

CASE 11-9
Tails by The Wayside
882 Boston Post Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
MARCH 7, 2011

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; and Nancy G. Rubenstein

Notice was published in the Sudbury Town Crier on February 17 and February 24, 2011, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Heather and Richard Clement, along with their attorney Michael Fee, were present to represent a petition for renewal of special permit 09-2 to operate a kennel, Tails by the Wayside, at 882 Boston Post Road.

Mr. Fee explained that this is the fifth time the applicant has come before the Zoning Board of Appeals to ask for a special permit. He said that the conditions imposed have all have been fulfilled and at this point the applicants are requesting consideration to increase the number of dogs allowed on the premises from ten to twenty. He also requested that the number of dogs allowed outside at a given time be increased from three to ten. The dogs would be monitored by a dog to staff ratio of five to one. Mr. Fee also asked for consideration of an extension of the renewal period.

Mr. Fee reported that there had been no complaints filed about noise or odors from the facility. The Board was in receipt of a letter of support dated March 7, 2011 from Jennifer Condon, the Animal Control Officer at the Sudbury Dog Control Office. Ms. Condon noted that from her visits to the facility she has found the conditions to be immaculate.

Mr. Fee said that the applicants feel that they have demonstrated their ability to operate the kennel and he referenced another kennel in town, Pet Nannies at the Stone Tavern Farm, that has many more dogs allowed with similar facilities.

Ms. Quirk said that Pet Nannies differ because they offer only day-time use and not overnight boarding. She also explained that the higher limit was allowed to alleviate concerns about client drop-off and pick-ups. Additionally Pet Nannies is located in a commercial district rather than a residential district.

Mr. Fee explained again that there have been no complaints filed and the kennel license is subject to review by the dog officer. He said that the business has grown and they have a client waiting list. The applicants are interested in hiring staff, which would only be possible if they had the ability to acquire additional clients. He said that the terms of the special permit are currently limiting the growth of the business.

Mr. Klofft asked whether the facilities have been made larger to accommodate additional dogs. No changes have been made and there are no plans to expand the facilities.

Mr. Gossels did not consider the doubling of the number of dogs to be a minimal increase. He questioned whether adding employees would still qualify as accessory use. Jim Kelly, Sudbury Building Inspector, said that perhaps a special permit would be required for a home business under Section 2340 of the Sudbury Bylaws, but the home business would allow up to one full-time employee. Mr. Gossels reminded the Board that he has abstained from the vote every time there has been a renewal for this kennel.

Ms. Quirk said that she would be fine with increasing the number of dogs if the renewal term was shorter. She felt that doubling the dogs was excessive, but she also understood the need for business growth.

Mr. Stevenson agreed with Ms. Quirk saying that the growth of a business that has been well-received was important. He also agreed that a shorter renewal term would be appropriate.

Ms. Rubenstein suggested that the renewal term should be one or two years to allow for review.

Mr. Klofft said that if there are no changes to the number of dogs then he would consider a five-year renewal term. He had concerns about the noise additional dogs outside would produce.

Ms. Quirk asked whether any members of the public wished to comment.

Lida Armstrong, 379 Concord Road, said that she has used the facilities to board her dog and she noted that there was plenty of land available for the dogs and no close houses.

Laura Meier, 85 Carriage Way, said that to her knowledge she is not aware that the dogs bother anyone.

In the end the Board discussed increasing the maximum number of dogs to twenty, with a maximum of ten dogs allowed outside with appropriate supervision. The renewal term was set at one year.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. The hearing was closed.

The following motion was placed and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Tails By The Wayside, LLC, applicant, Richard J. & Heather C. Clement, owners of property, renewal of Special Permit 09-2, granted under the provisions of Section 2313 of the Zoning Bylaws, to operate a kennel on the premises, property located at 882 Boston Post Road, Wayside Inn Historic Preservation Zone, subject to the following:

1. The dogs do not become a nuisance.
2. The maximum number of dogs allowed on the property is twenty (20) boarding dogs plus a pet.
3. All boarding dogs must wear tags which identify the business.

4. Only ten (10) boarding dogs will be allowed outside at a time, under supervision, within the fenced-in area. This condition does not apply to the family pet.
5. Any complaints should be reported immediately to the Dog Officer.
6. Compost bin(s) shall be provided for disposal of dog waste. The number and capacity of the bin(s) shall be appropriate for the number of dogs. The composting system must be placed at least 100 feet from the property line.
7. In the event the shallow well is brought back into use, it shall be tested for nitrates and coliform bacteria within the terms of this permit, with results sent to the Board of Health Director.
8. No commercial activity consisting of breeding or sale of dogs will be allowed on the property.
9. No sign advertising the kennel will be allowed.
10. This permit is non-transferable and will expire in one year on March 7, 2012, and the Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date.”

