

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES
June 2, 2009

A regular meeting of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Planning Commission was held in the Assembly Chambers, Borough Administration Offices, 809 Pioneer Road, Fairbanks, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Tom Marsh, Chairman.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Marsh Jennifer Peterson
David Pruhs Umit Spencer
Ian Hebert Nello Cooper

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tom Temple Kevin McCarthy
Brian Flemming Michael Wenstrup

OTHERS PRESENT: Bernardo Hernandez, Director of Community Planning
Melissa Kellner, Planner II
Jill Dolan, Asst. Borough Attorney
Marnie Long-Boehl, Secretary

A. ROLL CALL

B. MESSAGES

1. Chairperson's Comments:

Mr. Marsh noted that there is a Public Hearing tomorrow, June 3rd, at 7:00 in the Public Library on the Illinois Street project allowing for two-way traffic on the Cushman Street Bridge.

2. Communications to the Planning Commission

Mr. Hernandez noted that we will be pulling V2009-008; a request by Sahn Investments for a variance. We have determined that they don't need a variance because they have a Grandfathered lot.

3. Citizen's Comments – limited to three (3) minutes

a. Agenda items not scheduled for public hearing.

None

b. Items other than those appearing on the agenda.

None

C. *MINUTES

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Consent Agenda passes all routine items indicated by asterisk (*) on agenda. Consent Agenda items are not considered separately unless any Planning Commission member or citizen so requests. In the event of such request, the item is returned to the general agenda.

MOTION: To approve agenda and consent agenda, including minutes of April 21, 2009 and May 19, 2009 by **Mr. Hebert**, seconded by **Mr. Cooper**.

Objections

None

MOTION APPROVED

E. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

F. PUBLIC HEARING

V2009-007 A request by James Ferris for a setback variance of twenty (20) ft to the Rural Estate-2 side yard requirement of twenty five (25) feet in order to construct a detached garage five (5) feet from the south lot line of Lot 06, Block A, Best View Subdivision. **(located south of Sunburst Drive, east of Chena Ridge Road)**

Melissa Kellner presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the proposed request.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Hebert asked where does the driveway on the adjoining property to the east – where does its driveway come in to the neighboring property.

Ms. Kellner answered that it's right at the top of Chena Ridge.

Mr. Pruhs review the reply from **Patricia Bergdahl** DPO - about it affecting impact value of her lot. He asked **Ms. Kellner** if they could see through the trees of where this garage will be built.

Ms. Kellner replied that **Ms. Bergdahl's** property is higher in elevation which is why we added the condition to be limited to one story in height.

Mr. Pruhs asked for **Ms. Kellner's** professional opinion if it would infringe.

Ms. Kellner expressed that she thought one story was reasonable for a garage.

Mr. Marsh asked **Ms. Kellner** to show the slope overlay. He noted that the slopes are very consistently steep in that area.

Ms. Kellner replied that the property to the north – they had to put switch-backs in.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions for staff.

Ms. Spencer wanted clarity if the lot next to the applicants had a residence on it.

Ms. Kellner stated that there was not a residence but a driveway.

Ms. Spencer asked the size of the property.

Ms. Kellner commented that she didn't know the square footage but it was slightly smaller – just under two acres.

Ms. Spencer asked of the layout of the neighbor's property.

Ms. Kellner replied "It's also quite steep and higher than the applicant's property".

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Patricia Bergdahl, resides at 4210 Parks Ridge Road, owner of the adjacent property. The driveway goes back and there is a turn-around on her property. We have a building site that's just down the hill at the end of our driveway. There's a cabin on it. She feels that building that close to the property line is close to where the best building site would be and I think it would negatively impact sale of this property which we are currently trying to sell. If it's that close to the driveway – it will impact the snow removal of the driveway. One side of the driveway is pretty steep.

Ms. Peterson asked **Ms. Bergdahl** if she could think of anywhere else the applicant could build a garage.

Ms. Bergdahl replied "I don't know".

Mr. Marsh asked **Ms. Bergdahl** – where does the property line start.

Ms. Bergdahl did not know.

Mr. Marsh commented that he visited the property and looking from Chena Ridge there's quite a distance back to where the property starts outside the right-of-way – from the street.

