

**Chichester Planning Board
Minutes of Meeting
Thursday February 17, 2021**

Members Present: Stanley Brehm (Chair), Michael Williams (Vice Chair), Richard Bouchard (ex-officio), Tom Houle, Tom Jameson, Allen Mayville, John Healy, Dr. Kevin Mara, DV M. and Kristy Jobin, Planning Coordinator.

Others present: Attorney Panciocco, Calgary Mackenzie, Jon Rokeh, Joe Allen, Cheyenne Willson, Jodi Pinard, Dave Morey, Everett Hodge, Mike Vignale, Donna Chagnon, James Lanoue, Earle Lund, Meghan Rothermel, Dan Rouleau, abutters, and other members of the public.

Mr. Brehm called the meeting to order at 6:30pm

Mr. Brehm appointed alternate member Mr. Healy as a voting member for the meeting.

Mr. Brehm noted that this hearing was originally scheduled for the February 3, 2022, meeting, but was continued at the request of Attorney Panciocco.

Mr. Brehm stated that the public hearing has been scheduled for the purpose of considering whether to revoke the plan previously approved on December 6, 2018, for Map 4 Lot 147 located at 46 Dover Road, for CM Truck & Trailer, LLC. The Board is considering revocation for the reasons stated below:

- Trailers are being stored in locations not authorized for storage.
- The north end of the site has been expanded onto the abutting property including a large earth berm, a parking area, and a detention basin.
- Stone retaining walls have been constructed on the south side of the site (near the highway) that were not depicted on the approved plans to further expand the trailer parking area.
- The wetland and wetland buffers at the northwest end of the site have been filled in with parking areas or erosion stone. Also, the stone has been placed above the invert of the existing drainage pipe (under the highway) which may cause sediment to accumulate in the pipe reducing its hydraulic capacity. Some fill has been placed in the wetland north of the proposed 12" wide drive. No erosion controls are in place.
- A detention basin without an outlet structure (other than the emergency overflow) was installed at the north of the site in a different location than the basin proposed and mostly on the abutting property

Attorney Pat Panciocco- CM Truck & Trailer, LLC.

Attorney Panciocco came before the Board to discuss the revocation. She stated that CM Truck & Trailer, LLC. started in 2016 in another location in Chichester and then moved to the

current location at 46 Dover Road.

Attorney Panciocco stated that in November of 2018 Mr. Mackenzie came in to see the Board for a conceptual meeting. He later applied for a home occupation and came in for the public hearing in December of 2018. Attorney Panciocco stated that in the minutes of this public hearing, an abutter asked to impose regulations on where trailers could be stored, and the Board said they were not able to put a restriction on where they could park them. She stated that when covid hit, the business started to grow and his display area ran short, which she stated was obvious from looking at the site.

Attorney Panciocco stated that the property in the rear of 46 Dover Road, which is 53 Cross Road was owned by Mr. Claude Bailat. She noted to be clear, the hearing was related only to the front parcel and not the back parcel according to the public notice. She stated that he arranged with Mr. Bailat to purchase the property doing a payment plan. He had from March of 2020 to July of 2021 to close. Mr. Bailat authorized him to make improvements if he paid the taxes and paid for permitting. She stated that the apartment in this building had personal items and it appeared to be a residential unit. She stated that he did do some improvements and he did clear some trees and brush.

Attorney Panciocco stated that Mr. Bouchard stopped in May of 2020 to let Mr. Mackenzie know that "He may need to update his site plan because things are starting to spill over the lot line". "But during this time, he was too busy running his business, and Mr. Mackenzie admits to that." She stated that in June of 2021 an email was sent from the Planning Department expressing concerns on what was going on, on the site. Attorney Panciocco stated that he never received that email and he later found it in his spam box. He didn't learn about it until one of his employees brought it to his attention and let him know the Town was looking to speak with him after receiving some voicemails.

Attorney Panciocco stated that at this time, Mr. Mackenzie hired council. Shortly after he hired surveyors, Mr. Rokeh, and a Mr. Wichert.

She stated that the chief surveyor from Mr. Weichert's office died unexpectedly which delayed things, and the work was completed in December.

