

**Town of Lincoln**

**100 Old River Road, Lincoln RI**

**Zoning Board of Review**

**November 14, 2006 Minutes**

**Present: Raymond Arsenault, Kristen Rao, Gabriella Halmi, Arthur Russo, Jr., David Gobeille, Nicholas Rampone, Town Solicitor Mark Krieger**

**Excused: Jina Karempetsos**

**Minutes**

**Chairman Arsenault asked if there any corrections to the October 3, 2006 Minutes. Motion made by Member Gobeille to accept the Minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Member Russo. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Correspondence**

**Gary & Lori Rosa, 34 Westwood Road, Lincoln, RI –Use Variance for a two family dwelling (existing) as part of a new subdivision.**

**AP 16, Lot 10 Zoned: RS 12**

**Gary & Lori Rosa, 34 Westwood Road, Lincoln, RI –Dimensional Variance for front and side yard setback.**

**AP 16, Lot 10 Zoned: RS 12**

**Chairman Arsenault read into the record correspondence from Attorney Michael Horan dated October 30, 2006. Applicants are requesting that their two applications be withdrawn without prejudice.**

**Motion made by Member Halmi to accept withdrawal of the Use Variance without prejudice. Motion seconded by Member Rao. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Motion made by Member Halmi to accept withdrawal of the Dimensional Variance without prejudice. Motion seconded by Member Rao. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Applications:**

**Prev. Court LLC, P.O. Box 567, Albion, RI – Dimensional Variance for front yard setback for the construction of two residential houses on Preserved Arnold Court, Lincoln, RI.**

**AP 20, Lot 4 Zoned: RL 9**

**Notice problem with the application for AP 9, Lot 139. Attorney for applicant addressed the Board stating property has recently been sold and condo out to three or four different owners. Applicant made an effort to obtain signatures of consent but was unable to do. They believe the notice problem is significant and requests that the application be continued to the December agenda to properly notify abutters. Motion made by Member Halmi to continue the application.**

**Motion seconded by Member Rao. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Omnipoint Communications, Inc., 50 Vision Boulevard, East Providence, RI/St. James Church Corp., 33 Division Street, Manville, RI – Use Variance for the installation, operation and maintenance of a wireless communications facility on property located at 33 Division Street, Manville, RI.**

**AP 37, Lot 198 Zoned: RG 7**

**Member Russo to sit with full privileges.**

**Represented by: Brian Grossman, Esquire**

**Chairman Arsenault read into the record standards that need to be met for a Use Variance.**

**Omnipoint applied has for the installation of a wireless facility in Manville. The original design change was for the installation of three antennas. Applicant will relocate the antennas from the bell tower to the stone tower and will have four antennas which will be placed back to back. The rest of the installation will remain the same with equipment being located inside the church. Two small GPS antennas will be painted to match the tower. Condenser will be located inside the bell tower and will be visited 1-2 times per month by technicians. There will be no increase in traffic flow and this site was chosen**

because of the unique topography and the existing structure on the premises to house the equipment. The antenna on the tower will be 68 feet high. There is no economic hardship but there is a need of coverage in this area. It is their intent to find gaps in coverage and then provide coverage for those areas. Installation of these antennas will not impact the visual landscape of the area. The height requested for the antennas is lower than what was originally proposed. This church is an existing non-profit entity and revenue generated from this lease will benefit the parish.

### **Witness**

**Frank Wunderler, JR., RF Engineer, T-Mobile**

**2.5 years as a radio frequency engineer for T-Mobile. Prior to that he worked for SunCom Wireless, AT&T Wireless Service and Verizon Wireless. Motion made by Member Russo to accept Mr. Wunderler as an expert witness. Motion seconded by Member Gobeille. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Plot #1 included with the application package shows areas of existing coverage (green) and areas where there is a gap in coverage (white). Plot #2 shows projected cell areas where service will be provided (pink). Member Gobeille asked how large an area will be provided additional coverage and witness replied 1.0 to 1.25 mile radius of the location of the antenna. Coverage areas on the plot maps were created electronically using software at T-Mobile taking into consideration topography and buildings. T-Mobile uses software to**

establish gaps in coverage and statistics that will count the number of calls that are dropped using drive testing data. There is gap in coverage and complaints from customers in the area. The topography is severe with hills due to the river and tall trees causing height issues. Alternative candidates were reviewed but the geographical locations were either outside the coverage areas or inside low land areas. The information for the alternative candidates was obtained from site acquisition agents. The church is the least intrusive site to provide coverage for the gap areas.

