

CITY OF CAMPBELL PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES

---

7:30 P.M.

TUESDAY

JULY 12, 2016  
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

---

The Planning Commission meeting of July 12, 2016, was called to order at 7:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 70 North First Street, Campbell, California by Chair Dodd and the following proceedings were had, to wit:

**ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present:	Chair:	Cynthia L. Dodd
	Vice Chair:	Yvonne Kendall
	Commissioner:	Pamela Finch
	Commissioner:	Philip C. Reynolds, Jr.
	Commissioner:	Michael L. Rich
	Commissioner:	Donald C. Young

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner: Ron Bonhagen

Staff Present:	Community Development
	Director: Paul Kermoyan
	Senior Planner: Cindy McCormick
	Associate Planner: Daniel Fama
	Project Planner: Naz Pouya
	Acting City Attorney: Heather Lenheart
	Recording Secretary: Corinne Shinn

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion: Upon motion by Commissioner Kendall, seconded by Commissioner Finch, the Planning Commission minutes of the meeting of June 28, 2016, were approved as submitted. (6-0-1; Commissioner Bonhagen was absent)**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

Director Kermoyan listed a number of desk items:

1. Appeal petition regarding Item 3
2. Emails of support for Item 3

**AGENDA MODIFICATIONS OR POSTPONEMENTS**

None

**ORAL REQUESTS**

None

**CONSENT**

None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Chair Dodd read Agenda Item No. 1 into the record as follows:

1. **PLN2016-138** Public Hearing to consider the application of Jaime Arafiles for a Site and Architectural Review Permit (PLN2016-138) to allow for a 499-square-foot, single-story addition to the rear of an existing residence located at **1045 Salerno Drive**. Staff is recommending that this item be deemed Categorically Exempt under CEQA. Planning Commission action final unless appealed in writing to the City Clerk within 10 calendar days. Project Planner: *Stephen Rose, Associate Planner*

Mr. Stephen Rose, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Chair Dodd asked if there were questions of staff. There were none

Commissioner Kendall provided the Site and Architectural Review Committee report as follows:

- SARC reviewed this item on June 28<sup>th</sup> and was supportive as presented.

Chair Dodd opened the Public Hearing for Agenda Item No. 1.

Ryan Wallace, Property Owner:

- Thanked the Commission for reviewing his request.
- Said he was available for any questions.

Chair Dodd closed the Public Hearing for Agenda Item No. 1.

**Motion:** Upon motion of Commissioner Young, seconded by Commissioner Reynolds, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 4308 approving a Site and Architectural Review Permit (PLN2016-138) to allow for a 499-square-foot, single-story addition to the rear of an existing residence located at 1045 Salerno Drive, subject to the conditions of approval, by the following roll call vote:

**AYES:** Dodd, Finch, Kendall, Reynolds, Rich and Young  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** Bonhagen  
**ABSTAIN:** None

Chair Dodd advised that this action is final unless appealed in writing to the City Clerk within 10 calendar days.

Director Paul Kermoyan advised the Commission that staff is working on a Code amendment to modify the processing of addition applications on R-1-8 and larger lots. It would incorporate a three-tier structure. The first tier would be for very minor additions at staff level approvals. The second tier process would be for mid-size additions that can be handled at Director's level. The last tier would be those larger additions that should continue to come before the Planning Commission.

\*\*\*

Commissioner Reynolds advised that he would need to recuse from Item 2 due to professional conflict of interest. He left the dais and chambers for this hearing item.

Chair Dodd read Agenda Item No. 2 into the record as follows:

2. **PLN2016-174** Public Hearing to consider the application of Leah Hernikl, on behalf of T-Mobile, for a Modification (PLN2016-174) of a previously approved Conditional Use Permit to allow the removal and replacement of three antenna panels and associated equipment on a PG&E Lattice Tower located at **1469 S. Bascom Avenue**. Staff is recommending that this item be deemed Categorical Exempt under CEQA. Planning Commission action final unless appealed in writing to the City Clerk within 10 calendar days. Project Planner: *Stephen Rose, Associate Planner*

Mr. Stephen Rose, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Chair Dodd asked if there were questions of staff. There were none.