Ms. Bergdahl replied that her property goes from Chena Ridge back quite a ways. The original driveway – some was bordering on the property line and part of it was on our property – it's been a share driveway.

Mr. Marsh commented on the pictures – the applicant's driveway is down and yours does not appear to go down.

Ms. Bergdahl communicated "That's correct – it goes straight back to a turn-around".

Mr. Marsh commented that your lot where someone might build is higher than where the applicant is going to be building.

Ms. Bergdahl replied "I guess – I'm not sure".

Ms. Spencer asked how far is your cabin from the property line is.

Ms. Bergdahl replied "Probably halfway back from Chena Ridge".

James Ferris, the applicant resides at 1442 Chena Ridge Road. We have little to no option for our garage. We tried to fit a garage on the lower end but have power lines that get in the way. We looked at building next to the cabin which happens to be the turn-around. We have exhausted every single avenue we could except for this driveway location. I don't think it's being intrusive. The property next door is higher. It is the best option we have for building a garage. The driveway from Sunburst is really steep.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Spencer asked about the markers – were they placed there recently or have they been there for some time and are you sure about the corners of your property line.

Mr. Ferris replied yes. All the markers were there when we purchased the home and we left them in place.

Mr. Pruhs wanted to see the plat on the overhead projector. He asked if the garage was a 20 foot or a 40 foot garage front.

Mr. Ferris replied a 20 foot in the front and 40 foot to the back.

Mr. Marsh asked about the location of the garage – does the ground slope off to the north.

Mr. Ferris replied yes.

Mr. Marsh commented about the parking area – if there was a pad.

Mr. Ferris replied that there was no pad – it's undeveloped.

Mr. Marsh replied that it looked like it extends to the trees.

Mr. Ferris responded – to the satellite dish.

Mr. Marsh asked if the satellite dish is where the garage is going.

Mr. Ferris answered yes.

Mr. Marsh asked if there was any way to move it down hill to the north.

Mr. Ferris replied no – that is a steep grade – a cliff. We also have a steep grade on the turn-around area and behind the cabin.

Mr. Marsh asked about the picture looking up the Chena Ridge driveway – fair amount of elevation difference – how tall is the bank where the garage is intended to be.

Mr. Ferris responded with “over 10 feet but down towards the garage location it levels off”.

Mr. Hebert asked if it was easy to make the switch-back to the cabin.

Mr. Ferris replied that it's pretty steep. The occupants of the cabin and myself have to share the same switch-back.

Mr. Hebert asked “But you can make that switch-back in the middle of winter”.

Mr. Ferris responded that it was a tight turn.

Mr. Hebert asked if he had considered having a partially buried garage.

Mr. Ferris replied yes.

Mr. Hebert wanted to know why it could not be closer to the house.

Mr. Ferris explained that the disadvantage would be – if you came off the top of the hill – the problem would be sliding into the garage itself.

Mr. Hebert asked about the foundation – the slab – will it be a similar elevation to the land to the south.

Mr. Ferris said yes.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to approve by **Mr. Pruhs** with two (2) recommendations and three (3) Findings of Fact and seconded by **Ms. Spencer**.

Discussion

Mr. Pruhs commended **Mr. Ferris** for coming forward for a variance before building. He will be voting in favor of this request.

Ms. Peterson asked **Ms. Dolan** about what extent we should be taking in to account – the neighbors property and their land use versus what’s already there. A vacant lot – would you think less about than a lot with a house already on it.

Ms. Dolan replied that you should take in account the neighbor’s property to the extent that you should still conform to intent and purpose of Title 18. You shouldn’t adversely affect the neighboring property by granting a variance. Someone is still entitled to make a reasonable use of their property with a variance if the variance is the minimum necessary. You should always be looking at this as if the property was vacant because the applicant cannot create the conditions that necessitate the variance. Variances are not designed for the convenience of the property owner. Sometimes they have the choice – do I have a guest house or a garage. Also consider this in your analysis.

Ms. Peterson asked if the property next door – should we consider what’s built on it. If they had a house that the view would be infringed – is that a valid consideration.

