

These minutes were approved at the April 12, 2006, meeting.

**DURHAM PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, DURHAM TOWN HALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Kelley; Arthur Grant; Nick Isaak; Stephen Roberts; Richard Ozenich; Councilor Needell

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Councilor Carroll; Bill McGowan; Susan Fuller; Lorne Parnell

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kevin Webb

I. Call to Order

Chair Kelley said alternate member Bill McGowan would be voting in place of regular member Kevin Webb that evening.

II. Approval of Agenda

Chair Kelley said Item IV, the presentation by Mr. Campbell on the duties and responsibilities of the Planning Board, would be switched with Item III, Discussion of the Master Plan Implementation Strategy, Chapters 1-3.

Councilor Needell MOVED to approve the Agenda as amended. The motion was SECONDED by Arthur Grant, and PASSED unanimously 7-0.

III. Discussion of Master Plan Implementation Strategy, Chapters 1, 2 & 3.

Councilor Needell explained that he had extracted the goals, objectives, and recommendations from Chapters 1-3, and moved them into a Microsoft Word document. He suggested that the recommendations and what had been accomplished concerning them should be tracked in a Table.

Chair Kelley noted that demographic information in Chapter 1 needed to be updated, and said these kinds of things should be noted in the Table, as the Board went through the various chapters.

Mr. McGowan asked what the accountability was in terms of implementing recommendations that were supposed to have happened, but didn't happen.

Chair Kelley said the Board should look at why a recommendation was not implemented, - because of budget issues, because it was no longer relevant, etc, and said this should be indicated in the Table, next to the particular recommendation.

Councilor Needell noted that for some recommendations, there was no intention that it would have been implemented yet. He said some of these longer-term items were being tracked in some way, by the CIP, etc.

Mr. Campbell said as the Board looked at the various recommendations, it could determine who the appropriate person(s) were to follow through with them in terms of implementation. He said that for some of these recommendations, there would be a specific due date, while other completion times would be open ended. He said it was his job, and the Board's job, to continually review that.

Mr. Roberts noted that the Historic District Commission's had come forward with a proposal the past year that the Planning Board had thought was overreaching. He said it was agreed at that time to revise the Historic District ordinance to the minimal extent possible, and to then revisit the issues later. He said he was concerned that the Board never did revisit these issues, noting that as Chair of the Board, he had promised to do this. He said he felt this was a key issue to address.

Councilor Needell asked if the HDC issues were on the list of Zoning rewrite items that Mr. Campbell was compiling.

Mr. Campbell said the HDC had wanted to do a lot more with the ordinance than the Master Plan said they could do, and noted that the courts overturned those kinds of things. He also said he didn't think the Board had forgotten the Historic District ordinance issues, but had simply had other things to deal with.

The Board next started to go through the Chapters of the Master Plan.

Chapter 1 – DEMOGRAPHICS, HOUSING AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT

SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING

Issue #1: The Town will continue to grow. If this growth is not planned for and managed appropriately, it could significantly impact the fiscal and environmental health of the community.

Goal: Plan for anticipated single-family growth so it will not adversely impact the fiscal and environmental health of the Town of Durham.

Objective: Explore school impact fees to offset the educational costs associated with new residential construction. Consider enactment of impact fees for Town services such as police, fire, and solid waste in order to ensure that new growth pays for the increase in service demand created by it.

Recommendations:

- 1. Examine costs associated with development and maintenance of a municipal impact fee program for single family and multi-unit development, and assess whether the growth in Durham warrants the costs associated with running an impact fee program.....**

There was discussion that the Town had made some strides concerning this. Mr. Campbell said a cost analysis had been done concerning administration of an impact fee program. He said a question was whether the amount of development in Town in recent years warranted such a program.

There was discussion on the kind and amount of administration needed for such a program, and whether there was enough growth to warrant the expenditure for administration of an impact fee program.

Mr. Campbell noted that the impact fee ordinance was now in place, but the methodology for assessing impact fees was not yet in place, and would need to be approved by the Council. He stressed that having the ordinance on the books did not mean the Town had to go ahead and start assessing impact fees.

Chair Kelley said Mr. Campbell should ask the Business Office to determine specific administration costs associated with maintaining the program.

Mr. Isaak said it might make sense to reorder this section somewhat. In response to Councilor Needell, who said the Board needed to be careful about making wholesale changes to the Master Plan since it was only five years old, Mr. Isaak said he was not suggesting this, but noted that the issue of impact fees applied to more than just single-family housing yet was addressed under Single Family Housing.

Chair Kelley summarized that the implementation of Recommendation #1 was certainly underway.

- 2. Work with the Oyster River School District to develop a long-range capital improvements plan that will accommodate projected growth in the district. This is required in order to develop a school impact fee system.**

Mr. Campbell said the School District did have a CIP, and Mr. Roberts said it was updated every year. Mr. Roberts also said the School had a long range planning committee.

Chair Kelley suggested that their reports should be provided to the Planning Board.

Mr. Grant noted that the consultant's impact fee report included and explained this information.

There was discussion that school impact fees were not to be used as part of the operating budget, and had to be spent within 6 years, or else had to be returned to the developer.

3. Implement a school impact fee system based on the Oyster River School District capital improvements plan. Assess the one-time impact fee on a per bedroom basis for all new construction and additions. Senior housing reserved for ages 62 or older should be exempt.

Mr. Campbell said that based on the recommendation of the consultant, the impact fee would be based on the type of housing, not the number of bedrooms. He provided details on this.

Councilor Needell noted that there were two categories of senior housing, and asked if recommendation #3 implied that age 55 or over was not exempt from school impact fees.

Mr. Grant said at the time the Master Plan was written, the Town only had the 62 and older category for elderly housing.

There was discussion on the Town Council's perspective on possible exemption of elderly housing from having to pay impact fees. Councilor Needell said there was discussion by the Council as to whether the elderly housing category should be addressed in the methodology for the impact fees.

The Board discussed how much it wanted to accomplish that night. There was discussion that perhaps some issues would need to be put aside for the time being so that they didn't get bogged down.

Mr. Roberts noted that Gerry Mylroie of Strafford Regional Planning Commission had recommended a process whereby the Master Plan could be amended on a regular basis, so that it could be a living document.

Councilor Needell pointed out that the beginning of the Master Plan discussed an amendment process.

Mr. Isaak provided some examples of ways to streamline the writing of this Section.

Issue #2: Durham has a high quality housing stock and numerous neighborhoods that create the small-town atmosphere cherished by Durham residents.

Goal: Preserves and enhance the integrity and quality of existing residential neighborhoods.

Recommendations:

- 1. Encourage developers to work extensively with surrounding neighborhood residents (e.g., through neighborhood meetings) to resolve the community's concerns prior to formalizing development plans and going before the Planning Board.**

Mr. Campbell said he did encourage developers to do this, although noting this could not be required of developers. There was discussion about this.

Chair Kelley asked if the idea of providing a questionnaire to applicants concerning this could work.

Mr. Grant said he thought that it might be premature to do that, at that stage of the process, but he suggested that it might be a good idea to add a line in the application asking if the applicant had worked with the neighborhood residents to address issues

Chair Kelley suggested that if developers said yes to this, they could also list the pertinent issues on the application form.

Councilor Needell questioned whether the concept of asking the applicant if the neighborhood had been contacted was defined well enough. He also asked whether neighborhood associations were generally contacted as part of the application process.

Mr. Isaak questioned whether this recommendation was practical or was really needed.

Chair Kelley said it was in a developer's best interest to get as much input as possible on a proposed development.

Mr. Campbell noted that the conceptual consultation option in the Subdivision Regulations got the word out on an application before there was a formal application.

Chair Kelley said he was not convinced there was something in place to really address this, but said the Board would move on, for the time being.

2. **Design traffic circulation systems to reduce speeding, commuter routes, or cut-through traffic that adversely affect street use in or the character of existing residential neighborhoods (see Transportation Chapter recommendations)**

There was brief discussion about this recommendation.

3. **Encourage infill development in the community rather than new development that sprawls into the countryside.Infill development should be in established neighborhoods and should be compatible with existing land use, compatible in scale with surrounding area, and adequately supported by public utilities and the transportation system.**

There was discussion about where infill development was possible in Durham, and where it had actually occurred in Town in recent years, - for example, Fitts Farm. It was also noted that it had been attempted at Fairchild Road. Mr. Campbell also said there had been a number of two lot subdivisions here and there that represented infill development.

Chair Kelley asked if there was any real area within the community core where there was actually potential for single-family housing.

Mr. Grant asked whether when the buildout analysis was done, a figure was developed on the buildout potential specifically for the core community.

Mr. Campbell said there was not, but said it could be determined based on the housing density allowed in that area.

There was discussion on the relevance of this recommendation.

Mr. Grant said there appeared to be potential infill development in the core community, based on the buildout analysis.

Chair Kelley said he would get some specific numbers on this for the Board.

4. **Use land use regulations and ordinances to stabilize residential neighborhoods adjacent to commercial and multi-unit uses through the establishment of transitional yards, vegetative buffers, and/or architectural screens and the control of vehicular access.**

After some discussion, the Board agreed the new Zoning Ordinance addressed these things.

5. **Regulate the amount of noise and light produced by nonresidential land uses to minimize impacts on nearby residential properties. This should be done by revising the Town's current noise ordinance and adopting a town lighting ordinance or regulation.**

Mr. Campbell explained that a lighting ordinance had been drafted, and had then been reviewed and revised extensively by Joe Murdoch, a lighting expert. He said a revised ordinance had not been completed yet. He said work had not been done yet on the noise ordinance, but said it had been put on the list of things to do.

Issue #3: Due to the size of the more rural portion of Durham, it is likely that this area will continue to outpace the more developed core of the Town with respect to new housing construction. However, if efforts are not made to direct housing into the community core in which services and infrastructure are available, and if the zoning for the rural portion of Town promotes "cookie-cutter" style development, the rural services area of Town will lose the characteristics that are so valued by the community.

Goal: Plan for areas of new housing development so that the development maximizes the use of existing infrastructure and minimizes the need for new Town roads and public facilities.

Mr. Isaak noted that the Board had essentially addressed this goal in the prior discussion.

Recommendations:

1. **New housing development should be directed through the Zoning Ordinance to occur on already approved lots and in the core areas of the developed portion of town, defined as north of the Oyster River and Mill Road and west of Johnson's Creek, excluding**

lands which are to be retained for conservation and restricted from development. This area is defined as the “community core.”

There was detailed discussion about this recommendation, and to what extent it had been accomplished.

Mr. Campbell said the Town had implemented some of this recommendation with the revised Zoning Ordinance.

Councilor Needell said that in a way, the Board had implemented this recommendation by increasing lot sizes outside the community core.

Mr. Grant asked if the Planning Office kept track of the number of subdivisions that had been approved, but not developed, and Mr. Campbell said it did. Mr. Grant asked if someone could come in and ask where approved lots were that could be built on in the core area, and Mr. Campbell said yes.

Chair Kelley said it would be good to put that kind of demographic data in the Master Plan.

Mr. Isaak suggested that some maps on this would be worthwhile in the Master Plan.

2. **Conservation based development design (see Land Development Regulations chapter – Chapter 9) should be required under the Town’s Zoning Ordinance and land use regulations for future subdivision proposals, particularly for the less developed portions of Town, for which growth is not desirable due to resource and infrastructure constraints (i.e., areas south of the Oyster River and Mill Road, and east of Johnson’s Creek. This area is defined as the “rural service area”.**

Board members and Mr. Campbell noted that this recommendation had been accomplished.

3. **Allow for private developers, at their cost, to extend water and sewer within the community core described above.....so long as the utilities are properly sized for the long-range development needs of the community, and the developer proves there is adequate capacity in the system. Since development typically follows facility improvements, utility extensions in the rural service area should not be permitted unless good cause is shown, for example, fire protection needs or failing wells or septic systems.**

There was discussion as to whether that recommendation had been implemented, and there was also discussion that the language in the recommendation might need to be strengthened.

Mr. Campbell said he didn’t think there had been a big push to allow this, but said he had certainly seen it discussed.

Mr. Roberts said the Board had suggested this concerning the Spruce Woods development, noting it would be something that would be good for the developer and would also be in the long-term interest of the Town.

Chair Kelley said he didn't see why this wouldn't be encouraged.

Mr. Campbell noted that a lot of people had been waiting for the Zoning Ordinance to be approved, and said this recommendation might provide an opportunity to work with developers.

There was discussion as to whether Spruce Woods was actually located within the community core. After some discussion, Mr. Campbell demonstrated the core area of Town on a map.

Chair Kelley summarized that although some revision to the language in this recommendation would be good, otherwise, it was ok.

- 4. Consider permitting higher densities and the use of the conservation development design approach (see Land Development Regulations chapter – Chapter 9) for sites served by municipal water and/or sewer so as to minimize roads and infrastructure, reduce housing costs, and concentrate growth within the community core. The use of the conservation development design approach does not require an overall increase in gross density. Implementation of this recommendation must be performed carefully, and in concert with the previously stated goal of preserving the integrity of existing neighborhoods.**

Chair Kelley said the Town had implemented the conservation design approach, but not the higher density part.

Mr. Campbell noted that as part of the conservation subdivision approach, if a developer hooked up to town sewer, higher densities were allowed. He provided details on this.

Chair Kelly pointed out that one of the Issues missing from this section was the flooding of pocket neighborhoods with student rentals.

It was noted that this was covered in other chapters in the Master Plan.

MULTI UNIT HOUSING

Issue: Well managed and well designed (including external features and internal floor plans) multi-unit housing can both provide the community with a variety of housing types, and also be a fiscal benefit to the community. However, if the development of this housing type is not carefully planned for, the impacts on town services and the community can be significant.

Goal #1: Encourage a variety of multi-unit housing that serves the needs of the community and minimizes impact on town services.

Objective: Encouraged the construction of units with few bedrooms per unit in new multi-unit developments.

Recommendation: After examining each zoning district individually, modify the Zoning Ordinance to control density through the total number of bedrooms or habitable rooms per acre instead of total units per acre.

There was detailed discussion on what “variety of multiunit housing” referred to, and if it simply meant student housing, while the word “variety” actually referred to the design of the housing. There was also discussion on what the densities were that were allowed in multi-unit housing, according to the Zoning Ordinance.

Councilor Needell said he thought the revised Zoning Ordinance had made a real attempt to implement this recommendation, and said he didn’t see that there was a problem with it.

Mr. Grant said he agreed, and said he thought the Board should wait and see what happened over time concerning this goal and recommendation.

Goal #2: Allow for an adequate supply of private-sector based, multi-unit housing in Durham while minimizing the negative impacts on the community that are often associated with multi-unit housing occupied by students.

Recommendations:

- 1. Identify desirable locations for new private sector based, multi-unit housing in Durham. Locations should be near the UNH campus and provide adequate buffers from other residential uses.**

It was agreed that the Board had done this as part of the Zoning rewrite process.

- 2. Require on-site property managers for large multi-unit developments that will cater to the student population.**

There was discussion that with the conditional use process, the Board had the power to require this.

- 3. Clarify via the Zoning Ordinance, strictly enforce and monitor the existing Ordinance requirement that essentially limits occupancy to a family plus two unrelated individuals or no more than three unrelated individuals per dwelling unit.**

There was discussion on what it had been thought needed to be clarified, when this recommendation was developed.

Mr. Campbell said the key words in the recommendation were “strictly enforce and monitor”, and said he believed that at the time it was written, this wasn’t happening. In response to questions from Board members, he provided details on how monitoring and enforcement was now done by the Town’s Code Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer.

- 4. Remove the provision for boarding houses within the Zoning Ordinance, This is an antiquated use that is not appropriate in Durham and the market is better served by multi-unit dwellings, bed & breakfasts, and inns.**

It was noted that this recommendation had been implemented.

Councilor Carroll said she hoped that the people who wrote the Zoning Ordinance meant to include work force housing as part of the variety of multiunit housing. There was some discussion about this.

SENIOR HOUSING

Issue: There is an inadequate supply of housing for senior citizens in Durham.

Goal: Develop and maintain an adequate supply of affordable senior housing.

Objective: Encourage additional senior affordable (not necessarily subsidized, low-income) housing in town through incentives to developers.

Mr. Ozenich said developers seemed to only want to provide elderly housing for rich people, and provided details on this. He noted that Fitts Farm and Spruce Woods were good examples of this.

Recommendation:

- 1. Actively encourage senior housing on lands most suitable for it. Examples include land located within walking distance to downtown, and serviced by Town water and sewer.**

Mr. Campbell provided details on senior housing in Durham that was located within walking distance of downtown, and also noted that the Spruce Woods development had a shuttle.

Chair Kelley said the shotgun approach to senior housing in Durham was not really living up to the letter of this recommendation, in terms of being located on land that was most suitable for it. He provided details on this, and there was discussion.

Mr. Campbell noted that State statute now required that the different chapters of the Master Plan be consistent with one another. He said as the Planning Board started to amend the document, it was important to keep this in mind.

Councilor Carroll said this was a good example of a recommendation that was outdated. She provided details on the fact that there was no longer an inadequate supply of senior housing in Durham

There was discussion that perhaps the recommendation needed to be amended to say affordable senior housing.

Mr. Campbell said he would be putting together a list on the amount of elderly housing currently available in Durham. He also noted that there were incentives for elderly housing in Durham, but not incentives specifically for affordable elderly housing.

There was discussion on how other states handled this, and there was also discussion on what the definition of affordable elderly housing actually was.

Chair Kelley said the Board would come back to this recommendation.

2. Do not charge school impact fees on properties reserved for seniors, age 62 and older.

Mr. Campbell said this was being looked at.

3. Continue the current Zoning provision, or a similar incentive based Zoning Ordinance provision, that allows for increased density for developments reserved for senior citizens.

It was noted that this recommendation had been done.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Issue: The trend in Durham is toward construction of new housing that does not contribute to the Town's affordable housing stock.

Goal: Provide an adequate supply of affordable housing in Durham, proportionate to affordable housing demand in the region.

Recommendations:

1. Ensure Zoning provisions, such as density requirements, do not prevent affordable housing.

Mr. Campbell noted the MUDOR, ORLI, OR 108 CBD, and Church Hill districts addressed this.

There was discussion that there were only a few subsidized affordable housing developments in Durham.

Ms. Fuller provided details on the cost of housing in Durham over the last two years, and summarized that on average, a house in Durham cost \$400,000.

Chair Kelley noted that the 2000 Master Plan said the average price of a house in Durham was \$240,000.

There was discussion that there was currently very little in the way of affordable housing stock in Durham.

Ms. Fuller suggested that perhaps some new “Issues” needed to be added to the Master Plan under the Affordable Housing category.

Mr. Parnell said that precluding mobile homes in Durham eliminated some affordable housing opportunities. There was discussion about this.

Mr. Isaak noted there were other options for providing affordable housing than mobile homes.

Mr. Roberts also noted that because of land prices in Durham, the idea of having mobile homes wasn’t necessarily a practical one.

There was discussion about the greater affordability of modular homes, which now came in all shapes and sizes.

Board members agreed that there had been some token effort to do recommendation #1, and that the issue of mobile homes in Durham needed to be addressed.

2. Support the creation of a non-profit housing trust to construct housing developments that provide affordable housing.

Chair Kelley asked who was supposed to be the entity that supported the creation of a non-profit housing trust.

Mr. Campbell said it would be a housing authority of some kind, and there was discussion as to how this would work.

Mr. Grant said he was surprised when he saw this recommendation, and said he thought it had just been a suggestion.

Chair Kelley said he thought Durham was a small community to have this kind of entity. He also said the Board needed input from the community on this idea.

3. the Town should work with the NH Housing Finance Authority, or other similar agencies, to assist residents with limited financial means in obtaining decent, affordable housing. These agencies can also help the Town with programs that will encourage a mix of housing values in Durham.

Mr. Grant said he didn't think the Town had ever even approached this idea.

Chair Kelley asked who would be in charge of doing something like this.

Mr. Campbell said he (Mr. Campbell) was probably the person who would oversee this, as after being authorized to do so by the Town Council.

Mr. Grant said it would be good for the Board to see a presentation on this issue by the NH Housing Finance Authority or from a similar agency.

Councilor Carroll asked if the Planning Board could say that 10% of the units in a subdivision must be affordable. Told that Durham didn't have any regulations concerning this, she said this would be a good idea.

4. Consider incentives, possibly through zoning density bonuses or other flexible means, to builders to include limited numbers of affordable housing units as part of a larger housing development.

Mr. Roberts said the Planning Board had asked Spruce Woods about the idea of providing some affordable housing units, but the developer had declined to do this.

Chair Kelley said the Town's density requirements were still not such that they encouraged developers to provide affordable housing. He noted housing in Dover where the density allowed was far greater than what Durham allowed anywhere in Town. He said he felt this was a big first step Durham would have to take, if it really wanted to see more affordable housing units in Town.

Ms. Fuller said the Town would also have to be proactive and seek out reputable developers/builders who might have their eyes on land in Durham where an affordable housing project might go. She spoke about a project in Stratham where this had happened. She noted that at present, there was a little less pressure on land than there had been in the past few years.

Mr. Roberts said Spruce Wood was the ideal place to put higher densities because of the potential hookup to sewer and water. He provided details on this.

Mr. Isaak said Durham's large lot size requirements were part of the issue.

Chair Kelley said one way to get around things was if there was an affordable housing overlay, where the zoning requirements would differ from those of the underlying district.

Mr. Grant said it was hard to see where this kind of development could be put, within the core community area. After further detailed discussion on this issue, Chair Kelley said the Board had some major work to do on this recommendation.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

Issue: Durham's recent growth rate has been comparable with the regional average. But at any point in time, the rate of growth in the Town could begin to be well in excess of that experienced by the region. If this occurs, the Town is taking on more of a burden than required under State law, and growth management provisions can be put in place.

Goal: Recognize that Durham will continue to grow, but at a controlled and manageable rate that maintains a high quality of life and sense of community in Durham.

Objective: Ensure that Durham is not accommodating a higher proportion of the population increase within the Strafford Region.

Recommendations:

- 1. As part of its annual reporting procedure, the Planning Board should analyze the growth in Durham to ensure that the growth in the Town is not at a level significantly greater than the surrounding region.**

Mr. Campbell said the growth in surrounding regions was far greater than Durham's growth rate. But he said it would be a good exercise for the Town to do this analysis on a yearly basis.

Chair Kelley suggested that perhaps this information could be included in the annual Town Report.

There was detailed discussion about the growth rate numbers in this section of the Master Plan, and it was noted that this data needed to be updated. There was discussion that the numbers should be based on the resident population, not the total population of Durham. Mr. Grant stressed that the total population figure was not a true number for the Town of Durham, and shouldn't be used.

- 2. A growth management ordinance, also known as a timing of development ordinance, should be developed and adopted for the Town that, when triggered by growth rates well in excess of the regional average, places a limit on the timing and phasing of development.**

Mr. Campbell provided details on the fact some Durham residents had developed a growth management ordinance a few years back, but he said the ordinance had not been discussed by Town boards.

There was discussion on how this recommendation should be handled. Chair Kelley said he would support the ordinance, perhaps as a long-term planning tool, in case the day came when it was needed. There was discussion on what an interim growth management ordinance was and how it worked, under State statute, as compared to a growth management ordinance.

Chair Kelley said the Board should look at this recommendation further.

- 3. If the planning board finds in its analysis that the Town is experiencing a growth rate significantly higher than the regional average and this growth is having a significant effect on Town services, then the provisions of the growth management ordinance should be enacted.**

Board members agreed this made sense.

4. Pursue an economic development program that will not unduly accelerate population growth and generate more residential development than the tax revenue increases created by the economic development.

There was brief discussion about this recommendation.

IV. Presentation by Planner, Jim Campbell, on the Duties & Responsibilities of the Planning Board.

Mr. Campbell provided a detailed presentation on the duties and responsibilities of the Planning Board. He noted that this would be televised that evening, but also would be shown on DCAT again over time.

The following topics were covered:

- Membership of the Planning Board
- The Planning Board's job
- Rules of Procedure
- The Master Plan – Purpose; Preparation; Adoption
- The Subdivision Review process
- Subdivision Regulations
- Application Procedures
- Pre-application review phase
- Phase I-Conceptual Consultation
- Phase 2- Design Review
- Formal Subdivision Application
- The Site Plan Review process
- Site Plan Review Regulations
- Application Procedures
- Pre-application Review Phases
- Formal Site Plan Application
- Conditional Use Permit
- Road Regulations
- Zoning Ordinance
- Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
- Technical Review Committee

V. Approval of Minutes – No minutes

VI. Adjournment

Arthur Grant MOVED to adjourn the meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Richard Ozenich, and PASSED unanimously 7-0.

10:05 pm Adjournment

W. Arthur Grant, Secretary