Chair Dodd opened the Public Hearing for Agenda Item No. 2.

Chair Dodd closed the Public Hearing for Agenda Item No. 2.

Commissioner Finch said that she has no problem at all with this application and offered to make a motion.

**Motion:**           **Upon motion of Commissioner Finch, seconded by Commissioner Kendall, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 4309 approving the Modification (PLN2016-174) of a previously-approved Conditional Use Permit to allow the removal and replacement of three antenna panels and associated equipment on a PG&E Lattice Tower located at 1469 S. Bascom Avenue, subject to the conditions of approval, by the following roll call vote:**

**AYES:**           **Dodd, Finch, Kendall, Rich and Young**  
**NOES:**           **None**  
**ABSENT:**       **Bonhagen**  
**ABSTAIN:**      **Reynolds**

Chair Dodd advised that this action is final unless appealed in writing to the City Clerk within 10 calendar days.

\*\*\*

Chair Dodd read Agenda Item No. 3 into the record as follows:

3. **PLN2016-200**           Public Hearing to consider the Appeal (PLN2016-200) of Sarbajit and Sanhita Ghosal of a Fence Exception approved for a reduced setback (PLN2016-98) to allow a seven foot tall fence with a zero setback on the street side property line of a corner lot, located at **1071 Lovell Ave.** Staff is recommending that this item be deemed Categorically Exempt under CEQA. Planning Commission action final unless appealed in writing to the City Clerk within 10 calendar days. Project Planner: *Naz Pouya, Project Planner*

Ms. Naz Pouya, Project Planner, presented the staff report.

Director Paul Kermoyan asked Planner Naz Pouya if the property lines come from the GIS.

Planner Naz Pouya said that they come from staff's field measurements.

Director Paul Kermoyan:

- Added on to the staff report.
- Pointed out that one request of the appellant is to be treated like anyone else.
- Explained that there are two types of corner lots. This particular lot is a reverse corner lot. Most of those types of lots don't have a fence around the entire property.

- Offered that the main two reasons for a Fence Ordinance are issues of safety and aesthetics.
- Stated that a property is not required to have a fence but most do.
- Reminded that this fence is before the Commission based on several code complaints filed by members of the public. Code Enforcement is reactive based on community complaints.
- Said that this lot is a corner lot with most of its yard area located on the front, essentially creating two front yards.
- Stated that the San Tomas Area Neighborhood Plan calls for creating open and rural appearance of its area. Most corner lots have open front yards. It is important to have a balanced street system. Staff is trying to compare apples to apples.

Commissioner Rich asked staff to confirm that the Commission does not have the ability to make an exception to allow this fencing to remain on public property.

Planner Naz Pouya said that the Fence Exception is for lesser setbacks and greater heights.

Commissioner Rich asked for verification that the existing fence is currently over the property line.

Planner Naz Pouya said it was over on both the front and side street sides.

Commissioner Rich said that even if moved back, the current fence design does not meet the appearance requirements.

Planner Naz Pouya said that while there is some lattice, most of the fence is closed in style.

Commissioner Rich verified that the Planning Commission can give an exception to the level of openness of the fence.

Planner Naz Pouya replied if the Commission felt it was appropriate.

Director Paul Kermoyan added that the Ordinance gives the Commission great latitude.

Commissioner Rich verified that the existing fencing will have to be moved back. Staff's recommendation is for a more open design of the fence.

Director Paul Kermoyan said the fencing on the left requires a Fence Exception. Staff recommends that the fencing in the front yard be open rail, which is more open than it currently is.

Commissioner Rich added that the fencing is required to be move back onto private property.

Commissioner Finch added that open rail is more acceptable under the Code.

Commissioner Reynolds asked if there was any input from either Public Works or Campbell Police Department regarding traffic and speed patterns on this corner specifically.

Planner Naz Pouya:

- Said that Public Works staff reviewed this application and measured the property lines.
- Added that there have been reports of vehicles cutting the corner so Public Works added striping and reflectors on the roadway to guide cars around that corner.

Commissioner Reynolds asked staff if PD has been questioned about traffic issues there.

Planner Naz Pouya cautioned that privacy fencing is not a way of creating traffic calming.