Ms. Dolan replied that to the extent it relates to the purpose of the setback in a zone – it is. Otherwise it would turn into a private nuisance action.

Mr. Cooper is under the opinion that the applicant has investigated to the degree that this is the only place it can be and that this variance should be granted.

Mr. Hebert asked staff what the distance from the south property line to the guest cabin.

Ms. Kellner replied that she was not sure.

Mr. Hebert asked about the satellite dish – is it inside of where the structure will be placed.

Ms. Kellner replied that it is at the furthest extent of the proposed site. Any further past that satellite dish – it slopes downhill.

Ms. Peterson commented on where the cabin is – what is the slope there.

Ms. Kellner responded that the soil there is classified as 30 to 45% slopes - does not know the exact slope.

Ms. Peterson asked staff if in her opinion – if the guest cabin was not there – that would be a good place to put a garage.

Ms. Kellner replied “it’s hard for me to say”.

Mr. Hebert asked if in the RE2 district – you are allowed unlimited number of garages.

Ms. Dolan replied “Garages are considered an accessory use and should be subordinate in size”. You would not see a 2,000 sq ft garage with a 1,000 sq ft house.

Mr. Hebert commented on procedure on a Commissioner liking to change one of the conditions of the recommendations. – at the end.

Ms. Dolan replied “A motion to amend would go first – then the Commission would vote on the amendment and if adopted then you would vote on the main motion with the amendment.

Mr. Hebert motions to amend the recommendation condition #2 to the following:

2. The garage shall be limited to one story in height and no greater than 15 feet above the top of the structure’s foundation.

Mr. Pruhs seconds the motion.

Objection to Amendment

Ms. Spencer asked if the applicant should be asked if the garage is only for cars or does he have other things to store.

Ms. Kellner asked the applicant and said the applicant proposes to store ATV’s, snow removal equipment, and two vehicles in the garage.

Mr. Marsh replied that a 10 foot ceiling would not hinder him.

Ms. Kellner added “I don’t believe so”.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other objections to the amendment.

None

Mr. Marsh added “The amendment stands for lack of objection”.

Ms. Peterson announced that if people use their real state to the absolute maximum and then come in to ask for a garage – as a body, we want to be careful about granting variances to someone that has over-loaded their property. I don’t think that that is what happened here and she will vote in favor of this request.

Mr. Marsh commented on that one of the exceptions that allows us to grant variances if that the terrain of the site constrains the full use of it. If this was a flat slope, we would have a hard time accepting that this property was constrained. I think this is a reasonable reason to grant a variance.

ROLL CALL

Six (6) in Favor: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hebert, Ms. Peterson, Mr. Pruhs, Ms. Spencer, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION TO APPROVE, PASSED.

PUBLIC HEARING

CU2009-008 A request by Alaska Pacific Powder for conditional use approval of a blasting agent manufacturing and explosive storage facility in the General Use 1 zone on Tax Lot 2903, Section 29, TL 3302 and TL 3303, Section 33, T4S, R4E, Fairbanks Meridian. **(located at the south end of Old Site Road, east of the Richardson Highway in Salcha)**

Melissa Kellner presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the request with conditions.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Pruhs asked **Ms. Dolan** if this would create a problem if the Owner is a client of mine. He has never seen or walked this property – does he have a conflict of interest.

Ms. Dolan replied “I don’t think you have a financial interest in this application based on what you just said. If they are an active client and given this is a conditional use permit – you’re in your quasi judicial rule not in a legislative rule like you are in rezones – I would be concerned that you have the appearance of a conflict – I think you should address if you have any bias or appearance in propriety and have the Chair rule.

Mr. Pruhs addressed the Chair and said that he thought that he could make an impartial decision here.

Mr. Marsh added that you feel you can make an impartial decision without affecting your relationship with the Owner.

Mr. Pruhs added “That is correct”.

Mr. Marsh ruled that there is no conflict of interest.

Mr. Pruhs asked **Ms. Kellner** about the application not holding the Owners signature. Does the Owner know about this conditional use?

Ms. Kellner replied that the applicant is Alaska Pacific Powder.

Mr. Pruhs replied that is not the Owner.

