



## Chatham County Planning Board Minutes August 1, 2023

The Chatham County Planning Board met in regular session on the above date and the meeting were as follows:

### Present

George Lucier, Chair	Jon Spoon, Vice Chair
Clyde Frazier	Shelley Colbert
Tony Mayer	Amanda Roberson
Mary Roodkowsky	Eric Andrews
Norma Hernandez	Elizabeth Haddix

### Absent

Kent Jones

### Planning Department

Jason Sullivan, Director, Kim Tyson, Subdivision Administrator, and Dan Garrett, Clerk to the Planning Board.

#### I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Lucier called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

#### II. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:

Chair Lucier stated there was a quorum, 8 members present, Ms. Hernandez and Ms. Roodkowsky arrived shortly after the approval of the minutes.

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Approval of the Agenda – Chair Lucier asked the board members if they were okay with adding an item to discuss the Airbnb topic under Board member items. The Board did not have any issues with the adjustment to the agenda. Motion made by Vice-Chair Spoon, seconded by Ms. Robertson. The agenda was approved, 8-0, unanimously.

#### IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Consideration of the June 6, 2023, meeting minutes. Minor edits were noted. Motion by Mr. Mayer to approve the June 6, 2023 minutes and seconded by Ms. Robertson. The minutes were approved 8-0, unanimously.

#### V. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION:

Mr. Karl Kachergis has signed up to speak but will speak during the board member item discussing the Airbnb.

## VI. SUBDIVISION ITEMS:

1. Request by Warren Mitchell, P.E. on behalf of Vickers Bennett Group, LLC for a **twelve (12) month extension of First Plat to extend the current first plat expiration date for Vickers Village from November 15, 2023 to November 15, 2024, consisting of 183 lots**, located off US 15-501 N, Vickers Rd, SR-1719, and Jack Bennett Rd SR-1717 parcels #18847, 18848, 60719, 18636, 60653, 79965, 89281, 89395, 80493, 69057, 89206, 18857, 87996, 89272, 18856, 87093, 93157, 79288, 93156, 93155, 93154, 85875, and 18914.

Ms. Tyson stated the deadline for submission of the construction plan is November 15, 2023. The request before the Board is for a twelve-month extension of First Plat approval to extend the first plat expiration date from November 15, 2023, to November 15, 2024. Mr. Antonio McBroom, Developer for Vickers Bennett Group, LLC, has stated in the extension request letter the team has been working non-stop since before Zoning and First Plat approval on wastewater design and permitting for the project. Considerable progress has been made and the permit is very close. Additional reasons are efforts to find a development partner has been hampered/delayed by the hike in interest rates, wastewater system design and approval process has taken longer than expected, and on-site sewer treatment and spray irrigation is a unique requirement in the broader market and finding a builder partner who is familiar with the system outs has taken more time than expected. Permits are actively being pursued and a twelve-month extension is requested to allow additional time to obtain the required permits.

Ms. Tyson said in closing, the Planning Department does not make recommendations on extension requests as this is a policy decision for the Board of County Commissioners.

- Chair Lucier asked Mr. Mitchell to explain their main reasons for requesting this twelve-month extension. Mr. Warren Mitchell on behalf of Vickers Bennett Group stated he is here tonight with his business partner, Mr. McBroom. Mr. Mitchell gave a brief overview of the Vickers Village project which is a compact community mixed-use development with residential of 100 townhomes on smaller lots to include affordable housing and commercial. The reason why the ordinance was changed to have time limits between First Plat and Construction Plans is because older developments before the change would drag on and on or even stall out. The two-year deadline was implemented to get the project jump started and keep moving towards the construction plans. This extension is important because we do not want projects to be rejected and then have to go back through the process because the cost would add to the price of the homes. Chatham County average home price is \$600,000 which might be the highest in the state, and that is mostly the result of not having any wastewater treatment. The surrounding counties seem to have unlimited wastewater processing and their growth is flourishing. Chatham chooses to be a rural county and to protect Jordan Lake and we do that better than any other county.