Director Paul Kermoyan:

- Said that the Commission is focusing on safety issues but there are two reasons for fence regulations that are – safety and aesthetics.
- Added that staff did not secure ticket or accident data from PD since the issues at hand are aesthetics and compliance with code requirements for the fencing itself.
- Stated that if necessary, this item can be continued and brought back with additional information from PD regarding ticketing and accidents in this area.

Commissioner Rich reiterated that this fence review was initiated by public complaints about what was put in place here.

Planner Naz Pouya said that the concerns of the reporting parties were “too tall” and “not right”. One complainant said that the fencing as it is makes walking a dog more hazardous.

Chair Dodd recognized the letter from the appellant. The appellant’s point is that as long as it meets Code, it should be permitted.

Planner Naz Pouya reminded that the existing fence is taller than allowed without a Fence Exception.

Director Paul Kermoyan reminded that the approval being appealed already granted exceptions. Staff is seeking a compromise between the side and front fencing sought by the appellants. He pointed out that others on similar type corner properties have either no fencing or open rail style fences.

Commissioner Rich verified that staff is seeking 50 percent open style fencing and specified setbacks.

Director Paul Kermoyan said that a solid fence up to six feet in height is allowed. If a fence is higher than six feet, it must be 50 percent open in style. A three-and-a-half foot high fence could be solid.

Chair Dodd reiterated that a seven-foot fence is supposed to be 50 percent open. The City is offering to leave that fence "as it is".

Director Paul Kermoyan said that this Fence Exception is necessary because the appellants seek relief from the required five-foot setback and instead ask for a one-and-a-half foot setback. In exchange, staff is asking for the opening up of the front fencing to incorporate a post and rail style of fence.

Commissioner Rich asked if the height is reduced because of visibility.

Director Paul Kermoyan said that the reduced height provides improve visibility that allows pedestrians more time to react if there happens to be a car backing out of their driveway.

Commissioner Rich said that he could support a reduction of one foot in height and moving it back off the public right-of-way.

Chair Dodd opened the Public Hearing for Agenda Item No. 3.

Sarbajit Ghosal, Appellant and property owner of 1071 Lovell Avenue:

- Said he appreciates staff's assistance in this matter.
- Distributed his presentation points in writing.
- Explained that most of their usable open space is location in the front. Their backyard is very small with a kitchen garden.
- Reported that this house has had a tall fence around it since 1968 per historic photographs from that time frame.
- Said that the things they have done so far have brought this fencing into compliance with the Code. They have reduced the "wall" space by approximately 60 percent.
- Stated that they propose to reduce the fence to six feet and move it to the property line as determined by a survey. They are willing to leave a small section to preserve the line-of-sight.
- Advised that they offer two alternative options. Option 1 is for a low fence for a 10-foot distance thus providing line-of-sight visibility. Option 2 is having a small fence to wall off a five-foot area, a six-foot fence at the property line.
- Added that they are requesting that no further modifications to the front fence be required. More expense will result from changes.
- Pointed out that the President of the San Tomas Area Community Coalition (STACC) provided a letter of support for their request. Pretty much every neighbor is in support.
- Advised that despite their 9,000 square foot parcel, they are left with just about 800 square feet of useable open space.
- Added that often neighborhood kids play on their property.

- Urged the Planning Commission to approve a six-foot fence along the side property line and to leave the front fencing “as is”.

Commissioner Rich clarified with Mr. Ghosal that his request differs from the staff recommendation. He wants his fence at the property line while staff wants it pushed back by one-and-a-half feet from the property line. Additionally, the Ghosals want the frontage fence as it is currently constructed.

Chris Bracher, Resident on Lovell Avenue:

- Explained that his home is three houses to the west of this property.
- Said he is here this evening to provide additional information.
- Reported that there had been a tall fence on this property for many decades. As a result, traffic didn't go around that corner as quickly.
- Said he has lived on Lovell since 2006.
- Stated he understands the lowering of the front fence.
- Explained that the side yard barrier is important and he hopes the Ghosals can keep it as it is.
- Asked that the traffic issues be taken into consideration.
- Suggested that they be allowed to have a more private yard fence. They have more side yard space than backyard space.

Commissioner Reynolds reported that he met with the Ghosals on their property.

