In accordance with notice to members of the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, a meeting was held on Tuesday, May 23 2006 at 6:00 PM at the Narragansett Bay Commission Boardroom – One Service Road, Providence, RI.

MEMBERS

Mike Tikoian, Chair
Paul Lemont, Vice Chair
Tom Ricci
Joe Shekarchi
Neill Gray
Dave Abedon
Dir. Michael Sullivan
Bruce Dawson

STAFF PRESENT

Grover Fugate, CRMC Executive Director

Dave Reis , CRMC Environmental Scientist

Brian Goldman, Legal Counsel

1. Chair Tikoian called the meeting to order at 6:04p.m.

Chair Tikoian made a brief statement of clarification on the council's permitting process.

2. READING OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

Vice Chair Lemont, seconded by Mr. Sherkarchi and Mr.Ricci moved approval of the minutes of the May 9, 2006 meeting. Director Sullivan had a question on Application #2005-12-06 and the Council approving an 80+ feet variance and stated that the primary justification, as he read the minutes, was that the individual needed a 7' draft for his boat. Director Sullivan wanted to address what minimum the council guarantees at another point either in the agenda this evening or on another agenda as. Director Sullivan was concerned with granting an 80' variance for a need of an individual's boat and not for resources. Director Sullivan noted that the council historically approves and targets for a 3' minimum depth. Chair Tikoian replied that he would have to review the file and said that some of the questions on the length had to do with there being eelgrass present in that area and one of the reasons for the additional length was to avoid impacting the eelgrass beds. Chair TIkoian said if you reviewed the file he raised the question of eelgrass causing docks to go out further. Chair Tikoian also stated that he would bring this up for policies and procedures. The motion was carried on a unanimous voice vote.

3. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no subcommittee reports.

4. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Fugate reported that they held their workshop for the UCG last night. Mr. Fugate said they received some oral testimony and packets of about seven or eight written comments from various organizations. Mr. Fugate said they would be going through the comments and analyzing them and recommending changes to the proposed regulations. He said they were also preparing a response to the comments received. Mr. Fugate said the changes would go out or they would request that P and P amend the version and have the Council approve them to go out to public notice and then adoption.

Mr. Fugate requested that any legal counsel present enter an entry of appearance on the application if they have not done so already.

5. Chair Tikoian read through the agenda to see which applicants/attorneys were present.

6. APPLICATION REQUESTING AN EXTENSION OF EXISTING ASSENT:

1998-07-052 CASTLE FARMS INVESTMENT/TOWER HILL GROUP – Extension (#5) of Assent for 34 Single House lots with open Space. Located at plat 50, lot 2 and plat 50-1, lot 1; Tower Hill Road, South Kingstown, RI.

Sean Coffey, attorney for the applicant was present. Dennis DiPrete, the applicant's engineer was also present. Mr. Fugate gave council members a brief summary on the application. Mr. Fugate stated that this was an extension request for a small subdivision. Mr. Fugate stated that the applicant had received an extension from him and this was the first council extension request under the new regulations. Mr. Fugate said there are no enforcement issues. Mr. Coffey explained that this was an additional extension request for a 34-lot subdivision including one existing house. Mr. Coffey said the existing house had been renovated at this time. Mr. Coffey noted that there had been some litigation years back which delayed the progress on the work. Mr. Coffey said the applicant is reviewing the current plan and may be coming back to the council within the next year with a proposal for down scaling the overall development and perhaps some alternate disposition of development rights. Mr. Coffey stated that they needed an extension to explore these options. Mr. Gray noted that he read a letter that said there was a full council extension last year. Mr. Coffey said yes there was a full council extension last year. Mr. Gray said this would be the second full council extension. Mr. Coffey replied yes. Mr. Ricci noted that Mr. Coffey's 12/7/05 correspondence and the CRMC assent extension request is actually signed by a Thomas Ricci but that it was not him and said he was in no way related to that particular Mr. Ricci and had no affiliation with the project. Mr. Shekarchi, seconded by Mr. Dawson moved approval of a second one-year extension on the application. The motion was carried on a unanimous voice vote.

7. APPLICATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN OUT TO NOTICE FOR 30 DAYS AND ARE BEFORE THE FULL COUNCIL FOR DECISION:

2005-07-027 DAVID ALEXANDER – Construct and maintain a residential boating facility consisting of a 135' x 4' fixed timber pier, 20' x 3' ramp, and a 10' x 15' float (150 s.f.). The facility will extend 90' beyond mean low water requiring a 40' variance to RICRMP Section 300.4.E.3.k (standard is 50' beyond mean low water). A letter of no objection has been received from the northern abutter (facility is 16.1' from the property line extension). Located at plat 17, lot 160; 5 Pokanoket Trail, Warren, RI.