Mr. Mitchell said they started the permitting process in April of 2021, and this project has a lot of consultants involved with the wastewater system. There are engineers, soil scientists, hydrologists, and attorneys working on all of the documents required for the wastewater plant. Because of the size and complexity of this project we are required to have a public utility company as an applicant for the wastewater system and we have been fortunate enough to have Aqua. It took a full year just to get all of these consultants involved and in May of 2022 we made our first application to the State for the wastewater treatment system. The State has 90 days to review and submit their comments back to us, and in August of 2022 they submitted those comments and because of the spray irrigation we were required to have extra levels of analysis and reports to the State. During the second review in November of 2022, they kicked the application out. In my 30 years as an engineer, I have never seen

an agency tell you to start over and it is purely because they do not have the staff and resources. It was very frustrating; our group has invested over \$500,000 into this wastewater treatment system for this project. This is just the wastewater portion of the project not to mention all the other permits required before we even break ground. We submitted the second application in April of 2023 to the State and we are currently waiting for their comments.

Mr. Mitchell stated the other issue is finding a builder willing to use this proposed wastewater treatment plant and in this current climate of high interest rates it is making it very difficult. We had a national builder lined up but dropped the contract due to the interest rates. Right now, we plan to have the wastewater approved within a month. We still have some permits we need to get back from NCDOT and Chatham County, but that will not be nearly as bad as the wastewater permit. With this project being a compact community, there is a subdivision portion and a zoning portion, the zoning requirement is 3 years, and the subdivision requirement is 2 years, so even our internal timelines do not match up. We are respectfully requesting an additional 12 months in order to complete the required permits.

- Mr. Robert Waldrop, an adjacent property owner asked if this request is going to make any changes to the originally approved plan? Chair Lucier stated there will be no changes to the approved plan, just an extension.

#### Board Discussion:

- Vice-Chair Spoon asked when the State kicked your application back for the wastewater system evaluation process, did you submit basically the same plans? Mr. Mitchell stated, yes, when submitting a permit there is a lot of back and forth with comments and suggestions, we resubmitted a plan that addressed all of their comments and concerns since we already knew them from the first submittal. Vice-Chair Spoon asked if this project would use all one builder, or will there be multiple builders? Mr. Mitchell stated all the residential homes will be built by one builder, my partners and I will keep the commercial portion of the project. Vice-Chair Spoon asked with this 12-month extension request, will that impact in any way the commitments you have made concerning affordable housing you had made in the original submission? Mr. Mitchell stated no it will not, we are committed to the affordable housing plan for this project.
- Ms. Colbert stated she appreciates the explanation that you provided tonight and also said she was present during the original hearing a couple years ago as well as the Board of Commissioners meeting where all of these issues were discussed. What I would like to convey to you is I wished some of the information you provided orally had been included in the original request because it is important for the public to have that kind of information in the package, and I would not have raised concern regarding the affordable housing aspect of this project as I did earlier with an e-mail to the Planning Board members. It is encouraged, if required in the future, to provide as much information and context as possible not only for us the board members but also the public for transparency.
- Ms. Haddix stated affordable housing is an important issue and we have a problem in this county with wastewater and this project has suffered and was delayed due to our limited wastewater treatment and the extra hoops that is developer is jumping through just to get that part of the project accomplished. Ms. Haddix stated the county ordinance has a 12-month restriction for a reason and I just do not feel I have enough information to confidently vote on this item tonight. Vice-Chair Spoon said the 12-month regulation we have had for awhile now in our ordinance, which was pre-pandemic and since the pandemic everything in the industry has changed with the timelines developers were expecting. Permits that used to take 4 to 6 months are now taking 6 to 8 months and sometimes longer than that. That is the reason we have started acquiring this influx of First Plat extension requests, the developers that have been in this industry for years and working with us as a Planning Board and State agencies, are no longer able to hit the timelines they were expecting with their previous history. Regarding the wastewater system, a development of this size, has to make their own package wastewater treatment

system, which is outside of our purview, which is regulated by the State, and everyone is dealing with NCDEQ to obtain those permits, which is a much slower process than it has been in the past. As far as the affordable housing aspect of this project, this developer worked very closely with the counties affordable housing personnel Ms. Stephanie Watkins-Cruz, and the applicant went above and beyond what was required of them for affordable housing. Most of the developers choose to do a payment in lieu where they can just write the county a check and they do not have to worry about affordable housing. We developed a payment in support system for this development because they do not just want to write us a check, they want to have actual affordable housing units within this development, and they are putting money towards those units and locating them throughout the development. Vice-Chair Spoon said he understands the issues they have faced and why they have requested this extension and for him it is worth allowing them 12 more months because it is out of their control. Vice-Chair Spoon also mentioned he is thankful for new members on the Board who are interested, paying attention, and raising questions. Ms. Haddix asked what is the affordable housing threshold for this project? Chair Lucier stated it is tied to the median household income and this project was approved for either 9 or 10 affordable units (5%), and the developer will pay \$47,000 to help make those units affordable. The units will also be sprinkled within the development, they will not just be clumped together. Vice-Chair Spoon stated we want our police officers and teachers to live here in the community where they work.

- Ms. Colbert asked the Planning staff, when we receive a request for the 12-month extension, what is the requirement under the local regulations to justify it? Mr. Sullivan stated the regulations has two provisions, one is subdivisions under 50 lots, a one-year extension may be granted if the applicant demonstrates that delays beyond their control are responsible for the lapse and have the extension submitted and reviewed following the process. Subdivisions with more than 50 lots will have a development schedule, the regulations require them to submit their construction plans for the first phase within 2 years. Per the regulations they can also submit for a 1-year extension. The reason Planning staff does not make recommendations is because we do not have clear criteria for reviewing it. Ms. Colbert stated, so the standard is, “beyond their control.” Mr. Sullivan said that is correct. Ms. Colbert said this is the standard we need to be looking at, are there issues beyond their control, whether or not the facts and the circumstances as described by the applicant meet that standard. It is a matter of consistency, equity, and transparency, for all applicants. It is one thing for an applicant to assert something, but the assertion is not the same thing as a fact. What I am trying to convey is when we receive a document as we did today compiled of assertions and not facts and circumstances. Part of my objection is we are not supplied with enough information as to why with facts the applicant needs this extension. Going forward in the future maybe we can convey that to the applicant to provide as many details and facts as possible in the extension request letter.
- Mr. Andrews stated the rise in interest rates is out of our control, but is that really a valid reason? The delays with NCDEQ are definitely beyond their control and I see it happening all the time, so that is in fact an acceptable reason. Something that might help the Board understand the difficulty obtaining a partnership with a builder. This is a project that will require a strong regional builder if not a national builder and my experience in Chatham County, a national builder will not do a well and septic, if there is water and a private system, they may consider it, but they are not happy with it. This does create a lot of difficulties. It is not what these national builder is used to, they are used to a development in Raleigh and Charlotte, they like to develop where there is strong municipal sewer. Their second argument I support, there are a tremendous amount of delays right now.
- Vice-Chair Spoon stated the trend we have seen having three of these extension requests in our last two meetings and they are not going to stop is evidence in itself, there is something happening outside of these developer’s control. These three requests were not the same developing group, it was three

separate developers asking for extensions experiencing the same delays and we need to be accommodating of that.

- Mr. Anthony McBroom with Vickers Group stated he is a Chatham County native with humble beginnings and wanted to make it clear we wanted to do something different that has never been done with affordable housing. We have run into builders that did not want to take part in affordable housing, but our commitment to that is a priority and we will require our builder to partner with us who has the same vision as us. We are passionate about the affordable housing aspect of this project.
- Mr. Sullivan stated he has spoke to the County Attorney about the affordable housing contract and it is signed and binding. We are also looking to have a public hearing in September for the subdivision regulations text amendments to increase the timeline between the First Plat and Construction Plans.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Spoon to approve this item, second by Ms. Robertson. This item was approved with a vote of 10-0, unanimously.

2. Request by Craig Nursey, P.E on behalf of RBV 1525, LLC for a **six (6) month extension of First Plat to extend the current first plat expiration date for Flatiron Forest from August 24, 2023, to February 24, 2024, consisting of 29 lots**, located off Hamlets Chapel Road, SR-1525, parcel #2037 and 2014.

Ms. Tyson stated the deadline for submission of the construction plan is August 24, 2023. The request before the Board is for a six-month extension of First Plat approval to extend the first plat expiration date from August 24, 2023 to February 24, 2024. WithersRavenel, representative for RBV 1525, LLC, has stated in the extension request letter the reason for the extension request is based on permits needed from various agencies. The applicant expresses in the letter dated June 28, 2023, the first round of comments has been issued by the various agencies and they have submitted the second round of resubmittals to NCDEQ-PWS and NCDOT. Permit applications have been submitted to Chatham County Watershed Protection Dept., Chatham County Utility Dept., USACE, and NCDEQ-DWR. The first review with NCDOT took three months and the second review was two months. WithersRavenel is actively coordinating with NCDOT to clarify their comments and WithersRavenel anticipates resubmitting to NCDOT within days of receiving a response.

Permits are actively being pursued and a six-month extension is requested to allow additional time to obtain the required permits in the unforeseen circumstance that permits are not received prior to the construction plan deadline on August 24, 2023. It is not anticipated for the permit approvals from the various agencies to take the entire six months request.

The Planning Department does not make recommendations on extension requests as this is a policy decision for the Board of County Commissioners.

- Mr. Andrews recused himself from this item.
- Ms. Sol Moore with WithersRavenel gave a brief review and facts of their extension request stating it has been tough with all of the permit delays. Currently they are waiting on NCDEQ and NCDOT, the wait time for these permits has doubled. Ms. Moore stated they feel that they will receive the permits in time but are asking for the extension just in case they do not come through. Chair Lucier stated this subdivision will expire before the September BOC meeting, so this will need to be discussed at the Planning Board with a recommendation tonight so it can be on the August 21<sup>st</sup> BOC agenda.

#### Board Discussion

- Ms. Colbert stated this extension request letter has a much better explanation with facts and legitimate reasons beyond the applicant's control. Why did you wait so long to ask for the extension? Ms. Moore stated they felt that they were so close to receiving the NCDOT comments, but it is just taking a lot

longer than normal. Ms. Colbert asked if they were to do it over again, would they request the extension earlier? Ms. Moore said yes. Ms. Roodkowsky asked why are you only asking for a 6-month extension when you are allowed a 12-month extension per the regulations? Ms. Moore stated we did consider asking for 12 months, but our NCDOT comments are down to only three comments, and we are confident we have met their requests. The permits should be coming to us very soon.

Motion made by Ms. Robertson to approve this item, second by Ms. Colbert. This item was approved with a vote of 10-0, unanimously.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

VIII. BOARD MEMBERS ITEMS:

1. Discussion about the Airbnb located on Stonewall Road.

- Mr. Karl Kachergis, who lives on Stonewall Road, stated he has lived in Chatham County since April 1969 and his home is all the way in the back of the woods on the 18-foot easement. A subdivision came to our road in 1995, but what is happening now is we are dealing with a complex of Airbnb rentals, it is like a mini hotel on 3.17 acres. Our road is so narrow it is unsafe for two vehicles to pass each other, one must back up and pull off for the other to pass. Currently we have four of these units being built, I am not sure how this happens; we will have four dwellings being served with septic lines on only 3 acres, is there enough room for the repair field? The road is simply not safe for the amount of traffic that will be using it. The other issue is there was a consent agreement from 1989 against any commercial development on Stonewall Road. I understand that Chatham County is saying Airbnb is not commercial, and I can understand that for people who set aside a portion of their house to rent out, maybe a room for extra income, but this is a complex that is just for Airbnb. We are all concerned about the people who are going to stay here will not understand the rules of the road, you need to drive slow so you do not kick up all the dust. Also, we do not have any road maintenance agreement, it is basically help repair the road if you can. The road is so narrow emergency vehicles cannot go down it if other vehicles are on this road, you cannot safely pass. This is very concerning, and I hope you are able to address this, there is not supposed to be any commercial use. They also built a warehouse for their toys that they rent out on weekends, from what I understand is they have inflatables and go-carts. Mr. Kachergis stated he values the Planning Board and knows they all value the future of our community.
- Vice-Chair Spoon asked has anyone in the neighborhood appealed this with the Board of Adjustments? That would be the next step for this, what is perceived as an incorrect assessment of our policies. Mr. Kachergis said he really does not know what his neighbors have done, but he will follow up with that. Vice-Chair Spoon said we will have to find a solution in our UDO, so this does not happen again, but for your current situation the next step is the Board of Adjustments. Chair Lucier stated the Planning Board only sees subdivisions with 5 lots or more, if it is less than 5 lots then it is handled administratively with the Planning department, it does not come through the Planning Board.
- Mr. Sullivan gave a summary of the approval process for these units. As Mr. Kachergis stated before, there is a 1989 consent decree put in place on Stonewall Road which allowed the ability to subdivide lots off of that road. The decree includes "none of the party and their heirs, hereto shall further subdivide their respected properties except upon compliance with applicable regulations of Chatham County." Since this has been put in place there have been lots created over the years on Stonewall Road, and I agree there are safety concerns with traffic on that road. However, the regulations have allowed for the creation of these lots. This all has to do with a pre-1975 roadbed regulation, we met with the consultants to remove this from the UDO. This is not the only road in Chatham where lots are being

created off of very narrow roads where emergency vehicles cannot drive down. In this particular situation there was a family that carved out and created this 3-acre lot so it could be sold. The lot was sold, and the new owners came into the office and said they would like to further subdivide this lot and because this pre-1975 roadbed option exists they were allowed to subdivide and go through to process of getting permits through Environmental Health for their septic systems. They do have suitable soil for all four units for the primary and repair fields. Regarding the actual homes and their use, we do not have any standards for short-term rentals in our regulations. We treat these as single-family dwellings because that is how they are submitted for permitting. The owners received permits for the principle dwelling and an accessory dwelling on both lots.

- Chair Lucier stated this is 2 lots, it is not subdivided into 4 separate lots. There are 2 lots each this a primary home and then an accessory dwelling unit. It is clear how all of this was approved, but we definitely need to address the pre-1975 roadbed regulations in the UDO. Accessory dwelling units have important uses, such as family members, elderly people living nearby for care, and things like that, so they are important, but we can express limiting short term rental in the UDO. Vice-Chair Spoon stated there is a line that can be drawn for commercial use, it is clear there was no intention for anyone to occupy these homes permanently, commercial uses should not happen on small private roads. Mr. Kachergis stated the consent decree in 1989 forbids commercial use, and this is a commercial use. Vice-Chair Spoon stated this is a strong case for appeal, but this is not the forum for this, we are looking to correct it in the future. Chair Lucier agrees they should look into the Board of Adjustments.
- Ms. Haddix stated she has done some looking into this issue since the last meeting and has been out to Stonewall Road and agrees that the road is very narrow and could be dangerous. The situation is a strange existence of what does not at all look like a primary dwelling and an accessory dwelling unit. I am glad we are going to address this in the UDO because it is very vague and subjective in the way that it is written. When you look at these buildings you cannot tell one from the other, they all equally look like a rental unit, same size, and shape. As far as Airbnb or short-term rental, this question of commercial use it is worthy of a lot of thinking because on one hand you can see HOA's creating rules to protect against this type of thing from happening, but on the other hand we have the courts who will mostly side with the homeowner as long as they are not executing an illegal use, what can we place in our UDO that is not going to impede on the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment rights. There have been some cases where that is address and I glad we are talking about it. Vice-Chair Spoon stated we have delt with where we have religious temples located on private roads and then all of a sudden they are having hundreds of people showing up on a particular day and just locking down the neighborhood and we cannot keep you from placing a temple anywhere, but we were comfortable saying it would need to be located on a state maintained road if you are going to have high volume traffic. Maybe we can make sure you have access to a state-maintained road for this type of use, or some kind of residency requirement where someone has to live on the property. We have a few avenues we can explore to address this issue.
- Ms. Colbert thanked Mr. Kachergis for speaking to the Planning Board and was shocked to hear about this at the last meeting and is sad that any of our Chatham residents have to deal with this situation and there seems to be a bit of a loophole to let this happen. Even though this did not come through the Planning Board I appreciate the time you and your neighbors took to bring it to our attention, even if we cannot help you directly, but we may be able to prevent this in the future within our UDO regulations. As we move forward and discuss the auxiliary uses on lots, and Ms. Haddix had a great point we will probably need to receive legal advice as well as additional discussions, but there are many other jurisdictions outside of Chatham County that not only delt with these issues, but they were also trying to juggle some of the affordable housing issues. That is something else we need to be mindful of is some of these accessory buildings could have other implications that are quite useful, so we just need to be careful.

- Ms. Roodkowsky said she shares the same feelings and stress of the situation and agrees with Chair Lucier about accessory dwelling units (ADU), and we need to be sympathetic and perhaps encourage ADU's in many cases, but they have to be an accessory to something, you cannot have an accessory, which is an accessory to an accessory. So, a suggestion for the UDO is an ADU has to be an accessory to something that has its own standard. The second concern is this storage shed and what its uses are, and should we have some kind of regulation for that? Ms. Roodkowsky said she hopes they are not using the building for a commercial use. Mr. Kachergis stated they are storing items in it that they rent out. Ms. Roodkowsky stated if there is commercial use going on that is something you could add to your case and your discussion with the Board of Adjustment. As far as the UDO, when does a storage shed go from storing things to a commercial enterprise? This is something we might need to address as well.
- Mr. Sullivan stated this storage shed has an open investigation right now, so it is on our Zoning Officials list. If it is being used as a business, then it will be in violation. When we discussed this at our June meeting, I had said I would follow up with the UDO consultants about short-term rental regulations. We had a meeting with them last week to speak solely on this topic and they have a lot of experience with this in other jurisdictions. We will work with them on different options, and we have been in discussions with the County Attorney on this topic as well.
- Mr. Andrews said these things happen very organically in Chatham County and what you have is a long private road that used to be a car path that becomes a shared road among other people and the properties become further divided and you have what is called a handshake agreement. As a community they all agree to take care of this road, but there is no formal agreement, no road maintenance agreement and that is a horrible situation and is much more prevalent throughout this county than most people realize, and it gets difficult when people try to obtain a mortgage or any kind of refinancing because after 2007 and 2008 lenders are very strict and they want some binding road maintenance agreement. The Airbnb situation was created by several loopholes in the regulations, and I dislike we are here now, and we do not want this happening again, but we do not want to overregulate to the point where we are restricting someone's property rights.
- Chair Lucier thanked Mr. Kachergis for his time and comments, and we will work through this with the UDO and not to overregulate but keep something like this from happening again. Bring this case before the Board of Adjustments and see how that goes.

## 2. Update from the Planning Board liaisons.

- Ms. Robertson stated she had been to the July 17<sup>th</sup> Pittsboro Planning Board meeting; the North Area Chatham Park was back on the agenda which they tabled last meeting. The Chair opened the meeting and put that item up for a vote, so there was no discussion, there was one public speaker who did comment, but ultimately it was recommended for approval. There were a couple text amendments, a storage unit facility requesting a conditional use permit, and a light and two heavy industrial rezoning requests within a residential area which was not recommended for approval on their agenda as well. There is also a project being discussed on 500 acres that will have 1600 units and one million square feet of office and retail uses. This item was tabled until their August 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.
- Ms. Hernandez attended the June Siler City meeting and there were two items on the agenda, a rezoning request for a parcel with road access to Hwy 64 to provide support services to the megasite. The other item was a rezoning request of 5 parcels to neighborhood business conditional, the plan is to have a mixed-use development. Ms. Colbert attended the July Siler City meeting via Zoom and there was only one item on the agenda, and it was a 500-unit mixed-use



development and was recommended for approval. Siler City has a new Planner for staff for the city and the next meeting will be held August 14<sup>th</sup>.

2. Discuss and decide the September Planning Board meeting location.  
The Board discussed and agreed the September meeting will be held in person at the Agriculture and Conference Center.
3. Reminder of the Planning Board Special Meeting to receive presentation from the consultants regarding the Moncure Small Area Plan. The meeting location will be at the Old Agriculture building at 65 E. Chatham St. Pittsboro, at 6:30 p.m.

IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORTS:

Mr. Sullivan reported on the following:

1. Minor Subdivision spreadsheet
2. August 21st Public Hearing items. Packets provided at your seat.
3. Unified Development Ordinance Update.  
The consultants have been working on updates and the UDO subcommittee should have some items to review in the next couple of months.
4. Moncure Site Area Update.  
The preferred scenario has been drafted and the consultants will provide a presentation.
5. Moncure Community Meeting to be held on August 9th at the Sprott Youth Center from 5-8p.m.  
The consultants will be presenting the preferred scenario for the Small Area Plan.

X. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_  
George Lucier, Chair Date

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Garrett, Clerk to the Board Date