VOTED: In favor: 4 Opposed: 0 Abstained: 1 (Gossels)

REASONS: The petitioner is requesting renewal of a Special Permit to operate a kennel on the premises. The Board finds that the petitioner has generally complied with the conditions of the permit. In addition, the premises were inspected by the Dog Officer who found no problems with the operation. Given that the number of dogs allowed has been increased, the Board finds that a one-year renewal period to be appropriate.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk

Jonathan G. Gossels

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Nancy G. Rubenstein

CASE 11-10
Susan Steele
11 Old Garrison Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 7, 2011

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; and Nancy G. Rubenstein

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on February 17 and February 24, 2011, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Susan Steele, applicant and owner of the property, was present to request a renewal of special permit 10-21 to conduct a home business, specifically for a therapeutic massage and alternate healing practice. Ms. Steele reported that the business was going well and there have been no complaints from any neighbors. At this point Ms. Steele was not planning any changes to business operations but asked for consideration in extending the renewal period for the special permit.

The Board then discussed that a five-year renewal term would be appropriate.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. No neighbors were present. The hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Susan Steele, applicant and owner of property, a renewal of Special Permit 10-21, granted under the provisions of Section 2340 of the Zoning Bylaws, to conduct a Home Business, specifically for a therapeutic massage and alternate healing practice, property located at 11 Old Garrison Road, Wayside Inn Historic Preservation Zone, subject to the following:

1. Hours of operation will be Monday-Saturday, 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.
2. All parking will be located in the driveway on the property. No on-street parking will be allowed.
3. No more than two client vehicles will be parked on the premises at any one time.
4. No more than one employee, other than the residents of the premises, will be allowed.
5. Any sign identifying the operation must comply with Section 3200 of the Sign Bylaw.
6. No more than five (5) clients per week, associated with this business will be allowed.

7. This permit is non-transferable and will expire in five (5) years on March 7, 2016, and the Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 (unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner seeks a renewal of a special permit for a therapeutic massage and alternate healing practice on the premises. The Board finds that the proposed operation satisfies the requirement for a Special Permit Home Business. It is in an appropriate location and does not exhibit any exterior indication of its presence. Adequate and appropriate facilities have been provided for proper operation. No abutters were present to oppose renewal. Therefore, the Board finds a five year renewable period to be appropriate for this case.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Nancy G. Rubenstein

CASE 11-11
Lida Armstrong and James P. Kelly
379 Concord Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, January 3, 2011

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; and Nancy G. Rubenstein.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on February 17 and February 24, 2011, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Lida Armstrong and James P. Kelly, applicants and owners of the property at 379 Concord Road, were present to request a Special Permit for a 936 square foot accessory dwelling unit. Ms. Armstrong said that the apartment has remained exactly as it was when they purchased the property. When they went to re-finance their home they discovered that the property was being taxed as a two-family residence. She said that the Building Inspector, Jim Kelly, suggested that they apply for a special permit for an accessory dwelling and therefore the property would be designated a single-family home.

Ms. Quirk and Mr. Gossels had both taken a look at the property from the roadway and said that the accessory dwelling was not visible from the street. Given that the accessory apartment was already in existence, had no impact on the exterior of the residence, and was only slightly over the allowed square footage, they said they felt comfortable granting the special permit.

No neighbors were present to comment on the proposal.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Lida Armstrong and James P. Kelly, applicants and owners of property, a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 5500 of the Zoning Bylaws in conformance with the application for the Special Permit dated February 8, 2011 and the plans submitted by the Applicants, to allow a 936 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit for property located at 379 Concord Road, Residential Zone C-1, as follows:

1. The Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be occupied by no more than four persons.
2. Adequate provision shall be made for the disposal of sewage, waste and drainage generated by the occupancy of the Accessory Dwelling Unit in accordance with all requirements of the Board of Health.

3. There shall be at least two off-street parking spaces for the principal dwelling unit and at least one off-street parking space for the Accessory Dwelling Unit.
4. The property owner shall file a sworn affidavit with the Town Clerk, with a copy to the Board of Appeals, certifying such occupancy is consistent with the Special Permit, every four (4) years.
5. This permit shall be recorded at the Middlesex South District Registry of Deeds prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory dwelling unit.
6. This permit will automatically terminate upon the sale, transfer, or other change in ownership of the principal dwelling unit.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner requires a Special Permit to allow a single-family accessory dwelling unit. The Board finds that the petitioner has fulfilled the requirements of the Bylaw for the granting of a Special Permit.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Nancy G. Rubenstein

CASE 11-12
Tucker Properties, LLC
81 Union Avenue

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 7, 2011

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; and Nancy G. Rubenstein.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on February 17 and February 24, 2011, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a use variance. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Jody Tucker was present on behalf of the property owner, Tucker Properties, LLC, to request a use variance to operate a retail business on land that is zoned industrial at 81 Union Avenue. Also present was Gray Baldwin of New England Garden Ornaments, the prospective tenant.