David Alexander, the applicant was present. Mr. Reis gave council members a brief summary of the application. Mr. Reis stated that the application was to construct and maintain a residential boating facility consisting of a 135' x 4' fixed timber pier, 20' x 3' ramp, and a 10' x 15' float. Mr. Reis said the dock will extend 90' beyond mean low water requiring a 40' length variance and a 9' variance to the property line setback. Mr. Reis stated that the current plans are on pages 26 thru 31 of the council's agenda and noted that if you look at page 29, the inland edge of the dock where the stairs are coming off the land this is where the facility comes within 16 feet of the property line extension. Mr. Reis said staff had no objection to the application or the variances requested. Mr. Alexander did not have anything to add to the application. Mr. Shekarchi asked if the applicant spoke with his neighbor regarding the variance to the property line extension and if they were okay with this. Mr. Alexander replied yes and that he had a letter of no objection from the abutter which should be part of the council's packet. Mr. Shekarchi, seconded by Mr. Ricci moved approval of the application with all staff stipulations and the two variances. Mr. Dawson referred to a letter objection on page 20 of the packet from the Warren Conservation Commission. Mr. Dawson said he does not think the applicants dock impacts the moorings or impacts on the access to shore. Mr. Dawson said here the dock location does not create a problem but dock after dock could and he just wanted to bring up the Conservation Commission's concerns. Mr. Fugate replied that this is a standard objection they receive from the Conservation Commission and also the Kickemuit River Association. Mr. Fugate noted that they have offered to meet with the groups to look at this and the best way to get at the issue of the terms of cumulative impact but had not received a response back to sit down and discuss the issue. Chair Tikoian asked what staff does to address these concerns. Mr. Reis replied typically its based on the staff members familiarity with area and that each staff member is assigned a certain town and is familiar with that town. Mr. Gray commended the applicant on his lateral access design. The motion was carried on a unanimous voice vote.

2005-09-006 SAND HILL DEVELOPMENT, LLC – Remove several existing structures on the property and to construct 4 mixed-use (residential/retail use) buildings serviced by public water and sewers. The building will house 8 retails shops and 7 condominium units. Located at plat I-G; Lots 73 and 74; 240 Sand Hill Cove Road, Narragansett, RI.

Donald Packer, attorney for the applicant was present. Mr. Reis gave council members a brief summary on the application. Mr. Reis stated that the application was actually a modification to a pool that was granted by the council. Mr. Reis stated that the applicant would demolish the existing residential and commercial structures and construct a new mixed use residential and retail space development. Mr. Reis stated that staff had no objection to the modification and that it was an internal partitioning of the structures that had been approved by the council. Chair Tikoian asked if what was written in handwriting relative to Section 335, public access was new. Mr. Reis replied no it was addressed the first time and this was the same decision worksheet from December 2005. Mr. Packer said Mr. Reis was not correct and that an assent had not been issued on this previously. Mr. Packer noted that there was another portion of this project, Sand Hill Development, which involved reconstruction of four-single family homes along the beach which had received a prior assent but that this portion had not received a prior permit. Mr. Packer stated that Section 335 relating this portion had not been addressed but that he would address it. Mr. Packer stated that this project has no impact on the public trust and that the plan was in the packet. Mr. Packer noted that the application before the council is for a number of small commercial developed cottages along the front on Sand Hill Cove Road. Mr. Packer said they are going to be removed and new

structures will be placed there. Mr. Packer said there is public access to Salty Brine's beach which is less than 100 feet from this particular project. Mr. Packer also stated that this was private property and this particular section of the development all fronts Sand Hill Cove Road and has nothing to do with the public trust portion of the State. Mr. Packer did not feel that Section 335 applied to this project. Chair Tikoian asked Mr. Fugate to clarify this. Mr. Fugate explained that staff had suggested after realizing the limitations of the site recommended that informational signs be posted in the area depicting where the other public access point was so that people would be aware of the public access points in those areas. Mr. Packer said they do have plans for signage on the project. Director Sullivan stated that in the layout granding there was something labeled existing building and asked if this was the George's of Galilee building. Mr. Packer replied no and that George's is on the next lot. Mr. Shekarchi, seconded by Vice Chair Lemont moved approval of the application with all staff stipulations, a stipulation for Section 335 and that the applicant provide appropriate signage. Chair Tikoian requested staff sign-off on the signs and leave it up to the executive director for signage approval. The motion was carried on a unanimous voice vote.

