

**CITY OF NORWALK
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
August 4, 2022**

PRESENT: Louis Schulman, Chair; Mike Mushak; Tammy Langalis; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Darius Williams; Galen Wells

STAFF: Steve Kleppin (arrived at approximately 7:30 pm); Bryan Baker

OTHERS: Vincent Hynes; Atty Liz Suchy; Michael Galante; Marissa Tarallo; Adam Towers; Liz Beinfield; Betsy Wrenn; Jenny Friedman; Brian Clarke; Paul Cantor; Alan Lo; Atty Adam Blank; Lieutenant Blake; Jessica Edward

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Schulman called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held on Zoom.com with all participants calling in, separately.

II. ROLL CALL

Mr. Kleppin called the roll.

III. REVIEW & ACTION ON APPLICATIONS

a. #2022-28 SPR – 32 Knight Street – Proposed exterior and interior renovation of building with medical office tenants – Preliminary review

Mr. Schulman asked the applicant to keep their presentation to 15 minutes or less. He also noted that he would ask for a peer review on this project.

Vincent Hynes, the engineer on the project, introduced the project team. He then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He also noted that the applicant would also be presenting the Conservation Commission at their next meeting. He then explained the proposed project which would be used by medical office tenants. He also noted that they were also waiting for approvals from different agencies. There was a discussion as to whether this would remain a one story building.

**** MR. ROINA MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE SENDING APPLICATION #2022-28 SPR FOR A PEER REVIEW.**

Ms. Langalis seconded.

Louis Schulman; Mike Mushak; Tammy Langalis; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Darius Williams; Galen Wells approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

There was a discussion about which consultants would work on the peer review.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Schulman noted that there were several public hearings which he hoped could be done expeditiously.

a. #2022-16 SP – Schoolhouse Academy Inc – 32 Weed Avenue – Proposed prekindergarten through grade 12 private school – Continuation of public hearing

Mr. Schulman noted that any one who had already spoken on this matter previously could not speak again, unless it was on new material that was presented. If someone had not spoken previously they could speak at this meeting. He then gave an overview of the rules of how public hearings would be conducted. He also said that they would continue meeting at the next meeting if this one ran too long.

Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation by introducing the project team. She gave a brief overview of the application and then explained the notification to the neighbors. She gave a brief history of the various uses of the building. She also explained the various buildings on the property. She then explained the proposed use. She noted that there would be a presentation of the traffic study.

Michael Galante, the traffic engineer, continued the presentation by noting that he would be responding to comments from the Department of Traffic, Mobility and Parking (TMP). He also discussed a sensitivity analysis and why it was requested by the city. He noted that the school would spread out start and end times. They have made modifications based on comments they had received. He also discussed the levels of service at different intersections and that there were concerns. He also said that there had been discussions about a roundabout which was being considered. There were concerns about traffic from the Fox Run Elementary School nearby.

Atty Suchy said that the applicant had no other material to present.

Marissa Tarallo of AKRF, the city's peer review traffic consultant, began her presentation with what she had reviewed from the applicant which included the sensitivity analysis. She said that there was a difference of opinion on the critical intersections. She noted that there were concerns about peak hours in the morning. She explained why they had asked for a roundabout. However, she was not sure whether it could be constructed there. She did not think it was less safe than what was currently there. There was a discussion about the traffic and whether it was deteriorating to congestion. Ms. Tarallo noted it was the westbound approach. There was a discussion about which way the vehicles were going once they left the school.

At this point, the public was allowed to comment.

Adam Towers, 15 Indian Spring Road, Norwalk, spoke on behalf of Schoolhouse Academy. He was excited at the prospect of the school opening. He has been happy with the schools but had concerns about the middle school. He noted that they could not afford a private school. He said that the facility was already in use as a school facility. He thought that more middle class families would stay in Norwalk so they could send their children to this school.