Mr. Klofft noted that the property has been previously used for a retail business.

The Board then went through the criteria for granting a use variance to see what was applicable.

In regard to Section 6220 of the Sudbury Zoning Bylaws Mr. Gossels felt that a retail use would be in general harmony with the bylaw. He questioned how the use variance would relate to Section 6131 which states that, "there must be special conditions relating to the soil conditions, shape, or topography of the land or structures thereon, and especially affecting the land or structures, but not affecting generally the zoning district in which the land is located."

Mr. Klofft suggested that perhaps this criteria was met because the structure that is already standing on the lot is essentially a retail structure and is not light industrial in nature. Mr. Gossels supported that concept as did Ms. Quirk. The board determined that the special condition in this case is that the existing building is designed for retail use because of the large plate glass windows, its close proximity to the road, the layout of the adjacent parking area, and its historical use as a retail operation.

Additionally the Board found that by issuing a use variance, in accordance with Sections 6133 and 6134 respectively, there would be no substantial detriment to the public good and no derogation from the intent or purpose of the bylaw. In regard to Section 6132 the substantial hardship for the owner would be finding a tenant for the building should the use variance not be granted.

In regard to the use variance criteria of Section 6140, the Board found that the conditions set forth by Section 6144 would best fit this case because the building is in good repair and its appearance is compatible with the vicinity. The Board also discussed the fact that since the building has been used for retail enterprises already, to deny a use variance would be unreasonable causing the owner a further hardship to renovate the facility for light industrial use.

The Board then discussed whether or not the use variance was subject to the limitations outlined in Sections 6145, 6146, and 6147. The Board found that allowing one retail business in the space meets Section 6145, which states, “the extent of the use nonconformity as to floor space, bulk, number of occupants or other relevant measure shall be no greater than the minimum necessary to provide relief from the statutory hardship.” As Section 6146 addresses restricted operations, including hours, noise, and level of activity, the Board felt that a retail use in this limited industrial area would be compatible. Because approval of the Use Variance was determined through Section 6144, then 6147 is not applicable.

No abutters were present to comment on or oppose the plan.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: “To grant Tucker Properties, LLC, applicant and property owner, a Use Variance, granted under the provisions of Section 2230, Appendix C, Use 11 of the Sudbury Zoning Bylaws to use the building and property for retail purposes, property located at 81 Union Avenue, Industrial District #2.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioners require a use variance to change the use of the property from an industrial use to a retail use. Given that the building has been used as a retail business in the past, the Board finds the proposed use reasonable and that it would not be detrimental to the neighborhood. The Board noted that no abutters were present at this hearing to oppose this petition.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk

Nancy G. Rubenstein

Jonathan G. Gossels

CASE 11-13
Nicholas and Candice Obraztsov
61 Lakewood Drive

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 7, 2011

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; and Nancy G. Rubenstein.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on February 17 and February 24, 2011, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a Special Permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Nicholas and Candice Obraztsov, applicants and owners, were present to request a Special Permit for demolition and reconstruction of their existing residence on a nonconforming lot that would exceed the area of the original structure at 61 Lakewood Drive.

Due to a clerical error the incorrect square footage was listed in the public hearing notice. The Board felt that the case should be re-noticed with the correct size listed. Ms. Quirk suggested that the applicants could withdraw their current application and could re-file a new application for a special permit with the Zoning Board to be discussed at the next scheduled public hearing. All filing fees would be waived.

Ms. Obraztsov then requested that the application for the Special Permit for demolition and reconstruction of their residence on a nonconforming lot be withdrawn without prejudice.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. The hearing was closed.

The following motion was placed and seconded:

MOTION: "To accept a request from the Applicants to withdraw Case 11-13 without prejudice."

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: Due to a clerical error in the public notification process which listed the incorrect size of the reconstruction, the application for Case 11-13 was withdrawn without prejudice.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Nancy G. Rubenstein

CASE 11-14
Peter Cramer and Ada Vassilovski
40 Singletary Lane

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 7, 2011

The Board consisted of:
Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; and
Nancy G. Rubenstein

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on February 17 and February 24, 2011, posted, mailed
and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit.
She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal
to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk,
and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Peter Cramer, applicant and owner of property located at 40 Singletary Lane, was present to request a
renewal of special permit 10-23 to raise chickens on the premises. Mr. Cramer said that he is not asking
for any changes to the conditions of the special permit except for an extension of the renewal period. He
reported that he has received positive reactions from his neighbors over the past year.

Ms. Rubenstein pointed to the fourth condition regarding screening and said that she felt that at present
there was not adequate vegetative screening as the coop is highly visible from the driveway. Mr. Cramer
said that he had planted several arborvitae and rhododendrons along the driveway and had hoped that they
would serve as adequate screening as they grew.

Mr. Gossels said that he had driven by the property and could not hear any noise from the coop, but he
too was surprised at how open the lot was. The Board then discussed that Mr. Cramer should add more
plantings to shield the area.

Ms. Quirk asked whether anyone from the public wished to comment.

Russ Kirby, 244 Boston Post Road, said that he felt that keeping chickens in Sudbury is a good idea. He
noted that the keeping of animals and chickens was common in Sudbury in the past and he feels that the
town has lost some of its agricultural character over the years, particularly among the young people. He
said that as long as the coop was properly cared for, and he has not seen evidence to the contrary, then he
urged the Board to consider renewing the special permit.

The Board then discussed that a five-year renewal term would be appropriate.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. No abutting neighbors were present. The
hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: “To grant Peter Cramer and Ada Vassilovski, applicants and owners of the property, a renewal of Special Permit 10-23, granted under the provisions of Section 2313 of the Zoning Bylaws, to raise chickens on the premises, property located at 40 Singletary Lane, Residential Zone A-1, subject to the following:

1. The chickens shall not become a nuisance.
2. The maximum number of chickens allowed on the property is twelve. No roosters shall be kept on the premises.
3. The chicken coop may be no greater than 6’x8’ in size. The total footprint will measure 10’x12’.
4. The chicken coop must be screened with vegetative screening along Windsor Road and between the coop and abutting property at 18 Windsor Road.
5. One low-watt light will be allowed in the chicken coop.
6. Composting of waste litter shall be allowed on-site, provided that odor does not become a nuisance.
7. No commercial activity consisting of the sale of eggs, chickens, or chicken products will be allowed on the property.
8. This permit is non-transferable and will expire in five (5) years on March 7, 2016, and the Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioners seek renewal of a special permit to raise chickens on the premises. The use is allowed in all districts by Special Permit from the Board of Appeals. The Board finds the use to be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Bylaw. The coop is situated in an appropriate location, is not be detrimental to the neighborhood, and its presence does not significantly alter the character of the zoning district. With the addition of more vegetative screening the coop should not be visible from Winsor Road and therefore will not be offensive to the neighboring properties. Adequate and appropriate facilities are provided for proper maintenance. The Board finds a five-year renewal period to be appropriate.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Nancy G. Rubenstein

CASE 11-15
Derek Acheson
82 Hemlock Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 7, 2011

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; and Nancy G. Rubenstein

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on February 17 and February 24, 2011, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Peter Cramer was present on behalf of Derek Acheson, applicant and owner of property located at 82 Hemlock Road, to request a renewal of special permit 10-22 to raise chickens on the premises. Mr. Cramer referenced a letter dated March 7, 2011 written by Mr. Acheson which the Board had in its possession. In the letter Mr. Acheson asked for permission to include a low-watt, electric light inside the coop so that the chickens could continue to produce eggs during the darker winter months. He said that the coop is screened on two sides by a six-foot tall stockade fence and so the light would not be highly visible to neighbors.

The Board agreed that a light could be added and did not feel that it would be a nuisance. They did not feel that there needed to be a restriction placed on the hours that the coop could be lit.

Ms. Quirk asked whether anyone from the public wished to comment.

The Board then discussed that a five-year renewal term would be appropriate.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. No abutting neighbors were present. The hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Derek Acheson, applicant and owner of the property, a renewal of Special Permit 10-22, granted under the provisions of Section 2313 of the Zoning Bylaws, to raise chickens on the premises, property located at 82 Hemlock Road, Residential Zone A-1, subject to the following:

1. The chickens shall not become a nuisance.
2. The maximum number of chickens allowed on the property is eight. No roosters shall be kept on the premises.
3. The chicken coop may be no greater than 8' x 4' x 5' in size.

4. The chicken coop must be screened with fencing.
5. One low-watt light will be allowed in the chicken coop.
6. Disposal of waste litter shall be off-site.
7. No commercial activity consisting of the sale of eggs, chickens, or chicken products will be allowed on the property.
8. This permit is non-transferable and will expire in five (5) years on March 7, 2016, and the Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner seeks renewal of a special permit to raise chickens on the premises. The use is allowed in all districts by Special Permit from the Board of Appeals. The Board finds the use to be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Bylaw. The coop is situated in an appropriate location, is not be detrimental to the neighborhood, and its presence does not significantly alter the character of the zoning district. Adequate and appropriate facilities are provided for proper maintenance. The Board finds a five-year renewal period to be appropriate.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Benjamin D. Stevenson, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Nancy G. Rubenstein