

**MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

2:00 PM

MARCH 8, 2011

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Jared Sheehan, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Assistant Fire Chief, Carl Roediger, Fire Inspector; Steve Dubois, Deputy Police Chief; Jon Frederick, Director of Parking & Transportation

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS – SITE PLAN REVIEW

A. The application of **Service Credit Union, Owner**, for property located at **2995 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 23,366 ± s.f. (footprint) 4-story office building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 291 as Lot 1 and lies within the Gateway District. (This application was postponed at the March 1, 2011 TAC Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Bradlee Mezquita, of Appledore Engineering, presented on behalf of Service Credit Union. Four sketches were handed out in response to comments made at the TAC Work Session last week.

The first sketch shows the bike racks which were relocated closer to the building. The second sketch shows the gated entrance which exits out onto Lang Road with additional signage added for authorized vehicles only. The third sketch includes a note per the Police Department regarding Motorola testing. The fourth sketch shows the location of the drainage easements in response to the conveyance of the road right-of-way for the Longmeadow Extension and the connector road.

Mr. Mezquita confirmed those were the only changes they made since last week's TAC work session. He went on to review the Site Plan.

Mr. Mezquita pointed out the site and the connector roadway on the displayed site plan, along with the four-story 25,000 s.f. footprint building, or 100,000 s.f. total. They have two parking areas, one of which will be used for reserve parking and won't be constructed immediately, but is shown to meet the parking requirement. They show extensive walking paths, a loading area, and a gated entrance into an

underground executive parking area. They had a work session with the Planning Board last month and went through the site plan layout and a lot of the LID and green technologies which are being proposed as part of the project. The City has come to an agreement with Service Credit Union on the roadways and the conveyance of the right-of-way. They are preparing three revised plan sheets for the roadway for the Planning Board.

Mr. Taintor advised the Committee that at last night's City Council meeting they enacted the zoning change related to the sustainability standards so the proposed development now complies with the standards for a Gateway Planned Development Conditional Use Permit. The project is scheduled before the Traffic & Safety Committee on March 10th and the Planning Board will be asked to act on three different aspects related to this project on March 17th. The site plan approval, the conditional use permit for the Gateway Planned Development, and the offer of land from Service Credit Union to the City.

Mr. Taintor opened up the public hearing and called for speakers.

George Stamos, of Eastwood Drive, was interested in the entrances and exits to the project and what is planned for Lang Road. He would also like information on the connector road.

Mr. Mezquita briefly reviewed the traffic circulation plan for Mr. Stamos. Mr. Stamos was concerned about the incline on Lang Road and whether people will have enough time to see the traffic coming out of the connector road. He was also concerned about the amount of traffic on Lang Road coming from Rye and going to Portsmouth and also from Longmeadow all the way down to Heritage. He asked about whether lights will be going in at Lang and Lafayette.

Mr. Taintor stated that part of the reason for the connector road is so that the Lang Road traffic can go across the connector road and over to the Longmeadow traffic signal so that people would not have to turn left from Lang onto Lafayette.

Mr. Desfosses explained that the State has identified the intersection at Lang Road and Route One as an intersection that is not going to get a traffic signal. In the State's long term plan they have identified the access road so that people coming from Rye can take a left on the new access road and go around to the Longmeadow intersection signal. People who are going from Rye to Route One and want to go towards the City will still be able to take a right onto Route One but they would not be able to take a left onto Route One anymore as the left lane would be eliminated. There will be signs at the access road that will tell drivers to take the access road to go south on Route One. The access road is intended to clear up the whole mess with Lang Road. The City has been dealing with the Credit Union for six months negotiating the access road so that they can clean that intersection up.

Mr. Stamos was also concerned about traffic coming out of the Dunkin Donuts and the car wash. He thought if you went into Dunkin Donuts, you were not supposed to come out and take a left. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that you are allowed to come out and take a left if you park in the front parking lot of Dunkin Donuts. If you go in through the drive thru or park on the side of Dunkin Donuts, you are not allowed to go back out and must use the access road to Roberts Street. That was what was negotiated at the time that site was approved. Mr. Desfosses also confirmed that the Longmeadow light will be re-timed to make traffic flow better.

Mr. Taintor reminded Mr. Stamos that the Traffic & Safety Committee will also be discussing this on March 10th. Mr. Stamos indicated he was all set.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to recommend approval with stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses stated he will need a full review of the Roadway Design Plan Set, and it should also be included in the Planning Board packet.

Mr. Desfosses requested that the easements shall be reviewed and approved by the City's Legal Department.

