted.
- **Exhibit 19**—May 1, 2024 email from Robert Gill expressing concern with possible impact on the Gill property of waivers as requested, and indicating there is a likely misconstruing among members of the Gill family regarding plans for the property.

D. Applicant Presentation—CORA Committee was asked to present their additional information and material, and their requests for waivers. Presented as written testimony and marked as *Exhibit 10*:

- **Safety Concerns**. Traffic congestion, concerns regarding strangers being attracted to the school area, etc
 - CORA met with the principal to address mitigation of the concerns expressed; signage will be clear with basic information about traffic, parking, hours of operation; CORA will be working with the Road Foreman to mitigate traffic concerns; contact with the school will be ongoing.
 - **Signage** to include:
 - Notice about pick-up/drop-off times: “*Please avoid driving to area during school pick up and drop off times*”(with list these times).
 - Caution about school children being in the area (noise, vehicle speed, etc.)
 - Basic “rules” such as “Leave no trace” principles, limit noise and distraction, etc.
 - Court/Pitch “Rules”
 - Map of site with legend
 - CORA plans to create an advisory committee to maintain the recreation area and to include a representative of the school on this committee.
 - CORA believes that having an area for local residents to walk, recreate, and be present in the adjacent property is more likely to deter use of the school grounds by strangers.
- **Hours of Operation**
 - *Regulations* suggest hours to be between 7:00^{AM} and 9:00^{PM}, but CORA feels that 10:00^{PM} would be appropriate as, at the summer equinox, civil twilight lasts until 9:15^{PM} and outdoor activities often extend beyond this point; lights will be token-operated, likely on a timer which will turn them off at 10:15 regardless of when the last token was dropped in thus overriding any extension of the operating hours; they feel there is little likelihood of anyone wanting to play before 7:00^{AM} so that should not be an issue.
- **Waivers**—Four waivers are requested:
 1. **Waiver to allow some design elements to be within the setback areas**—CORA believes that having portions of the walking path, some rest benches, an exercise station, ±½ of the parking, and ±½ of the pickleball/tennis courts within the setback area will not compromise travel ways, access, or safety, nor will it constitute any meaningful intrusion

onto adjoining properties.

- *North Boundary.* The existing “Shed and Outdoor Kitchen” structures that belong to the school already lie within the front setback (North boundary) minimum setback of 35 feet. The school is expected and encouraged to continue to make use of these existing structures and the entire CORA area. Additionally, the welcome kiosk is proposed to lie within the setback area. There are plans to also have vegetation, some of it hedges that will be higher than the benches, particularly along the school-facing, North border to minimize noise and visual distraction for the school.
 - *West Boundary.* Setback requirements are fully met;.
 - *East Boundary.* The setback is at 65' to accommodate the State Class II wetland buffer requirements.
 - *South Boundary.* The majority of the elements within the setback zone are ‘ground level’ (i.e.: paths and a small portion of the parking lot), with a few benches and sections of tennis court fencing (10' high chain link).
2. Waiver for Lot Depth to be less than 200 feet—The town lot on which CORA is planned is between 167' and 168' deep, north to south. The planned development of the lot is minimal, consisting of only 1 structure (an open pavilion) and fenced courts. CORA does not feel that the ‘density’ of this plan will compromise the surrounding area or the village center in any way. This development will provide a common recreational area for residents as well as improve the visual appearance with landscaping in an area that currently is mown field with significant invasive trees/shrubs.
3. Waiver for lot coverage to be more than the 15% maximum allowed by the Regulations for a less-than-3-acre parcel in District VI.—The CORA lot is ±2 acres. The lot coverage for this project as proposed will be 17.2%. (2 acres = 87,120 sq ft; 15,014 sq ft of impervious surfaces). Bernard & Gervais, LLC are determining if a storm water permit will be needed. As a reference, state regulations require a storm water permit only when a development (of any size) has more than 0.5 acre of impervious surface.
4. Waiver for court lighting poles to be 20' tall (15' is the height limit for this district).—To provide adequate lighting for the courts with 4 light fixtures, the poles need to be 20' tall. Two additional light fixtures would be needed to get the same coverage if the 15' height maximum is adhered to. This would mean a total of 6 poles by the courts (8 poles on site rather than 6), and would be a significant increase in cost (\$5,100).

The CORA committee completely agrees with the need to minimize light pollution and will use LED*, down-facing lights. They will ensure that the lighting is only turned on when needed, has automatic shut off after a period of 60–90 minutes, and can be prevented from being turned on after 10:00^{PM}. This will be accomplished through timers and/or a token-operated system. This is preferred to motion detector activation which could be triggered by wildlife and activate at any hour of the night.