Chairman Arsenault asked about the safety of radio frequency emissions in a residential area. Witness replied that they follow FCC guidelines closely and the amount of emissions is about the same as a microwave. Member Rao asked what makes this such a unique site.

Witness replied the way the land lays at that location makes it ideal for a small site with an existing building. Member Halmi asked how many more people will be serviced utilizing the St. James Church site and are more towers being considered in the future. Witness replied that another carrier is interested in putting a tower to the south but this would not serve the same area as the one they would be providing service to.

Attorney for applicant informed the Board that Omnipoint is a FCC licensed carrier and under the terms of that license there are certain build-out conditions they must meet. There is a gap in their service and applicant is looking to provide service to their customers and the

**church is the best existing location to install their antennas.**

## **Witness**

**Warren Kelleher, Site Acquisition Engineer for Onminoint**

**Has six years site acquisition experience working for various carriers and has been involved with numerous site acquisitions located throughout Massachusetts and Rhode Island. He identifies potential site locations, submits them to Radio Frequency Engineering and obtains the sites. Has participated in 20-30 zoning applications.**

**Motion made by Member Rao to accept Mr. Kelleher as an expert witness. Motion seconded by Member Russo. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**He searches for a site as identified where there is a gap in coverage and searches for candidates to fill that gap. He then reviews the zoning ordinance to see where the use is allowed and drives the area to see if there are any existing sites and then submits the potential sites to radio frequency engineers for review and they get back to him after analyzing and determine if they are viable candidates. He provided the search acquisition services for this site. When looking for a site they look into zoning to see if the use is permitted and what the setback requirements are. He visited the area and determined this was a leasable existing structure which they prefer. Bulk of Manville is residential. Last resort would be to build a new tower because it is obtrusive. A compound at the base of the tower would need to be 40 feet by 40 feet. By using an existing structure they can**

use a room 8 feet by 10 feet. They looked at right of way land but most lots were too small and also looked at lots along the Blackstone River. Bulk of lots which were accepted were in residential areas of Manville. His Affidavit (Tab F) lists other sites which were looked at such as the water tank located at Rocky Way. The church tower is the least intrusive of all sites looked at.

Member Gobeille asked if the higher you go the more coverage you would have. Witness replied in theory yes. Member Gobeille then asked what other sites were looked at such as Manville Park or the St. James Cemetery. Witness replied that Manville Park was a candidate that was not accepted by their engineers and the cemetery as not considered because of gap coverage. Route 99 bridge spanning the Blackstone River is located too far north and not a viable candidate.

Member Rao asked why the water tank was not pursued. Witness replied he made several attempts to reach the Town Administrator to set up a meeting but was unsuccessful. The Water Department owns the tank and the town owns the property and because the equipment sits on the ground that is why he needed to meet with the Town. They would need a lease from the Town and one from the Water Dept. Other towns have antennas located on their water towers.

Member Halmi asked about Manville Park stating at 120 feet it would provide double coverage as the church and did not understand why they did not pursue that location. Member Russo asked if the water

tower was depicted on one of the plot maps and witness replied “yes”. They studied the site but were unable to contact the town and that site would have required a use variance.

Attorney Krieger stated the Manville Park site was rejected because it did not provide adequate coverage but the plot map showed it provided more coverage than would be provided by the church. Witness replied that Mr. Wunderler would address that question. Manville Park location would require the construction of a new tower and was not approved by their radio frequency engineer.

Mr. Wunderler addressed questions about the Manville Park site shown on Tab 10 of the application packet. Between that site and the river there is a bridge crossing the river and increase in terrain height which would provide little coverage going across the water causing a shadowing issue and would not solve their objective or provide gap coverage. By placing an antenna on the church tower it would resolve the service problem.

Member Rao stated she was having difficulty reading the plot maps because they were inconsistent. Chairman Arsenault replied that they were not drawn to scale and that is why some shaded areas showing coverage looked larger than others.

Member Halmi asked Mr. Wunderler to explain that in his affidavit he stated the site will operate at a level of 400 watts with a maximum of

**700 watts. He replied the power emitted is similar to that of a microwave. There are FCC regulations they need to adhere to. If the tower is greater than 30 feet it is excluded from extensive studies other than calculations.**

**Chairman Arsenault asked applicant to present their Dimensional Variance.**

**Omnipoint Communications, Inc., 50 Vision Boulevard, East Providence, RI/St. James Church Corp., 33 Division Street, Manville, RI – Dimensional Variance for front and rear yard setback and height relief for the installation, operation and maintenance of a wireless communications facility on property located at 33 Division Street, Manville, RI.**

