Chairman Tim Doherty called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Secretary Danielle Masse-Quinn called roll:

**PRESENT ROLL CALL:** Tim Doherty – present
James Bergeron – present
Danielle Masse-Quinn – present
Roger Montbleau - present
Joe Passamonte – present
Bruce Bilapka – present
Selectmen’s Representative Charlene Takesian – present
Selectmen’s Alternate Representative Jaie Bergeron - present
Alternate Hal Lynde – present
Alternate Paddy Culbert – present
Alternate Samuel Thomas – present
Alternate Scott Sawtelle – present
Alternate John Spottiswood – present
Planning Director/Zoning Administrator Jennifer Beauregard – present
Recording Secretary Heidi Zagorski – present

**NOT PARTICIPATING:**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MEETING MINUTES**
Ms. Masse-Quinn asked for a correction to line 405. She said there should be an “e” added to the last name of Masse-Quinn.

**MOTION:** (Passamonte/Bilapka ) To approve the October 23rd, 2023 meeting minutes as amended.
**VOTE:** (6-0-1) The motion carried.

**CONTINUED BUSINESS**
**Case #PL2023-00031
Map 14 Lot 3-81-0-23**
**FOWLIE, Paula J – 5 Oriole Circle - Seeking a Waiver to Article IX, Section 307-52D of the 2014 Zoning Ordinance, which was in effect at the time this 55 and older community was approved, to construct a deck that encroaches into the 50’ building setback. The proposed deck is to be approximately 36’ from the property line where 50’ is required per the approved Site Plan.**

Ms. Paula Fowlie introduced herself from 5 Oriole Circle. Mr. Doherty said that various members visited the property for a site walk. Mr. James Bergeron said he visited the property for a site walk. Mr. Bergeron said the topography of the land is such that this particular location is down grade by quite a bit. Mr. Bergeron said in their spirit of intent section of the zoning ordinance, it is clear that the Planning Board can grant waivers where it would be a benefit to the site. Mr. Bergeron said there wouldn’t be any intrusion. He said he also thinks the word building means building and a deck is a deck, and they are two different creations. He said if this would remain an open deck with just a railing, he said he would be more than likely to support it.

Mr. Joe Passamonte said he did a site walk as well. Mr. Passamonte said in the back there is a big berm, adding that if the deck was there, it wouldn’t be an issue to anybody.

Mr. Bruce Bilapka said he also did a site walk of the property. Mr. Bilapka said there are decks on some of the other units. Mr. Bilapka said he wouldn’t see any issue with a deck.

Ms. Charlene Takesian said she does not see any unnecessary hardship in granting a waiver for the deck on the back of the applicant’s property. Ms. Takesian said the applicant has an existing patio that she can use. Ms. Takesian said there is a 50’ buffer zone for a reason to keep people away from the lot lines to protect the homeowners on the other side of the 50’ buffer. Ms. Takesian said since there is no unnecessary hardship to the applicant, she would not support this waiver.

Ms. Danielle Mass-Quinn said she was not able to do a site walk of the property. Ms. Masse-Quinn said she would be concerned if there was a safety factor. Ms. Masse-Quinn asked the other Board members if anyone had seen any type of safety issue. Mr. Bilapka stated that when you walk out of the slider in the back, it is a step-down. Mr. Bilapka said there are three steps, three rises, and no railing. Mr. Bilapka said according to the building code, you do not need a railing, however, you are stepping out onto a step. Mr. Bilapka said if you look down at other units, they have decks on them. Ms. Takesian said the other units that have decks are not in the 50’ buffer. Mr. Passamonte said when he looked at the property, those steps should have had a landing before you hit the two rises coming down. Mr. Passamonte said he thinks for the applicant and everyone else coming out of the slider door, it is a safety issue. Ms. Takesian said if they want to fix the steps, they can fix the steps. Ms. Takesian added that they do not need a deck to fix the landing.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion to the public for abutter input. Seeing and hearing no response, he closed the discussion to the public.

**MOTION:** (Bergeron/Bilapka) To approve the request for a 15’x13’ deck with the condition that it remains an open deck with no roof.
**VOTE:** (6-1-0) The motion carried.