The light poles for the parking area illumination will be only 15' high as this will permit adequate lighting for that area. These lights will be on a regular timer so will illuminate only when needed and turn off at closing time. (Ideally, this would not be right at 10:00^{PM} but perhaps 10:10^{PM} to allow CORA users to safely get to their vehicles and leave.)

E. DRB Questions

- Lighting—Please explain about the lighting. **CORA:** The required 15' height limit is not quite tall enough to provide adequate lighting for the pickleball/tennis courts if 4 15' poles are used. The options are to add 2 more poles at an additional cost of \$5,100 or stay with 4

poles, but increase their height to 20'. Increasing the height of 4 poles would cost less than adding 2 additional poles (\$25,368 for 8 at 15' vs \$19,857 for 2 at 15' and 4 at 20').

- *Eliminate the lighting—Would this be possible? Middlebury has no lights.* **CORA:** Shoreham finds lights beneficial. They might also help usability when the park is used for other events.
- *Year-round—Is there a potential for year-round use or using further into the winter months?* **CORA:** The light timer would be adjustable so could be changed to come on earlier. The automatic shut down time would over-ride any time remaining from the last token(s) inserted.
- *Other towns' issues—Have Shoreham or Middlebury noted any issues with noise and distractions? What are their hours?* **CORA:** No hours posted at either place. Pickleball is noisy, so potential for distractability is high. Night play could be especially troublesome.
- *Plant purchases—Clarify issues regarding plant purchases.* **CORA:** The cost of full-size plants can be very high, the plan is to purchase younger plants that will eventually reach their full size after planting.
- *South side setback.—How far into the setback area will the courts extend?* **CORA:** Not entirely certain, about 3' leaving a setback from the south boundary of about 32'.
- *Parking—How many spots are proposed?* **CORA:** There are 12 spots, 2 are ADA compliant and 2 are in the setback areas (one on the North and one on the South). CORA is willing to eliminate the southern spot if necessary.
- *Plat—Why is the plat still a draft?* **CORA:** The final plat was waiting for the final perimeter pins to be set which happened earlier today. A “stamped” plat is being sent.
 - *Pin accuracy—How confident is Gervais about the pin placement?* **CORA:** They are GPS placed, so Gervais is very confident about their accuracy.

F. Public Questions/Comments

- *Brian Gill—Raised a question about the common boundary between the Gill and CORA/Town properties and how it might impact the Gill family's plans. A short discussion ensued.* **DRB** pointed out that the question was not pertinent to what the DRB was convened this evening to do. In any case, the question was better posed to the Selectboard.
- *Stan—Noted that although the Perpetual Easement extended beyond the end of School Road, the CORA lot was nonetheless an interior lot as it had no frontage on School Road.*
- *Bruce—Asked if the relief requested by CORA meant that the school garden and structures in the north setback area would need to be moved.* **CORA:** No
- *Robert—His property will be affected by the lighting, storm-water run-off, etc; shares Brian G's concerns about the mound and boundary between the Gill and CORA lots, but feels any talk of building a structure east of the mound is premature, the Gill family has yet to discuss this.*
 - *DRB—Can you clarify your lighting concerns?* **Robert:** A pole in excess of 15' amounts to light pollution.
 - *Septic easement?* **Robert:** Does not want anything that might encroach on his setback, thinks an easement might be needed if they want access to the east side of their property, does not think his mound system encroaches onto the CORA lot. **Brian K:** Noted that the curtain drain's drain pipe encroached on the town property by about 3' **CORA:** Would be amenable to an easement if there is sufficient room.
- *Gail—Supports the CORA project and appreciates the opportunity to speak.*
- *Brian K—Speaking as a private citizen, he expects that an equitable solution can be found regarding the Gills' concerns about the shared boundary between CORA and themselves.*

- *Bruce*—Thinks the 12th spot at the south end of the parking lot should be retained for any over-flow that might happen onto the school lot from an event at the Park.

G. DRB Final Questions—None

H. CORA Final comments—None

I. Wrap—At 8:25, after determining that the Board felt they had sufficient information to open their deliberative phase, Barbara closed the hearing. She advised that the Board had 45 days to issue their decision, but did not expect it would take that long.

Break

7. Hearing—Carver/ Dehn/Boeckman—Application for waiver

This hearing is for an application for a setback waiver brought by Alex Carver on behalf of property owners John Dehn and Ann Boeckman. The application is brought in connection with the proposed construction of a house and garage on a 19.86 acre parcel located on the south side of Sperry Road, about 800 feet to the west of Route 30. The property is in the LDR. The applicant seeks a waiver of the 50-foot sideyard minimum.

A. Introduction—Barbara explained how the hearing will be conducted, and that it will follow an orderly manner, in accordance with the DRB’s rules of procedure.

- First, some housekeeping matters,
- then, the Committee will present their additional information, materials, and waiver requests;
- the presentation will be followed by Board questions and an opportunity for public comment, then a further opportunity for Board questions.
- the Applicants will have opportunities to respond in each of those stages.
- when all questions and comments are done, the Board will confer to determine if they are ready to close the hearing and begin deliberations, or if there is a reason to recess the hearing and reschedule.

B. Housekeeping: Conflicts of Interest—Board members to disclose any conflict of interest, ex parte communications, or visits to the property:

- *Barbara*
 - Noted she had had some ex parte discussions with Alex Carver to request additional material the DRB would like to have filed—list of abutters with info from the Town Clerk to make sure names & addresses are up to date, tax map with abutters marked on it, setbacks marked on maps.
 - Walked the property on April 15 with Adam.
 - Barbara and her husband have been working with an architect to renovate the back corner of our house. The architect has been in touch with a few builders to see if they are interested, one of them being Alex Carver’s company, Northern Timbers. Alex and his partner came to look at the house a few weeks ago. At this point there has been no contract or negotiation with any of the builders and she does not see this as a conflict.
- *Douglas* visited the site on April 27.
- *Shari* visited the site on April 22.
- *Molly* visited the site on May 1.
- *Adam* visited the site on April 27 with Barbara, as noted.

C. Housekeeping: Exhibits

Exhibit 1—Warning, or Notice of Hearing (which was posted in a timely fashion at the Town Hall and Town Garage, on the Town website, and on the property)

Exhibit 2—Certified mail receipts for warnings sent to abutting property owners, along

with list of abutters,

Exhibit 3—Tax map marking the subject property and the properties of the abutters.

Exhibit 4—Copy of original application for Zoning Permit with Road Access Permit, elevations, and 8½" x 11" part of conceptual site plan attached.

Exhibit 5—Application form, attachment, and clarification. The original application was filed on April 2 and ruled complete. Additional materials were filed later that week.

5A: Completed application form dated March 25, 2024

5B: Document entitled "Request for Building Permit & Site Waiver"

5C: Document entitled "Correction/Clarification of Applications for Building Permit & Site Waiver"

Exhibit 6—Trustee's Deed dated June 8, 2023 from Bread Loaf Farm Realty Trust V to John Charles Dehn and Ann M. Boeckman.

Exhibit 7—8½" x 11" copy of Survey Plat of Proposed Subdivision of the parcel dated September 13, 2012; we understand that subdivision was never completed

Exhibit 8—Proposed Lot 2 site design (wastewater design) dated March 1, 2021- both a full size copy and an 8½" x 11" copy

Exhibit 9A—Proposed Conceptual Site Plan dated April 1, 2024—full size copy

Exhibit 9B—Proposed Conceptual Site Plan—8½" x 11" copy

Exhibit 10—proposed construction schedule

Exhibit 11—May 2, 2023 memo from Aimee Rutledge to John Dehn regarding Sperry Road Wetlands/Water Resources Review

Exhibit 12—October 25, 2023 memo from Travis Hart to John Dehn entitled "Summary from Site Visit Monday"

Exhibit 13—Cornwall Conservation Commission review of the application dated April 18, 2024, with attached Vermont Agency of Natural Resources map.

Exhibit 14—Email from VG Gooding expressing his support for the Dehn/Boeckman project, dated April 29.

D. Applicant Presentation—Alex Carver started with an introduction for himself and John Dehn, then turned the presentation over to John.

- In addition to Alex, Dehn consulted with Dubois and King, and Travis Hart (ANR/Dept of Fish & Wildlife, State & Private Lands Biologist).
- Dubois & King's report indicated the following:
 - The entire parcel is about 19.8 acres, the "Lot 2" portion being 9+ acres, the remainder being "Lot 1".
 - Agency of Natural Resources' Natural Resource Atlas website shows a wetland advisory layer, hydric soils near the northwestern corner of Lot 2 and across Lot 1. A stream traverses the western portion of Lot 2, with a watershed measuring 0.5—2.0 square miles, and therefore is subject to a state regulated 50-foot river corridor.
 - A steep ravine crosses the west side of Lot 2 with the east and west sides of the lot sloping toward the ravine.
- Travis Hart did a site review relative to the vegetation. His findings included:
 - Extensive invasive species growth (honeysuckle and buck-thorn)
 - Pines that are not in good condition
 - He provided a starter list of hardwoods that could be planted .
 - He also suggested a bush-hogging program be set up, the pines be cut down, and herbicides used to kill the invasives.
- All the above serve mainly to point out the constraints within which Dehn/Boeckman

must work to build their house and the limited space available for construction.