**AP 37, Lot 198 Zoned: RG 7**

**Attorney addressed the Board stating they were asking for height relief under Article 3(B) which has a maximum allowed height of 35 feet and they are asking for height relief of 47 feet using the maximum height of 35 feet and to the top of the antenna is 68 and including the GSM antenna is 82.6 feet. The church does not meet the 20 foot setback and the existing building does not meet the 35 foot setback. Chairman asked how much of a setback variance do they need. They need two front yard variances one for the church and one for the rectory. Attorney was not sure how much relief he needed for variances. Chairman informed attorney for applicant that because he**

**was not sure what was needed for dimensional relief, it would be best to continue the application to the January 2007 agenda and return with the correct setbacks.**

**Motion made by Member Gobeille to continue the Dimensional Variance to the January 2, 2007 agenda. Motion seconded by Member Russo. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Omnipoint Communications, Inc., 50 Vision Boulevard, East Providence, RI/St. James Church Corp., 33 Division Street, Manville, RI – Use Variance for the installation, operation and maintenance of a wireless communications facility on property located at 33 Division Street, Manville, RI.**

**AP 37, Lot 198 Zoned: RG 7**

**Chairman Arsenault read into the record Planning Board recommendations:**

**Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted project plans and application. The Planning Board recommends Approval of this application. The proposed project represents the installation, operation and maintenance of a wireless communications facility on the property. The applicant is proposing to install color and texture coordinated telecommunication**

antennas onto the church steeple. The antennas measure approximately 4” deep by 12” wide by 72” long. The applicant proposed to install three antennas to the steeple. All other equipment will be located within the existing church facility. Based on a site visit, the Planning Board feels that the applicant presents a realistic site layout that meets the intent of the zoning with special consideration given to the Article 11.A.7.14. The Planning Board feels that the telecommunication installation will not be detrimental to the surrounding residential neighborhood. The Planning Board feels that the use variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area and will not impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance, nor the Comprehensive Plan.

**In Favor:**

**Robert McKenna, 11 Blue Mist Drive, Manville**

He is a Town Council member and has not received any opposition to this proposal. The Town would not allow a tower to be built in a recreational area. He has a town water tank in his back yard and does not want to see an antenna placed at the top of the tower. What is proposed is the least obtrusive plan and conforms to the zoning ordinance and recommends approval of this application. Member Halmi asked him why he would not want it located at Manville Park. He replied that children have climbed the water tower and it is a safety issue.

**In Favor:**

**Richard Mandeville, 240 New River Road, Manville**

**He has difficulty getting cell phone reception in Manville and doesn't start getting a signal until he is on Route 99.**

**Motion made by Member Gobeille to deny the application for Use Variance stating:**

- The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is not due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant.**
- The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.**
- The granting of this variance will alter the general character of the surrounding area and will impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.**
- The relief requested is not the least relief necessary.**
- The subject land or structure cannot yield any beneficial use if it is required to conform to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.**

**Motion seconded by Member Halmi. She finds it hard to justify any of the five points. To realize greater financial gain, it is not the least relief necessary and other options were available, the town was not reached to discuss the water tower, and does not feel this is the best solution.**

## **Discussion:**

**Member Russo stated he would like to see the antenna placed on an existing structure. The thought of placing a tower in a park where children play should not even be on the table because it would be a safety issue and ruin the esthetic value of the park. The town is trying to preserve land where children can play and a tower would not make sense. He would like to have seen the analysis of the water tower because it is an existing structure.**

**Chairman stated that the applicant made an attempt to disguise the antenna as much as possible. His concern was with radio frequency emissions and now knows that the antenna gives off fewer watts than his microwave.**

**Albert Ranaldi, Town Planer addressed the Board stating what applicant is proposing is the least of all evils regarding tower communication. The FCC mandates these companies to fill in all the gaps. The antenna will be disguised within an existing structure and residents will probably never know it exists there. Putting a tower in Manville Park will disturb the character of the Manville community. The Board has an opportunity here to preserve the character of the area and allow the antenna to be installed at the church. He is very involved in planning the Manville Park usage and has been speaking with the Little League, football, soccer groups who are advocates for the use of this area. There is no space in the park to place another structure which is used at its full capacity and Manville Park should**

**be taken out of consideration and the Board should vote affirmatively for this application.**

**Member Halmi stated in light what Mr. Ranaldi just said, she wanted to withdraw her motion to second. She did not know that Manville Park was not a viable alternative and was not familiar with the area.**

**Motion made by Member Russo to approve the application for Use Variance. Motion seconded by Member Halmi. Motion carried with a 4-1 vote with Members Arsenault, Russo, Halmi and Rao voting aye and Member Gobeille voting nay.**