Attorney Panciocco stated that Mr. Rokeh filed an Alteration of Terrain permit with the Department of Environmental Services. He then came up with a restoration plan for wetlands. She stated that the site was 40,000 sq ft. over the allotted amount. DES has approved the restoration plan to correct the issues on the site. The pond will need to be upsized and Mr. Rokeh will have to come up with the outlet and drainage.

Mr. Rokeh stated that last week he made application for this property to go to the Technical Review Committee and is trying to get an active application in front of the Planning Board. He would like to move this forward so that while they are waiting to mitigate the DES violations, they can get things approved on the Town side.

Mr. Brehm stated that everyone has seen the state mitigation plan, so they know that those concerns are being addressed, but there are also other issues that need to be addressed.

The reason she wanted Mr. Rokeh to go over the mitigation, was because his hands were tied until the wetland study had been completed and he knew the limits of the wetlands and establish the buffer. She

stated that due to this, she feels that it has appeared that her client was ignoring the Town, but they couldn't do anything until they received the approval of the State.

Attorney Panciocco stated that she has heard reports of a well being installed too close to the abutting property, which she thinks they are referring to the radius. There was a complaint about trees being removed and excavation, which she admits was out of bounds. She stated again that the notice only deals with the front parcel.

Mr. Brehm stated that there is nothing in the notice regarding the well or the trees, although those have been complaints, so we needed to stay on topic.

Attorney Panciocco stated that one of the complaints is that trailers are being stored in locations that are prohibited, but the Town's minutes say that there is no authority to tell him where to park trailers. She also stated that it doesn't say that on the plan, and there is nothing in the regulations regarding that.

Mr. Brehm stated that Mrs. Jobin just pointed out to him that if you reread the minutes, it does say that trailers shall not be parked in the right of way, and they have been in the state right of way. The first violation may be referring to the back lot also, but there were no specific parking spots, like a car lot with lines, but there are allotted storage areas, and no trailers can be parked in the State right of way.

Attorney Panciocco asked Mr. Rokeh if the trailers are in fact parked in the State right of way.

Mr. Rokeh stated that he was not sure where the right of way was.

Mr. Brehm pointed out that on the original plan, the State right of way is shown, and the trailers now are parked right up to the corner, which is in the State right of way.

Mr. Williams asked what the State right of way is on Route 4. How many feet from the edge of the pavement or from the center line.

Mr. Rokeh stated it's about 10 feet from pavement, but he was not sure.

Mr. Brehm stated that regarding unauthorized storage of trailers, if you refer to his approved plan you can see that there are currently trailers stored in areas marked as wetlands, existing well, and detention pond area. The area marked for gravel was for trailer storage, which has been far exceeded.

Mr. Brehm asked at this point if all the wetlands are being redefined and are no longer the same as on the original plan.

Mr. Rokeh stated that the original wetland and buffers were taken off the original subdivision plan for the property. Mr. Wichert has replotted the wetlands.

Attorney Panciocco stated that the next complaint is in regard to the north end of the site has been expanded onto the abutting property including a large earth berm, a parking area, and a detention basin which refers to the other lot, and not 46 Cross Road.

Mr. Williams stated that you cannot deny that no matter what lot we are discussing, it's an expansion of what was approved by this Planning Board.

Attorney Panciocco stated that they are not denying that, however this public hearing is only in reference to 46 Dover Road, and not 53 Cross Road.

Mr. Brehm stated that it was the front lot that was approved, not the back lot for use of the business. This business was expanded onto another piece of property.

Attorney Panciocco stated that the next complaint is stone retaining walls have been constructed on the south side of the site (near the highway) that were not depicted on the approved plans to further expand the trailer parking area.

Mr. Rokeh stated that retaining walls were added without plan approval.

Attorney Panciocco stated that stone walls are considered landscaping and doesn't know how much weight that should bare.

Mr. Rokeh stated the retaining walls are at least four feet high but wasn't sure of the exact height.

Attorney Panciocco stated the next complaint is the wetland and wetland buffers at the northwest end of the site have been filled in with parking areas or erosion stone. She stated this is admitted. Also, the stone has been placed above the invert of the existing drainage pipe (under the highway) which may cause sediment to accumulate in the pipe reducing its hydraulic capacity. She stated if that is an issue out there then that will be addressed once the weather breaks. Some fill has been placed in the wetland north of the proposed 12" wide drive. No erosion controls are in place. She stated that is on the back parcel.

Mr. Rokeh stated that there is not any fill in the wetland, only in the wetland buffer. That is part of the restoration plan.

Attorney Panciocco stated the last complaint is a detention basin without an outlet structure (other than the emergency overflow) was installed at the north of the site in a different location than the basin proposed and mostly on the abutting property. She stated that is true, the original basin was not constructed where it should have been.

Attorney Panciocco stated that they have taken all the steps they have needed to and hired the professionals to fix the issues and had to wait until the State approved the mitigation plan. Mr. Rokeh is also working diligently to get the front and back lot before the Planning Board with an application.

Mr. Rokeh stated that he has recently submitted a plan to Mrs. Jobin for TRC to get both lots approved, and he assumes once the issues with DES are mitigated that the lots will be merged and will have one site plan for the business.

Mr. Brehm stated that he did notice in the DES paperwork that there are some dates that work needs to be completed by.

Mr. Rokeh stated that the wetland and buffer needs to be restored by May 26, 2022.

Mr. Brehm asked if there were any questions for the Board or if the property owner would like to say something.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that, "first thing in May of 2021 there was a fire that took place that we all heard. We have all done some shit in our life, we all regret it, we all do stupid things. I used gasoline and diesel,

I made an explosion in the ground to burn brush that was too big, if I knew what the outcome was, I never would have done it. At the time had my eight-month-old baby sleeping in my house who didn't wake up, but aside from PD, FD, neighbors, at the end of the day the biggest thing and the biggest concern that I had is my kid and I would have never done that if I knew what would happen. I have never done a drug in my life. I have had probably twelve beers my entire life, I'm levelheaded, I'm a straight shooter, we all make mistakes. I can go down the line, every single one of you have made a mistake in your life. I can tell you right now the reason why we are here two years after, a lot of it has to do with what took place that day, and that's on me. I'm not blaming anyone else. I apologize to the Town, Fire, Police, and everyone that had to come that day. Moving forward from that, I made mistakes on that, Pat said what I did wrong. I didn't go to college, I didn't have a mother, father, anyone to help me or to invest in me, I made a mistake. This is my college; this is my \$100,000.00 mistake. This is my school, that I fucked up on that I am doing right now. You guys all see it as some young punk that doesn't listen, you know his way or the highway, whatever, he doesn't want to listen to anyone. That's not who I am. I'm a straight shooter, you came to me (looking at Mr. Bouchard) when I did that excavation, you were very polite, you said you may be over the plan, you're a nice young entrepreneur, you may want to give Kristy Jobin a call, I gave her a call, I left her a voicemail and I called her again the next day. I never got a call back. She has a life, she might have been busy, it was during covid, I'm not looking to point fingers at anyone, but I'm going to look you in the eyes and tell you I did exactly what you asked me to do (looking at Mr. Bouchard). Fast forward to this past June, she had called me and asked me and told me multiple issues that were written down in the letter that David Morey had sent in. I just found it funny that at that time frame, that all kinda came down crashing at once. We are almost two years ya know from when that all happened and now, we have a issue. Besides the point, besides all of that, this front parcel, there are mistakes that I have made, there are things that need to be fixed but in a world that we are all going through, businesses going out of business, people crashing, people losing their homes, we have a twenty four year old kid trying to put food on his families plate, and he grinds every day for his 10 employees and his 15 truck drivers that live up the east coast that are reliant on me, and you want to put me out of business because of mistakes that I made. Its, ya know, there used to be an economic impact, economic committee that you guys would meet on to bring businesses to the Board, to the Town of Chichester. I have five different business that have come to me about issues that they have had with the Town of Chichester. You guys are doing your job, you're on the Board, you need to do what you need to do, any consequences, fines I need to deal with, that's on me. But I want to let you guys know that I have made mistakes, I am going to fix the mistakes, we are only human, I want to fix my lot, I want to run a business, and I want to be able to sleep at night, like I haven't been able to for the last eight months worrying about, am I going to lose my business, am I going to lose everything I have worked for since I was a 17 year old kid with a dollar in my bank account. So, whatever you guys want to do tonight is up to you, that's all I have to say, thank you for your time".

Mr. Brehm asked if there were any abutters or anyone from the public who would like to speak.