Ms. Kellner concurred that the Owner’s signature is not on the application.

Mr. Hernandez stated that we cannot act on a Conditional Use without the Owners signature on the application.

Ms. Dolan communicated that the applicant certifies that he is authorized to act for the Owner of the property. Has anyone asked that question to him or have proof of authorization?

Mr. Pruhs stated that tomorrow morning when he has a call to Greg Jones and he mentions “We heard about your permit coming before us last night and I don’t want to hear - what permit from him”.

Ms. Dolan interrupted **Mr. Pruhs** and said she does have a concern now that you have a conflict – it would be inappropriate to discuss this with somebody during the appeal period”

Mr. Pruhs excused himself.

Mr. Hernandez stated that if you find this Conditional Use worthy – approve it with the condition that the Owner of the property signs the application.

Ms. Peterson disclosed “Do we no longer have a Quorum”?

Mr. Marsh stated that we do not have a Quorum so we cannot take any formal action.

Ms. Dolan stated that you began the meeting with a Quorum and you began the item with a Quorum so with the conflict – you won’t lose it.

Mr. Marsh commented on getting a signature after the fact – you believe that is ok.

Mr. Hernandez said “I think that would address the situation”.

Mr. Hebert asked the appropriate time to add that condition would be during the approval process.

Mr. Hernandez replied yes.

Mr. Marsh added “After Public Hearing”.

Ms. Dolan added that you have an application claiming that Alaska Pacific Powder is the Owner's representative – they certify they are authorized to act for the Owner – so Planning can verify this tomorrow but you should act as though you have jurisdiction over this application. If it turns out that the Owner didn't sign the application – you wouldn't have had jurisdiction so you can go ahead and rescind your action at a later time. Just proceed with what is on the publication is correct and they are authorized to act for them.

Mr. Marsh asked if there is any further discussion.

Ms. Spencer asked staff if there are structures on the property currently.

Ms. Kellner added "yes – all the structures are described on the overhead are currently on site".

Mr. Marsh added that in the staff report it was mentioned that this was a former emissions site for the Air Force.

Ms. Spencer asked if they were going to use the property as is.

Ms. Kellner responded with yes.

Ms. Peterson commented on that they have been doing this on the property for a period of time before this Conditional Use.

Ms. Kellner responded yes.

Ms. Peterson asked why are they now asking for a Conditional Use.

Mr. Hernandez responded to the question that someone from this company thought they saw a Borough car driving around their property so they called us and we asked them what they had on their property. We sent out our Code Enforcer and told them they needed a Conditional Use to operate this explosive storage facility.

Ms. Peterson asked **Ms. Kellner** to what extend did it come into play that they are not in a fire district for you to recommend approval.

Ms. Kellner stated that she spoke with the Salcha Rescue and they are aware of the operations and the applicant submits annual reports about what kind of chemicals are on site and what kind of hazards are in place. Salcha Rescue will not respond to a chemical incident but would respond to a bush fire or EMT response. North Star will not respond unless they were requested to do so by the Borough. The applicant agreed to coordinate with the Emergency entities but they recognize that they are on their own out there. Their plans are to notify the neighbors and get out if anything happens. They are isolated in their location - we felt that this is a suitable location.

Ms. Peterson asked about how many neighbors are near this area.

Ms. Kellner replied that there are several.

Ms. Peterson asked if the road is a dead end.

Ms. Kellner replied yes.

Mr. Marsh asked what the general terrain is – is it flat – is it a bluff along the road?

Ms. Kellner replied that's true along the highway.

Mr. Marsh asked if the relationship on the south end with the residence and the site – that's not flat.

Ms. Kellner said it's not.

Mr. Marsh asked if there was some physical barrier – a bluff or hill in between.

Ms. Kellner said she is not sure but the neighboring that this property to the south is quite a bit lower.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions for staff.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Chad Comeau, the applicant, said that they have been there for many years. He is the Branch Manager for the last two years and does not know why there was not a permit. The Company has leased the property since 1978. Everything out there is contained in bunkers which have 2 foot thick walls – top, bottom, and floor. The plant itself is on the top of the hill. It slopes down on both sides.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Peterson asked how many buildings housed explosives.

Mr. Comeau replied with 4 buildings that house explosives.

Ms. Peterson wanted a description of the buildings.

Mr. Comeau added that they were the old nuke missile sites. They have 2 foot thick concrete walls and ceilings and there is dirt over the top of three of them.

Ms. Peterson asked if there was an engineer's report about the structural ability of what these buildings would with-stand.

Mr. Comeau does not. He could get with the Owner.

Ms. Peterson asked about the silos – what do they house.

Mr. Comeau replied "Ammonia Nitrate Fertilizer".

Ms. Peterson added that the security is a padlock gate.

Mr. Comeau replied yes.

Ms. Peterson asked if there was a fence around the perimeter.

Mr. Comeau replied no – it is pretty dense. All of the bunkers are locked with two locks that you can't get into to cut them.

Ms. Spencer wanted to know the number of employees.

Mr. Comeau replied seven (7) total.

Ms. Spencer was concerned with what could go wrong – did you have any incidents in the pass.

Mr. Comeau responded with no.

Ms. Spencer asked what the chances of a fire are.

Mr. Comeau does not know how to answer that.

Ms. Spencer asked what the emergency plan consisted of.

Mr. Comeau said that they have an emergency plan that is set up through Salcha – we notify everyone and get out of there.

Ms. Spencer asked if a fire started – not caused by you – could it activate what you have over there.

Mr. Comeau replied that everything is inside of the bunkers and it should not get to them.

Mr. Hebert asked if ammonia nitrate could be ignited by itself at the right temperatures.

Mr. Comeau replied that it is only fertilizer and what it uses to activate it is diesel fuel. It is not mixed until the end of our process when it goes into the truck.

Mr. Cooper asked why you don't have a security fence.

Mr. Comeau said that ATF was only concerned about having a gate up and it being locked. We also do security watches on Saturday and Sunday to check it out.

Ms. Peterson asked if they had security cameras.

Mr. Comeau replied no.

Ms. Peterson asked how often does ATF come to visit.

Mr. Comeau replied once a year and they do an audit.

Ms. Spencer asked what kind of checks – how you run the business – what do they check.

Mr. Comeau said they check on the stuff locked up and the inventory. We cannot be off on our inventory. They check out that we have the explosives at a certain distance from each other. We have to be within the ATF guidelines and the National guidelines. They do monitor what we do at all times.

Ms. Spencer added that you have only been here for two years – do you have any historical information about when the Air Force left and your Company took over – were there other residents in the 70's.

Mr. Comeau believes that there were residents. Some are seasonal residents.

Ms. Spencer asked what the distance from the main road and your plant.

Mr. Comeau said that he did not know.

Ms. Spencer asked how long do you drive on the side road.

Mr. Comeau replied 4 or 5 miles.

Ms. Peterson asked if ATF accesses the structural integrity of the buildings in which you store the material.

Mr. Comeau replied “Just the doors to make sure they are locked”.

Mr. Marsh added that this has been operational for 30 years. The only regulations that you are required to follow is Federal. The State has no regulations.

Mr. Comeau replied we are covered by State also – OSHA.

Mr. Hernandez asked if the applicant plans on expanding their facility.

Mr. Comeau replied no.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to approve **CU2009-008** with four (4) conditions and four (4) Findings of Fact by **Mr. Hebert**, seconded by **Ms. Peterson**.

Discussion

Mr. Hebert will be voting for approval of the conditional use based on the historic success and I agree with the Findings of Fact.

Mr. Cooper said that he is still pondering the issue and believes that they have been operating within the guidelines of Federal and State. Has an issue about no fences around the perimeter of their buildings.

Ms. Peterson commented about ATF being concerned about where the stuff goes and she is concerned about what happens if this stuff blows. We have a spruce forest with buildings and bunkers but no engineers report stating what would happen if the materials within the buildings explode. Spruce is born to burn – if there is a fire – we need to look at this since ATF is not looking at this. No one in our Borough is equipped to protect. You have a facility that has one way in and one way out. If a forest fire starts there it could be a natural disaster. A single building is more manageable than four buildings. We need an Engineers report.

Ms. Kellner pointed out that towards the end of the application packet, in front of the pictures – there are explosive storage magazine description worksheets and one of the items on the worksheet is a description of what could be damaged if the contents of the magazines exploded - Item D on the worksheet.

Ms. Peterson asked who fills out these forms – is it a self assessment.

Ms. Kellner replied yes – it is part of their requirements for ATF.

Ms. Peterson would argue that an explosion in the middle of a spruce forest would damage more than the earth and berm around the building.

Mr. Hebert commented on other worksheets and replied that it says the trees would be damaged.

Mr. Marsh commented that **Mr. Comeau** said that they are not mixed together to become explosives until they are ready to go on the truck and leave. They are not storing bombs. They are storing materials to become explosives. Operating for 30 years makes a good argue that they have been operating properly. He does not have a problem with the application and the conditions as stated.

Mr. Hebert committed that there are some buildings that are not the earthen buildings that have detonators stored in them. Some have wood roofs. They have steel doors.

Ms. Spencer asked **Ms. Kellner** if she was aware of any other plant operations from the same company. Do they have other locations?

Ms. Kellner checked with the applicant.

Ms. Spencer wanted to know if they have other locations – do they have a permit.

Ms. Kellner stated that the applicant said there are no other locations for a plant but they ship to Anchorage and Ketchikan and they have storage in Anchorage.

Ms. Spencer replied with “Does this storage plant have a permit”?

Ms. Kellner said that the applicant informed her they are permitted but he is not sure if it's through the Borough or the City of Anchorage. They transfer the materials with Carlile trucks and ship to Anchorage.

Ms. Spencer commented on congratulating the enforcement section approving this operation. I totally concur with **Ms. Peterson**.

Mr. Cooper needed clarification on what was in the bunkers.

Mr. Hebert replied “That is the explosives”.

Mr. Cooper asked **Ms. Kellner** to show on the overhead the bunkers. I don't see the earthen berms around the bunkers.

Ms. Kellner explained that it is behind the bunker and at the roof angle it is covered in earth.

Mr. Marsh clarified by saying that the building has earth on top; B3 and B4 have berm in between them.

Ms. Peterson stated that there are two things that could make her vote for this application and neither is mentioned: 1) third party verification of the structural integrity of the buildings. 2) Trust in ATF to verify the structural integrity but they don't. I can't vote for this.

Mr. Hernandez announced if there is enough concern – I propose that we postpone this for a month and that will give us an opportunity to work with the applicant.

Ms. Peterson moved to postpone to July 7, 2009, seconded by Mr. Hebert.

Mr. Hernandez communicated that the concerns were about the structural integrity of the buildings and what happens if a fire goes through this area (can the buildings with stand a fire from the outside)

Mr. Hebert added "Fire vulnerability from the inside/outside. He also added about an emergency access – two access points".

Mr. Cooper suggested that they have been operational for 30 years and the buildings date back to the 1950's.

Ms. Spencer added that security by ATF be more than once a year since this operation is public knowledge now.

MOTION TO POSTPONE, No Objection

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

H. NEW BUSINESS

I. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

1. FMATS

Ms. Peterson reported that there have been no FMAT meetings since our last meeting.

2. Title 17 Rewrite Project

Mr. Hernandez said that we have the "DRAFT" before the committee and they are looking at it line by line. We are meeting tomorrow for half a day.

3. Vision Fairbanks Update

Mr. Hernandez said they drafted some guidelines for the Fairbanks plan and talked with the Downtown Association and showed them what we prepared and they were in agreement. Now our Legal Department is looking at the draft.

4. North Pole Land Use Plan

Mr. Hernandez stated that there was a Public Hearing last night at the City Council. The decision has been postponed.

5. Comprehensive Plan Advisory Board (CPAB)

Mr. Hernandez announced that they are working on turning GU-1 zone into GU-5. We have just signed the contract with the Consultants that are working on our Land Suitability Analysis. They will attend CPAB meeting on July 1st to work on this project.

6. Other Commission Comments

Ms. Spencer asked if the Grandfather clause can be included under Commission Comments for next meeting and how the Grandfather affects the variance that was before us tonight.

I. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.