**PLANNING BOARD**

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Recorded by Janice Pack**

**January 11, 2016**

Public Hearing on Zoning Amendments

Members Attending: Paul Renaud, Ken Paulsen, Robert Marshall, Sherry Fox, Andre Wood, Jim Fletcher

18 members of the Public present signed in (see below)

7:02 PM Meeting Opened

(JFletcher sitting in for KO’Connell as Chair)

PRenaud began reading the Dec 28th meeting minutes. A few changes were noted. There was discussion of the wording on lines 68-70 regarding businesses not being a residence(the homeowner doesn’t necessarily have to reside there). Tabled. To be discussed later

Motion to accept the minutes as amended, unanimous in favor at 7:25 PM

**Mail**

Supply Lines With the Source DES Newsletter, Winter 2015

Letter from Michele Perron dated Nov 8, 2015 (just to be filed)

Town of Greenfield Y-T-D Budget Report dated 1/5/16

From Barbara C. Harris, New England Forest Products lot line adjustment

**A/P**

Paul signed receipts for computer, software and wireless mouse procured for new reporting secretary

**7:30 public hearing begins on changes being considered to the Greenfield Zoning Ordinance**

JFletcher presiding in KO’Connell’s absence

Record members present

Michele Perron, Karen Day, George Rainier, Aqueta Brown, Ned Brown, Loren White, Bob Grunbeck, Kurt Vincent, Marilynne Hedstrom, Kristin Batty, Norm Nickerson, Sheldon Pennoyer, Conrad B. Dumas, Carol Irvin, Linette Seigars, Debra Rafter, John Gryval, Mary Ann Grant (sign in sheet with addresses on file)

Jim asked if there were any member who feels like he should be disqualified? No one responded

Purpose of meeting stated: To go over Zoning amendment proposals for 2016

The changes include:

1. Changes to the Open Space ordinance that would enable cluster style developments in Open Space subdivisions
2. Creating a Special Event Facility ordinance in the General Residential and Rural/Agricultural districts.
3. Changes to the minimum lot size and setbacks in the Business District
4. Changes to the Accessory Dwelling in the Business and Village districts.
5. Changes to Permitted Use in the Village district.
6. Dividing the Village district into a Central Village district and Lakeside district.

JFletcher reminded everyone that this is a non-smoking building, and asked all individuals to be respectful of others’ opinions and comments. Please wait to be recognized to speak. All questions should be directed to the Chair first.

Jfletcher asked “Is there a corresponding notice and was it properly presented?” Yes, and letters were sent (regarding changes to lot size and the proposed splitting of under 100 properties, a new provision in RSA states that if you are proposing changes in districts of less than 100 properties, you must send letters to all …) A list of all addresses was submitted (on file).

**Amendment Article #1 Section III Districts**

To split Village District into 2: Lakeside Village District and Center Village District

To fit into current structure as its now written, have proposed changes viable for all

(next 2 amendments are contingent on this passing)

Small change in how ordinance is written. For rules and regulations, absolutely no changes

PUBLIC COMMENT none

**Amendment Articles #2, 3, 4 and 5**

**Amendment Article #2** – In Center Village district, no business is currently allowed. The intent is to permit customary home based occupations that are currently allowed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS Conrad Dumas: Please explain which districts, what map

Answered by PRenaud (pointing to the zoning map on the wall) It’s the dark blue squarish thing, heading south on Forest Road to just about where East Road is, Sawmill Road to the beginning of Center Mountain Road, 136 west toward RR tracks, most of Forest Road and property abutting Forest and Slip Roads are the business district. Some property is in both districts (such as Greenfield Inn)

**Amendment Article #3** – R Marshall spoke to explain the vision of the master plan worked on since 2003 “Concern of many residents about mounting taxes…attracting businesses…housing choices…mix of housing options to serve all ages and income levels…” Looking at the zoning ordinance now, the only way you can put an apartment in the Village district is if it’s for one of your relatives. It doesn’t encourage that form of growth. Maintenance of larger properties is difficult for some residents. This would bring workforce housing, and provide ways for affordable housing to come into the district.

SPennoyer commented on adding an apartment to an existing building, didn’t want to be fixed into adding as ATTACHED. Could *choose* to have attached, but it would be nice if they had the flexibility to not be. May want to have ratio to give perimeters. CDumas – A large building could be made into apartments (not attached). RMarshall says the intent is to enable that to happen, but not a whole bunch of little buildings being built on one property.

SPennoyer commented that you either choose a ratio of the original building (max size) or the attachment could be an outdoor connector. Concerned about prototype and what may or may not be allowed to happen. RMarshall thanked him for his comments.

LWhite spoke – at first glance it appeared to him that this says we can allow up to 3 units to be built on existing space without being attached. JFletcher explained that by the intent of provision, 3 units could be contained in same structure (3 or 4 separate units contained within 1 building) RMarshall explained that they are trying to contain the scope. Legal Advice said be careful of the word ATTACHED. It was felt that “ sharing primary wall” defined that.

Sheldon states that he does not want to end up with row houses downtown. Thinks “connector” may keep the scale of what you really want, speaking from personal experience from what he does.

PRenaud speaks to addressing the word “Detached” (allowing 1 detached structure but no other attached accessory dwelling). Says we can possibly look into next year adding a detached accessory dwelling provision.

RMarshall – We are attempting to maintain the character of the dwelling (avoiding row style) by definition

LWhite asked if we move forward, will it prohibit anyone with an attached building from adding on? JFletcher and PRenaud say that would not be the intent. It would not deter someone with an existing detached building from adding on.

MGrant asked if she could make her house into a duplex. AWood says Yes, adding a caveat that it has to maintain the current look and feel (FC regs, adding sprinklers, fire escape, etc.)

BGrunbeck stated under E “Life Safety” – AWood was not sure whether that applied or not. “Life Safety “add-ons may change the character of the building. BGrunbeck responded that fire escapes may be an option. AWood said the intent was to minimize that impact.

SPennoyer asked again: So no changes can be made to the outside of the building? RMarshall says as long as it does not detract from the character of the building.

Comments: RMarshall - Everyone has their own perspective and if we want to grow the community, we have to step up and take chances and make changes. We are trying to enable that to happen.

SPennoyer says he endorses this change, but is concerned about the language. Perhaps another set of guidelines describing scale and proportions might work, but not sure if the town is ready to do that.

JFletcher says this seems pretty flexible – just can’t make changes that would detract from the character of the original structure.

LSeigars asked for clarification to changes to her barn (not attached). JFletcher confirmed that she could not make the changes to her detached unit (make it into 4 apartments). RMarshall suggested she try and find a way to attach the barn to the house.

Sheldon asked the question: Could I put an outdoor connector to connect the house to the barn? AWood says: It is something we can consider.

MPerron says that would impact her house – she could gut her barn and make it into apartments? PRenaud says no, she is not in the Village District, so this would not apply.

PRenaud says over the next year we will be looking at the accessory dwelling issue and see how we can fit in an additional description

MHedstrom asked “Can I have an in-law apartment?” RMarshall says as long as they are related. MHedstrom asked: Now any of those homes could be turned into up to 4 houses (Apartments) within the house as long as you don’t change the facade? Answered “Yes” by the board (if it meets the other requirements…300 sq ft per unit, etc.)

LSeigars asked“You could theoretically add on to your house?” JFletcher says as long as it doesn’t detract from the character.

SPennoyer says “We’re looking at where the downtown is going. This could give the ability to help people pay their taxes. We’re looking at a large house with small rental properties (apartments). Not to say that the *block* of apartments is a bad thing, just commenting on a major unit, and smaller units within.”

NNickerson has a shop downtown with an apartment in it – looking at it like that, we DO need more housing in town, but he feels that more renters in town with kids would eat up the revenue by having to support these children (schools, etc)

No other comments.

**Moving on to Amendment Article #4**

RMarshall explained this article – With the zoning ordinance in effect right now, you could not build the kind of village you want to. So we reviewed the ”build-to line”, front setback and lot sizes. This is proposed solely in the Business District (essentially Slip to Forest Road to the school) and the build-to line is determined by the average setback of the buildings you are considering working with. One of the effects is traffic calming – the closer the buildings are to the street, the more likely you are to slow down to look for people. Also to reduce lot size – this would decrease the minimum lot size in the Business district from 1-1/2 acre to ½ acre. Several proposed changes include some of the language changed years ago being updated.

Comments? SPennoyer says it is an excellent way to approach this. Noted question about the half acre – what does that mean for septic if lots can be subdivided? RMarshall noted it could be tied into the Village septic.

LWhite asked for clarification “Just the Business district?” RMarshall said no, only where the set back requirement exists.

AWood says the definition is global, but this is just concerning the Business District.

The term “Build-To Line” is ONLY referenced in the Business District ordinance.

RMarshall agreed that we only use the Build-To Line language in the Business District.

AWood asked if his concern was that the definition would be applied to other districts?

LWhite says he would think that it WOULD apply to the other districts

RMarshall says that if you went to your own district, and started there, you would not get to that definition.

LWhite wanted clarification that it could not be applied. RMarshall said Legal had reviewed this.

No other comments

**Amendment Article #5**

SFox noted: Same exact wording

No other comments

**Amendment Article #6**

PRenaud explained this article came about because of dissatisfaction on the original Open Space amendment; one big proposal had both sides unhappy. First section describes the term cluster development. This might be a way to have cluster subdivisions in smaller lots while still allowing open space.

Described changes back to the original function of this ordinance, rather than a collaborative effort between the developer and the Planning Board which could lead away from the original intent of Open Space.

One change was that some of the general requirements (G) were added in because of confusion as to what was included. Because things weren’t spelled out, terms were ambiguous. These changes are more specific.

Biggest change is #3 Part J Wells and Sewage Disposal Systems (if this passes, we would have to change subdivision requirements) State Statutes for Open Space subdivisions allow a part or all of the septic or sewage waste disposal system to be off of the lot.

Other towns allow up to 50% - something he would be willing to hear opinions on. As of now, staying at 40%. Now including what is already developed as not part of the Open Space, but part of the Development. Thinks these changes allow a bigger cluster development and will preclude existing open space from being developed.

SPennoyer feels there are some extremes on this model (i.e. Peterborough example 30 units, common spaces) feels that 40% on 100 acres means you preserve 40 and develop 60? PRenaud said “Yes, if all else meets requirements.” SPennoyer feels that we should think more about septic systems and wells. RMarshall says our intent is to get back what we lost in 2007 when we created smaller regular subdivisions and we weren’t able to cluster them. By clustering them closer together, we can reduce driveways and utilities. Thinks getting back to the point where we can cluster things, we can preserve more open space. PRenaud added to septic and well conversations that we would have to convince DES to allow. Says he has doubts about conservation land. As it is now set up, the homeowner association would have it set up as being a private development, and would need to write easement so it could be approved by planning board. PRenaud felt that could be an area of discussion because homeowner association would still be holding the conservation easement as opposed to the Town or a 3rd party. Maybe by changing subdivision ordinances and requiring this kind of specific language that could be changed? PRenaud said we could change it now, or deal with it in the subdivision ordinances.

SPennoyer says we could propose conserving the entire area that surrounds the outside and make an exclusion area (can’t build but could hold septic within a defined area – common area) part of the conservation easement. PRenaud reiterated SPennoyer’s concern.

CIrvin asked for clarification to “homeowners association”, conservation easement on the deed for an individual could potentially be reversed. Says there should be a requirement that a 3rd party hold it. Doesn’t think it sets up a priority for conserving land.

PRenaud stated that if we were to allow in the open space area to build well radii, a 3rd party holder would balk at a personal waste disposal system being put in.

CIrvin felt that would not be a problem – something that the easement owner comes to an agreement with the land owner so they can meet certain goals, may need to disturb things to do that. She explained that when she had an application before the board before, one thing that was worrisome was someone coming forward to say this part of the property is under an easement…she felt that what she was looking at was not a valuable portion of open space (didn’t have a lot of conservation value to it). Does not feel that this part of the amendment is going to solve the problem. CIrvin asked “Is there an entity who will judge if this part of the open space is valuable?”

SPennoyer started talking about 4 and 5 under Purpose…

CIrvin interjected that she feels there is more value if the piece of land is bigger. When it is chopped up, it loses value.

JFletcher asked CIrvin for clarification: “So you feel that without a 3rd party, you might not get the easement you desire?”

CIrvin said: “Not necessarily because if the Board is entertaining an application using this ordinance, at some point *before* it goes to a land trust or 3rd party it should be clear that you have something that is worth saving and that the development isn’t affecting the property so much so that it diminishes the value of keeping the open space.”

AWood asked if she was more concerned with the shape of the open space and less concerned with the volume? CIrvin says “Yes.” She doesn’t want to put the cluster development in the middle with the open space around it. Prefers to put the cluster in a corner.

LWhite says he agrees that we are trying to create a natural pathway for mammals to get through. If you put a bunch of houses in the middle, the animals can’t pass through. Should insert language in development of cluster housing to see where animals are using it, to see if the open space is worth saving.

JFletcher clarified that we can create our own process as the Planning Board when something comes before us.

PRenaud asked: Are you saying it should be a requirement for some 3rd party to look at this and possibly suggest where the cluster development should be? Usually applications come in fully formed.

CIrvin says as part of the process of an application, it is usually required for someone to ascertain that the open space is valuable and the proposed development has not changed it or its value.

SPennoyer commented on some other models where approvals had to be gotten and it had been determined that the open space remaining would not be valuable. It took a land trust to say that the development would be detrimental.

CIrvin would prefer to see a Land Trust approval be part of the requirements. Feels that the only way you can adequately police it is with a 3rd party.

PRenaud clarified this is an alternative to a conventional subdivision, and we don’t want to end up with more conventional subdivisions taking up more land. Part of this is beyond the conservational aspect, we don’t want massive lots with no open space…lots taking up 5 to 10 acres.

RMarshall says he doesn’t think that a conservation subdivision was originally desired when we first spoke to open space. An open space ordinance is different from a conservation easement. Do we look at Open Space subdivisions first, and then at conservation? We do not want lousy land use, or land that cannot be used. We need to preserve the open space concept that we have. Let’s get the open space cluster concept back, and then address the rest.

SPennoyer says that is excellent clarification of what we are trying to do here right now. Maybe down the road we can add in a conservation ordinance. But under Definition #4 conserve land “shall mean land that is owned by, controlled by….” SPennoyer asked “Does that mean that it needs to be held by an outside entity?” PRenaud says that part of the definition is unchanged.

SPennoyer says that may have to come out.

RMarshall and PRenaud feel that if you take that out, the homeowners association is responsible for the management of that property. AWood says that over time, it would mean that the homeowners association could change the intent.

JFletcher says the definition of conservation lands is 3rd party owned. Says that under general requirements, these are preserved with deed restrictions.

CIrvin wonders if the Purpose Statement should then be changed.

CIrvin asks “Talking about land worth saving – conservation value – is this reflected in the purpose statement or should it be changed to reflect what our goals really are? If our goal is really to have cluster development, shouldn’t that just be stated in the purpose?”

AWood says this is a board of individuals and we are still trying to clarify the goal.

KDay says if we want to change to just Cluster Development, the language says we do need a 3rd party, and we would have to take a lot of the conservation verbiage out.

CDumas states that this is a tool to protect some of the land. If we want natural wildlife and protected space, this is reflected.

RMarshall says he agrees – the open space ordinance gives us another tool, an opportunity to look at other alternatives. RMarshall states “Sometimes you can’t build on open space land anyway because of other issues. Also we are not hearing from the landowners who want to be able to build on a space. If we’re requiring a 3rd party, wouldn’t we perhaps be *not allowed* to develop in that way? It would end up as a typical subdivision.” PRenaud reiterated that we are just trying to preserve the character of the town.

PRenaud wonders if we need to spell out the value of the 3rd party. PRenaud questions “Are they going to come in and tell us what we can do, and where?” He thinks that a developer would not want to be dictated to exactly how they need to design their subdivision.

CIrvin answered that if that is what they’re asked to do (design an open space in a subdivision), then that is what they would do. She asks “Not sure what the problem is with that?” Asking about process she wonders “when would we decide what is put on the ballot?”

PRenaud said if we make changes, we will have to meet again in 2 weeks,

SPennoyer asked for more clarification:“If we do a cluster development versus one with a conservation easement, would that be creating an incentive?” PRenaud says we do not have density incentives.

SPennoyer continues, “Getting back to expert review and how that would work in the process, when would this expert be brought in? at what part of the process? If an expert suggested a conservation easement but they determined it wasn’t worthwhile, they wouldn’t do it. If an expert suggested a pattern of development in a piece of land, would that be before the application?”

NBrown says “You’d have a mess. You can’t talk about conservation easements like something you buy at a store. You can’t trump them by your own particular regulations. He would leave it as Open Space; simpler.”

GRanier asked “Isn’t the planning board able to bring in experts to offer advice?” He states, “You can’t do anything without a plan first.“

RMarshall says he likes the idea but not where it happens. He continues, “If the developer spends thousands on a plan and then we tell him he has to get an expert, it’s not fair. The preconceptual consultation would be okay, but saying to the landowner ‘Go out and invest in a site plan and THEN we’ll ask the expert,’ who may say ’You can’t do this,‘ is not fair.”

KDay says that SPennoyer’s idea of tying it to the number of lots is a good idea. She states “Conservation experts assign value to projects – high value vs. low value, that could be tied in at the beginning.”

SPennoyer says that he’s critical of the process, asking the developer to dot their I’s and cross their t’s before a plan is brought to the table. He says it should be conceptual to start, a 2-part process.

CIrvin asked if the ordinance could state that.

JFletcher felt that the incentive was allowing them to save money.

**Section XIV Special Event Facility Ordinance**

PRenaud spoke to this ordinance and explained the intent of the ordinance, and what events would be allowed. A Special Event Facility would be allowed only in Rural and Agricultural areas. Caveat is that if this passes and an event facility was approved, it would be good for 3 years. Record keeping required for renewal (dates of events, notes of what happened). Asked for comments, especially on number of events.

MPerron thanked the Planning Board for everything they’ve done. Remarked that the common line in the amendments we’re proposing is that we want to do what’s right for the growth of Greenfield. We have to be forward-looking. That can be hard as we want to break through barriers, and feel comfortable with the status quo. She feels this ordinance would help increase income coming into the town. It would enhance exposure to the area and the Town of Greenfield with people coming in from other towns. It would enhance tourism, skiing, bicycling, and enhance opportunities for other income, sleigh rides, etc.

To address the concerns that it “sounds line anyone can do this” - from personal experience, MPerron stated that the requirements are very restrictive and costly, so no, not just anyone could do this. Also she says we have really limited what the special events can be. She feels that would be a concern for someone new coming in to the area and looking to run events. She questioned “How can you monitor? How can you tell the size of the group?”

MPerron continued “It would clearly a benefit to the Town. Things we have gone through hoops to make this a safe benefit for the townspeople.”

She feels that it could be opened up to other districts, not just rural/agriculture, but the restriction for land acreage would prohibit that. She feels it would also be good for historical preservation (like her barn). From personal experience, she knows that the Town is in favor of doing that. She doesn’t think there are many other areas in the Town where this could be done and meet the requirements. She feels this is personal, this ordinance has to do with her primarily, so she is concerned with 4b, says it can’t be monitored and could deter others who may want to run events. She feels the number of attendees is important to protect the spirit of this (small intimate weddings) and perhaps we should address the numbers (no one wants to hold 3 weddings in a day).

PRenaud stated that other towns do limit the number of events, and size. Feels limits may make this more attractive to others.

SPennoyer says he agrees with MPerron’s comment on monitoring, but he doesn’t like the limit of time (12 hour)

RMarshall says it doesn’t limit their stay, just the actual time of the event. Says this matches the noise ordinance.

SPennoyer says that perhaps it should be clarified – asked MPerron to comment. PRenaud also clarified that we are not discouraging a 3-day event. RMarshall added event scenarios and monitoring, why we listed the numbers that we did, and how they make sense.

CDumas stated that this is just not for MPerron, but for the entire town. He stated that the real issue to MPerron’s original application was noise, and RMarshall stated that this still needs to pass the other existing provisions, site plans, etc.

CIrvin said she didn’t want to be negative, but that the way this is worded, this could bring other kinds of events. Events we can’t even begin to imagine at this point. She asked “What if someone wanted to have a gun shooting event?” She would be very unhappy about that. She contued “How can the other ordinances police what other kinds of special events might want to be held?”

RMarshall says noise ordinance does prescribe a certain decibel. Also pointed to the intent of the ordinance (#4)

AWood suggested we have thought of a number of nightmare scenarios, but we cannot write an ordinance for just one person, so we tried to write something that would address the kinds of events that we could allow.

JFletcher reminded the floor we had the 3-year permit. It was suggested we could shorten that. PRenaud said when the permit was granted, we would know the types of events were planned to be held.

GRainier brought up another option. SFox said if it was part of the approved usage, it would be allowed, but if not, it would need to go before the board again.

MPerron suggested that she felt the numbers were low.

Discussion about supporting Agricultural events – these are already supported under a different ordinance. PRenaud clarified ordinances governing agricultural activities.

AWood said we struggled with this, and the wording of this ordinance, and wondered if we had it right yet.

JFletcher asked if we stressed event numbers, what numbers were reasonable?

KDay said trying to set a number was to restrict someone’s income.

MPerron said parking was also a problem in the winter.

JFletcher again asked what was a reasonable number.

SPennoyer suggested some numbers but suggested we defer to MPerron for this. RMarshall redirected the focus of the group and reminded them that this is not an ordinance solely for MPerron but for the Town.

RMarshall asked, “Asked how do we meet the needs of the Community as a whole?”

Discussion continued about how setting number limits also restricted income, possibly for potential new venues coming into town. Restrict numbers of events, and/or number of attendees. Parking could limit attendees, too. What about a bus?

JFletcher called for other questions or comments.

LWhite asked “What about policing statements included in the ordinance? (policing the ordinance, not the activity) and if we have an abusive applicant, at what point do you pull the plug?” He says that should perhaps be stated.

RMarshall asked how the Selectmen would deal with that? KDay said during her term, it had not come up.

LWhite again asked for some sort of protocol/wording in the ordinance, just to protect enforcement. He said it should be in writing. He continued “If there is a penalty, what would it be? Perhaps an article that would empower the policing of the event.”

PRenaud said that could necessitate another review. Discussion on enforcement ensued, and members went to the books to check what was already in place. PRenaud cited page 51 in enforcement of the ordinance. JFletcher cited page 54 (fines)

PRenaud stated we do have to have some agreed upon perimeters to know when the ordinance is being violated.

JFletcher called for any further comments.

SPennoyer thanked the board for what they are doing.

10:08 JFletcher thanked everyone for coming, and closed the Public Hearing.

RMarshall reminded everyone to check the paper in case there were any major changes in anything we’ve discussed.

**Public Meeting Closed**

**Amendment Article 1** – no changes RMarshall motioned, PRenaud Seconded, vote unanimous in favor of presented as written.

**Amendment Article 2** – strike words in the parenthesis ***(legal, accounting, insurance, medical, technical and other similar types of commercial services***) and add after Professional Uses “as defined in Section IV:B” Motion by RMarshall, seconded by PRenaud. No further discussion, vote was unanimous in favor of the revisions.

**Amendment Article 3** – no changes RMarshall motioned, PRenaud Seconded, vote unanimous in favor of presented as written.

**Amendment Article 4** – no changes RMarshall motioned, PRenaud Seconded, Vote unanimous in favor of presented as written.

**Amendment Article 5** – no changes AWood motioned, KPaulsen seconded, vote unanimous in favor of presented as written.

**Amendment Article IX Open Space Subdivision Ordinance** –

Discussion about open space and the ability to put the septic in the open space, and whether or not the homeowner’s association may have the ability to weasel out of our intent. Definition on Common Area, and Open Space and how to define open land that is not in conservation.

Members were not in agreement on changes. PRenaud moved to withdraw Amendment Article 6. RMarshall seconded the motion. More discussion on why the Amendment should not go forward as written. Vote was unanimous in favor to withdraw Amendment Article 6.

JFletcher asked if we had to notice that we were withdrawing it, answer was “No.”

RMarshall wants the board to commit themselves to addressing the Open Space Ordinance again soon. Perhaps putting it on the agenda and forming a subcommittee would be a good idea.

**Amendment Article 6 – Section XIV Special Event Facility Ordinance**

Discussion on types of events allowed and the wording thereof

Strike “**but not limited to”** under 4.

Discussion of definition of event strike “**in a calendar day”** under 4c.

Discussion about number of events, 4b. Decided to leave as it.

AWood motioned to present the amendment as revised, RMarshall seconded, PRenaud voted Against; SFox, KPaulsen, RMarshall, JFletcher and AWood voted For, Motion passes.

**New Business**: Application for property swap was received; JFletcher will leave for KO’Conell in his mailbox.

RMarshall moved to adjourn, KPaulsen seconded, all in favor.

**Meeting adjourned at 12:07 AM**