Dave Morey, who is a neighbor to the East stated that he would like to comment on a couple things. He stated that first, the explosion was not two years ago, it took place this past year, and everyone heard it. He stated he applauds anyone that wants to work and make a living, but there are rules that need to be

followed. You can't just come in, do what you want and hope you don't get caught. He asked the Board if the violations at 53 Cross Road would be addressed.

Mr. Bouchard stated that the Board of Selectmen deal with violations and they address those at their meetings.

Mr. Brehm stated, at some point they will be bringing forward a new site plan to the Board and it would be his suggestion that these lots be merged.

Mr. Morey asked if that would require another Planning Board meeting?

Mr. Rokeh stated that there are a lot of things that needs to be worked on, but once he applies it will require at least one public hearing.

Megan Rothermel of 43 Cross Road stated that they moved to Chichester this past July. Mr. Mackenzie came over and was super nice and introduced himself and gave them a card. Then they saw the berm that he put up with trailers that directly abuts their back yard. She stated that they moved to Chichester to enjoy their backyard and nature and now all they see are red and black and white trailers and trucks shining their lights in their window. This is our home, not our business where we have to be all the time. There is not any trees left. We have not had any issues besides this. Mrs. Rothermel stated that Mr. Mackenzie stated to her that he was putting the berm up so they wouldn't have to hear any noise and there will be nice separation, then a week or two it was full of trailers.

Mr. Rokeh stated that the berm is 14 ft. tall from the front and he is unsure about the back.

Mr. Brehm stated that this berm is on the rear lot so its not part of the hearing tonight, so that will have to be addressed when they review the new site plan.

Mr. Williams stated that prior to Mr. Mackenzie talking, he had no prior knowledge of the explosion at this property. From his point of view, it has nothing to do with this public hearing.

Mr. Brehm also stated that until it was brought up again tonight, he did not remember it happening either.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Mackenzie that when you put the berm in and expanded across the property did you not believe you were not violating the site plan that you came to us previously with.

Mr. Mackenzie stated, "not at all."

Mr. Williams asked, "you did not think you would be violating the site plan by going on to a different property?"

Mr. Mackenzie stated "its my property, so I didn't know that. Are you talking about the berm, or the whole property as a whole"?

Mr. Williams answered the whole project that expanded beyond the one lot. In the back.

Mr. Mackenzie stated he never knew about the Alteration of Terrain.

Mr. Williams answered, "not the AOT, the site plan, the particular plan that you brought to us, when you went beyond that did you not think that was wrong?"

Mr. Mackenzie stated, "no, I didn't. The reason why is, its two separate parcels, it's in two separate names, and now, not that I knew that was a thing after talking to Jon, and ya know AOT is 100,000 sq. ft. I understand that I made mistakes on the front piece, but I didn't know I needed a site plan on the back piece. After going through what I went through the past year, it makes 100 percent sense. Again, I didn't have the education or the person to tell me what was right or wrong other than when you came from the Board in the spring, so it was after the work was done".

Mr. Williams asked what he thought the site plan was for then.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that it was a plan for the business, and my business is addressed at 46 Dover Road. My business is not run out of 53 Cross Road.

Attorney Panciocco stated that he thought it was just storage.

Mr. Rokeh stated that he could do two different things on the lots.

Mr. Williams stated that he has difficulty believing that if you come here for a plan on one parcel of property and you extend that without asking to amend that plan beyond what you tell us I have a hard time believing that you thought that was ok.

Attorney Panciocco stated that he thought it was storage and didn't really think it through. He's 24. Its kind of the way I have thought about it. She stated that she does this all day and that she finds that young people are just clueless.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that they don't teach that in real life or in school. He stated the only reason that he knew he needed a site plan was because he needed his dealer's permit.

Mr. Healy asked Mr. Mackenzie if this is the only business that he owns.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that this is the only actual business that he runs, but he owns other LLC's.

Mr. Bouchard stated that he initially impressed him when he came in the first time for his site plan. Mr. Bouchard stated that he remembered Mr. Mackenzie asking a lot of questions and saying that that he wanted to do everything right, which is why he wanted to reach back out to him. The front lot doesn't resemble anything like the site plan. He stated that everyone in the Town and Boards, love your business, everything your doing looks great, but unfortunately its in wetlands.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that at the end of the day he wanted to get the approval so he could continue on running his business. He stated that no one ever told him how to read a site plan.

