

**TOWN OF WARREN
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
WEDNESDAY JUNE 20, 2007**

Members Present: David Markolf, Chris Behn, Bob Kaufmann, Virginia Roth, Lenord Robinson and Peter Monte [arr. 7:12].

Others Present: Bill Nedde, Bill Maclay, Kathy Beyer, Dave Olenick, Erin Post, William Senning, Susan Hemmeter, Alec Newcomb, Don Swain, Charlie Snow, Jim Caffrey, Miron Malboeuf and Ruth Robbins.

Agenda: Call the meeting to order, 7:00 pm.

- 1) Review Notes of Site Visit: **Underhill**
- 2) **Applications, 2007-06-SD, 2007-06-CU, 2007-06-PRD (Continued from April 4th, 2007), Housing Vermont seeks Sketch Plan, Preliminary Plan Review and Final Plan Approval for a planned unit development Wheeler Brook/Blue Tooth HLP, of 18 units with 29 bedrooms of affordable housing (originally, the applicants requested 20 Units with 38 bedrooms of affordable housing).** Housing Vermont, Sugarbush Development, LLC & Summit Ventures NE LLC, have reapplied for 18 Units of Affordable Housing on 8.95 ± acres located at 1423 Sugarbush Access Road in the Rural Residential District and the Vacation Residential Districts... The applicant requests waivers to combine all Subdivision Review Hearings, reduce parking space size and reduce the side yard setback by 1/3. The development combines two parcels. One located in the Rural Residential District, Article 2, Table 2.2, C(18) and Vacation Residential District Article 2., Table 2.5, C(13). The first parcel, located at 1423 Sugarbush Access Road, is approximately 1.25 acres owned by Sugarbush Development, LLC and the adjacent parcel, owned by Summit Ventures NE, LLC, is approximately 7.7 acres. This reapplication will be reviewed as a Minor Subdivision, Conditional Use and Planned Residential Development, PRD .under Article 8, *Planned Unit & Planned residential Development*, coordinated with , Article 6, §6.1, §6.3 §6.4, Sketch Plan, *Preliminary Plan Review, Final Plan Approval*. Article 7. *Subdivision Standards* and Article 5. *Development Review* of the Warren Land Use and Development Regulations
- 3) **Application 2007-01-SD: Danforth and Alex Newcomb, Seven Lot Subdivision(formerly 9), off the South End of Main Street(# 839), Warren Village (Continued from May 23rd, 2007)** The applicant, Danforth and Alexandra Newcomb, seek Preliminary Plan Review and Final Plan Approval for a Major Subdivisions, 9 Lot off 839 Main n Street, VT. Route 100 and Fuller Hill Road in the Rural Residential (*RR*) and Warren Village Historic (*WVR*) Residential Districts. This application requires review under Article 2, *Zoning Districts & District Standards*, Table 2.2, *Rural Residential District* and Table 2.3 *Warren Village Historic Residential District*, and Article 6, *Subdivision Review* § 6.3, *Preliminary Plan Review and* § 6.4, *Final Plan Approval*, and Article 7, *Subdivision Standards*, of the Warren Land Use and Development Regulations.
- 4) **Application 2007-08-CU, Conditional Use, Construction of a Development Road & Single Family Residence in the Meadow Land Overlay District (Continued from May 23rd, 2007)** The applicant, Keith C. Underhill, Trustee, seeks approval to develop within designated *Meadowland*. The 11 +/- acre parcel, ID # 023003-600, is located at 1695 Fuller Hill Road in the *Rural Residential District*, partially in the *Meadowland Overlay District* & the *Forest Reserve Districts*. This property had received a Conditional Use for Development in the *Meadowland* on May 22nd, 2002, (2002-11-ZP); however no Land Development resulted and the permit expired in May of 2006. This application requires review under Article 2, Table 2.1, (*Forest Reserve District*), Table 2.2, (*Rural Residential District*) & Table 2.13, (*Meadowland Overlay District*) Article 3, § 3.1, *Access, Driveways & Frontage Requirements*, and Article 5, *Development Review* of the Warren Land Use and Development Regulations.