Mr. Desfosses asked Mr. Mezquita if they had checked the site distance coming out of Lang Road and confirmed that it met all of the criteria for 35 MPH. Mr. Mezquita confirmed that he had done so.

Mr. Taintor requested that the roadways be shown as public roads and also that the land being provided to City shall be accepted by the City Council.

Mr. Taintor requested that a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan be prepared.

Mr. Allen requested that the capacity use surcharge paperwork be submitted.

Mr. Desfosses requested that today's exhibits be included in the revised plan set for the Planning board.

Mr. Allen indicated their approval is subject to approval by the Traffic & Safety Committee.

The motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

Conditions Precedent

(to be completed prior to final site plan approval)

1. The site plans shall incorporate the changes shown on the following four exhibits provided at the March 8 TAC meeting:
 - a. Bicycle Rack Exhibit
 - b. Gated Entrance Exhibit
 - c. Site Notes Exhibit
 - d. Proposed Drainage Easement Exhibit

2. The site plans shall show the new roadways connecting Lang Road and Longmeadow Road (currently shown as “50 ft. private road easement” and “60 ft. access & utility easement”) as public roads.
3. The site plans shall include the complete roadway design plan set (Lang–Longmeadow connector road, Longmeadow Road extension, and Lang–Lafayette intersection), following review and approval by the Department of Public Works.
4. The site plans shall address any recommendations of the Traffic & Safety Committee.

Conditions Subsequent

(to be completed after final site plan approval and prior to release of site plan security)

5. The applicant shall submit capacity use surcharge paperwork to the Department of Public Works.
6. The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan for review and approval by the City.
7. The applicant shall convey the land for the new roadways to the City, subject to approval by the City Council.
8. The proposed drainage easements shall be reviewed and approved by the City’s Legal Department and recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

.....

II. OLD BUSINESS - REFERRAL FROM PLANNING BOARD

A. The application of **Bonhomme Richard Realty, LLC, Owner, and Chinburg Builders, Applicant**, for property located on Kearsarge Way, for Final Subdivision Approval to consolidate Lots 118, 119 and 122 as shown on Assessor Map 212, totaling 227,623 s.f. (5.2255 acres), and subdividing the lot into 21 individual lots varying in size from 5,007 s.f. to 14,002 s.f. Said lots lie within the General Residence B (GRB) District. (This application was postponed at the March 1, 2011 TAC Meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

This application was tabled at last Tuesday’s TAC meeting to address comments. Revised plans were handed out to the Committee members by the applicant.

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, first addressed comments made by Mr. Desfosses. On the Existing Conditions Plan, Sheet C-1, they added the test pit logs. There was a question about wetland flag C12 so they added Note 9 to that drawing, indicating that the wetlands were delineated by Jack Hayes and Jim Gove. Flag C12 was eliminated and Jim Gove is present to speak to that. He will also explain why the drainage ditch by the old road is not a jurisdictional wetland.

Jim Gove, of Gove Environmental, explained that Jack Hayes originally delineated this area and Mr. Gove was asked to go out and take a look at it Afterwards, Mr. Hayes agreed with the re-delineation.

They had an area fed by off-site drainage that came in and discharged and formed a scoured channel which never reached any of the other wetland areas. It just flattened out. Mr. Gove asked them to envision a 2' culvert taking just road drainage which goes fast and scours down, extends to the property, hits a flat spot, dissipates and goes away. They called Collis Adams at the Wetland Bureau, and explained it doesn't have hydric soils, doesn't have wetland vegetation, it's a man made conveyance feature with stormwater, and he asked how they should handle it. Mr. Adams sent an email back to Mr. Gove which stated that because it doesn't have wetland vegetation, because it doesn't have hydric soils, because it is created by an off-site drainage which is man-made, he did not consider this a jurisdictional area. It is essentially a man-made drainage swale and it doesn't fit in any of the jurisdictional areas. He provided that email to Peter Britz.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the definition of wetlands has changed over the years because he remembered that a wetland had to have hydric soil, plants and a reason for the water to be there. He asked why they would flag it on a plan. Mr. Gove explained that his review said that he did not believe there should be one and to confirm that, he asked the Wetland Bureau, in part to make sure that Jack Hayes was comfortable with the decision. The wetland definition has not changed and he did not have 2 out of the 3 required items. Mr. Britz asked if DES agreed it wasn't a wetland or if it wasn't jurisdictional. Mr. Gove confirmed they agreed with both. It's just not a wetland and it should be removed from the plan.

Mr. Gove addressed the second issue which also ties into his review. He handed out photos of the area which shows the off-site ditch along the railroad tracks. It shows standing water and low vegetation but they do have hydric soils. The second page of photos shows another portion of that ditch area and it does have standing water, the soils are not very strong in hydric and it has some wetland vegetation. Moving towards Flag C12, it shows that the ditch got drier. Further down the vegetation does pick up again. When he dug down it was all cinders, gravel, it didn't have any redox features in it and did not have hydric soil. There is a break between the areas with standing water. He displayed a plan showing the area getting drier and drier and then it starts widening out and becomes more of a vegetative area. Therefore flag C12 was removed because they do not have a wetland there. Also, Jack Hayes looked at this and agreed with Mr. Gove's determination. Mr. Britz asked how long the upland strip was. Mr. Gove stated it was a little over 50'.

John Chagnon continued with Mr. Desfosses' comments. He stated that the sight distance at the intersection has been analyzed and a plan was handed out. They set a point 10' back from the edge of the road and 2' off of the center line of the street and they were able to measure a 300' sight distance in either direction. They had to remove 40' of the guardrail from the southerly approach to complete 300' of sight distance. Mr. Desfosses asked about the end section on the guardrail and noted that these sections have changed over the years. He felt going back one more half section would make the intersection work much better.

Mr. Taintor asked about the sight distance to the left of the intersection and what obstructions were in that direction besides a tree. Mr. Chagnon indicated they are proposing to plant two trees and there is an existing pole, proposed light and transformer to the west and south. Mr. Taintor indicated they would stipulate that there would not be any branching below 7'. Mr. Allen added that the issue would be that once someone moves in they could plant anything they want and block the sight distance. Mr. Chagnon felt they could add an easement for sight distance.

Mr. Chagnon discussed the sidewalk location. The new plans show the sidewalk adjacent to the property line coming down the street all the way to just before the cul-de-sac. They decided to move the sidewalk to the edge of the cul-de-sac curbing to provide more turning movement for fire trucks. They have not heard about changing the light wattage or type and that can be a condition. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that he has the cut sheets for them.

Mr. Chagnon pointed out that they have shown the gas on the Utility Plan and they have all utility connections to all of the lots on the plan. Their PSNH work order is for the design for the new subdivision utility service so this layout was provided to them by PSNH. He sent the gas company the layout two weeks ago and has not heard back. Dave Lauze, of Chinburg Builders, stated that the gas company will supply the subdivision but have not gotten back with approval of the final design yet.

On the Grading Plan, Sheet C-4, Mr. Desfosses had questions about grading on the north side lots so they made some adjustments. Mr. Chagnon indicated they also included provisions for basement sub-drains. The retaining walls on the southern side have been connected as a continuous wall.

They are on the Traffic & Safety Agenda for March 10th to review the sight distances for the road and the driveway. They moved the hydrant in the cul-de-sac 15' to the NW as requested.

Mr. Chagnon then addressed the changes they made to drainage. They handed out their revised analysis and wetland map. In the original design they captured the stormwater runoff from the road and brought it to a surface filter pond. They also took the runoff coming onto the site and created a swale and brought that to the pond also. This concentrated the runoff to one point of discharge which was a concern for the Public Works Department. That design did a number of things. They were able to reduce not only the peak flow but the volume of water getting to the railroad track. Given there is concern about the single point of discharge, they redesigned the drainage so that the subdivision railroad drainage comes down and utilizes the pond and exits through a controlled outlet structure which then feeds to the long swale to spread out the runoff as much as they can. They brought the runoff from the street side and designed a pipe to bring it around to the east. Therefore, they created two discharge points which will be metered out through a long swale. They revised the drainage analysis HydroCAD model and all peak flows and volume, including up to a 50-year storm, are reduced. They agreed with Mr. Desfosses that the swale beside the railroad track is not in good shape but it is not on their property and it would be difficult to get permission from the railroad to work on it. In anticipation, they show on the new plan an easement area along the southern property line to allow for the City to work in that area but not on the railroad property. They are not increasing any runoff to the railroad line. Mr. Chagnon handed out a new Foundation Drainage Plan, Sheet C-5, showing a separate system that will collect drainage from the foundations on the northerly side lots to a stone trench north of the surface and filter pond. The collection system will be adjacent to the catch basins and in the same trench as the drainage pipes and it will then disperse north of the surface sand filter pond. They feel that will help and assist in getting the water back into the ground.

Mr. Chagnon highlighted the changes to the plan set. On the subdivision plan they added easements on the southerly side of the plan. On the Existing Conditions plan they added a note about the wetland delineation and added the test pit logs. On the Landscaping and Layout Plan they moved the sidewalk and show a different tree layout with the planting scheduling in the upper left hand corner. They are showing more trees and show specific plantings in the cul-de-sac. Gas service was added to the Utility

plan and a note that they will install an oil snout hood on catch basin #1. On Sheet C-4 they made some revisions to the grading and redesigned the drainage system. There is an area where the gravel is still in place which was part of the railroad crossing when it was a road and they put a note on the plan that they would restore that swale, thereby creating more area and better flow regimes on the railroad property. There are some new swale details on the sheet and on the secondary outlet they are adding a headwall and a plunge pool.

They took out a detail on D-1 for the level lip spreader as they now have a plunge pool. They revised the tree planting detail, put in a detail for a dry laid stone retaining wall for full protection on the southerly side. In consultation with the landscape architect they are planning dense hedge plantings at the top of the wall and believe it meets the code. They added a sump pump installation detail to Sheet D-3 showing how the homes would be connected to the ground water drainage system and on Sheet D-4 they added the plunge pool detail.

Mr. Chagnon requested favorable recommendation from the Committee and asked if there were any questions.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen made a motion to table to the next TAC meeting. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion. Mr. Allen acknowledged that a lot of work has been done and it is close to approval. However, a lot of details have been added to the plan and they are just seeing this in a reduced plan size. He was not comfortable giving his approval as the revisions are significant.

Mr. Taintor asked for comments from the Committee.

Mr. Allen requested a note that all water work be done in accordance with the City Water Division regulations. He also requested that they flip the Profile Plan as the view is upside down and is awkward. Mr. Chagnon stated it would be difficult to turn the text around but agreed it was awkward. Mr. Desfosses indicated that all utilities shown on that plan are also on the utility plan. Mr. Allen indicated he would leave it as a comment for now and Mr. Chagnon could decide how to deal with it.

Mr. Allen requested more detail on the proposed retaining wall as they only provided a simplified sketch and a review by the building department would be appropriate. He thought some of the retaining walls looked to be 8' – 9' tall but it's hard to tell on the reduced plan.

Mr. Allen felt that the sump pump detail may be okay but he wants to review that at DPW to make sure they are consistent with other installations they have spec'd out.

Mr. Desfosses felt that, in general, Mr. Chagnon has done an excellent job getting these plans ready but he also agrees with Mr. Allen that there is a lot that they haven't seen yet.

Mr. Desfosses asked Mr. Chagnon to look at moving the retaining walls away from the asphalt driveways by a couple of feet so that they don't have loading right next to the wall. They talked about putting the street water back into the detention pond but that is not shown on the plan. They also talked about having the two outfalls. Mr. Chagnon requested that they discuss that so that he receives some direction. Mr. Desfosses stated he would like to see 2 small 8" outfalls that are substantially further apart from each other. Mr. Chagnon asked if they want them to reintroduce some of the City's drainage into the treatment regime of the sand filter. Mr. Desfosses confirmed they are leaning that way if there is available capacity.

Mr. Desfosses felt that the City drainline is very close to the utility pole as shown under the guardrail section and he asked them to look at that. They should be at least 8' – 9' away from the telephone pole.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the swale that goes through the woods should be stone all the way down. They won't get a lot of growth in the trees so he felt they should do a 6" rock. Mr. Crawford agreed it would entail less maintenance.

Mr. Taintor requested that the sight distance easement be added to the plans. He asked if the light fixtures had been discussed with Mr. Desfosses. Mr. Desfosses confirmed they can use the same light fixture with the medium based socket so they can use the compact florescent blubs.

Mr. Frederick stated they are going before the Traffic & Safety Committee on Thursday and Mr. Britz stated they are going before the Conservation Commission on Wednesday.

The motion to postpone to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Portsmouth Housing Authority, Owner**, for property located at **175 Greenleaf Avenue**, requesting Site Review approval for renovations at Wamesit Place apartments, including resurfacing pavement, drainage improvements and exterior alterations to 5 units, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 243 as Lot 3 and lies within the Garden Apartment/Mobile Home district. (This application was postponed at the March 1, 2011 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Taintor stated there was a question at last week's Work Session regarding compliance with the Zoning Ordinance on some of the parking spaces. There was concern because they could not find anything in their records showing that approval had been granted for a reduction in parking space size or for the number of parking spaces. He reported that he had discussed this issue with the City Attorney, who advised that the existing parking layout could be considered protected under the concept of municipal estoppel. This is due to the fact that the City has approved several applications over the

years so the City had implicitly approved those changes. Therefore, variances are not required for those two items.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Joanne Fryer, of CLD Engineers, was present representing Portsmouth Housing Authority. Also present was Dave Bates, also of CLD, and Bill Cutty, from Portland Builders. Ms. Fryer explained that the buildings are 40 years old. The site is a 100 unit housing facility located on Greenleaf Avenue, off the Route One By-Pass and Holiday Drive. The buildings are proposed to have complete renovations to the exterior and to the units within the buildings. They are also proposing to create five handicapped accessible units, three of which require footprint expansions. The site improvements include the removal of existing pavement and they plan to replace the parking lots and walkways at the same grades and within the same footprint. They will restripe the parking lot and designate handicapped accessible parking spaces. There will be several additional walkways added to facilitate the ADA units. There will also be replacement and repair of the concrete landings of the units as required.

Ms. Fryer stated that subsequent to last week's meeting, they did additional investigation on the drainage and provided a Drainage Area Plan, Sheet 4A. The existing drainage including two closed drainage systems will be maintained. One closed system includes catch basins and pipes along Holiday Drive and outlets on the other side of the last driveway entrance to the parking lot. There is a drainage swale that continues to the southern property corner. There is an inlet for overland flow to the second closed drainage system on the site, which goes to an existing culvert along the back of the property. This carries drainage from abutting properties and she pointed out inlets from the adjacent properties. The two swales join together and continue to a culvert crossing under Greenleaf Woods Drive into a wetland that is a direct tributary to Sagamore Creek.

Ms. Fryer indicated that they tried to investigate the condition of the pipes. They were able to locate several of the outlets but most of the pipes are underground. They have proposed to put a note on the plans requiring an investigation once the structures are removed to evaluate the condition. If the condition is deteriorated, the pipes would be replaced with HDPE pipe.

They looked to see if they could do any additional treatment over the proposed hoods on the catch basins but given the built-out condition of the site, there is not a lot of grade difference between the outlet and where it goes into the wetland area.

Ms. Fryer pointed out that they also prepared a Temporary Parking Plan, Sheet 3A. They are proposing to construct the parking lots one at a time. The construction would include getting up to the base course of pavement and after all parking lots were constructed they would come through with the final wearing course and striping. They are proposing to use the Community Center parking as over flow parking for tenants as needed and for the construction workers. There are normally extra parking spaces during the day so they are not anticipating a problem.

Ms. Fryer indicated that two other comments were raised at the Work Session. They are working with the lighting engineer to come up with a lighting fixture. They have several candidates and had hoped to have catalog cutsheets today but will provide them subsequent to this meeting.

They also will be updating the plans to show dumpster screening consisting of a solid fence with gates on the front, made from PVC fencing.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the PVC fencing and if it will be hardy and replaceable if damaged.

William Cuddy, of Portland Builders, stated it was a PVC type material and you can replace wall panels. If one side is damaged it is replaceable. It simply detaches from the vertical post which will be a 6 x 6 within a PVC tube, embedded in concrete. There will be two swing gates on the front and on the side and there will be a tenant access gate with a latch and spring hinges so the gate will never stay open.

Mr. Desfosses asked Ms. Fryer if she had gone out and looked at the drainage swales and if, in her opinion, they were doing everything they should be doing, i.e., conveying stormwater properly, cleaning the stormwater the way they are intended and she also looked at what shape are they in. Ms. Fryer stated that the swale that runs along the back property line is well defined. There is not a lot of grade and the water seems to move fairly slowly so they get additional opportunity for settlement of particles. The swale from Holiday Drive is not as well defined as the water makes its way down. Most of the area on the other side of the fence is covered with snow so it is hard to tell exactly what is going on in that area. Once they get into construction there may need to be some work done on their property. Most of the ditch is on the other side of their property, adjacent to Greenleaf Woods. Mr. Desfosses asked if some of the Greenleaf Woods drainage goes into the ditch once it crosses the property line. Ms. Fryer confirmed there is drainage from basically any property which is abutting their property on that side. Mr. Desfosses requested a report, once the snow has cleared, on whether any work needs to be done to it. Ms. Fryer also felt they could have a site meeting once they started the work to make a final decision.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approve with stipulations. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses requested that once winter subsides and the snow clears, the engineer shall provide a review of the drainage system, including both the subsurface pipes and the swales to determine if they are in good working order and whether they need to be up-graded. Also, final lighting catalog cutsheets be submitted for final approval. He would like to see the exact model of dumpster screening to make sure it meets the intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Taintor requested a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan.

The motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. Once the snow clears, the applicant shall provide a review of the drainage system to DPW, including both the subsurface pipes and the swales to determine if they are in good working order and whether they need to be up-graded.
2. Lighting catalog cutsheets shall be provided to the Planning Department for final approval.
3. A dumpster screening detail shall be provided to the Planning Department for final approval.
4. The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan for review and approval by the City

.....

IV. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:37 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant