



Town of Barnstable Zoning Board of Appeals



Board Members:

Alex Rodolakis – Chair David Hirsch – Vice Chair Herbert Bodensiek - Clerk
Jacob Dewey – Regular Member Paul Pinard – Regular Member
Todd Walantis – Associate Member Mark Hansen – Associate Member Robert Twiss – Associate Member
David Bogan – Town Council Liaison

Staff Support

Elizabeth Jenkins – Director - elizabeth.jenkins@town.barnstable.ma.us
Anna Bringham – Principal Planner – anna.brigham@town.barnstable.ma.us
Carol Puckett – Administrative Assistant – carol.puckett@town.barnstable.ma.us

Minutes

Wednesday, January 22, 2020

James H. Crocker Jr., Hearing Room – 2nd Floor – 367 Main Street, Hyannis, MA

Alex Rodolakis - Chair	Present
David Hirsch – Vice Chair	Present
Herbert Bodensiek – Clerk	Present
Jacob Dewey – Regular Member	Present
Paul Pinard – Regular Member	Present
Todd Walantis – Associate Member	Absent
Mark Hansen – Associate Member	Present
Robert Twiss – Associate Member	Present
Vacant	

20 JUN 24 P 3:30

BARNSTABLE
TOWN CLERK

Also present were Elizabeth Jenkins – Director of Planning & Development, Anna Bringham – Principal Planner and Carol Puckett – Administrative Assistant

Call to Order

Introduction of Board Members – **All members present introduce themselves**

Alex reads the following into the record with no response:

Notice of Recording

Please note that this meeting is recorded and broadcast on Channel 18 and in accordance with MGL Chapter 30A §20. I must inquire whether anyone is taping this meeting and to please make their presence known.

Alex reads the following into the record:

Discussion

MPG Corporation, 1617 Falmouth Road, Centerville, came before the Board in March 2018 (No. 2018-007) with a plan for a new service station that included a drive-thru. The Board approved the plan but without the drive-thru. The Applicant returned to the Board in April 2019 (No. 2019-017) with a revised plan that was approved by the Board but appealed by an abutter. That appeal was later dismissed. At this time it was discovered that the plans referenced in Decision 2019-017 did not include all of the revised plans. An “Error in Script” was drafted and stamped in at the Clerks Office on October 1, 2019, but it was recommended by the Town Attorney that the Applicant should appear before the Board for a discussion, an acknowledgement that the Board approved the correct plans, and a vote.

Members: Alex Rodolakis, David Hirsch, Herb Bodensiek, Jake Dewey, Paul Pinard

Peter Garret president of MPG corporation introduces himself and states that he is here to answer any questions the board may have.

No questions from the board. Alex asks for public comment. No one speaks.

Alex clarifies that it is in reference to the two maps that the board members received.

Anna states the proposed alterations will be in substantial conformance with the plan entitled "Centerville Convenience Center" prepared for MPG Corporation dated October 31, 2017, with the last revision date of January 30, 2019 for C3.0 Layout and Dimension Plan and the last revision date November 2, 2018 for sheet C2.0 Existing Conditions Plan

Motion to approve and confirm that these are the correct (revised) with a revision dated of January 30, 2019 plans is made by David Hirsch and seconded by Paul Pinard

**Vote:
All in favor**

Alex reads the following into the record:

Old Business

7:00 PM Appeal No. 2019-038

Shoestring Properties

Stuart Bornstein, Shoestring Properties, has appealed the Building Commissioner's determination that vehicles parked on a vacant lot at 53 South Street are not an allowed use as a matter of right. The Appellant has also requested zoning relief. The subject property is located at 53 South Street, Hyannis, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 326 as Parcel 125. It is located in the Harbor District (HD) Zoning District.

Continued from August 7, 2019, September 11, 2019 and October 30, 2019. Members assigned on 08-07-19: Alex Rodolakis, David Hirsch, Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard. Members assigned on October 30, 2019 were: Alex Rodolakis, Robert Twiss, Jacob Dewey, Herbert Bodensiek and Mark Hansen. Continued from December 11, 2019. Members assigned on December 11th: Alex Rodolakis, Robert Twiss, Jacob Dewey, Herbert Bodensiek, David Hirsch.