2005-12-034 FOX ISLAND, LLC – Construct and maintain: replace the existing 150 sq. ft. float with a 144 sq. ft. float and incorporate a float lift and separate boat lift system. Also install six (6) additional tie-off piles. Located at plat 31, lot 48; Fox Island, North Kingstown, RI.

Turner Scott, attorney for the applicant was present. Richard DiSalvo, Rhode Island Mooring was also present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Reis gave council members a brief summary on the application. Mr. Reis stated that the application was to relocate an existing ramp and float. Mr. Reis said the applicant would replace the existing 150 sf. float with a 144 s.f. and incorporate a float and separate boat lift system at the existing facility. Mr. Reis also stated that the applicant would install six additional tie-off piles. Mr. Reis said there are no variances to the application and staff had no objection to the application. Mr. Scott had nothing to add to the application and would leave it to the staff's recommendation. Mr. Shekarchi, seconded by Mr. Ricci moved approval of the application with all staff stipulations. Director Sullivan said it would appear the previous facility was limited to 4 recreational boats and asked if by adding the lift if you were expanding the facility and if it was their intention to have additional vessels there. Mr. Scott replied no and that the four boats would include the boat lift. Mr. Fugate stated that this was a standard staff stipulation. Mr. Reis noted that this stipulation was on page 31 of the staff report. The motion was carried on a unanimous voice vote.

2006-01-067 CANDICE NOLL -- Construct and maintain: a residential boating facility to consist of a 4' x 211-foot fixed timber pier with a 4' x 20' fixed lower access platform. The terminus of the dock will extend to 124-feet beyond mean low water (MLW) requiring a variance from the RI-CRMP Section 300.4 standards. Located at plat 4, lot 106; 256 East Shore Road, Jamestown, RI.

Turner Scott, attorney for the applicant was present. Richard DiSalvo, Rhode Island Mooring was also present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Reis gave council members a brief summary on the application. Mr. Reis noted that the application was construct a residential boating facility to consist of 4' x 211' fixed timer with a 4'x20' fixed lower access platform. Mr.Reis said the dock extends 124' beyond MLW and requires a 74' length variance. Mr. Reis said staff has no objection to the application. Mr. Reis noted that the dock is off the shore of Jamestown in an area where there is eelgrass which was

driving the length standard to obtain a depth of -5' below MLW. Mr. Scott stated that there had been a question on the application regarding beach access and that this had been corrected and the plan had been revised to show the lateral access along the pier. Chair Tikoian asked Mr. Reis to explain the Burdick and Short method and why they use these standards with respect to eelgrass and why this dock length is because of the eelgrass. Mr. Reis explained that the Burdick and Short method is based on achieving adequate sunlight underneath the dock and depended on the orientation of the dock to the sun. Mr. Reis stated that the length variance is another item and not necessariliy related to the Burdick & Short method. Mr. Reis said by policy they have been trying to get the terminus of the facility out to a depth of minus 5' MLW with the understanding that the average boat propelllor depth is approximately 3 feet. Mr. Reis said they would still be cutting eelgrass and this was a balancing method to try to protect the eelgrass from major impact. Mr. Gray said staff is saying that only the terminus end of the pier which is allowed per vessel. Mr. Reis replied yes. Director Sullivan asked Mr. Ries about the 5' depth and the vessel capacity. Director Sullivan said even the largest outboards and many inboards are 3' depth to keel. Mr. Reis stated that they work off the 3' propeller depth and not the size of the boat. Mr. Reis said there was no standard for this and this was a balancing thing. Mr. Gray, seconded by Director Sullivan moved approval of the application with all staff stipulations and the length variance. The motion carried. Mr.Shekarchi was opposed.

2005-12-018 NICHOLSON PERSONAL RESIDENCE – Construct and maintain a residential boating facility as shown on the attached plans. The structure is to consist of a variable width (6-8 foot) fixed timber pier with an L section at its terminus. In addition, the pier leads to a ramp that leads to a 150 SF float held in place by 3 piles. A single tie-off pile is also proposed. The structure is to extend 110' +/- seaward of the cited Mean Low Water mark. The proposed design is variant to several RICRMP dock construction standards. Located at plat 166, lot 5; 13 Low Lane, Bristol, RI.