**Maureen Alexander, 1519 Smithfield Avenue, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Variance for front and side yard setback for the construction of an addition.**

**AP 9, Lot 118 Zoned: RL 9**

**Member Halmi recused herself from this application and Member Rampone sat with full privileges.**

**Chairman informed Mr. Alexander that the name of applicant is different from the signature (Michael Alexander). Attorney Krieger asked Mr. Alexander to state that he is not the owner. Maureen is co-owner with his mother – both names are on the deed. Attorney Krieger informed Mr. Alexander that the applicant needed to amend the application to reflect the ownership as Maureen Alexander and**

**Elizabeth Alexander and that Maureen needs to sign the application. Attorney Krieger asked if Maureen was present and he replied they did not feel it was necessary and he was here to represent them. Russell Hervieux, Zoning Official informed the Board that there was a problem with the notice to owner Lot 180 being returned. Address on envelope was addressed to Current Owner, School Street, Lincoln, RI (as listed on field card) and should have read School Road. Mr. Alexander asked if Zoning Official should have picked up on the fact that the address was incorrect. Attorney Krieger replied that it is not the Zoning Official's responsibility to provide an accurate list of abutters for notice and "Current Owner" is not an adequate address. It is applicant's burden to provide a correct list for notice. Two other notices mailed to "current owner" were not returned. The one which was returned was taken care of. Attorney Krieger felt notice had been complied with. Chairman asked Attorney Krieger if the application could go forward with a condition that the application be signed by applicant, Maureen Alexander, prior to the filing of a Decision. Attorney Krieger replied that could be an imposed condition.**

**Motion made by Member Russo to go forward and hear the application with the condition that the application be signed by co-owners prior to the recording of a Decision. Motion seconded by Member Rampone. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Chairman Arsenault informed applicant what standards needed to be met for a Dimensional Variance.**

**Michael Alexander, Contractor, 33 Crest Avenue, Lincoln**

**This property is owned jointly by his mother, Elizabeth Alexander, and his sister, Maureen Alexander. He is a licensed contractor and will be doing the construction. Applicant wants to square off an existing den into a bedroom for his mother so she does not have to go up stairs. There is no benefit other than his mother remaining her home. They are looking for 8.85 foot front and 3.74 foot side yard relief on the north side of the property. Addition would be one story addition with a pitch roof and matching siding and roofing. No exterior lighting will be installed.**

**Chairman Arsenault read into the record Planning Board recommendation:**

**Members of the TRC visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The Planning Board recommends approval of the application for a dimensional variance. The Planning Board feels that due to the unique characteristics of the structure, and the limiting size of the property, the application meets the standards of relief for a dimensional variance. The Board finds that the relief requested will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.**

**Motion made by Member Russo to approve a Dimensional Variance for a 8.85 front yard and 3.74 foot north side yard setback with the**

**condition that the application be signed by Maureen Alexander and Elizabeth Alexander prior to the Decision being recorded. He further stated:**

- The hardship from which the applicant seeks is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant.**
- The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.**
- The granting of this variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.**
- The relief requested is the least relief necessary.**
- The hardship amounts to more than a mere inconvenience, meaning there is no other reasonable alternative to enjoy a legally permitted beneficial use of the property**

**Motion seconded by Member Gobeille. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Gary LaChance, 84 Parker Street, Lincoln, RI –Dimensional Variance for rear yard setback for the construction of an addition.**

**AP 16, Lot 272 Zoned: RL 9**

**Member Rampone to sit with full privileges. Attorney Krieger was involved in this real estate transaction but has no financial interest in**

**this property.**

**Chairman Arsenault informed applicant what standards needed to be met for a Dimensional Variance.**

**Applicant wants to build a 3-season room onto an existing 12x14 foot deck and needs an 11 foot rear yard setback. Addition will be all glass with no vinyl siding and a roof. Deck came with the house when he purchased it four years ago. Addition will be designed specifically for his deck at the company and then installed. Company will not design the addition until zoning approval is received.**

**Russell Hervieux, Zoning Official informed the Board that when he checked the plans submitted for the construction of the house it did not show a deck at the rear of the property and was probably built on once the house was completed with a certificate of occupancy received.**

**Chairman Arsenault read into the record Planning Board recommendation:**

**Members of the TRC visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The Planning Board recommends approval of the application for a dimensional variance. The Planning Board feels that due to the unique characteristics of the existing structure that the application meets the standards of relief for a dimensional variance. The Board finds that the relief requested will not alter the general**

**character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.**

**Motion made by Member Halmi to grant an 11 foot rear yard setback stating:**

- The hardship from which the applicant seeks is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant.**
- The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.**
- The granting of this variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.**
- The relief requested is the least relief necessary.**
- The hardship amounts to more than a mere inconvenience, meaning there is no other reasonable alternative to enjoy a legally permitted beneficial use of the property**

**Motion seconded by Member Russo. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**New Hope Fellowship, 45 Cedarcrest Drive, Pawtucket, RI/Don & Pat Ryan, 25 Carrington Street, Lincoln, RI – Use Variance for the operation of a church organization to be located at 25 Carrington Street, Lincoln, RI.**

**AP 5, Lot 62 Zoned: ML 0.5**

**Chairman Arsenault informed applicants what standards needed to be met for a Use Variance.**

**Mrs. Ryan wants to rent out 1,700 square feet of the RYCO portion of the building. She purchased the property 17 years ago when it was zoned for manufacturing but there is not a big demand for that type of space. She advertised but received no inquiries. The flood last year hurt the business and she has been unable to get back on her feet. The site is slated for conversion into a mixed use by the Town Council but has not been approved. She was approached by New Hope to rent space. Her second floor tenant recently moved out. New Hope will be located on the first floor and the use will be as a place of assembly. She submitted a letter from Timothy Griffin, Fire Chief of the Lonsdale Fire Department stating they have met with applicant and she agrees to bring the entire building up to current fire codes. The building already has a full sprinkler system and the new fire alarm will have heat and smoke detectors, emergency exit signs and emergency lighting. The road leading to the site is not maintained by the Town and she needs the tenants to help maintain the cost of the building. New Hope will be paying \$650 per month for rent. Church traffic will not affect the area and will only operate on Sunday. A sign will be placed by the church on the building but will be uniform in character with the new RYCO sign which she recently replaced. There is enough parking for 61 spaces which does not include the**

**graveled 54 spaces.**

**Pastor David Olson, New Hope Fellowship**

**The portion the church they will rent is 53x27 feet and will be divided into two sections – one section will be a classroom and the other will be an auditorium. The second floor only has one means of egress so he will be renting the first floor. He has been trying to find another location for the church and this would be perfect. He works full time and conducts church services on Wednesday evening and Sunday mornings. They are currently leasing space at MacColl field. The \$650 per month rent is reasonable for 1,600-1,700 square feet of rental space. The church currently has 30 parishioners. Mrs. Ryan stated entry would be through the front door with an archway to the back half of the building which will serve as a second means of egress. The existing loading dock will be converted into a handicap ramp. She plans on possibly installing 2 additional exterior lights for safety purposes.**

**Member Russo asked if this site is slated for mill conversion and the Pastor replied yes and it would be an allowed use. Member Rao asked about signage and Mrs. Ryan replied it would match the existing**

**RYCO signage on the building and conform to zoning regulations.**

**Pastor has youth groups on Friday nights, holds community and church services on Wednesday and Sunday and no bingo will be**

**conducted at the site.**

**Chairman Arsenault read into the record a letter dated November 13, 2006 from Timothy Griffin, Fire Chief of the Lonsdale Fire Department.**

**Chairman Arsenault read into the record Planning Board recommendation:**

**Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted site plan and application. The Planning Board recommends Approval of this use variance application. The Planning Board feels that the proposed use compliments the existing use of the building and has enough parking to accommodate each use. The proposed mix-use of this property will be a less intensive use of the parcel. Residential and light business uses currently surround this area and the proposed development will compliment the established residential neighborhood surrounding this parcel of land. Based on the Comprehensive Plan's objectives, the Town developed a proposed zoning ordinance amendment for mill conversion. This amendment would establish the conversions of existing mill buildings into mixed use complexes as a special use permit. This application could easily fit within the objectives and standards of the proposed amendment. The Planning Board feels that the use variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area and will not impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance.**

**In Favor:**

**William Cruz, Sr, Mendon Road, Cumberland**

**He feels the granting of the Use Variance would be beneficial to the community. This church has changed his life and the Pastor has always been there for him. The church needs a new home.**

**Steven DeAngelis, Cobble Hill Road, Lincoln**

**He use to get into trouble and the church has changed his life. Feels the church can do good for others like him.**

**No opposition present.**

**Motion made by Member Rao to grant the Use Variance stating:**

- The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant.**
- The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.**
- The granting of this variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.**
- The relief requested is the least relief necessary.**
- The subject land or structure cannot yield any beneficial use if it is required to conform to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.**

- **The applicant has tried for some time to rent out the manufacturing space but has been unable to do so.**

**Motion seconded by Member Halmi. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Motion made by Member Rao to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Member Russo. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Ghislaine D. Therien**

**Recording Secretary**