**ADMINISTRATIVE CONTINUED**
 **Map 15 Lot 8-216**
**Landmark Estates – Abacoa Road, Basswood Road, Redwood Road – Request for Bond Release.**Mr. Doherty stated that this is a 42-unit elderly housing development. Mr. Roger Montbleau recused himself. Mr. Doherty stated that Mr. John Spottiswood would vote in place of Mr. Montbleau on this case.

Mr. Jim Peterson introduced himself as the developer and stated he resided at 11 Majestic Avenue.

Mr. Bruce Bilapka said he had visited the site and had taken photos of where there was some water runoff and passed these copies out to the Board members. Mr. Bilapka explained that the photos show the access road that comes from Abacoa Road and crosses back over. Mr. Bilapka said there is a neighbor there lower than the road and there has become a water runoff. Mr. Bilapka said he thought if that berm was continued down to the end of the access road, then there wouldn’t ever be a chance for runoff. Mr. Bilapka said he also thought there was supposed to be a gate installed. Mr. Jim Peterson said the Fire Department decided not to have a gate. Ms. Jennifer Beauregard said this was before her taking over as the Planning Director but she did take a look at the plans. Ms. Beauregard said the plans do not show a gate. Ms. Beauregard said she was positive that the Fire Chief at the time did not want a gate there, adding that they installed signage. Mr. Peterson said in the final plan it does not show a gate. Mr. Bergeron said he believed the issue is more about the traffic on Simpson Road. Mr. Bergeron said there are reports that people are using it as a cut-through. Mr. Bergeron asked if the signage was adequate to stop people from cutting through. Mr. Peterson said from his observation, that most of the traffic cutting through is from Simpson Road going to Rte. 111, adding that from his observation it is not people from the association. Mr. Bergeron said entering Simpson Hill Road from Claudine Road is a safety issue and if they are cutting through, they are cutting through a private association. Mr. Bergeron said if the gate is not going to happen, there should be signage posted. Mr. Peterson confirmed that there is signage posted there now.
Mr. Doherty asked about the water issue with the berm. Mr. Peterson said the water issue was corrected. Mr. Petersonsaid the town engineer went by and wrote a letter stating that he was happy with the repair.Mr. Peterson said they loomed and reseeded the area. Mr. Peterson said it is also not the neighbor's property. He said the water was coming down on the condominium’s property, going down a swale, and then going down the road. Mr. Peterson said they did fix it anyway. Mr. Peterson provided a photo of the property which showed the swale, the neighbor’s property line, and the road.

Mr. Bergeron noted that the lighting had been added. Mr. Peterson confirmed the lights were installed. Mr. Peterson said he received notice that the stone bounds were knocked out and he had them put back in.

Ms. Beauregard asked if the signs say ‘for emergency vehicles’ only adding that people may be less apt to go that way if so. Mr. Peterson said it says, ‘travel for authorized vehicles only’. Mr. Peterson said he has no problem changing the sign if that helps.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion to the public for abutters input.

Mr. Nick Spanos introduced himself from 9 Claudine Drive. Mr. Spanos stated he was also representing his neighbor, Eugene Webster from 3 Claudine Drive.

Mr. Spanos began with Mr. Eugene Webster’s comments. Mr. Spanos said Mr. Webster thought there were supposed to be two signs at the beginning of Claudine Drive that said, ‘not a throughway’. Mr. Spanos said Mr. Webster also thought the sign spoke about earlier, was supposed to say, ‘for emergency vehicles only’.

Mr. Spanos said he had spoken with numerous people in the condo association, and they said the GPS tells them to go that way, referring to the location of the signage that states ‘for authorized vehicles only’. Mr. Spanos said that the people using this throughway the most are delivery drivers. Mr. Spanos said if they could remove it from the GPS, it would help. Mr. Doherty inquired if Mr. Spanos had talked to the Fire Department about this. Mr. Spanos said he had just been made aware of this. Mr. Spanos suggested a plastic chain with a sign in the middle. Mr. Doherty said he would have to go to the Fire Department to see what they would allow. Mr. Spanos recalled the terminology used ‘it could not negatively impact the neighborhood’, adding that the delivery drivers negatively impact the neighborhood.

Mr. Spanos said he thought the water was not supposed to be diverted onto Claudine Drive. Mr. Spanos said there is no guarantee that the loom and seed will hold and if the water surpasses the swale, the water will go into his driveway. Mr. Spanos questioned why the soft curb was not installed with a few more feet to avoid any potential issues.

Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Spanos what was unresolved. Mr. Spanos said he worries about what would happen if the loom and seed doesn’t take, the berm issue, and the signage issue. Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Peterson if he would keep a small amount of the bond for the surety that the grass would take. Mr. Peterson said that would be fine. Mr. Peterson said he could check it in the Spring.

Mr. Bergeron read a section from the last part of an inspection report from Mr. Jeff Quirk: “When onsite, another resident of Claudine Drive complained of water from Landmark Estates affecting her property. After inspecting her property, which is about 600 feet down the road from Landmark Estates, I determined the issue was limited to the drainage on Claudine Drive and notified Jim Hoffman, the Pelham Highway Agent, of the issue.”

Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. Hoffman had been out to look at this. Mr. Spanos said he did not know. Mr. Spanos said he had asked Jeff Quirk to follow back with him, and he never did.

Mr. Bergeron asked Ms. Beauregard if Mr. Hoffman had looked at this. Ms. Beauregard said she did not know if Mr. Hoffman had looked at it yet. Mr. Peterson said Mr. Quirk said there was a catch basin issue on that road and that is why the water wasn’t going where it was supposed to go. Mr. Spanos added that the two catch basins are far off the road, and they are very deep.

Mr. Doherty asked if any other abutters would like to speak. No one from the public came forward.

Mr. Doherty asked Ms. Beauregard if she had any comments about Mr. Quirk’s lack of response to Mr. Spanos. Ms. Beauregard said she did forward the email from Mr. Spanos over a year ago when she received it.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Peterson what it would cost to redo the loom and the grass seed in the spring if it was needed. Mr. Peterson said he would be fine if they held $5,000 of the bond which would be more than enough.

Mr. Doherty asked the Board if they would agree with holding $5,000 from the bond reduction in case the seed didn’t take, and it needed to be redone in the spring. The Board members agreed.

**MOTION:** (Passamonte/Masse-Quinn ) To release $272,610.00 of the bond, retaining $5,000 to ensure the earth berm that was installed along the edge of pavement behind the abutting property on Claudine Drive owned by Mr. Spanos is stabilized in the Spring.
**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**NEW BUSINESS

Case #PL2023-00032**
**Map 41 Lot 10-249
Ranger Engineering Group, Inc. (applicant), Ramy Realty Trust (owner) – 16-18 Bridge Street - Conceptual discussion of a 3-acre mixed-use parcel that currently has a vacant house and garages. Proposing to demolish the existing buildings and construct a 12,000 sf. 2-story mixed-use building that would house a donut shop with a drive-through, and 1 apartment on the main floor. The second floor would contain 5 additional apartments. The plan also proposes a 4,000-sf. storage building with 20 units with garage doors. The entrances to the property would be from Bridge Street and Jericho Road. A Variance was granted, Case #ZO2019-00009, and renewed on 3/14/2022 Case #ZO2022-00008.**Mr. Doherty said although this is a conceptual discussion, the applicant chose to notify abutters.

Ms. Masse-Quinn read the list of abutters.

Mr. Ben Osgood introduced himself from Ranger Engineering Group in Salem, NH. Mr. Osgood said he is here representing the owners of 16-18 Bridge Street. Mr. Mr. Osgood said they are looking to get input from the Board. Mr. Osgood said the property is on the corner of Jerricho Road and Bridge Street and is a three-acre parcel of land. He said it is zoned residential but has had a variance issued that allows any use in the industrial zone.

Mr. Doherty asked Ms. Beauregard if this property was in the commercial district. Ms. Beauregard said no, she said this one parcel was left residential in the middle of some commercial and industrial properties. Ms. Beauregard said they received a variance a while ago to permit all uses that are in all five business districts. Ms. Beauregard said they renewed this variance in 2022 and are getting to the point of renewing it again.