5) Other Business:

- a. Review and approve Minutes from June 6th, 2007
- b. Review & sign mylars {LBO, Sugarbush/Weinstein, Sardi}

The meeting was called to order at 7:06 by Mr. Markolf.

1- Review Notes of Site Visit: **Underhill**

Mr. Markolf stated for the record that the attendees at the Underhill site visit were as follows: Mrs. Roth, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Kaufmann, Mr. Behn, Mr. Markolf, Mr. Olenick, Mr. Senning and Mr. Malboeuf.

- 2- Applications, 2007-06-SD, 2007-06-CU, 2007-06-PRD (Continued from April 4th, 2007), Housing Vermont seeks Sketch Plan, Preliminary Plan Review and Final Plan Approval for a planned unit development **Wheeler Brook/Blue Tooth HLP**, of 18 units with 29 bedrooms of affordable housing (originally, the applicants requested 20 Units with 38 bedrooms of affordable housing).

Staff reminded the Board that the last hearing for Wheeler Brook was on March 21st and that a short laundry list was created that included 1) letter from the Warren Fire Dept. 2) an Erosion Control Plan and 3) an amendment to the right-of-way with Mrs. Smith.

Mr. Maclay presented the Board with a revised site plan and renderings of the proposed buildings for the members to review. Included in on the site plan was a landscaping plan that also indicated the type of trees/shrubs and Mr. Maclay stated that they wanted to create a rural character for the project.

Mr. Markolf asked where the hydrant was located and Mr. Kaufmann asked about exterior lighting. Mr. Maclay pointed out where the hydrant was located and told Mr. Kaufmann that the lighting would be recessed along the porches under the soffit. Mr. Maclay then introduced Mr. Nedde who went over the engineering aspects of the project. He stated that they planned to be able to maintain the current grade as much as possible so that there would be minimum cuts and fills. They would also be utilizing standard silt fences and establishing a storm water basin that would collect any runoff both during construction and once the project is completed. Mr. Nedde also explained how they would be using in some areas of the project grass lined swales post construction, and initially before the grass has grown they would be filled with crushed stone (referred to as "stone chuck dams). It was also noted that erosion blankets would also be used.

Mr. Behn asked about the depth and the maintenance of the storm water basin or pond. Mr. Nedde replied that the depth was only 18 inches and that periodic maintenance was dependent on other factors such as the surrounding vegetation, cleaning out of catch basins and amount of winter sanding and whether or not the road is swept. He continued to say that he's seen sediment removed from a storm water basin as soon as five years and one that has gone fifteen years without significant sediment build up. Mr. Monte asked if the plan outlined what the maintenance should be for this project. Mr. Nedde replied yes, that scheduled maintenance was part of the plan. He added that yearly inspections would be required to be done by the property management. Mr. Monte asked for confirmation that drainage was taking place away from the east side of the property where the brook is located and was told yes, that was taken very much into account when designed.

Mr. Maclay noted that there was a fence around the storm water pond on the engineers plan but not on the architects plan and that the intention was to not have a fence. It was asked what the distance was from the pond to the nearest building and the reply was 40 feet. There was concern

expressed by many of the Board members about the lack of a fence being a safety issue. Ms. Beyer commented that one of the reasons for not having a fence was for aesthetic reasons and in a similar situation in Middlebury they were planting raspberry bushes to act as a barrier in lieu of a fence. Mr. Maclay also stated that the area between the buildings and the pond would eventually be “grown up” with trees and other vegetation as they did not plan to maintain it as lawn area. Mr. Robinson suggested a fence with raspberry bushes to screen the look of the fence. The question was asked as to the size of the pond and the Board was told it was approx. 110 feet long by 20 feet at the widest and 8 feet at the narrowest. Comment was made that it was not unlike having a swimming pool in the back yard. Ms. Beyer said that Housing VT was not opposed to having a fence should the Board decide it was necessary. Mr. Monte asked about retention ponds that do not have water in them all the time – ones where there is water after a rain event and then dry out. Mr. Nedde replied that there were pros and cons for both types, the main one for a “dry” pond being the lesser capacity for retaining sediment.