Mr. Nicholson, the applicant was present. Richard Sherman, the applicant's attorney and Ernest Rabideau, the applicant's engineer were also present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Reis gave council members a brief summary on the application. Mr. Reis stated that the application was to construct a residential boating facility. Mr. Reis noted that the application requires several variances a float variance for the 240 s.f. float a 50' length variance Mr. Reis noted that the applicant is also requesting a variance to the dock construction using Trex instead of timber. Mr. Reis stated that staff had no problem with the length variance or the material variance but had a problem with the float variance as they felt it was not justified. Mr. Reis said the current plans are on pages 16-21 in the packet. Mr. Sherman wanted to address the issue of the variance for the 10' x24' size float and their reasons for safety, engineering and especially with regard to the fetch. Chair Tikoian noted that Mr. Rabideau had testified as an expert before the council. Mr. Rabideau explained that the pier and float are in a very exposed location at the south end of Bristol neck and felt that even a 10' x24' float was going to move a great deal. Mr. Rabideau said this would make it difficult for the applicant to board and disembark from his boat from the float. Mr. Rabideau stated that the applicant currently owns a 10' x24' float and will move it to this site. Mr. Rabideau said the float would provide a place to put dinghies for accessing the applicants boats on the mooring. Mr. Rabideau said a small float probably would not be able to hold the dinghies because of the motion they are going to experience at this site. Mr. Sherman asked if the facility was purely for the purpose of docking dinghies. Mr. Rabideau replied no. Chair Tikoian asked if the fetch is that strong is a dock appropriate in this area. Mr. Rabdieau replied that there are a number of docks in this area. Chair Tikoian said that

was not his question, he asked if a dock was appropriate in this area. Mr. Rabideau replied yes he believed so. Mr. Rabideau explained the design of the dock. Chair Tikoian stated that the Executive Director just pointed out that a neighboring dock and this dock are going to be consolidated into one and asked if this was correct. Mr. Rabideau replied no. Mr. Fugate explained that there is an existing dock to the north and that the float they want to use is attached to that dock. Director Sullivan asked if they take this 10'x24' float are we going to see another 10'x24' float on the dock to the north. Mr. Fugate replied no that if there is another float there staff recommended a standard float on that dock. Vice Chair Lemont asked Mr. Rabideau if he said staff objection to the length was based upon the type of vessels that would be used. Mr. Reis stated that it was difficult for staff to handle because there are not any standards in the program in terms of how they address variances depending on the types of vessels utilized at a residential dock. Vice Chair Lemont said if you had a mega yacht you would go out a couple hundred feet. Mr. Reis replied no there comes a point where we have to basically decide where to draw a line it's a judgment call. Vice Chair Lemont asked how long the dock was next to this. Mr. Reis replied that they are fairly large lengths. Vice Chair Lemont said he had difficulty granting this variance because of the present owner has a boat of such a size. Vice Chair Lemont noted that if the applicant sold the property and the new owner has a boat or no boat there is a dock sitting out there. Mr. Fugate said in fairness to staff, the director raised a point today regarding the maximum depth and that's what you need in order to control the length of these docks. Mr. Fugate said if there was a maximum depth it would help control the length of the dock. Vice Chair Lemont noted that there is a lot of fishing in this area. Vice Chair Lemont asked if this had any impact on boats going back and forth. Mr. Reis replied some people would say there is an impact and others would there was no significant impact. Mr. Dawson asked if the existing dock to the north, that's in a corral, is protected. Mr. Rabideau replied yes there is a wave screen on the two sides of the dock. Mr. Sherman said a wave fence was not allowed at this site. Mr. Gray asked on the existing facility there are two floats there. Mr. Fugate replied correct. Mr. Gray asked if they take the float off of this dock, can they deny a float in excess of the program. Mr. Gray stated that they are allowed 150 s.f. float under the regulations. Mr. Gray felt the council would be remise on requiring someone to put a smaller float in this area which is going to be hazardous to this area. Mr. Gray said he leans towards a larger float. Mr. Gray said staff had no problem with the dock length or the materials used. Mr. Gray felt #9 the lateral access needed to be addressed. Mr. Gray said the staff report comments do not satisfy him. Mr. Gray asked how much clearance there was underneath the pier on the beach. Mr. Rabideau replied that there is 3.5' clearance at MHT and 7.6' clearance at MLT. Mr. Gray said they need to make sure people can clear at MHT and asked what the applicant can do to remedy this. Mr. Rabideau said it could be remedied by raising the pier deck but that it would make it inconvenient for someone in a wheelchair to use the dock and that was why they kept the profile level. Mr. Gray said he can understand this but they need to consider public access. Mr. Gray said the standard is 5' and they need another 1.5' at 30' and it would be gentle enough and not affect handicap. Mr. Sherman said he would accept this as a stipulation and that this portion of the pier could be redesigned and submitted to staff for a minimum number of a 50' coloration at the high tide mark for the area of the pier near the shoreline. Mr. Gray said this was a good compromise. Chair Tikoian said the only issue remaining is the size of the floating pier. Vice Chair Lemont, seconded by Mr. Gray moved approval of the application with all staff stipulations, with the stipulation of the rise for lateral access. Mr. Fugate had a point of clarification and noted that the float is going to be moved over and staff suggested that they modify the plan to show either no float or that it be a standard float for the old dock. Mr. Fugate said if they want to add another float they

would have to come before the council. Mr. Sherman said a separate owner owned that dock and they would have to come before the council with an application for any new float or structure. Chair Tikoian did not what that person coming back to CRMC and saying they gave up a float and now they want to build a new one and its going to be the same size in the assent. Mr. Goldman agreed there is nothing to prohibit them from putting another float there. Mr. Gray said this was why staff said we should stipulate in the motion that the assent for the old dock be modified to eliminate the float. Chair Tikoian said you could not do this legally. Mr. Goldman said you could not do this because it's a separate owner. Director Sullivan suggested a clear affidavit of ownership on that float and that it did belong to the applicant and he is moving it to his property from one space to another. Director Sullivan had a hard time putting a change on something that is not before the council. Mr. Goldman asked if the other dock was related. Mr. Sherman said the dock was owned by Stanley Livingston, the applicant's brother-in-law, and he had a letter from him that the applicant owns the float. There was council discussion on the float. Director Sullivan asked if this was all in the family why they needed an additional dock. Mr. Nicholson explained that in 1960 there was a small dock to the north and he approached his brother, who owned the dock, and asked to put an extension on the dock at his expense. They put the extension on the dock and there was a legal agreement between them. Mr. Nicholson said his brother died and the property has been sold by the estate. Mr. Nicholson said the new owner, his brother-in-law, would like to eliminate the right-of-way and the permission of access in the event that he wants to sell the property. Director Sullivan suggested an acknowledgement from the applicant's brother-in-law that he no continuing interest in the ownership or a shared ownership in the dock and they could address the float issue at a later time. Mr. Sherman said if this was a stipulation he would prepare such acknowledgement signed by Mr. Livingston and Mr. Nicholson and submit it to the council. Vice Chair Lemont felt this was beyond their scope and said he did not intend to amend his motion. Mr. Ricci said from a legal standpoint they are discussing placing a stipulation on someone elses property and he had a problem with that. Mr. Goldman said unless there was an agreement with them. Director Sullivan said its not a stipulation its just recording an oral presentation made before the council. Mr. Fugate said what the Director is trying to get at is you have an agreement that they are going to remove that float and move it to this dock and that the float would not be replaced on the old dock then they would have to modify the assent. Mr. Gray said yes if the owner of the old facility was here making that recommendation. Mr. Gray said the applicant is just telling us where the float is coming from but it does not change the assent that is there. Vice Chair Lemont moved the question. Mr. Sullivan said based on the failure to include his amendment he would be forced to vote against the application because he was not comfortable with this action. The motion carried. Director Sullivan was opposed.

Chair Tikoian noted that Mr. Shekarchi left at 6:40 p.m. and did not vote on the application and that the council still had a quorum.

8. Public Hearing on Changes to the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Program and Management Procedures:

<u>The following changes are proposed</u>:

1. RI Coastal Resources Management Program - Section 300.4. - Recreational Boating Facilities - Add NEW 300.4.B.13:

The purpose of this proposed change is to specify how the Council will regulate and manage outhauls in conjunction with municipalities.