Mr. Bouchard stated that is what Mr. Rokeh, your surveyor is for.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that Mr. Rokeh is not the one out there running the excavator.

Mr. Brehm stated that he doesn't know him personally, but he knows many people who have used the business and really liked it. The business is very pleasing to look at. He stated that nobody is trying to shut anybody down, The Town is interested in developing more business. But, when you start filling in wetlands, things need to be addressed. After reading the minutes, it appears the concerns of the Town have been ignored and this has been dragged out. Mr. Rokeh is working on it now, but there was a period when the Town was trying to get in touch and have a discussion and that's why we are here today. All of this takes time. We are here tonight to vote on this, and whether we go forward with the

revocation. The appearance from the Towns perception is that when you were spoken to, it appeared that instead of working with the Town, you continued to move forward and develop the property further. This has been drawn out.

Mr. Mackenzie stated "when Kristy called me in June, I'll tell you word for word, finish the berm and finish whatever you're doing because we will be revaluating your plan. And She said I know you're a young hustler and entrepreneur and I don't want to see this go this way, but you need to finish what you're doing. Then I received a cease and desist in July."

Mr. Rokeh stated that we had started the AOT process on July 14, 2021.

Attorney Panciocco stated that her and Mr. Rokeh has kept in touch with the Town and the State. There was a delay due to the death of a surveyor. When the surveyor was doing things, they were moving things around.

Mrs. Jobin stated that she wasn't sure how she was misunderstood, but she would never tell him to keep moving forward with construction. She stated that she said he needed to be done with construction and stop working, not to continue to violate the site plan. The whole point of the phone call to Mr. Mackenzie was to let him know that he needed to stop what he was doing and submit a new site plan to the Planning Board.

Mr. Mackenzie asked what he continues to do after the phone call.

Mrs. Jobin stated that he continued to excavate, continued to build the berm, continued to build and do more and more.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that the only thing that he did after the phone call was loam and hydroseed. He stated that need to be completed to stop erosion.

Mrs. Jobin asked, "are you saying that the only thing you have done to improve your property since our phone call in June, is loam and hydroseed?"

Mr. Mackenzie stated, "after the conversation we had, yea."

Mrs. Jobin stated, "so all the pictures in here are not accurate?"

Mr. Mackenzie stated, "if you want to get into the nitty gritty, we can take that up in Superior Court."

Mr. Morey stated that he thinks the Board should weigh the statement heavily that Cal made regarding not knowing he was required to do a site plan. He stated, if you come before the Board to have a site plan approved for a piece of property, it would seem that despite any level of education, if your going to do the same stuff to another piece of property, that you just went through the process for, then you should recognize that this would also be required for the next piece of property.

Mr. Healy asked at one point he had noticed some trailers had moved off the berm, was a response from the Town.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that it was in response to the Town, and the reason they were moved was so the surveyor could do their work. Then before Christmas he was served with papers which made it clear they had to get trailers off the lot, which then he moved trailers to Bobcat, an authorized trailer dealer. Then Kristy and Jodi told Mark Blanchard that they could not be stored there. He stated that he made

every effort he could to move the trailers to an authorized trailer dealer and then he had to move them again.

Mr. Rokeh stated that there has been another application to store third party trailers for the next meeting so he can store them there as rental space. They currently do not have approval for rental space. When they have approval, then they can move some other there.

Mrs. Pinard stated that they did have a conversation with Mr. Blanchard, owner of Bobcat that he was not authorized to store third party trailers on his site according to his site plan. It was not personal; we did the same thing to DBU when they were storing campers for another business. The Town has been very vigilant regarding third party storage if your site plan doesn't call for that. They were not singled out, and as they do every time, we made a real quick call to discuss the issue, because we don't like it to get to this point. We work very hard to work with business owners. Mr. Rokeh can attest to that.

Mr. Rokeh acknowledged that and stated that is why he made the applications to bring them into compliance.

Attorney Panciocco stated that when she went to the Board of Selectmen in August, the Board asked if he would move the trailers off the rear parcel. She stated he did. When the surveyors showed up, he had to put keep them there and had no place to put them.

Mr. Brehm closed the public hearing.