- The only spot on the property suitable for a dwelling turned out to be in the Northwest corner of Lot 2. This was due to the overall topography consisting of woodlands, wildlife habitat, wetlands, ravine, and ledges.
- The CCC noted a large area as prime conservation land.
- The goal is to build a net-zero dwelling. For this reason, the house was placed to take full advantage of the sun via roof panels and passive solar via placement of windows.
- They feel they have done all that they can and that they have met or exceeded the energy efficiency goals of the Town Plan and provisions of the *Zoning Regulations*.
- The house is also designed for one-level living with disability/accessibility options as well as energy efficiency.

E. Board Questions

- **DRB:** *Can you expand on the solar and battery back-up?* **Dehn:** The house is to be situated for maximum solar exposure with solar panels on the roof and many south-facing windows for passive heat gain. No panels on the garage as it does not have appropriate orientation
- **DRB:** *What about the septic?* **Dehn:** There were two drawing that came with the property. The Lot 1 location was better for the mound, but not great for the house. They preferred the Lot 2 location for the house. The mound site is permitted.
- **DRB:** *Can the house be moved slightly to the Southwest?* **Dehn:** The garage would make that difficult wherever it is placed. They are very concerned about adding infill. There are two groundwater areas south of the ledge.
- **DRB:** *Has a BLA with the Calitris been considered? It could make the question of a waiver moot.* **Dehn:** He has spoken with them though not about a BLA specifically. **Lisa:** They are willing to discuss a BLA.
- **DRB:** *Could you clarify the waiver request?* **Dehn:** It is 24' from the garage wall to the Calitri boundary so they are looking for a reduction in the setback from 50' to 24'.
- **DRB:** *Please explain the clearing that has occurred.* **Dehn:** On the advice of Travis Hart, the pines that were not useful for habitat or flourishing were removed.
- **DRB:** *Can the garage be moved closer to the house?* **Dehn:** Possibly, but the gain would be no more than 4 or 5 feet.
- **DRB:** *How close to the Calitri boundary is the drive? It can't be closer than 5'.* **Carver:** Definitely not as close as 5',
- **DRB:** *What is the drive portion that extends beyond the garage?* **Dehn:** Primarily for heavy equipment like the well driller, or other heavy equipment that might need access in that direction.
- **DRB:** *What is included in the coverage figure? Also, just for the record, note that we consider gravel to be an impermeable surface.* **Dehn:** The house, breezeway, and garage (±1,892 square feet).
- **DRB:** *Can the garage be moved behind the house?* **Dehn:** Would shield the panels and negatively impact the passive solar exposure.
- **DRB:** *Can the panels be ground-mounted to the south?* **Dehn:** Thought the preference was to have them roof-mounted. Ground-mounting might be a possibility. Moving house or panels to the south might make them more visible.
- **DRB:** *Could you explain "potential wildlife corridor"?* **Dehn:** The woods connecting the North and South areas provide an avenue for wildlife to traverse from one section to another. The corridor area includes the river corridor and trees on both side.

F. Public Questions/Comments

- *Lisa*—The issue of sight-lines is important to her mother who has concerns about impacts on her sight-lines. **Carver:** He can arrange for a marker, perhaps a balloon, to be attached to an oak tree in that area so the Calitris can see if the sight-line will be impacted.
- *Lisa*—What is the height of the garage? **Carver:** It's about 2' lower than the peak of the house.
- *Lisa*—Concerned about using herbicides to clear invasives. **Dehn:** He is not inclined to pursue that course of action, that does not fit with their feelings on environmental issues.
- *Ronald*—Would like to follow-up on line of sight issues further. Thinks their mother might be amenable to a BLA land swap. **Carver:** He would like to look into that as soon as possible, perhaps within the next couple of days.
- Short discussion on how a BLA works, what the advantages might be to both parties, and the effect it would have in removing the need for a waiver. All agreed it is well worth looking into.

G. Additional Applicant Response—They could consider building the house without a garage if necessary.

H. Additional Board or Public Questions—None

I. Wrap

- After the BLA discussion, it was decided to go ahead with scheduling the next hearing, but with the understanding that if the Calitris and Dehn/ Boeckman come to an agreement on a BLA, the hearing will be cancelled.
- At 9:35, Barbara adjourned the hearing to June 5 at 7:00PM at the Town Hall.

Recording stopped, Board Agenda resumed.

8. CORRESPONDENCE—Barbara passed around a Thank You message from Sue.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

- **Old:**
 - **Zoom:** Screen sharing during meetings—Douglas will write out the set up process for screen sharing.
- **New**—None

10. MEETING AVAILABILITY

- **June 5:** All available.
- **July:** Following a survey of when the DRB members would be available for a July meeting, July 15 was selected with all expecting to be available.

11. DELIBERATION: The Board held a brief deliberative session. Robin will pull together the CORA hearing notes for the decision and prepare the base format.

12. ADJOURNMENT: At 10:10^{PM} Joan MOVED, Douglas SECONDED, to adjourn the meeting. *Motion passed.*

Respectfully submitted,
Robin Conway, Board Secretary