



TOWN OF OLD SAYBROOK  
**Planning Commission**

*Paula S. Kay, Chairman*  
*Mark Patterson, Vice Chairman*  
*Robert D. Missel, Secretary*  
*Kathleen A. Sugland*  
*Douglas S. McCracken*  
*Meghan Joufflas, Alternate*

302 Main Street  
Old Saybrook, Connecticut 06475

*Dennis Tulimieri Jr., Alternate*  
*Michael K. Bender, Alternate*

**oldsaybrookct.gov**

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
**Wednesday, April 21, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.**  
via teleconference

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

The Chairman called the teleconference to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. **ROLL CALL**

Present: P. Kay, M. Patterson, R. Missel, D. McCracken, K. Sugland, M. Bender

Members Absent: M. Joufflas, D. Tulimieri Jr.

Staff Present: C. Gilman, Recording Clerk; C. Costa, Zoning Enforcement Officer

III. **REGULAR BUSINESS**

A. **Minutes**

P. Kay asked that two items be added to the minutes from the 4/7/21 meeting. At end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph add "P. Kay asked if the lights could be lower if there were more poles and still light the field center. M. Mahoney responded that maybe they could get them down to 60'. But the 26-degree angle was needed to have no light spill over at the property edge." At the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph (at the bottom of page 2) add "P. Kay asked M. Mahoney if the "box of light" could be seen 1/4 mile away, on Rt. 1. M. Mahoney responded that it depends on the weather."

M. Bender pointed out that D. Tulimieri Jr.'s name was incorrectly spelt in the 2<sup>nd</sup> to last paragraph on page 2.

**MOTION to approve the meeting minutes** for the 04/07/21 Planning Commission meeting as amended to include: At end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph add "P. Kay asked if the lights could be lower if there were more poles and still light the field center. M. Mahoney responded that maybe they could get them down to 60'. But the 26-degree angle was needed to have no light spill over at the property edge." At the end of the 5<sup>th</sup>

paragraph (at the bottom of page 2) add “P. Kay asked M. Mahoney if the “box of light” could be seen ¼ mile away, on Rt. 1. M. Mahoney responded that it depends on the weather.” Fix D. Tulimieri Jr.’s misspelt name in the 2<sup>nd</sup> to last paragraph on page 2. MADE by D. McCracken; SECONDED by P. Kay: VOTING IN FAVOR: Kay, McCracken, Missel, Patterson; OPPOSED: None; ABSTAINING: K. Sugland; **APPROVED** 4-0-1.

## B. Correspondence

The only correspondence received was related to the agenda items.

## B. Committee, Representative & Staff Reports

C. Costa reported that the commission meetings will be going to a hybrid schedule in June. She will have more details soon. There is also a small sub-division coming before the commission in June.

D. McCracken gave an update on the Regional Plan of Conservation and Development. C. Costa sent out an email to the Planning Commission that the Lower Valley Regional Planning Committee part River Cog is going to have a public meeting on Monday April 26<sup>th</sup> at 7pm for the first day of the 65 day public comment period for the Regional Plan of Conservation and Development. You can log onto RiverCog.org and look up ROPCD to access the link. It is a public meeting and they are looking for feedback and comments.

## IV. New Business

### A. “Smoke on the Water at Dock & Dine” Application for Special

**Exception/Coastal Site Plan Review** for a 300 seat outdoor restaurant with temporary restaurant trailers, 725 s.f. permanent pavilion and tents. 145 College Street, Assessor’s Map 24/Lot 42-1, SP-2 District, CT River Gateway Conservation Zone, Coastal Area Management Zone, FEMA VE 15 Special Flood Hazard Area Zone

*Owner: The Point, LLC Applicant: Smoke on the Water at Dock & Dine.*

*ACTION: Consider per Town Plans; report on consistency to Zoning Commission for 5/3/2021*  
PH

Attorney Ed Cassella was present and gave an update on the proposed outdoor restaurant, Smoke on the Water at Dock & Dine, which is located at 145 College ST. Attorney Cassella was before the Planning Commission back in February of 2021 regarding the regulation amendment. The Zoning Commission approved the text changes that they were requesting for outdoor restaurants cited in the SP2 District and for the concept of the temporary restaurant trailers to be included in the zoning regulations. Last week they went in front of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) and received questions and comments regarding the design and landscaping planned for

Smoke on the Water. The ARB was looking for the fine details of the proposed restaurant. Attorney Cassella referred to the Planning Commission as the “big picture” commission and the need to see if the proposed restaurant is consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD).