Mr. Williams asked what is being asked of the Planning Board.

Mr. Brehm stated that the Planning Board needs to weigh the evidence and decide to revoke the site plan or not.

Mr. Mara asked if the original site plan was approved as a home occupation. He stated that he has 10 employees, which is a violation.

Mrs. Jobin stated he also doesn't live there, so its not a home occupation. It was approved as a home occupation; the Town did not have multiuse when this was originally approved.

Mr. Brehm stated that this issue would be addressed when they come back with the site plan.

Mr. Williams read the RSA for Site Plan Revocation, **676:4-a Revocation of Recorded Approval.**

(b) When the applicant or successor in interest to the applicant has performed work, erected a structure or structures, or established a use of land, which fails to conform to the statements, plans or specifications upon which the approval was based, or has materially violated any requirement or condition of such approval.

Mr. Williams stated that even Attorney Panciocco has gone through and admitted that the site plan is in violation. The site plan is violated, its whether the Board wants to revoke it or not. The site plan is pretty much worthless.

Mr. Brehm stated that this has dragged on way to long, but if you look in the packet there is an approved mitigation plan from the DES, which is one of the biggest violations.

Mr. Williams inclination is to revoke the plan, but he could be talked into postponing this another month.

Mrs. Jobin stated that they did submit plans for a TRC, but the application is not complete because they have not submitted payment for escrow.

Mr. Jameson asked what happens if the plan is revoked.

Mr. Bouchard stated that there is a process that was explained by Town Counsel. There is a 30-day waiting period before it can be filed, so nothing will happen immediately. After appeal, a cease and desist could be filed. Either way, nothing will happen immediately.

Mr. Williams asked if the Board of Selectmen would have an issue if the plan was not revoked.

Mr. Bouchard stated that if the Board does not feel there is enough information to revoke, then he doesn't feel there would be an issue.

Mr. Williams stated that he has enough information to revoke the site plan. They did try to come here with a plan.

Mr. Brehm stated that everything in the notice is true, and DES has also issued violations, so they confirmed it is true.

Mr. Brehm stated there are three options. The Board can vote to revoke the plan, to not revoke the plan or to table it until the next meeting.

The Board discussed whether they should table the discussion and make a discussion at the next public meeting.

Mr. Brehm asked Attorney Panciocco if her client was willing to put a condition in place for the Board to table the decision.

Attorney Panciocco stated that once Bobcat has approval from the Planning Board to store the trailers, they could move those trailers off the back lot into storage.

Mr. Mackenzie stated that he has orders from DES that he is not authorized to do anymore dirt work on both parcels until AOT is granted.

Mr. Brehm stated that the trailers being stored in places that they shouldn't be and are not approved. Its not the Town's issue that the business does not have enough storage and should seek storage elsewhere if needed. He also stated that the trailers in the State and Town right away should be moved. A good compromise would be to go back to the approved site plan and operate within the bounds of the approved area.

Mr. Bouchard stated that he would not suggest to them to move the trailers on the back lot because that is a separate issue that has already been addressed with the cease and desist. The Board needs to focus on the front lot.

Mr. Williams stated that he doesn't want to give or solicit any promises regarding the decision. He stated they know what the violations are. The Board has already established that it could be tonight, and he would be ready to vote tonight if someone makes a motion.

Mr. Mayville stated that he is a big believer in a property owner being able to make the property useful to him. He is concerned that if the Board doesn't follow through with the revocation that the mitigation plan may not be followed through on for DES. He suggested postponing the vote. Performance so far has been poor, so if he doesn't work on his plan his vote will be to revoke.

Mr. Williams made a motion and Mr. Bouchard seconded to table the decision of Site Plan Revocation for CM Truck & Trailer, LLC. to the next meeting on March 3, 2022. Unanimous vote. **Motion passes.**

Discussion on the White Birches of Chichester-

Mr. Hodge, the Building Inspector stated that there are some issues that need to be resolved up in the development.

Mrs. Pinard stated that violations need to be brought to the Board of Selectmen.

Adjournment- Having no further business, a motion was made by Mr. Williams and seconded by Mr. Houle to adjourn the meeting at 7:59pm. **Motion passes.**

Respectfully submitted,

Kristy Jobin, Secretary

Chairman, Stanley Brehm

Not approved until signed