Morgan Gerhart, Resident on Sonuca:

- Advised that she lives adjacent to the Ghosals' side property and has since 2009.
- Added that she is in support of their request for side yard fencing and a variance.
- Stated that she has the same concerns as others since that road is used as a significant cut-through.
- Reported that a few years' ago a car ended up in her yard. The driver was drunk.
- Said that the full fence was in place when the Ghosals moved into the neighborhood. Their new fence has significantly opened things up.
- Opined that she doesn't notice a difference between the Ghosals' side fence, as compared to others in this neighborhood. Modifications to the front fence have opened up the house.
- Concluded that the neighborhood is in favor of the exceptions they have asked for.

Jennifer Didone, Resident on Sonuca Avenue:

- Reported that her property has a Fencing Exception.
- Advised that four houses on Sonuca have smaller lots. Along Sonuca just four houses front on the street while the remainder are side yards with their front doors facing other streets.
- Said if the fencing is pushed back then they end up with less open space.
- Described her fence as starting with a three-foot retaining wall, then a six-foot wood fence and then two-foot lattice at the top.
- Added that all the houses in her area have six-foot solid with two-foot lattice fencing to help create the same aesthetics.
- Stated that the previous fence at this home for decades was much taller.

- Advised that she had secured traffic citation information from Campbell PD. Between 2011 and 2016, there were eight traffic citations.
- Pointed out that 44 kids live within these three blocks, 13 of which go to Rolling Hills. Many of those kids play in the Ghosals' yard. Since so many of the backyards are tiny, the ability for children to play safely in a front yard is very important.

Commissioner Reynolds said he was impressed with the details offered by Ms. Didone. He asked for her impressions about the amount of available open space and park area in her neighborhood.

Jennifer Didone:

- Said that there are lots of parks nearby, including Budd and San Tomas Aquino.
- Pointed out that one neighbor has a pool and another has a basketball court.
- Admitted that she wishes that the Sonuca would dead-end at her house. There have been eight known crashes near her home.
- Stated that safety is more a driving issue than their fence.

Commissioner Rich said that the citations referenced are a separate issue as to whether the Commission takes staff's recommendation or the appellants' request.

Jennifer Didone reminded that lots of kids play in the Ghosals' yard.

Commissioner Rich said that staff is not asking for the removal of the fencing. The discussion under way is what type of fence is preferred.

Jennifer Didone reminded that the City made an exception on her fence. It's on her property line and is higher than normal. It is aesthetically pleasing.

Director Paul Kermoyan said that the fence as it currently is constructed obstructs the line-of-sight for drivers on Sonuca. He added that staff looks at a request in its totality. They must consider the whole picture and apply the standards uniformly.

Chair Dodd asked if staff has seen the proposals offered this evening by the appellants.

Planner Naz Pouya said that the original approval made by staff was made based on minimum code requirements. A Fence Exception is a discretionary decision.

Director Paul Kermoyan said that if the appellants wanted to duplicate the fencing currently in place on other properties in this neighborhood, staff would be supportive.

Chair Dodd closed the Public Hearing for Agenda Item No. 3.

Commissioner Rich:

- Said that he was in favor of the staff recommendations except for the front fence.
- Stated that he likes that design and finds that it flows better.
- It should be pushed back so that it is entirely on their private property.

- Pointed out that a closed fence allows balls to stay inside the yard rather than rolling out onto the street.

Commissioner Finch:

- Recounted that her neighbors had a post and rail fence and balls often went out onto the street.
- Said she too agrees with the current design of the front fence.
- Stated that, as a realtor, she sees the front of this house being on Sonuca rather than Lovell.
- Advised that she does support taking the fence placement back so it is entirely on private property.
- Said that it is important to try and preserve safety. On a street with no sidewalks, there is more reason for fencing of some sort.
- Reminded that it seems that the neighbors are in favor of this request. It's attractive and offers enough visibility.
- Said that the angle (Option 2) is better than Option 1 as proposed by the appellants.

Commissioner Young:

- Reported that he walked this neighborhood.
- Said that safety is more an issue of the line-of-sight when turning the corner.
- Pointed out that the reason for setbacks is safety.
- Stated that the front fence is not a visual intrusion and that eliminating any encroachment onto the public right-of-way makes sense.
- Opined that the old fence looked like a fortress and the new fence is more open.
- Admitted he worried about encroaching on the existing utility pole.
- Stated that the side fence should be pushed back off the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Kendall:

- Agreed with Commissioner Young but said that she'd like to see the front fence opened up.
- Reminded that the San Tomas Area Neighborhood Plan calls for having things be open.
- Admitted that she is feeling more in alignment with staff's recommendations and that she actually prefers having no fence in front. There are lots of properties without front fences. It currently looks closed off to her.

Commissioner Rich asked Commissioner Kendall if she is recommending the front fence be open or not be there at all.

Commissioner Kendall said open but that she could be swayed to leave it as it is.

Commissioner Rich recommended the open fence design.

Commissioner Kendall said that if she could convince the other Commissioners, there would be no fence at all there. However, she is satisfied with the low fence as long as it meets setbacks and entirely off the public right-of-way.

## Commissioner Reynolds:

- Stated that he would support the appellants' request.
- Reported that he observed cars taking the left turn from Sonuca onto Lovell crossing the painted white lines on the street intended to guide the path of vehicular traffic.
- Said that he read the staff report and believes the appellants claim that traffic sped up when their fence came down.
- Recounted that he is growing shrubs in front of his house to create a barrier other than a fence.
- Reminded that lots of children use the Ghosals' yard and that is a fast corner. There have been accidents.
- Advised that more traffic enforcement is needed and recommended that staff notify PD of that need.
- Cautioned that most tickets given during enhanced enforcement efforts end up being issued to residents of the neighborhood.
- Stated that he'd like to move the fence behind the property line. There is no need for a private fence in the public right-of-way. As long as the fence is on private property he is okay with it, including its height.
- Pointed out that there is no opposition here tonight and STACC supports this request so he too will support this request.

## Commissioner Young:

- Said that this approval may set precedent.
- Suggested low fences with shrubs as a creative solution.
- Added that the appellant indicated they would move the fence back so it is fully on their property line.

## Chair Dodd:

- Cautioned that design is not the purview of this Commission.
- Said that the decision on the line for tonight's consideration is the placement of the fence and the percentage of openness. Anything else is up to the appellants.
- Suggested focusing on one issue at a time.
- Said that she was concerned about line-of-sight for the driveway with a six foot fence on the side property line.

## Commissioner Finch:

- Pointed out that just findings for denial have been drafted by staff.
- Said that this item might have to be continued in order that conditions can be drafted.

Planner Naz Pouya agreed that the item would need to be continued if the Commission chooses to approve aspects of the appeal.

## Chair Dodd:

- Said that she is hoping for agreement.

- Supported staff's recommendations for the side fence to be approved based on safety.

Commissioner Reynolds said that in regards to the side fence and visibility from the driveway, he is okay with Option 2 as suggested by the appellants.

Director Paul Kermoyan pointed out that Option 2 is a deliberate attempt to circumvent the Code and results in completely blocking off more.

Commissioner Reynolds asked Director Paul Kermoyan whether omitting that and adding a left angle if staff would be okay with that.

Director Paul Kermoyan replied yes.

Commissioner Reynolds said that what they are trying to gain is that when vehicles are backing out of the driveway, the fence is moved five feet further away to increase visibility.

Chair Dodd asked if that would be aesthetically appealing.

Commissioner Reynolds replied yes. They are taking out a block and giving it an off-set. That is different than a standard right angle.

Commissioner Finch said if the Commission includes this, a five-foot wall, it will be reduced in height.

Commissioner Reynolds said that if it is currently six feet, we're not gaining anything.

Commissioner Young said that he was in favor of setbacks since line-of-sight is a big deal.

Commissioner Rich said he was okay with the staff recommendation but he wants to see the front yard fence in a closed style.

Commissioner Kendall:

- Said that the setback already approved for the side fence represents an exception.
- Added that a compromise fits more closely with the intent of things.
- Suggested denying this appeal.

Commissioner Finch:

- Said that she likes Option 2 but with an angle on the other side too. It will soften the starkness of the fence to pull it back.
- Added that she is okay with the 1.5-foot setback for the side fence.

Chair Dodd said it seems that the Commission has reached consensus with staff recommendations on the side fence.

Director Paul Kermoyan said that it seems the consensus of the Commission is to allow the front fence to stay closed as it is. Staff will come back with a resolution that upholds the appeal on part of the administrative approval and denies some of the points of appeal.

Chair Dodd stated that the consensus is that the side fence needs to be setback so that part of the appeal is denied while most seem to think that the front fence is okay.

Director Paul Kermoyan said he heard four Commissioners express support for the current design of the front fence.

Chair Dodd said that the support is not for the style of fence but the issue of the fence being of open or closed design.

Commissioner Young expressed concern that the side fence is encroaching upon the drip line of a rather large tree.

Chair Dodd asked for clarification on the recommendation for the front fence.

Commissioner Finch said that it seems the Commission does not want to push the fence back as far as staff recommended but rather to allow it to be placed closer to the property line but "on the property and not on the public right-of-way." The Commission is in favor of the current style of that fence.

Commissioner Kendall asked staff if they didn't support the setbacks being suggested by the Commission.

Planner Naz Pouya said that currently the front fence is higher than three-and-a-half feet. However, the Commission can approve an exception from height limitations.

Commissioner Finch suggested placing the fence as close to the property line as possible but to lower it to the required maximum height of three-and-a-half feet.

Commissioner Young asked if anyone else was concerned about the encroachment of this fencing on the drip line of the large tree.

Chair Dodd asked if he is referring to the front fence.

Commissioner Finch suggested not pushing the fence as far as staff recommends but rather allowing it closer to the property line as long as it is entirely on the private property and not at all on the public property. She advised that she is in favor of the current style of that fence.

Commissioner Kendall asked if that means that the staff recommendations for setbacks are not supported.

Planner Naz Pouya said that for a fence over three-and-a-half feet tall the Commission has the ability to approve an exception for height.

Commissioner Finch stated her recommendation to have the fence as close to the property line as well as lowered to three-and-a-half feet.

Commissioner Kendall said that she was indifferent to the design of the fence but would not want to see it more closed up than it currently is.

Commissioner Reynolds said that he was okay with the height of the front fence. It is more important to consider the safety of children allowing them to play in their yard with balls that won't end up on the street. He said that he supports the side fence being on the property line but not in the public right-of-way.

Chair Dodd asked if he supports the front fence running along the front property line as long as it is three-and-a-half feet high?

Planner Naz Pouya stressed that no part of the fence should encroach on the public right-of-way which depends upon the type of footing used.

Chair Dodd said the front fence is supported at a three-and-a-half foot height and doesn't matter if it is open or closed in style.

Planner Naz Pouya said that staff's preference was for an open style fence there.

Chair Dodd said that she agrees with Commissioner Kendall that some aspect of openness is desirable.

Commissioner Rich stated his support for a three-and-a-half foot height for the front fencing and located at the property line.

Commissioner Finch asked if the time is right to make a motion.

Director Paul Kermoyan said that a motion for continuance with directions to staff would be appropriate.

**Motion: Upon motion of Commissioner Finch, seconded by Commissioner Rich, the Planning Commission CONTINUED TO A DATE UNCERTAIN the consideration of an Appeal of a Fence Exception approved for a reduced setback (PLN2016-98) to allow a seven foot tall fence with a zero setback on the street side property line of a corner lot, located at 1071 Lovell Ave, with the following direction to staff:**

- Staff will come back with findings denying the appeal for the side yard fence;
- Staff will modify the findings for the front yard fence requiring it to be at the private property line without encroaching onto public property,
- The front fence will be at a three-and-a-half foot height or lower with a ratio of openness.

**by the following roll call vote:**

**AYES: Dodd, Finch, Kendall, Reynolds, Rich and Young**

**NOES: None**

**ABSENT: Bonhagen**

**ABSTAIN: None**

\*\*\*

**REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

Director Paul Kermoyan had no additions to his written report.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 9:16 p.m. to the next Regular Planning Commission Meeting of **July 26, 2016**.

SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Corinne Shinn, Recording Secretary

APPROVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Cynthia Dodd, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Kermoyan, Secretary