Liz Beinfield, 4 Roton Avenue, noted that she had lived near a school for over 10 years. As a realtor, she did not believe that property values would decline. She thought this was an opportunity for people who wanted to move to Rowayton. She had seen the property and was impressed by it.

Betsy Wrenn, 67 Weed Avenue, had concerns about speeding on Weed Avenue. She had concerns about the traffic, especially from other projects like Wegman's and the Sikh mosque.

Jenny Friedman, 23 Craw Avenue, a real estate agent, spoke in support of the project and would not negatively impact property values.

Brian Clarke spoke in support of the project.

Paul Cantor spoke against the project. He did not think that it would improve the property values of the city. He thought it would ruin the reputation of the city and was not in the best interest of Norwalk.

Atty Suchy continued the presentation by asking Mr. Galante if he had any comments to address on Ms. Tarallo's presentation. She thanked everyone for their work on the project. She then noted that they had provided information on the traffic study that was presented. She then read from the city's traffic regulations and explained that the applicant had abided by them. She also addressed comments that were made about the neighbor's property values. She also addressed comments about some people not trusting the applicant. She also spoke about the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) and how the application supported it. She noted that some students attended schools in other towns and that this school would allow Norwalk students to continue their education in Norwalk. She also commented on providing funds to the city to construct sidewalks and a roundabout. She suggested that the applicant provide funds over time as the school grows.

There was a discussion about vehicles idling along with buses. Atty Suchy noted that this should be enforced by the police.

Ms. Tarallo said that there were two separate studies, one done by her company as well as TMP. Her company did not suggest an amount to fund the roundabout and that it did not come from them.

Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

i. Action on item IV.a. #2022-16 SP

Mr. Mushak said that \$500,000 was not a lot of money for a neighborhood that would have to absorb another school. He thought it was a good idea but in the wrong neighborhood. He thought the traffic flies through the neighborhood and has turned it into a cut through. He did not think this site was designed for this project. He compared this school to another private school, Winston, in Norwalk. He suggested that this school should be opened on Long Ridge Road. He would not be voting in favor of this application.

Mr. Roina said that he agreed with Mr. Mushak. However, he had concerns about the traffic. He also said he could not vote for this application. Ms. Wells said she agreed with both Mr. Roina and Mr. Mushak.

Ms. Langalis said that she did not agree with the previous commissioners. She noted that other Norwalk schools were in neighborhoods with traffic. The same problems that were at this school were the same as at other Norwalk schools. However, Ms. Langalis then dropped off the Zoom call.

Ms. Jordan-Byron said that she was excited about the prospect of a new school but was concerned about the roll-out of the number of students. She thought that if the roll-out was 8-9 years as stated by the applicant, that should be enough time to work out any kinks.

WHEREAS, the Commission reviewed the application on April 20, 2022, at which time AKRF was hired to conduct peer review of traffic;

WHEREAS, AKRF and City staff, consulted with the applicant and reviewed traffic and site impacts related to the new development;

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted a public hearing on the proposed application at a special meeting on June 28, 2022, at which time written and verbal testimony was received;

WHEREAS, the Commission continued the public hearing to allow for additional information;

WHEREAS, the Commission considered all testimony received and closed the hearing on August 4, 2022;

WHEREAS, the Commission finds that this properties trail access and conservation easements provide an “open space” component for the neighborhood;

Planning & Zoning Commission

August 4, 2022
Page 4 of 14

WHEREAS, the Commission recognizes the importance of student safety should the school occupy the site;

WHEREAS, the Commission has determined that schools are an allowed special permit use in residential zones.