Attorney Cassella shared a map of the property. The property is a 2-acre piece of land on the river and has historically been used for commercial uses. He commented that there has been a restaurant on the property since the 1940s. The previous Dock and Dine included the deck over the river. Currently, the deck is remaining and the dock is in disrepair. In 2013 a new indoor restaurant proposal was received and approved. The property is located in the BE15 zone, which requires any building to have the first floor 12 feet in the air. The lower area must be flood compliant with breakaway walls and flood resistant materials.

Attorney Cassella stated that the general concept of the site plan is to have trailers on a temporary basis, up to 180 days a year, to provide a restaurant facility and have some structures (a pavilion and an electrical utility platform) to service it. From the “big picture” point of view this is a six-month outdoor restaurant because building a building on this property is difficult due to the current regulations. The outdoor concept of the proposed restaurant allows it to be on the ground and meet the FEMA regulations. Attorney Cassella stated the proposed restaurant provides a great amenity and public use for residents of Old Saybrook and the area. The ARB had some concerns about what the property is going to look like. Attorney Cassella presented some renderings and a video demonstration to give a visual of the proposed restaurant and property. Attorney Cassella stated this is a large property with ample room for adequate parking and screening.

C. Taylor gave an overview of his perspective in regards to Smoke on the Water. He stated that the requirements to build the tall structure to meet the newly placed FEMA codes would be cost prohibitive. He estimated it could cost over \$7 million dollars to build such a structure and would be impossible to recoup that building cost. He went on to state the property has been for the community and the goal is to figure out a logical and positive way to give it back to the community. He stated that this is a lunch and dinner, family restaurant that is geared towards some nightmare entertainment. There is no stand-alone bar. C. Taylor lives a mile away from the property and believes that the proposed restaurant is what the town of Old Saybrook needs. He believes the property will help the economy and attract boat traffic as well as celebrate the nature and beauty of the location.

Attorney Cassella gave some additional comments. He had drafted a letter that was submitted to the commission back in February. Attorney Cassella stated that the application is consistent with several of the policies and goals of the POCD, in particular with the economic development section as it increases tourism in winter, fall and spring as well as redevelops an underperforming property. As he previously stated, Smoke on the Water is a seasonal, 180-day property, but in the off season the property will remain

as it is developed with the pavilion and will have a park-like setting to provide year round appeal. They have been in contact with the town of Old Saybrook and Park and Rec regarding additional uses in the off season. The Park and Rec maintains the mini golf to the East, Founders Park to the West, and Gardiners to the North so the property will be a natural extension in the off season for additional town use. The trailers and restaurant will be gone in the off season, but the property will remain beautiful year round. Attorney Cassella went on to add that the property is consistent with the POCD as it enhances and improves the economic well-being and quality life of all members of the Old Saybrook community and would bring back a popular tourism destination to the Saybrook point area. He stated it meets the Resilient Economy section as it states the need for business development that mitigates risks due to natural disasters. Additionally, it meets the Coastal Access section of the POCD as the proposal has a defined easement on the eastern part of the property, which is the CT River, so there will be coastal access along this side of the property. Attorney Cassella stated that the docks are going to be rehabilitated and the boating community will be able to access this restaurant. Attorney Cassella concluded his presentation and P. Kay opened up discussion for the Planning Commission members.

D. McCracken stated that he has reviewed all the letters received regarding the property in question that are both for and against the proposed restaurant. He asked Attorney Cassella if they anticipated an impact of traffic in the area? Attorney Cassella stated no, because it is a maximum 300 seat restaurant. The old Dock and Dine was a 450+ seat restaurant and the approved proposed restaurant in 2013 was a 455 seat restaurant, which included 189 outdoor seats. He believes there will be less traffic than the previous Dock and Dine restaurant. D. McCracken also asked about the noise levels regarding people outside and outdoor music and would it be consistent with town ordinances? C. Taylor stated that the property would be consistent with the town noise ordinances and he confirmed that there would be no live music past 10pm. The previous 2013 plan had elevated outdoor dining where the proposed restaurant is at ground level and sound will travel less. They have met with professional sound technicians and were told noise travels less over water and with the seasonality of the property the marsh area will be lush as well as the trailers will be blocking some of the noise.

P. Kay asked Attorney Cassella to pull back up the map shown at the beginning of the presentation. She asked what is to the east on the map. Attorney Casella stated that is Great Island in Old Lyme, a wildlife preserve, which is located about 3 quarters of a mile away. P. Kay expressed concerns over the noise level reaching Old Lyme and stated since there was nothing to stop the noise on the water wouldn't it make the noise easier to hear? Attorney Cassella stated the closest property that could be compared to Smoke on the Water is The Back Porch. They had music out on their deck and there were no complaints from Old Lyme to his knowledge. P. Kay stated that the noise is a major issue and how it travels to the adjacent business. Attorney Cassella stated that the mini golf has amplified music and that is what is being proposed at Smoke on the Water.

M. Patterson asked in the 2013 application what was the resolution for the outdoor music for the raised decks and raised music? Attorney Cassella stated he didn't believe there it was an issue regarding music. M. Patterson stated he has been to The Back Porch and the music stopped promptly at 10pm due to the town noise ordinance. He also believes there were not any complaints from Old Lyme.

R. Missel stated he has read through all the documents received and expressed concerns over the unresolved issues, one of them being the Emergency Evacuation Plan, particularly who will do it and how long it would take? And at what stage would the evacuations take place in regards to storm levels? Attorney Cassella stated that have been working on a flood ordinance amendment for this project which details specifically the events R. Missel asked about. The draft ordinance has originated from DEEP and is pending with the Board of Selectmen. In the ordinance there is a defined plan regarding Tropical Storm and Hurricane warnings. The emergency management directors would let the property know what to do and it would all be spelled out in an ordinance. R. Missel expressed concerns about not seeing the ordinance. Attorney Cassella offered to bring it up on his screen. R. Missel expressed concerns in regards to the septic system and asked if the original septic system was to be used? Attorney Cassella stated yes and the current system is oversized for the property so it is capable of accommodating the proposed restaurant. M. Patterson asked if the Lower Connecticut Valley Health Authority would have to give approval to the septic? Attorney Cassella stated yes, the restaurant would not be able to open without their approval of using the existing septic system. C. Taylor explained that the septic has been inspected by Duncan Downie and is a 12,000-gallon unit that was found to be in good working order. He added that the burden of a septic system is largely reduced for an outdoor restaurant mainly due to pots and pans not needing to be cleaned, as well as dishwashers. C. Taylor stated that the automatic dishwashers cycle is the largest load carrier in an indoor restaurant. Each trailer has their own independent water supply tank as well as a waste water tank. These will be piped with a quick disconnect where the tanks will be disposed of in the septic tank at night. Attorney Cassella shared the most recent version of the amendment of the Flood Plan Management Ordinance which was edited by Attorney Cassella, J. Kadama, Chris Costa, and Diane Ifkovic (DEEP Flood Plan Management Supervisor). R. Missel requested the report be emailed to him or provided by C. Costa. R. Missel asked if there are 8 trailers to move? Attorney Cassella stated yes, as well as tables and chairs and other materials. C. Taylor stated that they have entered into an agreement with a company in Old Saybrook who would move and store the trailers and materials.

P. Kay asked to go back to the last paragraph of the amendment. Attorney Casella read, "The fine for not removing the temporary nonresidential structure is \$250 per day for a willful violation and \$100 day for a regular violation and/or revoking the permit." P. Kay asked what would happen on windy days regarding napkins and plastic wear because the proposed restaurant is a temporary picnic situation? C. Taylor stated that the people already eat outdoors at the Point and places such as Bill's Seafood. He added that there will be a large amount of disposable trash cans around the facility as well as biodegradable and compostable plates and utensils.

D. McCracken asked about the ARB concerns. He stated that the POCD talks about quality design of commercial sites and the sites being complementary to the history of Old Saybrook. He asked if there would be any resolved issues from the ARB? Attorney Cassella stated that the ARB hasn't seen what was shown tonight in regards to the video and renderings that were shared. The ARB would like the restaurant to be Dark Sky Compliant so there was a question about string lights. The ARB also had concerns about the screening of the trailers and the electrical platform from the neighboring facilities. Attorney Cassella stated the property has a thick grove of cedar trees to the north and the west that surrounds the developed portion of the site. They are working on enhancing that screening and providing additional screening.

M. Patterson asked what the trailers look like? Attorney Cassella stated these are high end quality trailers and shared a picture of the trailers proposed. M. Patterson asked what the buffer was in the original 2013 plan? Attorney Cassella stated there could be no buffer because the restaurant was to be elevated. D. McCracken stated in summary they were trying to work through all the ARB concerns? Attorney Cassella stated yes, C. Taylor worked last week to create the video to meet the ARB requests. They have also done an ecological study from UCONN for the best non-invasive plants to use. They are planning on using the evergreens and grasses. In addition, they are planning to use mulch so a slip hazard won't be on the walkways.

Attorney Cassella addressed the other concern of smell. Originally they were going to use a charcoal smoker; however, they have decided to go with propane smokers, which elevates most of the smoke. P. Kay asked about how they would control food odors because there would be no hoods to capture food smells? C. Taylor explained the outdoor cookers are completely enclosed and trap about 90% of the odors and smoke within. They will be doing simple grilled seafood and meats and there are no deep fryers, which require hoods.

R. Missel asked if the the parking lot condition and the drainage system problems are being addressed? Attorney Cassella stated they are aware of the flooding and are proposing a catch basin connecting it into the drainage system on site. M. Patterson inquired who the owner of the access driveway is? Attorney Cassella stated it is owned by J. Kadama and Point LLC and there is an easement with the town. R. Missel commented that the Planning Commission has looked at this project twice before, one being in 2013. His concern was a 12-month operation was needed rather than a seasonal one. Attorney Cassella stated one of the benefits of this project is it could be a temporary fix and the property could start being productive.

M. Patterson asked what the town or Park and Rec would use the property for during the off season? Attorney Cassella stated that there would be nice landscaping and a pavilion left during the off season. M. Patterson inquired who would take care of the trash during the off season? Attorney Cassella stated that would be worked out with the town. P. Kay also expressed concern of the insurance and liability issues.

P. Kay asked if Attorney Casella would like to address the concerns of the neighbors near the property? C. Taylor explained that he has operations in Essex. P. Kay asked if those businesses were inside? C. Taylor stated yes. P. Kay stated that is the concern because the property proposed is outdoors. C. Taylor stated that everyone wants the building in the long run but cash flow is needed to pay for the building due to higher costs of building with changing FEMA codes and zoning regulations. C. Taylor explained asked the commission to look at it from an economic business perspective and having the outdoor restaurant would allow the property to start making money that could pay for the building. C. Taylor is trying to balance a project that meets the regulations. P. Kay inquired about houses in town built on FEMA stilts and the expense. C. Taylor stated the average weight for a house per square foot is 25 pounds, while the average weight per square foot for a restaurant is 100 pounds. In addition, elevator access is required. C. Taylor explained those two items add a huge expense to building a restaurant on stilts.

M. Patterson asked what the cost would be to put in all the pillars needed for a restaurant on stilts? J. Kadama stated that the structural engineer consulted described the project as building the first floor of a parking garage that you would build your building on with the corresponding cost of doing that.

P. Kay inquired if there were additional questions and comments.

M. Bender expressed that he thought, although not complete, the proposed project is well thought out. M. Bender stated that the key concerns are litter, traffic and noise.

P. Kay asked if anyone from the public would like to speak?

P. Kay asked to revisit the video that Attorney Cassella shared. C. Costa pointed out that Attorney Even Seeman had his hand raised. P. Kay acknowledged that and asked to review the video first. Attorney Cassella re-shared the video as well as renderings and went over all the aspects shown in the video. P. Kay asked what is in the back of the video? Attorney Cassella explained those were the trailers and what each trailer was for. P. Kay inquired about bar service. C. Taylor explained that the bar trailer services the guest and there is not an actual bar. P. Kay asked if the bar trailer would be there to service the guests and if there would be a liquor license? C. Taylor stated yes. M. Bender asked if there was a walk up or sit down bar? C. Taylor said no, there is no walk up or sit down bar. Attorney Cassella went through the video and showed where the septic and other trailers would be, which contain the mobile kitchen, dry storage, and restrooms. P. Kay asked if the trailers would be in use while the business is open? Attorney Cassella stated yes as the restrooms would be in use and the other trailers would be used to provide what is needed for the business. C. Taylor described it as a mobile restaurant with a mobile kitchen, mobile refrigerator which is all cold prep, a mobile bar which is accessible only by employees, and a dry storage trailer, which also contains an office and controls for lighting, music and control of the security cameras.

The dry storage trailer also doubles as space to load the tables and chairs, if needed, for inclement weather and at the end of the season. P. Kay asked what is to the left of the trailers? Attorney Cassella stated that it is additional parking for the employees. P. Kay asked if there is a 40-mile per hour wind patrons would go to the car to eat? C. Taylor stated they could do so if they choose. Attorney Cassella pointed out the restaurant area on the video and C. Taylor stated you could see the smoker is completely enclosed. C. Taylor explained there will be service windows about eight feet wide on the food and bar trailers. Those were not included in the video as he didn't have time to input them. Attorney Cassella went over the configuration of the docks and deck. P. Kay asked about a pool of water on the video. Attorney Cassella stated that it is part of the river. He also showed the pedestrian way which will be from the mini golf property to the other town park and is where the easement will be. P. Kay stated the pavilion doesn't have sides. Attorney Cassella stated that is correct and is FEMA compliant. P. Kay asked if there would be wind flaps on the pavilion? C. Taylor said they cannot have flaps because of the cooking devices and they need open sides to be flood compliant. He also stated that any flaps would need to be 30 feet away from a cooking area. P. Kay asked if boats would be tying up to the docks? Attorney Cassella stated yes and showed the docking structure. M. Patterson inquired if the docks would be reconstructed this year? C. Taylor stated yes, the docks would be reconstructed before opening. Attorney Cassella stated when on the river the wall with railing must be 42 inches high which will block seeing most of the trailers. C. Taylor stated the trailers are 10 ½ feet tall.

Attorney Evan Seeman was given a chance to speak and P. Kay reminded everyone this is not a public meeting. She stated that Attorney Seeman had two minutes to speak. Attorney Seeman stated he is a lawyer representing David and Earla Frisbee who reside at 42 Cromwell Place. Attorney Seeman asked the commission to provide a negative recommendation on the pending application due to concerns of music at night and traffic due to the nature of the restaurant and the turnaround rate of customers. He also expressed concerns over the results of the ARB meeting and the property does not meet several zoning requirements. Attorney Seeman provided a letter to the commission this morning and attached to the letter was the one-page ARB report. Included in the requirements were setbacks, parking, and buffering. He also stated the application is incomplete and it doesn't comply with zoning requirements and expressed the need for a variance application if the project wasn't going to meet the zoning requirements.

D. McCracken asked Attorney Cassella about the non-conformities on the property. Attorney Cassella explained that there have always been non-conformities on the property. He also went onto explain they have been making changes to the proposed plan due the ARB meeting to landscaping, screening, and buffering.

M. Patterson asked if Attorney Cassella if we have a 10pm noise ordinance on record for the town? Attorney Cassella said yes, and he believes the property will be a lunchtime and dinnertime place as it is not a bar. P. Kay stated they should consider a closing time of 10pm to settle the noise issue as the current request is to midnight. Attorney Cassella explained that the live music would not go until midnight and there would only be background music, if anything, after 10pm. P. Kay expressed the concern of the music because it is outside. Attorney Cassella pointed many restaurants are offering outdoor



dining due to the pandemic.

R. Missel reviewed the letter from Attorney Seeman and asked for clarification on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page. Attorney Seeman explained that it is legal jargon to state a change of use. Attorney Seeman disagrees this it is a restaurant to a restaurant use, but rather an indoor restaurant to and outdoor restaurant because of the required zoning amendment regulations needed. He also went onto state that the non-conformities cannot be carried over to a new use that is more intense than the prior use. Attorney Seeman referred to a case whose outcome was that the Planning and Zoning Commission does not have the authority to deviate from zoning requirements. M. Patterson asked with that case if it was a commercial restaurant use to a commercial restaurant use? Attorney Seeman stated it involved a McDonald's restaurant. M. Patterson asked how does the case in question relate to the proposed property? Attorney Seeman stated it is relevant because the applicant asserts that the property is not going to comply with zoning requirements and encouraged the commission to read his letter. He went on to explain in the case it was determined that the Zoning Commission cannot waive zoning requirements and that is what the Zoning Board of Appeals is for. He encouraged the commission to review the ARB report regarding the concerns that were raised. Attorney Seeman stated that the purpose of the zoning regulations is to implement the POCD and once again expressed concerns that the application is incomplete.

Attorney Cassella responded that tonight's meeting is not for the Planning Commission to look at the finer details and zoning considerations that are necessary. He asked the commission to look at the application from a "big picture" point of view and to determine if the application is consistent with the POCD. He also stated if the Planning Commission had comments that they wanted the Zoning Commission to consider than the commission could make that part of their motion. C. Taylor added that the case Attorney Seeman referenced is a change of use from a farming, residential area to a modified business district for McDonald's. He stated they are staying within the traditional use of the property and doesn't believe the case Attorney Seeman mentioned is relevant.

P. Kay asked C. Costa to speak in regards to the incomplete application in regards to the POCD. C. Costa explained that the purpose of the application for special exception is for the applicant to demonstrate that they meet the zoning regulations. Currently, there is insufficient information for the Zoning Commission to make that determination. She believes the applicants would like the Planning Commission to look at the application from a "big picture" point of view and if it meets the POCD. She also stated that the ARB also expressed concerns of the application not being complete and not having the details of the proposed project. C. Taylor added that after the ARB meeting the applicants listened to the recommendations and the video and renderings were not part of the ARB meeting where the ARB stated it was an incomplete application. Attorney Cassella stated that the discussion could be tabled until there is more information. D. McCracken asked if there would be more material presented if they tabled the conservation in regards to the POCD. Attorney Cassella stated he didn't believe there would be additional information in regards to the POCD. He went on to state that the details were being looked at by the ARB and the Zoning Commission.

**MOTION to send recommendation to the Zoning Commission for the denial of referred petition “Smoke on the Water at Dock & Dine” Application for Special Exception/Coastal Site Plan Review** for a 300 seat outdoor restaurant with temporary restaurant trailers, 725 s.f. permanent pavilion and tents. 145 College Street, Assessor’s Map 24/Lot 42-1, SP-2 District, CT River Gateway Conservation Zone, Coastal Area Management Zone, FEMA VE 15 Special Flood Hazard Area Zone as it not consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development to protect the enjoyment of historic sites, harmonize with the neighborhood and is incongruous with the scenery at the mouth of the CT River. Furthermore, it is an incomplete application.; MADE by: P. Kay; SECONDED by: R. Missel. VOTING IN FAVOR: Kay, Missel; OPPOSED: Patterson, Sugland, McCracken; ABSTAINING: None; **DENIED** 2-3-0.

Motion was defeated and P. Kay asked for a motion to approve.

**MOTION to send a favorable recommendation to the Zoning Commission for the approval of “Smoke on the Water at Dock & Dine” Application for Special Exception/Coastal Site Plan Review** for a 300 seat outdoor restaurant with temporary restaurant trailers, 725 s.f. permanent pavilion and tents. 145 College Street, Assessor’s Map 24/Lot 42-1, SP-2 District, CT River Gateway Conservation Zone, Coastal Area Management Zone, FEMA VE 15 Special Flood Hazard Area Zone as it is consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development of Old Saybrook; MADE by: M. Patterson; SECONDED by: K. Sugland. VOTING IN FAVOR: Patterson, Sugland, McCracken; OPPOSED: Kay, Missel; ABSTAINING: None; **APPROVED**: 3-2-0.

## V. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION to adjourn** the Planning Commission public meeting of April 21, 2021 at 8:50 p.m. to the next regular meeting on Wednesday, May 5, 2021 at 7:00 P.M. via Zoom Meeting: Public Zoom Link: <https://zoom.us/j/95698333313?pwd=NndIRm1lenJPS0JBBeDVyaHhtMERDQT09> teleconference Dial: 929 436 2866 US, Meeting ID: 956 9833 3313; or One tap mobile: +19294362866,,96382281249#  
MADE by: R. Missel; SECONDED by: P. Kay. VOTING IN FAVOR: McCracken, Missel, Kay, Patterson, Sugland; OPPOSED: None; ABSTAINING: None;  
**APPROVED** 5-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Christeen Gilman