Members assigned 01-22-20 = Alex Rodolakis, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Jake Dewey, Bob Twiss

Representative: Jeffrey Johnson, Esq. Attorney Johnson notes that the staff report has been updated with suggestions. He also has some good suggestions as to how to handle the findings which the applicant is amendable to and hopes that they can agree. He states that in the future the board should not be surprised if the hospital approaches the board for permission to use the overflow parking that Mr. Bornstein has, during their construction. If and when the hospital decides to do that then they will make that presentation to this board. It will not be paid-for-parking and Mr. Bornstein has indicated to the hospital, as long it doesn't cause problems with his existing decision, he would be willing to donate the use of that land in the off season when the restaurant is closed and is preliminary. Alex Rodolakis asks if Attorney Johnson has had a chance to look over the staff report with the findings and conditions. Attorney Johnson states that they would be in favor of them on the ones that would have them overturn.

No questions from the board

Alex asks for public comment. No one speaks.

The Board deliberates. Jake Dewey asks if the Building Commissioner (BC) would be in favor of enforcing this. They discuss the off season restrictions.

Elizabeth Jenkins thinks that the BC has taken a position and has enforced it as a violation; the licensing authority sees it as a use that is not allowed under the license for the Dockside restaurant and staff has taken a stand on that to date. Should the ZBA find it appropriate to issue a decision then the enforcement personnel would go by what the board decides.

They discuss enforcement issues. Attorney Johnson thinks that the board should make a finding that it has historically been used as overflow parking for the restaurant.

Elizabeth Jenkins refers to the 1991 court case that the previous owners put before the Superior Court. She reminds the board the current applicant's request. The board discusses what is needed to Overturn or Uphold the Building Commissioner's decision.

Attorney Johnson states that this is not a request for variance or special permit and the Town Attorney agrees that conditions are not per se appropriate; however, if they make findings it is something different. You can't condition the overturning but can do findings. In the future if they misbehave on that lot and someone collects money for parking they can be enforced.

Bob Twiss is in favor of finding some limited use of the parking lot such as use of the parking lot for overflow parking until some permanent use of that land is made. He does not agree that there is evidence to support a finding that the landowner has the right to park as-of-right. He is in favor of a compromise which would allow the use on reasonable terms as to how to do that. However, Town Counsel has said that it would be a problem, therefore, his choice is to uphold the BC.

Herb Bodoensiek states that at the last meeting, Attorney Johnson stated that he wasn't willing to go for a variance or a special permit. Attorney Johnson doesn't think they have variance conditions and thinks that he would have a better chance appealing this in Superior Court if this board finds to uphold the BC.

Alex makes findings with respect to Appeal No. 2019-038, Stuart Bornstein, Shoestring Properties, has appealed the Building Commissioner's determination that vehicles parked on a vacant lot at 53 South Street are not an allowed use as a matter of right. The Appellant has also requested zoning relief. The subject property is located at 53 South Street, Hyannis, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 326 as Parcel 125. It is located in the Harbor District (HD) Zoning District

Alex will make findings to overrule the Building Commissioner's determination and finds that there was an opportunity for a hearing and that she reviewed the materials submitted by the applicant and an opportunity for public comment and that:

1. The Board finds the use of 53 South Street, Hyannis is only be for accessory overflow parking for the restaurant use at 110 School Street, Hyannis. As presented by the applicant, parking at 53 South Street is required for the restraint use at 110 School Street (as presently licensed) to meet parking requirements under the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The Board finds the use of 53 South Street as a commercial parking lot is prohibited and any use of this property as a commercial parking lot will be subject to enforcement.
3. The applicant has represented that to ensure parking at 53 South Street will only be used as an accessory use to the restaurant at 110 School Street, the applicant shall:
 - a) Continue to post signs from May through October indicating that 53 South Street is for restaurant parking only with a two hour limit for such parking and that any cars left more than two hours/overnight will be towed.
 - b) Fence in 53 South Street in the off-season (November through April), to prevent any parking, subject to approval by the Hyannis Main Street Waterfront Historic District Commission.
 - c) No form of payment for parking shall be permitted on 110 School Street or 53 South Street either property without formal zoning approval.
4. It is in reliance of the representations in Finding #3 that the Board is voting to overturn the Building Commissioner's decision.
5. The Board finds that any use of the 53 South Street as a commercial parking lot will constitute an abandonment of the accessory parking use.

Jake asks if there are conditions that can be attached to this. Alex clarifies that these are just findings. The board discusses further. Bob Twiss recommends modifying Findings #5. Alex states that it would be a conditional findings which he doesn't think they can apply.

Vote:

AYE: Alex Rodolakis, Paul Pinard, Bob Twiss

NAY: Herb Bodensiek, Jake Dewey

BUILDING COMMISSIONERS DECISION UPHELD

Alex reads the following into the record:

7:01 PM Appeal No. 2020-003

Hunt & Bogan

Heather Hunt and David Bogan, as Appellants, have filed an application for Other Powers requesting Enforcement Action. The Appellants are requesting the Board to 1. find Scudder Bay's use of 438 Main Street to be illegal under the Ordinance, and 2. order Scudder Bay to cease and desist its illegal commercial use of the property. The Appellants are claiming that Scudder Bay Investment Corporation has been operating a commercial rental operation within the Residence C (RC) Zoning District and that only single-family residential uses are allowed within the District which is in violation of Section 240-7 and 240-13. The subject property is located at 438 Main Street, Osterville, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 164 as Parcel 001. It is located in the Residence C (RC) Zoning District.

Continued from January 8, 2020. No members assigned, no testimony taken.

Members assigned tonight: Alex Rodolakis, David Hirsch, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Bob Twiss

Jake Dewey and Mark Hansen recuse themselves and leave the hearing room.

Representative: Joel Quick, Esq. states that they were here last August of last year and their request was denied because the Building Commissioner had not declined the enforcement request in writing. A few months after that there were further communications with the Town and then a case was filed in the Land Court seeking the Building Commissioner (BC) to issue a written decision. A couple of months after that, the BC did issue that determination on November 14, 2019 and that determination is what they are asking the board to overturn.

Alex states that the property has been sold recently and wants to clarify that. Attorney Quick states that the property has a new owner but that the use has remained the same. Alex clarifies again that this is a new owner but that the same use as the previous owner still exists. Attorney Quick has handouts that the new owner has advertised on AirBnb and they are back to square one. Alex states that, however, the relief being requested was particular to the previous owner. Attorney Quick states that this is an appeal that they are not going to enforce as it relates to the use and that and the question remains the same as to whether the BC should enforce the use and not just to this particular owner. Alex question whether they would be stepping on the previous owners due process rights.

Attorney Quick states that the existing use is identical to the previous owner's use and, in this appeal, they are appealing the BC's decision about him being unable or unsure. Alex reiterates that this would be particular to Scudder Bay. They discuss. Alex states that the letter from the BC pertains to Scudder Bay and is particular to Scudder Bay and that owner is not there any longer. Attorney Quick states that it took them a long time to get a letter from the BC and would prefer to proceed but if they have to seek another enforcement request it might take another year. Alex is concerned by this because it pertains to Scudder Bay who no longer owns the property.

Attorney Quick asks if he can submit his handouts. Alex hasn't make a decision to go down that road yet.

Heather Hunt of 424 Main Street, Osterville, the appellant, introduces herself and clarifies that she does not speak for David Bogan and David Bogan does not speak for her in this matter. She states that she has spent approximately one year trying to get a decision and clarity on what is permitted zoning next to her home. She asks to be heard tonight and if they want to keep the record owner so that the current owner can come back she would come back also but again ask to be heard tonight.

James Lampe Esq., is here tonight for the Town tonight along with Dan Lampke, Esq. He explains that they are well aware of the what the petitioners had to go through but it is not the Town's doing that Scudder Bay sold the property to another property owner. It is news to them that the other party is doing the similar use and advises the board not to proceed until the new owner is notified and there are due process issues involved. He cautions the board about proceeding in regards to the new property owner and what they are probably doing.

Daniel Lampe, Esq. addresses the mootness of the issue. He states that this appeal that is brought before the board is to find that Scudder Bay's use of the property is illegal under the bylaw and order that Scudder Bay should be issued a cease and desist. He believes what the appellants wants is to transfer that request against Scudder Bay and now transfer to a new party who is not here.

Heather Hunt speaks about the transfer and the Town's knowledge. Although counsel was not aware that the transfer happened, the building inspector did issue an inspection report finding a violation to the new owner of a continued use of an illegally constructed attic bedroom.

Attorney Quick asks if the board members got their response to the staff report that was sent out yesterday. The board members are given copies by Anna Brigham. Attorney Quick believes there were inaccuracies however, he would like to convey this has been frustrating and how difficult it has been to get an answer on the zoning and should not be this time consuming or expensive. He thinks that this is not moot and thinks that the use is continuing at the same property. He would suggest that this be continued, to be given notice and to be heard.

Alex reiterate that the question is about the new owner, does not have an objection to continue this to explore those issues.

James Lampke, Esq. will leave it to the board. However, there is a new owner and if there is a new violation it needs to be properly processed. He states that they were aware that the property was sold and had spoken with the appellants counsel

Board discusses.

Heather Hunt asks for clarification as to what the path will be going forward. She states that she came into Town Hall in February of 2019 and reported a series of violations to building, health, zoning and asked formally for zoning enforcement. She then received an email saying that it would be acted upon one day and then received nothing. She reported continual violations and received nothing. In the summertime, and one thing that was left off the staff report, is that she sent another zoning enforcement request and asked for an acknowledgment of receipt and received nothing. She then forwarded that request to the Town Clerk to get acknowledgement of receipt and did get a response from that office indicating that it did arrive but again no response. She then had no other choice but to go to Land Court to ask a judge to get the Town to do anything regarding zoning. Before she went to Land Court she sent another request to Mr. Ells, Mr. Florence, Town Attorney and all Town Council saying that she didn't want to go to Land Court and was concerned that this Town is creating a system of zoning haves

and have notes. The Town ignored that and she had to go to Land Court. She thinks that what she is now hearing is that she should back to the Building Commissioner and ask for that process to start all over again although the use is identical.

Alex states that the party that owns the house has a due process right because everything before him is for Scudder Bay.

Heather Hunt would welcome the opportunity to appear before this board with the new owners. Alex clarifies that what she is seeking is relief from one particular party but doesn't think this board can without them being a party to this what they are seeking from this board refers to one particular party who no longer owns the property.

David Bogan speaks on his behalf and is here also as the Town Council liaison to the ZBA and with all due respect, the question is whether or not the BC should've issued an enforcement decision at that time which he did not. To characterize the issue as you have, places the burden on the appellants which is totally inappropriate. The Town came before you the last time and said you had no jurisdiction because the Building Inspector had not acted. The appellants then went to Land Court and were told they missed their opportunity because they should've appealed the Building Inspector's ruling back in March. The court asked what ruling they were referring to and said what they had was not a ruling. This is going in circles and what this board needs to decide is whether or not the Building Inspector was right or wrong at the time he issued the letter that he issued which, at the time, was owned by Scudder Bay. It is irrelevant who owns the property today and the question today is whether his action is appropriate.

Dan Lampke, Esq. says that if this case was not moot and talks about enjoining that relief and the underlying legality. This board does not make advisory opinions or make opinions of zoning.

Attorney Quick disagrees with the structuring of the mootness issue. Alex Rodolakis talks about time extensions. Attorney Quick asks to table this and a recess for 5 minutes.

Heather Hunt asks about the two members of this board that have recused themselves tonight but that had participated in the August hearing on this issue. She asks did their cause of their recusal result from business interest after the August hearing or where they conflicted at that hearing also. Alex states that he would defer and asks for a five minute recess.

Vote:
All in favor

Another motion is made to table this matter later this evening after other scheduled appeals. Motion to table is made by Alex Rodolakis and seconded by Paul Pinard.

Vote:
All in favor

TABELED

Alex reads the following into the record:

New Business

7:03 PM

Appeal No. 2020-005

Holcombe

Peter C. and Kathleen F. Holcombe, Trustees of the Kathleen F Holcomb 2016 Trust, have filed an application for Other Powers requesting Enforcement Action. The Appellants are requesting the Board to 1. find Scudder Bay's use of 69 Fox Run, Centerville, to be illegal under the Ordinance, and 2. order Scudder Bay to cease and desist its illegal commercial use of the property. The Appellants are claiming that Scudder Bay Investment Corporation has been operating a commercial rental operation within the Residence C (RC) Zoning District and that only single-family residential uses are allowed within the District in violation of Section 240-7 and 240-13. The subject property is located at 69 Fox Run, Centerville, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 227 as Parcel 157. It is located in the Residence C (RC) Zoning District.

Request received 01-09-20 to continue to February 12, 2020 at 7:00 pm.

Members assigned tonight: Alex Rodolakis, David Hirsch, Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard

Alex Rodolakis states that an email from Peter and Kathleen Holcombe was received on January 9, 2020 asking to continue this matter to February 12, 2020. Peter and Kathleen Holcombe are here tonight. Kathleen Holcombe explains that her counsel is now here and wants to withdraw her request for a continuance and would like her case to be heard tonight. Alex states that he has some concerns and that he was prepared to continue to February 12th per her request. In reliance on her request that took other steps.

Kathleen Holcombe explains that Scudder Bay owns the property next to her, sees that the property owner is here tonight and believes that he would do the same thing, sell the property next to her, and would like to ask him if he is in the process of doing that.

Alex states that the materials for tonight were not previously reviewed because they anticipated that this was going to be continued and feels that the members would be at a disadvantage. He would like to proceed to continue this.

Motion to allow the applicant to continue to February 12, 2020 at 7:00 PM is made by Herb Bodensiek and seconded by Paul Pinard

Vote:

AYE: Alex Rodolakis, Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard

NAY: David Hirsch

ABSTAINED: None

CONTINUED TO FEBRUARY 12, 2020 AT 7:00 PM

Alex reads the following into the record:

7:04 PM

Appeal No. 2020-006

Chapman/Hesse

William Chapman and Eric Hesse have petitioned for a Variance pursuant to Section 240-36 in order to convey 1,521 square feet from the owner of Lot 5, William Chapman, to the owner of Lot 6, Eric Hess. The owner of Lot 6, Eric Hesse, wishes to convey 1,521 square feet shown as Parcel 6A to the owner of Lot 5, William Chapman. The subject properties are located at 39 Meadow Lane and 53 Meadow Lane, West Barnstable MA as shown on Assessor's Map 133 as Parcels 005-003 and 006-000. They are located in the Residence F (RF) and Resource Protection Overlay District (RPOD) Zoning Districts.

Members assigned tonight: Alex Rodolakis, David Hirsch, Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard

Representative: Joseph Berlandi, Esq. who states that William Chapman and Eric Hesse are here and have owned the properties for awhile. He states that the intent of their proposal is for the exchange of their properties in order to reconfigure their lots. The driveway of one of the properties actually sits on the abutting property line and they are trying to exchange to reconfigure so that the driveway will no longer be on that property line. They are located in Residence F and RPOD and when bought it was 1 acre and is now 2 acres. This exchange will not make either lot smaller, just an equal exchange. No adverse impact and relief will not be a detriment to the neighborhood. He states that he has letters of support from abutters which he hands in (Exhibit A).

Alex asks for public comment. No one speaks. Alex reads who the letter are from that Attorney Berlandi submitted.

Jake Dewey makes findings:

Variance Findings

The statutory requirement of MGL Chapter 40A, Section 10 for granting a variance is a three-prong test. The Board is required to find that each of the following three requirements has been met in order to consider granting the variance:

1. owing to circumstances related to soil conditions, shape, or topography of such land or structures and especially affecting such land or structures but not affecting generally the zoning district in which it is located; as it relates to the driveway
2. a literal enforcement of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would involve substantial hardship, financial or otherwise to the petitioner; and eases up the financial burden on the neighbors for the driveway
3. desirable relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance. – Letters of support from abutters were submitted.

Vote:

All in favor

Jake Dewey makes a motion to grant relief with the following conditions: Attorney Berlandi has seen conditions and states that they are agreeable to the applicants.

Variance Conditions

1. Variance No. 2020-006 is issued to William G. and Monthian Chapman and to Eric M. and Lee Ann Hesse for reconfiguration of lot lines. The owner of 39 Meadow Lane (Chapman) wishes to convey 1,521 square feet shown as Parcel 5A to the Owner of 53 Meadow Lane (Hesse). The owner of 53 Meadow Lane (Hesse) wishes to convey 1,521 square feet shown as Parcel 6A to the Owner of 39 Meadow Lane (Chapman).
2. The Petitioners are required to submit and receive approval for an ANR plan (Approval Not required) from the Planning Board.
3. The lots shall be reconfigured in substantial conformance with the plan entitled "Plan of Land of #39 & #53 Meadow Lane West Barnstable, MA" prepared for Hesse/Chapman by Down Cape Engineering dated August 29, 2019.
4. This decision shall be recorded at the Barnstable County Registry of Deeds and copies of the recorded decision shall be submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals Office and the Building Division prior to issuance of a building permit. The rights authorized by this variance must be exercised within one year, unless extended.

Vote:
All in favor

GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

Alex reads the following into the record:

7:02 PM

Appeal No. 2019-058

Conrado

Ricardo Conrado, as prospective owner, has applied for a Special Permit pursuant to Section 240-94 – Expansion of a Pre-Existing Nonconforming Use. The Applicant is proposing to construct a detached four-car garage with a two-bedroom living unit above on a lot where there presently exists a two-family dwelling in a single-family residential zoning district. The subject property is located at 60 Nautical Road, Hyannis, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 307 as Parcel 235. It is located in the Residence B (RB) Zoning District.

Continued from December 11, 2019. Members assigned: Alex Rodolakis, David Hirsch, Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard. No testimony taken, only request to continue.

Members assigned tonight: Alex Rodolakis, David Hirsch, Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard

Alex Rodolakis states that a letter from Attorney Mark Boudreau was submitted on January 21, 2020 asking to Withdraw without Prejudice.

Motion to allow the applicant to withdraw without prejudice is made by Alex Rodolakis and seconded by David Hirsch

Vote:

All in favor

WITHDRAWN WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Back to Hunt/Bogan appeal.

Attorney Quick explains that with regard to this matter, the sense is that the board is not able to get past this mootness question and to get to the narrative. He doesn't know that continuing this matter will do any good in that regard and asks that the board find that this matter is not moot and is prepared to go forward should the board agree to hear this.

Alex and the board deliberate on the mootness issue. Alex thinks this is particular to the owner and that Scudder Bay does not own it any longer.

Bob Twiss states that the petition is based on the behavior of the former owner who no longer owns it and thinks the matter is moot.

Jim Lampe, Esq. suggests that the board move to dismiss this for lack of jurisdiction and mootness.

Attorney Quick thinks zoning has to be done as to the use and thinks the board should decide the use.

Motion is made by Alex Rodolakis to dismiss and to deny that they don't have jurisdiction because the owner of the property has changed. Board members discuss.

Bob Twiss clarifies that the motion is to dismiss the matter as being moot because the body of interest against which the petitioner has filed no longer owns the property and there could be no relief in the context of the vehicle which is before them. And what is before them and to straight up or down to dismiss or not to dismiss.

Vote:

AYE: Alex Rodolakis, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Bob Twiss

NAY: None

ABSTAINED: David Hirsch

APPEAL IS DISMISSED

Correspondence

Received January 3, 2020 from Atlantic Design Engineers, Inc., providing the Stormwater Operation and Management (O&M) Plan revised 12/4/19 for proposed car wash at 600 Yarmouth Road. The revised Stormwater O&M Plan addresses the requirements of Condition #11. A, B, C and D of Special Permit 2019-047 granted by the ZBA.

Received January 9, 2020 - Cape Cod Commission Hearing Notice for Development of Regional Impact for Tractor Supply, Hyannis. Hearing will be held on January 23, 2020 at 3:00 PM in the East Wing Conference Room, Barnstable County Complex, 3195 Main Street, Barnstable.

Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair

Upcoming Hearings

February 12, February 26, March 11

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn is made by Herb Bodensiek and seconded by Paul Pinard

Vote:

All in favor

Approved