

Town of Colonial Beach Planning Commission Minutes

Date: January 06, 2011 – Town Center, 22 Washington Avenue

Time: 4:30 P.M.

Present: Cynthia Misicka - Chairperson
Ed Grant
Margaret McMullen
Maureen Holt
David H. Coombes
Desiree Urquhart

Absent: Kent Rodeheaver

Also Present: Val Foulds, Town Manager
Gary Mitchell, Director of Building and Zoning
Andrea Erard, Town Attorney

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Mitchell called the Planning Commission to order at 4:30 P.M. and stated that the first order of business was the election of a new Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

Mr. Mitchell asked for any nominations.

Ms. Holt nominated Cynthia Misicka for Chairperson.

Ms. Urquhart raised the question as to whether a Chairperson could serve two consecutive terms as the Chairperson.

Ms. Erard stated they could, they just needed to be re-elected each year.

Ms. Urquhart nominated Mr. Grant for Chairperson.

Mr. Grant stated he would like to decline in favor of Ms. Misicka.

Ms. Misicka stated that she would like to nominate Ms. Holt. Ms. Misicka stated just for the record at a prior date Ms. Holt has turned this down because she had not taken the Planning

Commission course. Ms. Misicka stated for the record that she has not completed the Planning Commission training either.

Ms. Holt stated she would like to decline.

Mr. Coombes stated that he would like them to vote on the nomination of Ms. Misicka.

There was general agreement to nominate Ms. Cynthia Misicka as Chairperson.

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRPERSON

Ms. Misicka asked for nominations for Vice-Chairperson.

Ms. Holt stated that she would like to nominate Ms. Urquhart. Ms. Urquhart said she would like to decline the nomination.

Mr. Coombes nominated Ms. Holt. Ms. McMullen seconded that.

There was general agreement to nominate Ms. Holt as Vice-Chairperson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 07, 2010 MEETING AND THE NOVEMBER 04, 2010 MEETING

-Approval of the minutes from the October 07, 2010 meeting

Ms. Misicka stated that the next item was to approve the minutes from the October 07, 2010 meeting.

Ms. Holt moved to approve the minutes from the October 07, 2010 meeting and Mr. Coombes seconded that motion. There was general agreement to approve the minutes

Ms. Urquhart stated that she would like to see from this point further that they be clear on pronouns and possibly substitute the proper nouns. Ms. Urquhart said sometimes there is more than one subject in a sentence and it makes it hard to follow.

There was general agreement to approve the minutes.

-Approval of the minutes from the November 04, 2010 meeting

Ms. Misicka asked for approval of the minutes from the November 04, 2010 meeting.

Ms. Holt moved to approve the minutes and Ms. McMullen seconded the motion.

There was general agreement to approve the minutes.

APPROVAL OF THE UPDATES TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION BY-LAWS

Ms. Misicka stated that the next item on the agenda was for them to approve the changes to the Planning Commission By-Laws.

Mr. Coombes asked that they go over the changes.

Staff explained that the only changes to the By-Laws were minor. They had updated the By-Laws to reflect gender-neutral and they had also updated the Town Attorney's Virginia code reference.

Ms. Misicka asked for any comments.

Ms. Misicka stated that she had a few comments and questions. She stated that on page 2 and again on page 3 where it talks about records of the meeting and agendas for the meeting on the Town's website. She stated that she checked that a while ago and this was not up to date. She stated that she wanted to make sure they were not committing themselves to something they could not do. She asked Staff if agendas were on the Town's website.

Ms. Foulds explained that she would look into this and that they have new IT personnel. She stated that she would take care of this.

Ms. Misicka stated that on page 3, duties of officers, it states that the Chairperson shall be informed of any official communication and report the same at the next regular meeting. She asked what is meant by official communication.

Ms. Erard said that it would be if they received something from the state. In example something from an agency like DEQ that the Planning Commission needs to be given notice of.

Ms. Misicka asked if that would be something from Town Council.

Ms. Erard stated it could be.

Ms. Misicka asked if any of the Commissioners were ready to act on the subject of "term limits".

Ms. Misicka stated that it was her suggestion that Commission Members be limited to not more than eight years or two terms. She stated it currently says in the By-Laws that members could be reappointed. She said that she was proposing that it read "Beginning at the appointment or reappointment in 2011 members should be reappointed for no more than two terms."

Ms. Erard explained that this should be done by and ordinance of the Town Council. She stated that if they wanted to approve it they could use this language as a basis for an ordinance.

Ms. Misicka asked if it is appropriate to vote on this.

Ms. Erard stated yes.

Ms. Misicka asked for discussion on this subject.

Ms. Urquhart stated that they had discussed several changes that they wished to make to the By-Laws. One getting certified by CPVEA, the others being term limits and disclosure statements. She stated that she would not like them to piecemeal the amendments to the By-Laws.

Ms. Holt stated that she remembered from reading in the minutes that they had agreed to wait on filling out the disclosure statements.

Ms. Erard stated that the time will be coming up soon that they will have to fill out disclosure statements.

Ms. Urquhart asked if they could wait until then and vote on everything at that time. So, that they do not have to keep revisiting this again and again.

Ms. Erard stated that her recommendation would be to approve the changes they have to review this evening because they are minor and then continue with the others at another meeting.

Ms. Urquhart said she agreed with that but the discussion of term limits, disclosure statements and the certified CPVEA should be done all at once.

Ms. Misicka stated this sounded fine to her.

Ms. Misicka asked if everybody agreed with this.

Ms. McMullen made a motion to approve the current changes this evening to the By-Laws and Mr. Coombes seconded the motion. There was general agreement to approve the By-Laws with no opposition.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON PLANNING COMMISSION MATTERS

Ms. Misicka asked if there was any public that would like to comment on Planning Commission matters. There was no public comment.

Ms. Misicka closed public comment.

REVIEW OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATION ORDINANCE

Ms. Misicka stated that the next order of business was to review the subdivision ordinance. She turned this over to Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell asked that they turn to page 27. He stated that this last section was called "supplemental requirements". He stated these were the last revisions to the subdivision ordinance. He stated that everything else they have seen and reviewed.

Mr. Coombes stated that they had approved everything else.

Mr. Mitchell said yes. He said this last section basically is the last set of requirements. He stated that now is the time to ask questions or discuss the contents of this document in regards to substance. He said that once they get through this then he would like to talk about the entire document.

Ms. Misicka said now is the time for discussion on the new section given to them.

Ms. Holt stated that on page 30, she has a question in regards to penalties. She said it states that the penalty is \$250.00 per violation. She asked if this was a standard amount for a misdemeanor.

Mr. Mitchell said it may be the maximum they could charge.

Ms. Erard said no that it was not the maximum. She said that she does not know if there is a standard amount that a locality can charge. She stated it varies from locality to locality. She added that it looks to her like this is what was in there before. She said that she believes that they could increase it.

Ms. Holt stated that she suggests they do that, because if there is a violation that takes staff out of their office then it should be worth their time and effort.

Mr. Mitchell stated they could check the maximum on this. He explained that this amount is for every day and they could cite them every day if they are in violation.

Ms. Erard stated that under this process since this is a misdemeanor they would have to go to the magistrate.

Ms. Holt said so then they would have to go to the magistrate every day.

Ms. Erard stated yes and then they would have to go to court.

Ms. Holt said then they should raise it.

Ms. Misicka stated her suggestion was to put the maximum in there so that they could decide later if a smaller amount may be appropriate.

Mr. Coombes stated that somewhere in his mind \$1,000 rings a bell. He said maybe it was the Chesapeake Bay Act that has a \$1,000 for the violations. He stated that he believed that the Town Council had verified that \$1,000 per day was the state maximum limit.

Ms. Erard stated yes on Zoning Violations.

Mr. Coombes asked if this was a preventer thing for a violator or was it to cover the Town's cost to go through this process.

Mr. Mitchell said probably both.

Ms. Erard stated that different communities have different philosophies. Some people feel a criminal penalty is appropriate way to remedy and some communities feel it is not worth the cost to send staff to court and people should just pay a civil penalty. They just think it is easier this way.

Mr. Coombes asked if they remember all their discussions on the \$1,000 not preventing people from doing things. If they are building a \$500,000 home then what is another \$1,000. He stated this is a concern here. That is why he asked the question, is it to cover the cost or is it a preventive measure.

Ms. Erard said it depends on how you look at it.

Mr. Mitchell asked if they would allow the Town Attorney to get back with him on what the minimum and maximum is by code. He stated then they could put the maximum in there.

Ms. Erard stated that she could tell them that a civil penalty is less. She said a civil penalty is not more than \$200.00 at the initial summons and not more than \$500.00 for each additional summons. She said that it states that when the penalties reach \$5,000 or more than they can be prosecuted as a criminal misdemeanor. She said that under the criminal it states it is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not less than \$10.00 not more than \$1,000. If uncorrected they must fix it and failure to remove the violation is a separate misdemeanor and any succeeding failure is a separate offense of a fine of \$100.00 to \$1,500.00.

Ms. Erard stated that the benefit to criminal is that it is scary for people to have to go to court and the person will have to take time off of work. She stated that some developers feel with a civil penalty it is just the cost of doing business and do not take it seriously.

Ms. Erard stated they recently revamped the magistrate system in Virginia. She stated it is not easy getting through to the magistrate. Ms. Erard said the court docket is so crowded that they spend a tremendous amount of time in court waiting for the cases to be called. She said frequently they will continue the case and they have to weigh the benefit costs to the Town.

Ms. McMullen asked if the rules change at the state level could they not just say “in accordance with those regulations”

Ms. Erard said okay. She stated they would need to pick whether it is criminal or civil.

Mr. Coombes stated with his experience in the past as both a Planning Commission member and a Council member. You do not get anywhere unless there is a penalty. He stated he is suggesting criminal rather than civil.

Ms. Erard stated that her experience in going to general district court is that people are not really intimidated by it. She said the results for the Town are minimal.

Mr. Coombes said that what Ms. Erard is telling him is it is either criminal or civil.

Ms. Erard said that on the civil side you still have the staff time of ascertaining the violation and working with the developer to correct the violation. If somebody does not respond to the civil penalty then they have other injunctive actions they could take in order to take them to court after a certain period of time.

Mr. Coombes asked if Ms. Erard was recommending a civil penalty.

Ms. Erard said her opinion is to do the civil penalty, because there was a case that they had a violation when Chuck Bird was here and they went to court a number of times. It took them three or four times at court for him to be found in violation and it was absolutely clear he was in violation. She stated the courts feel sorry for the people and want to give them a chance and the docket is crowded. Ms. Erard said it may take 6 to 9 months for the judge to make a decision. She said the judge ruled in the Town’s favor against the person and she was in her car on the way home when she received a phone call from the courts office saying that the judge changed his mind and rescinded the ruling and continued the case for another 3 or 4 months. She stated that when they came back to court the judge then dismissed it.

Ms. Misicka stated she felt the best of both worlds would be to do this civil right now. She said with the civil route they start a little easier for the Town and then if need be and the violation continues it could turn into something criminal.

Ms. Erard said that truthfully this is her recommendation.

The Commission agreed with this.

Mr. Mitchell stated he would change the wording so that it read “as described in that section of the code of Virginia”.

Mr. Coombes stated that what Ms. Erard was saying is that they have not been very successful in the courts.

Ms. Erard said that the courts do not like enforcement cases.

Ms. Misicka asked for any other comments in section 7.

Ms. Urquhart asked that all the language be gender-neutral. She pointed out that on page 28, section 7.1.2 it stated "him" on the third line and on page 29, 7.2.1 on the fourth line.

Ms. Urquhart stated she had some other grammatical things she would leave with Staff.

Ms. Misicka stated she had few comments, one being a matter of clarification. On page 29, under section 8, she said it talks about where a sub divider has an undue hardship and conditions are met then the Commission can authorize an exception. She said that seems like it may be a big deal. She asked if they could authorize an exception to the number of units in a subdivision or the setbacks in a subdivision.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the key here is topographical or other situations depicted on the site. He stated it is kind of like a variance. He stated that this means for instance if there is some sort of topographical situation that does not allow you to do the subdivision as the ordinance requires. He said this would be a separate fee and then they would need to come before you and it would be a public hearing.

Ms. Erard stated that no public hearing is required.

Ms. Erard stated that they currently have some exception language in their current ordinance. She stated that her past experience with exception language is that it could lead people down the wrong path. She said that you may have a Planning Commission member that looks at this and it may be in example somebody they went to school with and they want to cut them a deal and they twist it to give them an exception.

Ms. Erard said that personally they are not her favorite thing.

Ms. Misicka asked what her recommendation is.

Ms. Erard stated that there is not an exception.

Ms. Misicka asked what about if the Commission reviews an exception but another body acts on it.

Ms. Erard said that would be fine. She said that with something like subdivision it is a ministerial duty so there is no discretion on the part of the locality. She stated if it is in our ordinance then somebody has to do it. She said it is not like a zoning action. She stated that it is supposed to be written out and layed out so the developer knows what he or she can and can't do. So, the provision for an exception really muddy's the water. She said it is supposed to be a blue print for what someone can and can't do.

Ms. Misicka stated beggars cannot be choosers. She said it would be awful if they lost a great hotel because somebody needed a setback of 18 feet instead of 20 feet.

Ms. Erard stated that they were talking about subdivisions. She stated they are really talking about houses with subdivisions. She stated a hotel is more likely to come with a zoning action. She said the setbacks is a question that would go before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). She said that is their determination.

Ms. Holt stated there is a subdivision on First Street and Second Street that the houses are built on top of each other and they must have needed a lot of variances. She said apparently in the past they had exceptions and there are ways to get around it. She stated you can see what that did it created a problem and they are all selling their homes.

Ms. Erard said that is how she sees it. It is usually somebody developing the land who wants to get the most profit out of it and it is usually for the detriment of the people living there.

Ms. Erard stated it may be easier for the Planning Commission if they just say it is ministerial and they do not have the authority.

Mr. Coombes asked what does Staff see elsewhere.

Ms. Erard and Mr. Mitchell stated they do see exceptions used in other localities.

Ms. Erard stated that when she sees exceptions used they are generally misapplied.

Mr. Mitchell gave an example of a misapplied exception in Caroline County.

Ms. McMullen stated that it seemed to her that if they decided to remove this exception language that she as a citizen or developer has the right to still come in and ask for an exception.

Ms. Erard stated no to this. She said there is no flexibility.

Mr. Coombes said they could add it back in at some point if they wanted.

Mr. Coombes made a motion to eliminate section 8-1, Exceptions.

Ms. Holt seconded the motion.

Ms. Erard stated that they do not have to vote on it now.

Ms. Misicka asked if everybody agreed with this.

There was general agreement.

Mr. Grant asked if these rules applied to individual land owners.

Ms. Erard responded that if you are moving one or more boundary lines you are generally engaging in a subdivision. She stated that this would not apply if you are just removing a lot line to just make your lot bigger. She stated that this would not be required to come before the Planning Commission and Mr. Mitchell could just do it.

Mr. Mitchell replied yes.

Ms. Erard stated that an example would be if you have a 3 acre lot and want to give 1 acre to each of your children. That would be a subdivision. She said it is a minor subdivision and the requirements are contained in this ordinance.

Ms. Erard stated that if you have an existing lot this ordinance is probably not going to apply.

Mr. Mitchell explained that they have only one property in Town that will require major subdivision activity. He stated that is the Potomac Crossings property.

Mr. Coombes pointed out the Lynnhaven property.

Mr. Mitchell agreed.

Mr. Grant pointed out the Eleanor Trailer park.

Ms. Misicka stated that her only other comment was on page 29, section 7-2-1. She asked what a per-rata-share payment is.

Mr. Mitchell draws the Commission a picture to show them what this is.

Ms. Misicka asked Mr. Mitchell to proof this section, the language is hard to understand.

Ms. Erard stated that it comes straight from the State Code.

Mr. Coombes asked that it be reworded so all can understand this section.

Ms. Misicka stated there was a similar issue on page 28, section 7-1-3. She stated it is all one sentence and asked if it could be broken up.

Ms. Misicka asked if there were anymore comments before they talk about the document as a whole.

Mr. Mitchell stated that what they have is minor subdivision process which is all done administratively. He stated that with a major subdivision the Planning Commission is the approving authority. He said that in the past he has been informed that even though it is a ministerial act the governing body which has no jurisdiction have reviewed major subdivision plats. He said this has been a past tradition.

Ms. Erard stated that the current subdivision is not really clear in terms of this process. She said in her research certain things may have gone to Town Council and other things did not. She stated they are trying to fix this.

Mr. Mitchell stated the other thing being that if he refuses to approve a subdivision plat then typically in the past this could be appealed to the Town Council. He said under his experience this really should go to the circuit court.

Ms. Erard said what Gary has done is that he has taken our ordinance and set it aside and come up with a more streamline and practical document that mirrors what the State Code says. He is trying to make it workable on the local level. But it is going to be different then in the past. She stated that in terms of what a subdivision is going to look like you want to make sure that everything you want when you look at an actual proposal is in this document. Because it may not come before you it may just go to Gary to approve.

Ms. Erard stated that if they decide to go with this ordinance people may recognize it as being a substantial change.

Mr. Coombes stated that they should look through this and see all the changes and edits that are being made. He stated it is kind of scary that all the years that he and Mr. Grant have been here they have virtually been dealing with nothing. He expressed how good it was that they were fixing this. He stated it goes to show that you get what you pay for and they now have professional staff. He said it is a classic example of this Town maturing.

Ms. Erard said Mr. Mitchell has done a nice job with this.

Ms. Holt stated that she agrees with Mr. Coombes that this is outstanding work. She said it is a work of art.

Mr. Coombes said it is a very good job. Mr. Coombes said that sixteen years on the Commission and they rarely have seen anything like this.

Ms. Misicka asked if there was anything else.

Mr. Coombes asked if it should go to public hearing.

Ms. Erard stated that she felt they should have one more last look at it.

Ms. McMullen stated that there were several areas in here where it sounded to her like they may need a specialist. She said on page 12, 4-3-16 and 4-3-17, the 2nd paragraph it says *"in accordance with the design standards and specifications of the Town of Colonial Beach for water construction and improvements and meeting the approval of the Director of Public Utilities and the Subdivision Agent."*

Ms. McMullen said that it seemed to her that this would require a specialist and it really does not say who is going to make this determination.

Ms. Holt asked if it is not already mentioned in paragraph 1 and is it not already implied.

Ms. McMullen stated thank you that was the answer to her question.

Ms. McMullen stated that there were three areas starting with 4-3-13, she thought she understood what monuments were but when she reads this it may be helpful for her to have a definition of monuments.

Ms. McMullen asked for a definition to be added for monuments.

Ms. McMullen stated that in paragraph 6-2-3 she would like to know what a "surety" is.

Ms. Erard that it is some type of insurance that says you are going to do what you say you'll do.

Ms. McMullen asked for RMA (Resource Management Area) to be defined.

Ms. McMullen asked for a definition for "pipe stem and flag lots".

Ms. Erard stated that RMA is defined in another part of the Town Code and she asked if they could just refer to that.

Ms. McMullen agreed.

Ms. McMullen stated that she will give the rest of her notes to Staff to review.

Mr. Coombes asked about the Wilkerson property and whether or not both the Preliminary Plat and Final Plat have been dealt with.

Mr. Mitchell responded that as far as he could tell the Final Plat in his office has been submitted for comments and review but nothing has been acted on.

Mr. Coombes asked about the time they had to do a final submission.

Ms. Erard responded that it was five years.

Mr. Coombes asked if it is possible to put a sunset clause in the document about how long someone has between the Preliminary Plat and the submission of the Final Plat.

Ms. Erard stated no, it is state code.

Mr. Mitchell responded that after five years they would have to resubmit everything.

Ms. Urquhart said Mr. Coombes's question was a good one.

Ms. Erard said yes and a lot can change in five years.

Ms. Misicka asked if there were any other comments.

Ms. McMullen stated that she appreciated this effort more than we could know and it brings us into the 21st century.

Ms. Misicka said she just a few more questions.

Ms. Misicka stated that just to be clear of the process. The Commission approves the preliminary plat and the Zoning Administrator has the authority to approve the final plat, if there have not been significant changes.

Ms. Misicka asked what if the Planning Commission feels there are significant changes then who approves the final plat.

Ms. Misicka asked what if Mr. Mitchell's successor approves a final plat and the Planning Commission feels there are significant changes.

Ms. Erard stated that there is not much the Planning Commission can do. She stated that maybe there is a cause of action that a citizen might be able to do.

Ms. Erard stated that it is very important when they look at this document to determine how much oversight they want. She stated that sometimes it is better for Gary to do it because it shortens the Planning Commission meetings and limits people coming and asking for the Commission to do things that they cannot do. Also Gary is more experienced at reading plats. But the Commission Members have lived in this community for a long time and know what it is like and maybe they want to have the input. She stated that maybe they wanted to have final plat input.

Ms. Misicka said that they live in a very small town and there is not much land left to be subdivided. She stated that she does not see it as a work load issue. Since the Commission has sole authority to approve a preliminary plat and they are already looking at it then she would like to see a procedure where staff makes a recommendation and the Commission has the final say on the final plat.

Ms. Erard stated they could do that but they must understand that they are bound by the Preliminary plat and they cannot change their mind.

Ms. Erard suggested Mr. Mitchell bring the Commission a sample of a preliminary plat and a final plat.

Mr. Coombes suggested the Wilkerson plats.

Ms. Holt stated that she would just like to say that there is so much over site when it comes to a final plat. (She referred to pages 23, 24 and went over some of the process)

Ms. Erard stated that the main thing they would want with a subdivision plat is somebody detail-oriented to review it.

Ms. Erard stated that if they were concerned that Mr. Mitchell may leave us and they would not have somebody detail oriented to review the final plat then maybe they do want to review it.

Mr. Coombes stated in regards to the Commission, he stated that none of them have the expertise to look and start talking definitively about plats. He stated that they have got to rely on hired staff and consultants if necessary. He stated that in the past they have not had educated staff but now they do. Mr. Coombes stated that he was not worried if Mr. Mitchell leaves because if he does then they would just fill the position back in with competent people. He stated that they have to be able to rely on staff to tell them what they need to know.

Ms. Misicka stated that this sounds good to her and asked if everybody agreed to leave this as is in the ordinance.

There was agreement.

Ms. Misicka stated that there was a definition on page 3, for immediate family. She asked how is immediate family relevant here?

Mr. Mitchell said that the code of Virginia states that the locality must allow a minor subdivision for immediate family members provided that the lot's meets the zoning requirements.

Ms. Misicka asked that if the code of Virginia would allow them to add to the definition coverage for Gay and Lesbian partners. She stated that as she understands it there is a growing population of Gay and Lesbian partners in Town. She stated that there are other instances where they are given things, for example like insurance and other things in states where they can't get lawfully married. She stated that they are given rights like family members in certain context. She stated that she does not have the blanket language for this.

Ms. Misicka stated that maybe it is already covered by natural.

Ms. Erard stated she would look this up.

Ms. Misicka asked the Commission if this was something they would want to add to immediate family if they could.

There was general agreement to add the language if allowable.

Ms. Erard stated that she has found the definition in the state code. (She reads this definition).

Ms. Erard stated they could not change this definition. It must remain as written by the state code.

Ms. Misicka stated that section 4 (four) is "General Standards" and section 5 (five) is "Design Standards" do any of this standards apply to minor subdivision.

Mr. Mitchell stated no they are for major subdivision.

Ms. Erard stated they could make them apply.

Ms. Misicka stated that it does not state anywhere in here that this does apply or doesn't apply. She asked what do they want.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he would clarify this when he brings it back to them.

Ms. Misicka reiterated what a great job Mr. Mitchell has done on this. She stated that he came to them very quickly with each updated section.

OTHER MATTERS

Ms. Misicka asked if there were any other matters.

Mr. Mitchell stated that at their seats tonight he has placed a copy of some updates to the Chesapeake Bay Act. He stated these are the changes required by the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). He said that he must present it to them by March and then to the Town Council by April to meet the terms of his grant agreement.

Ms. McMullen asked if they needed any other input with these changes.

Mr. Mitchell stated that they have already gotten input from DCR and they are happy with the changes.

Ms. Misicka asked if this is more of an FYI.

Mr. Mitchell stated yes, they can discuss it at the March meeting.

Ms. Erard stated that with the changes to the Chesapeake Bay ordinance they do not have much choice they must make the changes.

Mr. Coombes commended Ms. Misicka on a good job chairing the meeting.

Ms. Misicka thanked everybody in advance for their patience. She stated everybody is lovely.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Misicka adjourned the meeting at 5:45P.M.

Ms. Cynthia Misicka
Chairperson