WHEREAS, the Commission finds that due to the lack of mass transit facilities or sidewalks in the area, that the applicant shall install sidewalks as recommended by City staff;

WHEREAS, the Commission finds that intersection improvements at the corner of Fallow Street and Richards Avenue are necessary as a result of the impacts from the applicant's proposed project;

WHEREAS, the Commission finds that potential roundabout improvements, at a minimum, will cost at least \$500,000;

**** MS. JORDAN-BYRON MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission, that #2022-16 SP – Schoolhouse Academy Inc – 32 Weed Avenue – Proposed pre-kindergarten through grade 12 private school, be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. There shall be no changes to the proposed start times unless approved by the commission.
2. The applicant shall provide staffing to ensure adequate traffic flow at the two entrances to the property and also internal to the property, to ensure there is continuous flow of vehicles.
3. Internal signage shall be posted, directing vehicles and pedestrians to designated parking areas and walkways.
4. In conjunction with the submission of the Building Permit applications, the applicant provide a revised Site Plan indicating the location of all sidewalks and pedestrian paths, as well as all wayfinding and safety signage.
5. The applicant shall install a sidewalk to City standards from the entrance/exit to the property on Little Fox Lane to Fox Run Road.
6. The applicant shall install a sidewalk to City standards from the entrance/exit to the property on Weed Avenue to Fallow Street.
7. The applicant shall make a monetary contribution in the amount of \$500,000 to the City of Norwalk to be placed into an account, specifically designated for intersection improvements at the corner of Fallow Street and Richards Avenue, to be used toward the construction of a roundabout or other intersection improvements, as determined by the City. Any unused funds shall be returned to the applicant.

8. The applicant shall place a conservation easement on the southern property line, a minimum of eighty (80) in depth, from the three (3) houses bordering the property, which front on Little Fox Lane, extending westward, connecting to the existing conservation easement. This conservation easement area shall not be available for public use, unless allowed by the applicant or future property owner(s).

9. The applicant shall place a conservation easement on the area along the northeast portion of the property, between the Earth Roadway and the properties that front Huckleberry Drive South. This conservation easement area shall not be available for public use, unless allowed by the applicant or future property owner(s).

10. Prior to obtaining any permits to renovate the building or site, for the proposed school, the applicant shall provide the Commission with a plan and schedule that provides specific times when the existing conservation easement areas and trail network, which encompasses the western portion of the property, will be available to the public. In addition, signage shall be located at the Fillow Street entrance indicating available hours and where parking is located.

11. The applicant shall install a small parking lot, improved with gravel or other pervious material to accommodate four (4) vehicles, off-of the access driveway to the "Barn", located off-Fillow Street, to accommodate visitors to the property. The parking area shall be properly signed to ensure that is permitted for transient visitors to the property.

12. Any future expansion or redevelopment of the site, including sports fields or sports equipment in the Lawn Area, is subject to Commission approval.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action shall be August 12, 2022.

Ms. Wells noted that her power had gone out and then returned.

Mr. Schulman said that he would not want to continue without Ms. Langalis to continue her presentation. Mr. Mushak had concerns about delaying the vote. Ms. Langalis then returned to the meeting. She was told that a motion had been made by Ms. Jordan-Byron. She apologized that her power had gone out and now it had been restored.

Ms. Langalis seconded.

Mr. Baker showed everyone the resolution. Mr. Kleppin noted that there were changes in red. There was then discussion about the funding of the improvements over a period of time. Mr. Kleppin said that the \$500K was a lower end of the minimum but could be leveraged from other funding sources. He noted that if the improvements wait, there could already be increased traffic.

There was then a discussion about how the students would be coming to school. There was also a discussion about the fact that all of the other Norwalk schools have already been in the neighborhoods for a long time. Mr. Williams suggested that they vote on this matter.

Louis Schulman; Tammy Langalis; Jacquen Jordan-Byron approved.

Darius Williams; Galen Wells; Richard Roina; Mike Mushak opposed.

No one abstained.

The motion failed.

b. #2022-25 R – Board of Education – Zoning regulation text amendment to revise Articles 80, 90, 120 and 140 for regulations pertaining to maximum allowable height, setbacks for structures and parking minimum parking requirements for public school and municipal uses and structures

Alan Lo began the presentation by noting that Atty Adam Blank would begin it. Mr. Schulman then explained the rules of the public hearing for anyone that had not been on the call at the beginning.

Atty Blank noted that the city had begun updating the aging school buildings in the last few years. These text amendments would make the process streamlined and efficient. He discussed state funding for these projects and that if the process is slowed, the city could miss out on it. He then showed them the proposed text changes which included building height, setbacks for accessory buildings, parking, etc.

Mr. Baker asked if any members of the public would like to speak on this application. No one spoke either for or against the application. He also noted that it was referred to other agencies as per the regulations. Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

i. Action on item IV. b. #2022-25 R

Mr. Roina noted that he had watched the video from the last meeting.

**Whereas the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing on this application on August 4, 2022;*

**Whereas the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission has received a finding of consistency with the Harbor Management Plan from the Norwalk Harbor Management Commission;*

**Whereas the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission has received a finding of consistency with the Coastal Area Management Act from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection;*

**Whereas the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission has found that the proposed text amendment is consistent with the Norwalk Plan of Conservation and Development;*

**** MS. JORDAN-BYRON MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2022-25 R – Board of Education – Zoning regulation text amendment to revise Articles 80, 90, 120 and 140 for regulations pertaining to maximum allowable height, setbacks for structures and parking and minimum parking requirements for public school and municipal uses and structures be **APPROVED**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the approved language is the following:

§ 118-810. General provisions relative to area and height regulations.

K. The height provisions of these regulations shall not prevent the erection of a church, private school, library or a public museum to a height not exceeding fifty (50) feet in a residence zone. Furthermore, the height provisions of these regulations shall not prevent the erection of a public school or a municipal building to a height not exceeding sixty-five (65) feet in a residence zone. The story provisions of the regulations shall not prevent the erection of a public school or municipal building not exceeding four (4) stories in height in a residence zone.

§ 118-910. Location of accessory buildings in residence zones.

H. Notwithstanding any requirement in this section, the foregoing rules shall not prohibit any accessory structure to a school or municipal building: (a) setback forty (40) feet or more from the front property line and (b) setback fifteen (15) feet or more from any side yard property line.

§ 118-1220. Amount of motor vehicle space to be provided.

C.(22)(b) Elementary School – 1 parking space per worker employed.

C.(22)(c) Middle School – 1 parking space per worker employed.

C.(22)(d) High School – 1 parking space per worker employed.

§ 118-1450. Special Permits.

D.(2) Building Setbacks: All building shall be setback from front, side and rear property boundaries by an amount not less than the minimum setback specified in the Residential Schedule plus six (6) inches for each foot of building length in excess of forty (40) feet, such length measure parallel to the property boundary. Notwithstanding anything in these regulations to the contrary, public school and municipal uses shall be required to provide no more than an eighty (80) foot front and rear setback and no more than a forty (40) foot front setback for all off-street parking and loading facilities, including all parking aisles and backup spaces.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the reasons for this action are:

1. To achieve Plan of Conservation and Development Goal #1 listed in Chapter 5: A Community Committed to Life-Long Education “The Norwalk public school system is the most successful city school system in Connecticut, with students exceeding state average achievement and high-need students having the smallest achievement gap” through Strategy A. “Continue implementation of the NPS Strategic Plan and publicize performance, improvements and benefits of diversity,” by implementing action i. “Continue implementation of the NPS Strategic Plan and development subsequent plans;” and

2. To achieve Plan of Conservation and Development Goal #2 listed in Chapter 5: A Community Committed to Life-Long Education: “The Modern Schools for a Growing City plan provides new and renovated schools to alleviate overcrowding and better serve students” through Strategy A. “Implement the facilities improvement plan over time” by implementing action vi. “Support sustained maintenance and renovation of all schools;” and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action is August 12, 2022.

Ms. Jordan-Byron seconded.