Ms. Takesian asked if this was used for commercial use previously. Ms. Beauregard said yes. She said it has been abandoned for over a year. Mr. Bergeron asked if this had been rezoned to business. Ms. Beauregard said yes.

Mr. Osgood said the applicant would like to build a mixed-use building that has retail with a donut shop on the first floor along with one housing unit and five housing units on the second floor. Mr. Osgood said it would be a 6,000 sq. ft. building. Mr. Osgood said there are currently two entrances on Bridge Street. He said they would close one and add an entrance on Jerricho Road.

Mr. Osgood said additionally they want to build a 4,000 sq. ft. self-storage warehouse. Mr. Osgood said the storage units would have garage doors. He added another thought was that the people renting the apartments could also rent the garages.

Mr. Osgood provided a preliminary artist rendition of the proposed building. Mr. Osgood said there is a drive-through donut shop on the first floor which would be part of the retail space which would probably be 4,000 sq. ft. He said the residential unit on the first floor would be approximately 1,000 sq. ft. Mr. Osgood said there would be a lobby entrance with the elevators to go to the second floor. Mr. Osgood said there are eight spaces for cars in the drive-through. He explained that there is a sidewalk system that goes from the front of the property to the back of the property. He said they would drill a new well in the rear of the property adding it has an increased well radius to 125 feet. Mr. Osgood said the southeast side along the brook would remain open. He said they would have stormwater treatment. He said there would be a septic system in the northeast corner. Mr. Osgood said they did a preliminary analysis that supports the use of 4,000 gallons per day of loading.

Mr. Osgood said for parking spaces, they have two dwelling spaces per unit. He said the donut shop has four seats per space and with 28 seats, that would be seven spaces. He added they would have 5 employees and that would be five spaces. He said then the retail is one space per 250 sq. ft. which is ten spaces, and the warehouse is eight spaces. This is a total of 42 spaces, and they have 44 spaces shown on the plan. Mr. Osgood said there is room for more spaces if it is needed.

Mr. Passamonte asked where the tenant parking would be located. Mr. Osgood said tenant parking would be either behind or to the right side of the building. Mr. Passamonte confirmed with Mr. Osgood that the tenant parking would be marked to eliminate customers parking there.

Mr. Bergeron said he would like to establish what the zone is for this property. Ms. Beauregard said it is zoned for business 1-5 adding that residential uses are permitted in all business districts.

Mr. Bergeron said the residential concept has six units. Mr. Osgood said they would be two-bedroom units. Mr. Bergeron discussed the loading calculations with Mr. Osgood. Mr. Bergeron asked where the alternate leach field location would be. Mr. Osgood said it would be in the same location as they have twice the area needed there. Mr. Bergeron confirmed with Mr. Osgood that there was not enough space for the alternate leach field in the same location as the proposed septic system.

Mr. Doherty asked if the entrance onto Jericho Road was able to be slightly moved. Mr. Osgood said they could probably move the entrance. Ms. Masse-Quinn questioned the area of the entrance/exit onto Jericho Road for safety because it is residential. Mr. Osgood said the closest entrance on Bridge Street to the intersection does not meet the Department of Transportation requirements. Mr. Osgood said the Bridge Street driveway would be the main entrance and exit. Mr. Osgood said the Jericho Road entrance would be for local residents to enter the plaza. Mr. Osgood said they plan on conducting a traffic study.

Mr. Doherty asked what the distance is from the proposed entrance on Jericho Road to the next intersection.

Mr. Doherty said normally in conceptual plans they do not open the discussion to the public however the abutters were notified. Mr. Doherty opened the conceptual discussion to the abutters.

Ms. Jessica Parziale from 16 Shannon Circle introduced herself. Ms. Parziale said she had some concerns that she wanted to bring up. She said they were unfortunately subject to a business previously that made lots of noise. She said at nighttime they could hear loud music and noises late at night from this business. She said her main concern is the noise that could come from the proposed business. She said she is concerned about the zoning variance and what would be allowed in the space as a business. Ms. Parziale said the traffic going in and out of the Jericho Road entrance could be dangerous and referenced a convenience store located opposite the proposed business. She said the brook that was referred to is more of a pond and she said on their land map it is called a pond as well. She said she is worried about the installation of the well and how that would impact their well and if there is any potential for their well drying out.
Mr. Dave Parziale from 16 Shannon Circle introduced himself. Mr. Parziale expressed concern about privacy along the pond. Mr. Parziale also mentioned concern about the location of the dumpster and the issues that a neighboring store has with trash blowing out of the receptacles onto the street.

Mr. Roger Montbleau asked Mr. Osgood about the storage area. Mr. Montbleau stated that there would be traffic in and out of the storage area as well. Mr. Montbleau asked who would be controlling the storage units. Mr. Osgood said the owner of the convenience store would own the storage units as well.

Ms. Holly Howe from 10 Jericho Road introduced herself. Ms. Howe said she had a couple of concerns. She asked if there were approvals from the state for wells because she knew of previous oil issues and dumping on this property. Ms. Howe said she was happy to hear that there would be a traffic study. She said she thinks traffic is definitely an issue if there is an entrance on Jericho Road into the proposed plaza across from the side road of Therriault Drive. Ms. Howe asked what type of storage units they would be and what would be allowed inside the units. Ms. Howe questioned if pop-up businesses would be able to rent a unit and operate out of it or if it is strictly for storage purposes. Ms. Howe said she knew there were a lot of ledge and wetlands, and a concern of hers would be where the septic would be. Mr. Passamonte asked about the contamination of the land. Ms. Howe said the land was contaminated from a previous business. Mr. Passamonte asked Mr. Osgood if they would have the land tested. Mr. Osgood said they would look into what had happened on the property. Mr. Montbleau said he was on the Board when they approved a tractor-trailer school on this property. He said before this it was a garage and scrap yard adding that in those days, everything would drain into the soil. He said his understanding is that there was a cleanup done there. Mr. Montbleau said although he has not seen the reports, the site should be clean. Mr. Passamonte asked if they could get confirmation on this. Mr. Doherty said they would have to get approval from the state.

Mr. Bergeron stated that Mr. Osgood had a stormwater treatment pond in a Wetland Conservation District. Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Osgood what the total aggregate load on the septic was. Mr. Osgood said it is less than 4,000. Mr. Bergeron said Mr. Osgood would need a 100’ side gradient setback and this does not work. Mr. Bergeron said the 4,000-gallon septic system looks close to the property line.

Mr. Passamonte asked if fire lanes would be required. Mr. Bergeron said yes. Mr. Passamonte asked Mr. Osgood to include the tenant parking on the plan. Mr. Doherty said they would need barriers to protect the outside dining.

Mr. John Spottiswood asked Mr. Osgood to clarify what the storage units would be used for. Mr. Osgood said they would have electricity for safety but no water and no sewer and would be rented out for dry storage.

Mr. Doherty confirmed with Mr. Osgood that he has enough guidance from the Board to move forward with his plans.

**ADMINISTRATIVE

Map 2 Lot 5-75 Parkside Drive – Request for Bond Reduction**

Ms. Beauregard said Parkside Drive was originally started in 2004 by George Charest. Ms. Beauregard said at that time the road was cleared and enough work was done with the drainage system at that point to vest his project. Ms. Beauregard said he began construction again a couple of years ago and sold it off to DC Development, who is Mr. Steve Doherty, and he completed the work. Ms. Beauregard said she has not received any complaints. She said the original bond was $89,832.25 and Mr. Jeff Quirk has gone out to inspect and recommends a reduction of $77,124.75 leaving $12,707.50 to retain.

Mr. Bergeron said he went by, and they did a beautiful job.

Ms. Beauregard said the developer is looking fairly soon for their road to be accepted. She said they are not quite ready, so they are requesting just the bond reduction and not the road acceptance.

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Bergeron) To reduce the bond and retain a balance of $12,707.50.
**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**Map 7 Lot 9-135 Wildwood Road – Seeking the Planning Board’s recommendation to the Board of Selectmen regarding the acceptance of Wildwood Road.**Ms. Beauregard said this is a project that she has not gotten any complaints on. Ms. Beauregard said they had gotten all the information needed for final acceptance including their final road inspection by the road agent. She said their as-built plans have been received and approved, and they received notification that their bounds have been set and received their draft road deeds. Ms. Beauregard said the initial question she brought up with the condition with the HOA (Homeowners Association) versus the two open space lots in this subdivision; she has since found older emails between them and Jeff Gowan. Ms. Beauregard said the town chose not to accept those two open spaces, so they did do up HOA documents that were reviewed and found satisfactory with legal.

Mr. Doherty asked where this was located. Ms. Beauregard said this is Wildwood Road off of Katie Lane which is off of Simpson Road. Ms. Beauregard said she believed it was right up against the power lines. Mr. Doherty confirmed with Ms. Beauregard that the town did not accept this open space. Mr. Doherty said they had been trying to get a wildlife corridor through there and potential walking trails and the town did not take that land. Ms. Beauregard said the developer stated the town did not accept those lots and they were put into the HOA. Mr. Doherty questioned if this would be the Board of Selectmen who made this decision, adding that he had a problem with this decision. Mr. Doherty explained that the town has been trying to continue along the power lines to someday get to Windham. He said the town did not take the land here and has now made it a moot point to try to have connectivity on that side of town.

Ms. Beauregard said there is no bond reduction being recommended because they were already down to $12,103.75. She said this would remain as a maintenance bond for one year. Mr. Doherty said they are looking for the Board to recommend that the town accepts the road.
 **MOTION:** (Masse-Quinn/Montbleau) To recommend to the Board of Selectmen to accept Wildwood Road.
**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**Adoption of revised By-Laws**Ms. Beauregard said she provided a copy of the changes to the Board members that were discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Doherty said they would adopt these changes tonight if the members choose to do so.

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Bilapka) To adopt the changes of the by-laws.
**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**BOARD MEMBERS/PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATES**
Mr. Doherty said the Board members have a copy of a draft of the proposed new Article IX Affordable Senior Housing. Mr. Doherty asked if the Board members had a chance to read the ordinance draft. Mr. Bergeron suggested giving everyone a chance to review the ordinance. Mr. Bilapka and Mr. Montbleau both stated they would like to read it again prior to the discussion. Mr. Bergeron asked Ms. Beauregard if she could email the members the original ordinance. Mr. Bergeron said he would like to consider getting some advice on the septic side to protect the abutters.

Mr. Bergeron read from the state minimum requirements: “In all cases, the lot shall contain a minimum of 20,000 contiguous sq. ft. of soil suitable for a receiving land.” “Every lot has to have an alternative leach field”. Mr. Doherty said the minimum lot size would be a ten-acre or a seven-acre lot. Mr. Doherty explained that it would not get broken down into smaller portions, it would remain as one lot.

The Board members continued to discuss the language of the ordinance draft and the different sections. The Board agreed to review the draft further and continue the discussion at the next meeting.

Mr. Bergeron asked Ms. Beauregard about a correspondence received. Ms. Beauregard said they were asked by a developer who was looking to do the water line on Sherburne Road if it was possible to meet conceptually but outside of a Board meeting with the Planning Board and Zoning Board members. Ms. Beauregard said she heard from NHMA and Attorney Rattigan and neither of them suggested any members of the Board meet with the developer outside of a public meeting.

Mr. Montbleau asked what the status was about receiving water from Dracut. Mr. Sam Thomas said Dracut did approve of the water, however, the state did not. Mr. Thomas said Dracut water is entirely out of the situation now. Mr. Thomas said Ms. Kimberly Abare spoke with him about a supposed approval of water coming from Londonderry to Pelham. Mr. Doherty said there is still the possibility of the wells at the bottom of Sherburne Road that were acquired by the town. Mr. Thomas said the Town of Pelham has signed two engineering agreements with Weston & Sampson; one is the strategic grant for $50,000 and the other is an MTBE grant that is being applied for water for $100,000. Ms. Beauregard said those two wells at the bottom of Sherburne Road are part of what this developer wanted to discuss. Mr. Thomas said the wells had a minimum of 183,000 gallons per day and the demand from Dracut was 134,000 per day. Mr. Thomas said he wasn’t sure if this was one well or both wells. He added that those wells are two of the wells that Weston & Sampson will look at as part of their study.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Passamonte) To adjourn the meeting at approximately 9:36 PM.
**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Heidi Zagorski, Recording Secretary