Ms. Beyer brought to the Board’s attention that they had also provided a copy of the Easement Modification Agreement between Housing VT and Margaret D. Smith, Mountain Water Company and Summit Ventures NE, LLC. Mr. Markolf asked where they were on their State wastewater permit and water permit. The reply was that they were close to submitting their waste water permit and that they had run into a delay on the water issue. It seems that the well they had planned on using, which had been drilled many years ago and had recorded good yields, was now not producing what they had hoped or needed.

Mr. Markolf also asked if Sugarbush had been contacted about hooking into their line for the fire hydrant. They had, and there was no problem. Mr. Nedde did ask though about tapping into the Sugarbush line, which is across the road, as to whether or not they had the option of an open cut versus an underground bore. Mr. Nedde continued by saying that using an underground bore requires a high degree of accuracy which can be difficult to achieve. Mr. Malboeuf replied that the roads were the province of the Select Board and that typically they dislike the fracturing of existing pavement. He continued to say that the applicant could certainly appeal to the Select Board and see what happens. Mr. Markolf asked about the culvert to the east and was told it was on the Town’s “to do” list and was not the responsibility of the applicant.

Mr. Monte asked the applicant what the density of the project was – units per acre. The reply was that the project was a total of 18 units on 9.75 acres which gave a density of 2 units per acre. No bonus was needed or requested and the project is in both the Rural Residential District and the Vacation Residential District with the actual structures located in the Rural Residential District.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the Board finds § 8.3 *Planned Residential Developments (PRDs) (C) General Standards (1)* is satisfied by the applicant. **SECOND** by Mr. Robinson. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Behn that the Board designates the project as a Crossroad Hamlet under § 8.3 *(D) (1)*. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the basin fencing shown on the engineer’s plan SP2 and SP3 be a four foot high fence - either chain link or some other type of fence that is backed by chicken wire to deter small children. Prior to occupancy of the buildings and prior to the installation of the fence, the design and materials of the fencing to be used must be approved by the Warren Zoning Administrator. **SECOND** by Mr. Behn. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Markolf that *Article 7 Subdivision Standards § 7.2 General Standards (A) through (H)* are found to be satisfied or not applicable. **SECOND** by Mr. Robinson. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that § 7.3. *Protection of Primary & Secondary Conservation Areas*, § 7.4 *Open Space & Common Land* and § 7.5 *Stormwater Management & Erosion Control* are found to be satisfied. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the five items in the Warren fire Department letter dated April 15, 2007 is incorporated as conditions in the final decision. **SECOND** by Mr. Robinson. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Behn that § 7.6 *Community Services & Facilities* and § 7.7 *Roads & Pedestrian Access* are found to be satisfied. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the water supply must receive State approval/permit before occupancy. **SECOND** by Mr. Behn. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that § 7.8 *Water Supply & Wastewater Disposal*, § 7.9 *Utilities* and § 7.10 *Signs* are found to be satisfied. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **DISCUSSION:** When asked if the applicant had any plans for signage, the answer was a standard town road sign only. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the Board approves the application subject to the standard conditions that may apply and those conditions previously voted on and including a digital copy of the final plat to be recorded. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

For the record, the Board informed the applicant that they should make sure they obtain any and all appropriate permits from the State that may apply.

- 3- Application 2007-01-SD: Danforth and Alex **Newcomb**, Seven Lot Subdivision (formerly 9), off the South End of Main Street (# 839), Warren Village (Continued from May 23rd, 2007).

Mr. Swain presented to the Board a revised plan that shows a 7-lot subdivision instead of a 9-lot subdivision. The seven lots include one lot for the current home, five lots accessed off of Fuller Hill and the seventh a small piece that will be taken care of as a boundary line adjustment (a sliver to be deeded to Grant) as it is intersected by Fuller Hill Road. Mr. Swain explained that the lot reduction was due to not having a road cut decision from the Select Board, though that decision has been made sooner than expected. At their June 12th meeting, the Select Board did decide to approve the original road cut, though that decision is opposed by Mr. Snow. Since this hearing had been warned for only seven lots, Mr. Swain said they would like to get approval for seven and that they will return at some future date for a further subdivision request.

In discussion, it was clarified by the Board that the road cut approved by the Select Board is not included in this plan as no subdivision is proposed on the lower portion of the property requiring the development of that road. Mr. Monte also asked about access to the possible fire pond on the Grants property. Mr. Swain replied that they still had not had any communication with the Grants and that requiring sprinkler systems for those homes off Fuller Hill will most likely be the solution.

Mr. Swain pointed out to the Board where adjustments had been made in the building envelopes on Lot 1 and Lot 5 to conform to the recommendations of the wildlife consultant to accommodate deer yards. Ms. Hemmeter asked about the 300 foot buffer that the wildlife expert referred to in his assessment for lot 5. Mr. Swain said that there was not a full 300 foot buffer but that the actual house site was limited to the level area and away from the area of conifers. Mr. Monte stated that it seemed that the 300 foot standard was not a hard and fast rule and that in this situation due to the topography and tree types they could sufficiently distance the building from the deer yard. Mr. Swain concurred. Ms. Hemmeter continued and asked if Lot 1 was going to

be allowed future subdivision, could the protection of the deer yards still be maintained? Mr. Swain answered that that provision was going to be removed as the probability of getting an additional house site would potentially be problematic thus, they were not going to pursue it. Mr. Monte assured Ms. Hemmeter that even if further subdevelopment was sought, they would have to come back before the DRB for full review and approval.

Ms Hemmeter also asked if the wildlife expert provided a map of where the deeryards were located or are we just imagining where they are. Mr. Swain replied that he did not provide a map and Ms. Hemmeter continued by stating that that was a concern of the Conservation Commission, and referencing *Article 7, Table 7.1 Subdivision Design Process to protect Conservation Areas*, that a subdivision should really be laid out with a clear picture of where the conservation areas are located [deeryards are considered a secondary conservation area] prior to the placement of building envelopes and infrastructure. Mr. Monte said that the report does give an idea of the deeryard areas and the question is whether or not it provides enough detail. Mr. Monte added that given the DRB's site visits and topography of this site, there was little doubt where the report located deer on the property. In future cases the DRB should routinely request mapping of wildlife habitats, but in the circumstances of the application at hand, he (Mr. Monte) saw no need for a map to locate the areas discussed in the report

Mr. Markolf said his understanding of secondary conservation areas in regard to deer was those areas that are considered "critical" habitat and the wildlife expert only testified in his report to evidence of deer – not critical habitat areas. Mr. Monte added that there is no blanket prohibition against development of areas that are included in the range of deer residences. Mere presence of deer does not make it "critical habitat" continued Mr. Monte. He continued to say that he felt it was mostly wintering areas that were included in the term "critical habitat". Then why even bother to adjust the building envelopes asked Ms. Hemmeter? Mr. Behn answered that even if it was not "critical" habitat that they were willing to lessen any impact the development might have on the wildlife. Mr. Swain commented that the wildlife expert was at the time charged with looking at the house sites and determine whether they were within what he thought might be sensitive or critical habitat areas.

Ms. Hemmeter then asked about the deer wintering areas being put into a conservation easement as mentioned in the biologist's report. Mr. Monte replied that there were conditions in the covenants that prohibited cutting in order to protect those areas. Those stipulations could not be altered without DRB approval he added. Mr. Swain also added that further clarification and emphasis was added to the site plan maps as well to support the language in the covenants. Ms. Hemmeter asked if there was any consideration given to creating a conservation buffer and putting it into a conservation easement so that it is in perpetuity. Mr. Monte replied that he personally was "scared" by "forever" that luckily for us our pilgrim forbearers did not define everything for us. He reminded everyone that this could not be changed without further review but it was not cast in concrete to be forever. In addition, Mr. Monte said he was not sure they had the authority to require a permanent easement and if they did he would not be in favor of it.

In conclusion, Ms. Hemmeter asked about the potential for public trails or pathways and was told that unless the Town already had an established plan the DRB did not have the general legal authority to require public access trails. In some unusual circumstances (for example, where an applicant requests a density bonus), the ordinance gives the DRB some power to require public access for recreation and the like, but those authorities do not apply to this application. Mr. Monte stated that he was concerned about having a line on a map that defines deeryards – maybe not as much with this property but certainly with other properties. In this situation the topography allows for understanding of where the boundaries lie. When others come in though, it

could be an issue where a map would be helpful. Mr. Markolf said he thought clarification of the definition of “critical habitat” would also be very helpful.

Mr. Malboeuf brought up a concern an abutter to the south had in regard to their spring and whether or not this development would impact it. It was quickly and easily determined that the distance was significant enough that it was a non-issue.

After determining that the reduction of subdivided lots constituted an amended application, the Board then went through the standards.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that *Article 7 Subdivision Standards § 7.2 General Standards (A) through (H)* are found by the Board to be satisfied subject to review of the final plat and the designated building envelope for Lot 7. **SECOND** by Mr. Behn. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Behn that *§ 7.3 Protection of Primary & Secondary Conservation Areas* is found by the Board to be satisfied. **SECOND** by Mr. Kaufmann. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

Mr. Monte asked if this project would require a CGP [Construction General Permit] and Mr. Swain answered that they were right on the “cusp” of needing one and would probably end up applying for one. He also said that the erosion control plan submitted should satisfy the State requirements as well.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the Board imposes a requirement that the sections of the Vanishing Brook Subdivision Covenants titled *Tree Clearing, Protection of Conservation Resources and Maintenance and Management of Common Facilities and Services* may not be changed or altered without the prior approval of the Warren Development Review Board. **SECOND** by Mr. Behn. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the Board finds the requirements of *§ 7.4 Open Space & Common Land, § 7.5 Storm water Management & Erosion Control, § 7.6 Community Services & Facilities, § 7.7 Roads & Pedestrian Access, § 7.8 Water Supply & Wastewater Disposal, § 7.9 Utilities and § 7.10 Signs* to be satisfied. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **DISCUSSION:** Mr. Behn asked if the requirements of the Fire Department had been addressed. Mr. Monte further **MOVED** that a condition of the permit be a requirement for either a pond fed hydrant approved by the Fire Department or that the dwellings on Lots 1 through 5 be sprinkled with 13-D systems. In addition all turning radiuses and turnouts will be constructed as shown on the plans. Mr. Markolf **SECONDED** the addition to the motion. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the Board approves the subdivision application subject to the conditions approved herein and the standard conditions as they apply to subdivisions. The project is approved as shown in the amended application showing a total of 7 lots. **SECOND** by Mr. Behn. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

- 4- **Application 2007-08-CU, Conditional Use, Construction of a Development Road & Single Family Residence in the Meadow Land Overlay District (Continued from May 23rd, 2007)** The applicant, Keith C. Underhill, Trustee, seeks approval to develop within designated *Meadowland*.

Mr. Malboeuf started the hearing by clarifying the warning – the proposed building lot is not in the meadowland, but the parcel contains meadowland through which the driveway is proposed. Mr. Monte also stated that a site visit had taken place prior to the evenings meeting. [see attendee list at start of meeting notes]. Mr. Markolf noted that at the site visit they measured the distance from what was assumed to be the northerly edge of the leach field to the spring box and well head of the neighbor to the north and found that the distance to the spring box was 160 feet and to the well was 230 feet.

In clarifying what was being reviewed, Mr. Monte asked if the system location was before the Board. Mr. Olenick said he did not think so as the septic system was not in the meadowland. Mr. Monte said he thought they were there for Meadowland review and Mr. Olenick said specifically for the road that goes through the meadowland. Mr. Senning said he would take issue with that conclusion since as a conditional use application it should encompass the entire parcel and its development. Mr. Monte thought they had done limited review before even when other information was shown on a site plan. Mr. Olenick concurred saying they had, more specifically on the original approval for this parcel. Mr. Monte asked why they were revisiting this if already approved. Mr. Olenick said that though a Conditional Use permit had been issued, an accompanying building permit (zoning permit) was not issued and no development was commenced within two years. It was therefore Mr. Malboeuf's contention that the Conditional Use permit had expired. Mr. Senning once again wanted to stress that the Conditional use Review of the Meadowland Overlay District should encompass the entire parcel while Mr. Olenick pointed out that the only "proposed development" was the road which went through the meadowland, nothing else was really on the table for discussion. Mr. Monte asked where the meadowland boundary was and confirmed that the septic, house site and well were outside of the meadowland. Mr. Senning quoted Table 2.14 (E) (1) (a) that refers to the "lot" not just the proposed development.

Mr. Behn asked Mr. Senning if his client was totally opposed to any development, and was told no, that his client just wanted to see appropriate conditions applied for the situation. Mr. Senning also commented that even though the possible building site was not in the meadowland it still had an effect on the meadowland. Mr. Monte did agree that Table 2.14 (E) (1) (a) (i) that states "minimizes the disruption of the scenic quality of the site" as possibly pertaining to the entire parcel. Mr. Senning reiterated that his client had no desire to see this permit denied but did want to see reasonable conditions applied to minimize the impact on the meadowland and the neighborhood as a whole. He continued to say that they hoped to have an end result that would condition for either the maintenance of trees between the proposed house site and the meadowland or a landscaping/screening plan in front of the building site. Mr. Robinson said that the Board has always been consistent with that type of approach. Mr. Malboeuf brought up that the installation of the septic system would require some tree removal around the house site. Mr. Senning pointed out that it seemed that with the elevation of the house site above the road and meadowland that there was still the potential for the owners to obtain a "view" and maintain some screening.

Mr. Robinson asked about the issue that Mr. Barker brought up in a letter he sent to the DRB regarding the possibility of the Underhill parcel sharing the existing drive of their neighbor. Mr. Monte said that if it had been thought of years ago it would have been a good thing but at this point it can't be insisted on. Mr. Robinson said that they could suggest it, but could not require it under these circumstances.

Mr. Behn asked if they could vote on what they were actually going to consider in this application. A **MOTION** was made By Mr. Behn that the Board confines their consideration to the area of the parcel that is in the Meadowland Overlay District only. There was subsequently no second to his motion and it therefore failed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that should the Board approve the application that there be a condition that 1) requires State approval of the septic system with attention given to the spring and well on the adjoining property and 2) prior to any construction the Board strongly encourages the owner to discuss the possibility of a shared drive with the land owner to the east. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that prior to commencement of construction of the dwelling or the septic system, the owner must obtain approval of a clearing and landscaping plan for the area between the building site of the dwelling and the meadowland to the south/southwest with the intent of the

plan being to satisfying *Table 2.13 (E) (1) (a) (i) “minimizes the disruption of the scenic quality of the site”*. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte to continue the hearing until July 18th to allow for the presentation of the cutting and landscaping plan to confirm that all parties are in agreement. **SECOND** by Mr. Robinson. **MOTION WITHDRAWN** with the approval of the seconder.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the Board approves the construction of the driveway through the meadowland with the conditions already voted on. **SECOND** by Mr. Kaufmann. **VOTE:** all in favor the motion passed.

MOTION by Mr. Monte that the Board schedules a hearing on July 18th to hear a motion to reconsider this decision if requested by the applicant. **SECOND** by Mr. Behn. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

5- In other business the Board signed minutes, decisions and mylars brought before them. The next scheduled meeting is for Wednesday July 18, 2007 at 7:00PM in the Warren Municipal Building.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth V. Robbins
DRB/PC Assistant

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Peter Monte date

David Markolf date

Lenord Robinson date

Chris Behn date

Virginia Roth date

Bob Kaufmann date