Louis Schulman; Mike Mushak; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Darius Williams; Galen Wells approved.

No one opposed.

Tammy Langalis abstained.

c. #2022-33 R – Norwalk Police Department – Building zone regulation text amendment to Article 80 to allow for EMS communication antennas to be installed on existing public utility towers

Lieutenant Blake discussed the replacement of the current radio system for different agencies. This project has been going on for about 7 years and is in the second phase. The old equipment is at the end of their life. He explained where the tower is. This text amendment would allow them to go above the current required height.

Mr. Baker asked if any members of the public would like to speak on this application. Mr. Kleppin noted that they worked with Lt. Blake to notify the neighbors. Mr. Baker also noted that it was referred to other agencies as per the regulations. No one spoke either for or against the application.

i. Action on item IV.c. #2022-33 R

**Whereas the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing on this application on August 4, 2022;*

**Whereas the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission has received a finding of consistency with the Harbor Management Plan from the Norwalk Harbor Management Commission;*

**Whereas the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission has received a finding of consistency with the Coastal Area Management Act from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection;*

**Whereas the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission has found that the proposed text amendment is consistent with the Norwalk Plan of Conservation and Development;*

**** MR. ROINA MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2022-33 R – Norwalk Police Department – Building zone regulation text amendment to Article 80 to allow for EMS communication antennas to be installed on public utility structures be **APPROVED**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the approved language is the following:

§ 118-810. General provisions relative to area and height regulations. [Amended effective 7-15- 1971; 12-5-1973; 7-27-2007]

M. Emergency-services communication antennas are permitted as an accessory use when located on an existing public utility structure and may extend above the existing structure by no more than twenty-five (25) feet. In addition, the color of the utility structure shall be incorporated into design of the antenna and any equipment structures shall meet building setbacks and be effectively screened from adjacent properties.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the reasons for this action are:

1. To achieve Plan of Conservation and Development Goal #5 listed in Chapter 9: Coastal Resources & Resilience: “Norwalk plans for and adapts to climate change;” and
2. To achieve Plan of Conservation and Development Goal #1 listed in Chapter 11: Public Facilities, Infrastructure & Services: “Norwalk’s infrastructure and public facilities are resource-efficient, well-maintained, cost-effective, sustainable and resilient” through Strategy B. “Continue to update, modernize and maintain Norwalk’s infrastructure and city facilities” by implementing action vi. “Ensure Norwalk’s emergency services departments are provided with appropriate funding for equipment and facilities to provide superior service and maintain a high level of public safety;” and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action is August 12, 2022.

Ms. Langalis seconded.

Louis Schulman; Mike Mushak; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Darius Williams; Galen Wells; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

d. #2022-38 SP – Jessica J. Edward – 25 Van Zant Street – Proposed adult day care center use within existing building

Mr. Schulman explained the rules of the public hearing for the members of the public that may have missed it.

Jessica Edward said she was the founder of Caring for Seniors and explained the purpose of Caring for Seniors. She then introduced Brian Clarke and said that he was the real estate agent on this project. Mr. Clarke explained that this was a center that was necessary in Norwalk, especially due to the aging of the population. He thought the location was perfect for its proximity to I-95. Ms. Edward explained the social programs that would be provided, including yoga, computers, movies, and outings. There was a discussion about whether there were regulations with the Health Department. Mr. Clarke said that they were meeting their requirements. He also noted that (WAtch video at 8:49 pm)

There was a discussion about why this was a special permit application which Mr. Baker addressed.

There was also a discussion about whether this was only a social program and what the ratio of employees to participants was. Ms. Edward explained her background to commissioners. There was also a discussion about outdoor space, which Ms. Edward said there was none. The property would be ADA accessible. There was a discussion about how close Veteran's Park was to the building.