Chair Tikoian opened the public hearing on the program changes. Mr. Fugate explained that there are a number of existing outhauls around the state typically found in Narrow River, the Salt Ponds, Jamestown and protected harbors. Mr. Fugate said they sort of popped up. Mr. Fugate said they do not fall within the program per se in terms of the regulations although they are regulated by the council at this point. Mr. Fugate said they are suggesting that in many cases this it better dealt with from a permitting process by the officials in the Harbor Management Plans. Mr. Fugate felt that it was better to allow the permitting process to continue through the local level where the locals are familiar with the navigational issues, use issues, etc. Mr. Dawson was concerned with #6 the date November 15 to April 15 with a boat not being secured by the device, the cabling system should be removed. Mr. Dawson said the way it reads the cable system should be removed during this period of time and felt it should be reworded for example when a boat leaves for a day. Mr. Gray replied that it was not the intent that when a boat leaves for November it was not the intent that they have to remove the cable when they go out. Mr. Goldman suggested saying when it's not used on an ongoing basis. Mr. Gray said yes. Mr. Dawson was concerned with the Harbor Management Council's Commission and asked how many we have now and how many plans are approved. Mr. Fugate replied that most of the plan out there either have interim approval or full five-year approvals. Mr. Fugate said the interim approval allows them a one-year authorization to implement their harbor ordinance while they are preparing their Harbor Management Plan. Vice Chair Lemont asked if this was the one that Mr. Reis wanted to have the two instead of the four. Mr. Reis said yes, staff was concerned with four outhauls per lot. Chair Tikoian called for public comment. There was none.

2. Management Procedures - Section 4.3 – Schedule of Fees - Add NEW Section 4.3.8 as follows:
The purpose of this proposed change is to be able to assess an administrative fee when applicants or their consultants submit unsolicited site plan changes during the course of the review of an application.

Mr. Fugate explained that this was to deal with a situation where we have been having multiple plan reviews by staff where applications are essentially gibing substandard plans. Mr. Fugate staff is finding problems with plans and they are throwing substandard plans back and staff is spending a lot of time review them. Mr. Fugate said this would enable the Executive Director to review and determine whether there has been abuse of the system and if so, plan an hourly rate on the review of the second or third set of plans to cut down on some of the substandard plans they are receiving. Director Sullivan felt this was the appropriate thing to do. Chair Tikoian called for public comment. There was no public comment.

3. Management Procedures - Section 4.3 – Schedule of Fees **-** Amend Section 4.3.2(r)(1) as follows:
The purpose of this proposed change is to cite the actual review rate fee as set by the Council's planning and procedures subcommittee.

Mr. Fugate explained that this was an existing regulation and that this changes the effecting date of this. Mr. Fugate said this allows us to charge an hourly rate for the review of plans. Mr. Fugate said the hourly rate last year was $500 an hour and this just carries the effective date for the hourly rate now to January of 2006. Director Sullivan

asked how we can post date something. Mr. Fugate said its reviewed every January. Director Sullivan felt that you cannot postdate something. Mr. Goldman explained that they are ratifying what the practice has been. Chair Tikoian called for public comment. There was no public comment.

RI Coastal Resources Management Program - Section 300.4. - Recreational Boating Facilities - Add NEW 300.4.B.13: Mr. Goldman suggested they clarify the language to say "Those not being secured by a device on an ongoing basis, outhaul capable. Mr. Reis suggested that they say " During the off season, from November 15 to April 15, when the boat is not being secured by the device, that the outhaul cables shall be removed". Chair Tikoian said council members were more comfortable with Mr. Goldman's assessment. Director Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Gray moved approval of Section 300.4. The motion was carried on a unanimous voice vote

Management Procedures - Section 4.3 – Schedule of Fees - Add NEW Section 4.3.8. Mr. Ricci Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Dawson moved approval of Section 4.3 new Section 4.3.8. The motion was carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Management Procedures - Section 4.3 – Schedule of Fees **-** Amend Section 4.3.2(r)(1). Vice Chair Lemont, seconded by Mr. Dawson moved approval of Section 4.3.2(r(1). Director Sullivan was not comfortable posting dating it back to January. Mr. Goldman said they can have the date effective May 23rd. Chair Tikoian noted that they have not charged for anything between January and to date. Director Sullivan asked why not. Mr. Fugate replied that the need has not a risen. Mr. Goldman said the motion has been amended to May 23rd. The motion was carried on a unanimous voice vote.

9 <u>Enforcement Report – April, 2006</u>

There were none held.

10. <u>Category "A" List</u>

There were no Category A's held.

There being no further business before the council the meeting, the council adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grover Fugate
Executive Director CRMC

Reported by Lori A. Field