

**TOWN OF DUCK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
July 10, 2019**

The Planning Board for the Town of Duck convened at the Paul F. Keller Meeting Hall on Wednesday, July 10, 2019.

Present were: Chair Joe Blakaitis, Vice Chair Marc Murray, James Cofield, Sandy Whitman, and Tim McKeithan.

Absent: None.

Also present were: Director of Community Development Joe Heard, and Permit Coordinator Sandy Cross.

Absent: Council Liaison Jon Britt.

Others Present: Ron Forlano.

Chair Blakaitis called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning Board for July 10, 2019 at 6:30 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

Discussion/Consideration of the Village Commercial Development Option

Director Heard stated that at the June 12, 2019 meeting, the Board completed its initial review of a draft ordinance revising the review process and criteria for the Village Commercial Development Option. He noted that per the Board's direction, staff amended the draft ordinance, which shows the recent amendments highlighted in green and the prior amendments highlighted in yellow.

Director Heard suggested that the Board review the draft ordinance from the beginning as the first page had minor changes to it, noting that the design storm was changed from 1.5 inches to 4.3 inches at the suggestion of the Town's consulting engineer. He stated that he is hoping to get additional suggestions from the Town's engineer as he thinks there are some ideas that the Board may find of interest relating to the design of stormwater management systems. Director Heard added that he will pass along any additional ideas to the Board members.

Director Heard stated that on Page 2 of the draft ordinance, it was decided to eliminate the statement under *General Findings* regarding adequate size and configuration to accommodate the scale and layout of the proposed development. He noted that it was an odd standard to meet

when asking for relief as if a site is of adequate size and configuration, there would be no reason to ask for relief. He stated that, for now, the scoring of eight points was left in the draft ordinance although some of the point receiving criteria were increased. He thought it may be something the Board wants to discuss moving forward.

Director Heard stated that Page 3 of the draft ordinance outlines the types of projects the Board wants to have fall under the review and meet the specific criteria in Subsection E. He explained that he drafted a section entitled *Exceptions* for certain types of projects that are small in scale and without substantial changes. He added that these types of projects will not have to meet C4 under *General Findings*. He stated that the Town Council will have to find that the other criteria have been met in the *General Findings* but will not have to undergo the point-based review with the specific criteria. He went on to review the *Exceptions* section of the draft ordinance with the Board and audience.

Member Cofield thought Director Heard did a good job of incorporating the Board's comments into the draft ordinance. Vice Chair Murray stated that it makes sense to him.

Director Heard stated under *Specific Criteria*, staff added several items, including increasing the amount of points available. He added that in some cases only one point was initially given, but the Board felt it was important enough to increase it to two - which were in lot coverage, historic preservation, and preservation of trees and vegetation. He stated that there was conversation regarding how best to apply the accessory residential and he made a change to in the draft ordinance. He explained that he struck the original proposal that offered two points for a mixture of uses including accessory residential and substituted one point for accessory residential per unit with a long-term lease with the understanding that the Town may not have full power to enforce the longevity of the lease. He added that having a point for each unit was a way to encourage the creation of units in more intensive commercial areas.

Chair Blakaitis asked how a unit is defined. Vice Chair Murray explained that if it has a kitchen, it is considered a unit. Director Heard added that it will need a kitchen and bathroom. Chair Blakaitis thought it will be an accessory structure if it has a kitchen. Director Heard stated that it does not have to be an accessory structure, more than likely the unit will be on the upper floor or rear of a commercial building.

Vice Chair Murray noted that under *Purpose*, Director Heard had removed the following wording: "...creating a mixed-use destination..." He asked if the change is related to the amendment under *Specific Criteria*. Director Heard stated that it is not, clarifying that the purpose of the ordinance is not to create a destination, but to allow development or redevelopment. Vice Chair Murray clarified that it is more of a housekeeping issue. Director Heard concurred that it is.

Member Cofield suggested the following language after long-term lease: "...one year or longer..." He felt there needs to be some definition to a long-term lease. Director Heard stated that many units that are being used were used for seasonal employees, who most likely will not be there for an entire year. Member Cofield stated that less than a year is not considered long-term. He stated that most definitions of a long-term lease are a year or longer and anything

shorter than one year is not considered long-term. Vice Chair Murray thought the point can be furthered considered once the Board starts their discussion.

Director Heard stated that the Board discussed the width of a pedestrian connection to the sidewalk and he added some wording addressing this point in the draft ordinance. He stated that he added “inter-property” connections to better define what the Board is discussing with regard to connections between properties. He stated that he added “fire hydrants” as another example of Public Infrastructure. He noted that the Board had a discussion about defining the intent in order to help an applicant understand what kind of things they should be looking at in order to meet some of the criteria. He stated that he added the subscript numbers and descriptions to further define the intent of some of the criteria. He went on to review the subscript numbers and criteria with the Board and audience.

Vice Chair Murray asked if the 4.3-inch design storm will automatically be included in the Village Commercial regulations. Director Heard stated that it will not as it is only for the Village Commercial Development Option. Vice Chair Murray thought it may be something that the Board wants to think about. He wondered if the Town’s engineer should be asked about it. Chair Blakaitis asked for an explanation. Vice Chair Murray stated that the 4.3 inch design storm is standard and he believes it is pulled from the State stormwater requirements. He added that very few projects disturb enough area in the Village Commercial to be required to have a State permit. He didn’t think it would be a bad idea for all projects to meet the same standard.

Director Heard stated that an opportunity to consider this issue will arise after the Board finishes the discussion on the ordinance. He noted that the next item on the agenda is to review the memorandum that the Board is seeking to forward to Council regarding parking surfaces and lot coverage. He added that if the Board wants to add something regarding stormwater management standards to the memorandum, staff will be glad to add it.

Vice Chair Murray asked if the Town gives lot coverage credit for semi-pervious surfaces. Director Heard stated that the Town gives 60% for semi-pervious surfaces, but nothing for gravel. Vice Chair Murray asked if the memorandum will only deal with gravel parking surfaces. Director Heard stated he is correct.

Member McKeithan noted that, with regard to subscript #1, the Board considered an orientation towards the boardwalk on the sound side. He suggested adding the following language: “...orientation toward the street or if sound side, also orientation toward the boardwalk...” Director Heard pointed out that he considers the location and orientation the Blue Point Restaurant to be among the worst in the Village District because the back wall is facing the public area at the front of the property and the active areas are solely oriented towards the sound. It presents a very uninviting picture to people from the front of the property. He stated that if Member McKeithan’s comment was meant to state that it has a dual orientation in those instances, then there would be value in it, but soundfront properties having preferential orientation to the boardwalk does not necessarily fit in well with the Village character. Member Cofield thought it is a nice thought, but noted the design of the Parker House Restaurant, with the orientation toward the sound, but there also well-designed with connections and curb appeal from the front. He added that the Board does not want to make the entire back toward the street. Member McKeithan pointed out that there is a lot of discussion regarding sound abatement and

things like that and what the Board had discussed was instead of having the building up to the front of the road, it can be advantageous to have it facing the boardwalk as it is appealing to people that traverse the boardwalk. He thought that a soundfront property should get credit either way - by appealing to the road or appealing to the boardwalk.

Member Cofield stated that Aqua Restaurant has an orientation toward both the sound and the street, adding that architecturally the street side is dressed up even though the sound is in the back. He stated that Village Table and Tavern is another business that takes advantage of its soundside location but has an attractive front façade. People don't know they are looking at the back of the building because architecturally it looks fine from the street side. He added that the street side needs to be addressed as part of the orientation. Director Heard noted that there will be some subjectivity in this category. He understood that the Board does not want strong, firm definitions and wants the flexibility to be able to look at something to see how it works. He stated that with regard to sound front property orientation, there are some properties that have wonderful orientation tied in with the boardwalk, but there are also some that do not. He stated that staff is trying to define things that the Board and Town Council value in a proposal with regard to location. He added that having an orientation toward the boardwalk could be positive. He stated that as far as the impacts, staff added in the final part with the wording: "...minimizing the impacts on adjoining residential properties..." He noted that the statement is partially intended to address the location of the outdoor entertainment areas.

Member Cofield stated that on Page 4 of the draft ordinance, the last item in the table has the language: "meeting a public need". He knew about public infrastructure, which should be encouraged, but isn't sure that the language should be in the table and allowing up to three points. He thought it will leave an open door for someone to come in and say what they are doing is meeting a public need. He added that it is the highest number of points they can get under any category. He noted that if it valued at one point, the statement wouldn't bother him, but if the Board is going to consider more than that, the Board should not leave that door open. Director Heard thought the reason it was put in the draft ordinance is to address the issues Member Cofield brought up. He explained that the Town identifies what a public need is. If someone who is seeking points decides to propose a fire hydrant and if the Town doesn't feel one is needed, the points will not be given for that. He noted that is why the draft ordinance as staff states it has to meet a public need. Member Cofield thought the Town not doing it will leave it for an applicant to propose a bench on their property thinking it will meet a public need. Director Heard agreed, adding that it would be a good point of clarification. Chair Blakaitis suggested the following language: "...as defined by the Town..."

Vice Chair Murray thought however it is clarified, the statement effectively means that staff will have to make the determination before an applicant submits an application. Director Heard disagreed. Chair Blakaitis stated that it would be after the application is submitted. Director Heard stated that the decision about what is needed will be made by the Planning Board and Town Council. He added that staff will try to advise people about things that may be of interest.

Vice Chair Murray understood everyone's point, but it seemed sticky to him because for Council, it is a quasi-judicial hearing. He stated that it may lead an applicant to juggle the points with a target in mind with each point giving a concession on the applicant's part. He added that by definition, the applicant is not supposed to discuss prior to the meeting all of the particulars of

their application. He stated that it seems like the Board is setting the applicant up to ask staff for direction. He added that the applicant can then come to the meeting and the Board can tell them that it will not be an issue. Director Heard stated he is correct, adding that staff would typically put in its recommendation whether a proposed improvement is a legitimate need or not, but the decision is not up to staff. He pointed out that most of the projects that come in under a certain scale are undergoing a site plan and technical review with the Fire Chief and Town engineer as part of it. Vice Chair Murray pointed out that the Fire Chief can make a finding before the Board's hearing and it may be confusing to an applicant to have the technical review meeting and be told that a fire hydrant is requested and then be told by Town Council that a hydrant is of no value to the Town and the applicant will not receive any points. He stated that it is not good when that happens. Director Heard noted that it has not happened. Chair Blakaitis asked why it would happen. Vice Chair Murray wasn't sure and is pointing out that the applicant can be told that the Board has to make a finding that it meets a public need. Chair Blakaitis noted that if the Fire Department already told the applicant where to put the fire hydrant, then the Town will likely support that request. Vice Chair Murray noted that the Fire Chief will have made that finding and not the Board. Chair Blakaitis thought the Board does not have to agree with the Fire Chief or the applicant. He added that Director Heard is explaining that the staff cannot make that final decision as it has to go before the Board. He noted that staff will make a recommendation, but the Board and Council will make the final decision. Vice Chair Murray stated that his point is that the Board makes the final decision on the value, but not whether it meets a public need. Chair Blakaitis stated that the Board can agree or disagree with staff, which is not an issue.

Member Whitman noted that if the Board is asking an applicant to come up with eight points, then he understands what Vice Chair Murray is saying. Director Heard stated that staff will show an applicant all of the ways they can obtain points, adding that it is no different than the way the project review works currently. Chair Blakaitis agreed, adding that the draft ordinance will give more technical input. Vice Chair Murray stated that he does not have a problem with the way the ordinance is written but has a problem about a public need being determined by the Board. He thought it can be misleading because it will be partially determined before the applicant comes before the Board. He added that whether it is actually determined or not remains to be seen but thought during the technical review the applicant will receive input that is not from the Planning Board. He reiterated that it seems misleading to make the clarification of meeting the public need at a Town Council meeting.

Member Cofield pointed out that it is no different than the entries where the points range from one to two, adding that there are several of those in the table. He stated that it is a determination that the Board makes whether it was one point or two, even if staff recommends it as one point, the Board can decide otherwise. Vice Chair Murray agreed, adding that his point is that if the ordinance states "...meeting a public need as determined by the Planning Board..." then the Board can state that it does not meet any public need and the applicant will receive zero points. He added that it could be a confusing experience for an applicant who was told that they needed certain improvements during the technical review.

Chair Blakaitis thought it is too much attention on a minor issue. He stated that the Board has the ultimate decision to make. Vice Chair Murray agreed. Chair Blakaitis stated that Vice Chair Murray is discussing the wording as being confusing in that staff reviews it and then the Board

has the final approval, which will confuse the applicant. Vice Chair Murray stated that if a public need is recognized, particularly for a fire hydrant, it will come up in the technical review. Chair Blakaitis pointed out that the applicant can make changes before it comes to the Planning Board. He stated that Vice Chair Murray is looking at one specific item. Vice Chair Murray stated that he is looking at it because the Board is discussing making it more specific. He thought it is fine with the language but suggested changing it to "...meeting a public need as determined by Town Council..." He believed it is an incorrect statement because it is largely determined before the applicant comes before the Planning Board in some cases. Chair Blakaitis stated that he has no objection leaving the wording as is. Member Cofield stated that he has a problem leaving it as is. He stated that the Board was specific about trees, water fountains, benches, and stormwater improvements. He thought meeting a public need is an open box in that anyone can come in and say they want to do something that is not one of the things listed, but only because it meets a public need. He doesn't think the Board should leave it open like that. Vice Chair Murray asked if "meeting a public need" can be stricken from the draft ordinance and ending it with "etc". Member Cofield stated that he is in favor of that.

Vice Chair Murray stated that the Board needs to think of everything on the list right now such as if the applicant volunteers to bury overhead power lines. He asked if that will meet a public need. Director Heard stated that it could be worded as such: "...to include but not limited to..." in order to make it clear that there are other improvements that can be considered. Chair Blakaitis thought it is a good suggestion.

Member Cofield stated that as public infrastructure offers more points, he thinks it should be as descriptive as possible and not leaving it open. Director Heard explained that the rationale for so many points is because some of these improvements can be very expensive. Vice Chair Murray pointed out that the Board still gets to determine the number of points. Director Heard agreed.

Vice Chair Murray asked if the lease length needed to be discussed. Chair Blakaitis thought the lease length being a year or more will conflict with the use of the accessory structure for workers in Town. Member Cofield disagreed, explaining that most workers in Town are here. Member Whitman stated that many are students. Chair Blakaitis stated that he is talking about the other workers. Member Whitman asked if Chair Blakaitis is discussing the seasonal workers. Chair Blakaitis stated he is, noting that they are not in Town year-round. Member Cofield stated that they are not employees of the Town. Chair Blakaitis stated that he meant workers in Town. Vice Chair Murray noted that they are employees of businesses in Town. Member Cofield stated that sometimes the point was discussed as a way of providing housing for employees of the Town. He added that it can also be used to reference employees of businesses. He noted that they are two separate things.

Member McKeithan thought there is a need for employees of the Town as well as seasonal workers. He stated that adding the accessory residential units in the ordinance should give credit if it is a seasonal lease. Member Cofield stated that he understands it as a long-term lease. Member McKeithan suggested leaving out long-term lease and refer it as a seasonal lease, which is different than a weekly Airbnb lease. He noted that this solution will take care of the people that are working in Town and need accommodations rather than additional tourists coming in.

Vice Chair Murray noted that the Board discussed enforceability of it based on the Town attorney's recommendations. He felt that the Board had decided to leave it in the ordinance because it is the Board's intent since it cannot be enforced. Director Heard stated that would probably be the case if the Town is challenged on it. He thought one aspect that would create an interesting discussion if a lawsuit happened is as part of a conditional use permit, if an owner has agreed to it, it becomes more of a contractual arrangement. He stated that that element of it may be stronger than an ordinance requirement.

Chair Blakaitis pointed out that everyone who works in Duck, including seasonal employees, should have an opportunity to live in the community if possible. He felt the wording in the draft ordinance should be left alone. Vice Chair Murray agreed.

Vice Chair Murray asked if the Board needs to discuss point values and the score of eight. He further asked what Director Heard needs from the Board. Director Heard stated that if the Board is comfortable with the concepts that were discussed and the minor changes, he will move forward with preparing a final draft document for the Board's consideration at their next meeting. He added that if there is anything in the draft ordinance that the Board wishes to have considered further, it is a good time to bring it up. Chair Blakaitis suggested reviewing it at the Board's September meeting. Director Heard stated that if the Board is comfortable with the changes, it is a matter of putting it in the final draft form for adoption.

Director Heard stated that there are 12 different categories of criteria in the draft ordinance with half being comprised of two points or more each, which adds up to at least 18 points. He asked if all an applicant needs is eight points, is that too little or where the Board wants it to be? Member Cofield thought if the Board left the point scoring as is, eight points is too low. Member Whitman thought some of the points will be hard to achieve. Chair Blakaitis wasn't sure if it would be easy or not. Vice Chair Murray stated that he would rather consider increasing the points later after a few applications in practice.

Member Cofield asked which points will be hard to achieve. Vice Chair Murray stated that fire hydrants, traffic lights, and possibly connections to the bike path. Member Whitman added connections to the multi-use path. Chair Blakaitis asked if achieving eight points will automatically guarantee the approval. Vice Chair Murray stated that it will not as the points are only one of the findings. Director Heard explained that it is one of the findings that Council will have to make. He added that the others are more general in nature and subjective.

Chair Blakaitis asked if the points are added up, what the maximum number of points an applicant can receive. Member Whitman stated that it is 18. Member McKeithan stated that it is 23. Director Heard stated that it can be more than that, adding that it is indefinite. He stated that it has approximately 19 standard points but the applicant can go above that for apartments. Chair Blakaitis clarified that the Board is working with eight points up to 18 or 19. He added that if an applicant receives half of the maximum points, they will be fine.

Chair Blakaitis asked Member Cofield where he will go if he thought the maximum points are too low. Member Cofield started calculating points for a hypothetical project. He stated that a mixture of office/commercial/institutional uses, depending on what the applicant is doing, might not meet that point. He thought the accessory residential can be met based on the size of the

structure, but probably not. He stated that the points for being consistent with commercial design guidelines can likely be achieved. He stated that the points for orientation toward the front of the property will receive at least one point, but if the applicant cannot achieve two points, then they should not build the building. He doesn't think an applicant would necessarily get points for minimizing lot coverage or enhancing stormwater drainage/filtration. He wasn't sure if an applicant will achieve the points for minimizing parking in the front yard. He thought pedestrian friendly will be an easy one for an applicant to receive points. Director Heard noted that an applicant can potentially receive two points. Member Cofield agreed.

Member Cofield thought connections to the public sidewalk could easily achieve the points. Vice Chair Murray pointed out that it isn't necessarily easy as there are several lots in the Village Commercial district that do not abut public sidewalks. Member Cofield stated that the applicant can easily put in a sidewalk to make the connection. Vice Chair Murray reiterated that it will not be easy if the sidewalk is not adjacent to the subject property. Chair Blakaitis agreed. Member Cofield asked for an example. Chair Blakaitis stated that Scarborough Faire and the Waterfront Shops are two examples. Member Cofield pointed out that they both have walkways which lead to public access. Vice Chair Murray stated that properties 103 and 105 Scarborough Lane do not front on Duck Road. Chair Blakaitis stated that it will only be part of the structure with many businesses inside, so if the Town receives an application for a particular business, they may not be able to connect to the sidewalk. Member Cofield agreed, adding that he does not mean it as a particular business asking for it. He didn't think if someone renovates a business in the Waterfront Shops, the Town should take something away from them because they cannot connect their property to the sidewalk.

Vice Chair Murray stated that the applicant will have to meet the requirements of the ordinance to not use the exception. Member Cofield stated that it is the property and not a particular unit in the property. Director Heard stated he is correct. Member Whitman asked about the Twiddy Realty maintenance office. Vice Chair Murray agreed that a sidewalk connection is infeasible for that location. He stated that Member Cofield had stated under building design if the applicant cannot meet it, they should not be building. He noted that the comment was made twice, and he wants to be clear that the only reason the applicant will enter the special exception application process is if they cannot meet the Village Commercial Development standards. He reminded the Board that anyone making the application is doing so because something is wrong with the existing conditions or it is a very small lot. He stated that in certain circumstances it may not be possible for the applicant to meet the point system guidelines. Member Cofield disagreed and pointed out aspects of the recent development approval at DVO. Vice Chair Murray stated that he isn't talking about the ice cream shop at DVO but the existence of DVO as they used the Village Commercial Development Option due to lot size in order to build their building originally. He thought they put a lot of architectural bells and whistles in it but were not able to meet all the commercial development standards.

Chair Blakaitis thought it would be nice to adopt this ordinance and see how it works without raising the points to a level that will be harder to meet. He suggested the maximum point basis be 8 or 10 and see what happens with the first few applications that come in. Vice Chair Murray noted that Member Cofield was going through the point system. He asked what the total score is for what was discussed. Director Heard thought it was seven so far. Vice Chair Murray thought

the inter-property connection will be hard because it depends on the layout of lots. Director Heard stated that a majority of properties will not have that option.

Vice Chair Murray asked if historic structures will achieve two points. He noted that the Town has a lot of nice trees. Director Heard stated that it will not apply to most projects, but where it does, it is an important factor. Vice Chair Murray stated that he would like to see the points stay under 10. Member Cofield thought 10 points is better than 8. Member Whitman offered a compromise proposal of 9 points. Director Heard explained that the point is to encourage good design when the Town is giving the applicant something in return. Member Cofield felt the number should be higher than 10 but is willing to agree to 9. It was *consensus* of the Board to have a maximum of 9 points for the scoring system. Member Whitman asked if the Board wants to change the scoring system, will it have to go before Council to change it. Director Heard stated that, as a text amendment, it will.

Director Heard asked if, in light of two Board members not being able to attend the August 14, 2019 meeting, review of the final draft is something that the Board wants on their August agenda. Chair Blakaitis didn't think it should be if the full Board will not be present. Director Heard stated that he will email a revised draft ordinance to the Board members so they can review it while its fresher in their minds. Chair Blakaitis thought it is good idea.

Review of Memorandum to Town Council Regarding Parking Surfaces/Lot Coverage

Member Cofield asked if the intent is to leave some sort of gravel out of the memorandum. Director Heard stated that if the proposal moves forward, it will make gravel parking surfaces exempt from lot coverage. He stated that it will be a decision for the Board for make as they study the issue. He added that at this point, the memo is just asking Council to authorize the Board to consider it.

Member Cofield thought there may be some element or percentage given for gravel. Director Heard stated that he had hoped to have information from the Town's engineer as it relates to a particular standard or design that the Town can accept. Member Cofield agreed that this information will be helpful. He thought the focus is in the interest of the Town.

Chair Blakaitis asked if the memorandum should wait and have it tie in with the VCDO ordinance before approval. Director Heard didn't think it should as it is a separate issue that can be brought up. Chair Blakaitis clarified that the memorandum will go to Council. Director Heard stated that it will if the Board was fine with it. It was *consensus* of the Board to send the memorandum to Council as presented.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from June 12, 2019 Regular Meeting

Member Cofield moved to approve the June 12, 2019 minutes as presented. Chair Blakaitis seconded.

Motion carried 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

STAFF COMMENTS

Summary of July 3, 2019 Council Meeting

Director Heard gave a short update on the July 3, 2019 Town Council meeting to the Board and the audience.

Project Updates

Director Heard updated the Board and audience about several Town projects.

BOARD COMMENTS

Chair Blakaitis asked if the Land Use Committee had any meetings. Director Heard stated that they've had two meetings. Chair Blakaitis asked how they were advertised since they are public meetings. Director Heard stated that it was in the Town's weekly enews and website calendar. He explained that the committee meetings are not advertised as a public meeting as the committee is evaluating the input received from the public.

Chair Blakaitis stated that a lot of people have been commenting about the vegetation that the Sanderling Inn removed. He asked if they violated any of the Town's regulations. Director Heard stated that they had an approved replanting plan which has been completed.

Director Heard stated that the Land Use Plan Committee has submitted comments regarding the surveys and the next step will be the distribution of a public survey which he hopes will be the largest, single instrument for collecting input from the community as a whole.

Director Heard stated that he is not anticipating anyone submitting an application to come before the Planning Board's August meeting. He asked if there is an interest in the Board having their August meeting. Vice Chair Murray suggested that it be canceled. Director Heard stated that if no one submits anything, there will be no reason to have a meeting. Chair Blakaitis suggested that Director Heard wait until July 12, 2019 and then send the Board members an email. Member Cofield stated that he would rather have the August meeting instead of having a long September meeting if there is business to conduct. Chair Blakaitis agreed.

ADJOURNMENT

Member Cofield moved to adjourn the meeting. Member McKeithan seconded. There was no vote.

The time was 7:57 p.m.

Approved: _____
/s/ Joe Blakaitis, Chairman