Mr. Baker asked if any members of the public would like to speak on this application. No one spoke either for or against the application. Ms. Edward thanked the commissioners for hearing her application. Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

i. Action on item IV.d. #2022-38 SP

**** MR. MUSHAK MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2022-38 SP – Jessica J. Edward – 25 Van Zant Street – Proposed adult day care center use within existing building be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That all CEAC sign-offs be submitted prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
2. That any changes to the approved plans be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Commission for their review and approval; and
3. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk DPW shall be applicable to this approval; and
4. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk WPCA shall be applicable to this approval; and
5. That this approval is subject to Section 118-1460 C. of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this application complies with Section 118-700 and all other applicable sections of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action is August 12, 2022.

Mr. Williams seconded.

Louis Schulman; Mike Mushak; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Darius Williams; Galen Wells; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 20, 2022

**** MR. WILLIAMS MOVED to approve the July 20, 2022 meeting minutes.**

Ms. Langalis seconded.

Louis Schulman; Mike Mushak; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams; Galen Wells; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

Richard Roina abstained.

VI. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR

Mr. Kleppin gave an update on the Industrial Waterfront Land Use Study. He noted that the draft had been sent to the committee a few weeks ago. There were very few questions or comments. It will go out to the general public in the next couple of weeks. The commissioners would receive a draft as well. They would then incorporate it into the POCD. Later it would be incorporated into the zoning regulations which are still being re-written.

He had attended the Economic and Community Development meeting during the first half of the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, at which time they discussed the industrial zone changes and then would be on the agenda for the Common Council.

Mr. Kleppin would also be discussing the timeline for the rewrite of the zoning regulations. They would also have an outside counsel to review the regulations to make sure they were still conforming to state regulations.

He then discussed the next meetings for the Planning and Zoning Commission which would be on August 17 as well as a special meeting for August 24. They would have the public hearing for Wegman's and Accessory Dwelling Units.

VII. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Roina asked about a seminar for the commissioners. Mr. Kleppin said that there was a certain amount of hours of training that commissioners would be required to attend, starting in January 2023. He would find some training from the CT Bar Association and that they could do some training in-house. Mr. Schulman noted that they could do a training with the city's corporation counsel, Mario Coppola, as they had done in the past.

There was a discussion about how long a commissioner could sit. Ms. Wells thought it was three terms. Being on the newly formed Planning & Zoning Commission did start the clock over again for the number of terms that a commissioner could serve.

Ms. Wells met with Darius Williams and Mike Mushak about the bylaws. She sent a draft to them and would send it to Mr. Kleppin as well.

Mr. Schulman thought that this evening's meeting on the school project did get a bit heated by the commissioners. He asked that they keep that out of their own discussions. Ms. Wells did not think anyone had been impolite. Mr. Schulman wanted to ensure that they all work well together.

Mr. Schulman said that he may not be at the meeting on August 17. He asked Mr. Mushak to run the meeting if he did not have a good Internet connection. He said that he did want to attend the meeting.

Mr. Mushak apologized to Ms. Langalis if he had engaged with her in an impolite way and as well as to Ms. Wells, if he had not let her speak. He acknowledged it was a difficult vote for him.

Ms. Langalis said that she was frustrated that her Internet went down at a critical moment and could not finish her statement. She thought that they should have a good

dialogue with one another. She had wanted to hear what the other commissioners had to say, especially since her computer had not been working.

There was a discussion about the vote on the school academy application. There was also a general discussion about voting on applications. Mr. Schulman said that he could ask each commissioner for their opinion before an application is voted upon.

Ms. Wells noted that her electricity had been down for a while and that she missed some of the commentary. There was a discussion about sharing each other's cell phone number so that if there was a similar situation they could reach someone to let them know. Each commissioner would send their cell phone number to Mr. Kleppin to share amongst themselves.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Jordan-Byron made a Motion to Adjourn.

Mr. Williams seconded.

Louis Schulman; Mike Mushak; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Darius Williams; Galen Wells; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero