

\*\*\*\*\*

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

November 14, 2016

4:00 p.m.

The Perquimans County Board of Commissioners met in a SPECIAL CALLED MEETING on Monday, November 14, 2016, at 4:00 p.m. in the Upstairs Courtroom of the Perquimans County Courthouse Annex Building.

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Janice McKenzie Cole, Chair Kyle Jones, Vice Chairman  
Fondella Leigh Edward R. Muzzulin  
Wallace Nelson Matthew Peeler (Recused)
- MEMBERS ABSENT: None
- OTHERS PRESENT: Frank Heath, County Manager Mary Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board  
Hackney High, County Attorney

After the Chair called the meeting to order, Commissioner Nelson gave the invocation and the Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance. She gave instructions to the public and asked that they refrain from any public comments or display of emotion. If they could not comply, she would ask the Sheriff to remove them from the meeting.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP-16-01

Chair Cole opened the Special Called Meeting stating that the purpose of the meeting was to deliberate over the proposed Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-16-01, by Timbermill Wind, LLC, c/o Apex Clean Energy Holdings, LLC, for a Large Wind Energy Facility in the Bear Swamp and Centerhill Communities [to include Tax Parcel Nos. 3-003900011B; 3-0047-00001, -00002, -00014 and -00028; 3-0048-00001 and -00003; 3-0049-00009, -00024A, -00025, -00026, -00038 and -00039(part); 3-0058-00004(part), -00007 and -00013; and 3-0059-00012A(part)], and extending west into Chowan County. She said that she needed some direction from the Board regarding the process they would follow. There is a list of specific conditions that the Board needs to review and consider for a conditional use permit as set forth in the Section 907.27 of the Zoning Ordinance.

She said that we could (1) go over these specific conditions and then get to the final approval of the CUP considering the Section 903 Findings of the Zoning Ordinance; or (2) integrate the discussion on these individual conditions and the impact that it would be on the four conditions listed in Section 903 of the Zoning Ordinance. It was the consensus of the Board to proceed with incorporating the discussion of the conditions. The discussion went as follows:

**SPECIFIC CONDITIONS FOR REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION FOR A WIND ENERGY FACILITY AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 907.27 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE**

1. Does the proposed wind energy facility meet the RA zoning requirements for a large facility? Reviewing the application, Planning Board Minutes, and the Clarion Report, the Board agreed that this condition had been met by the Applicant.
2. Does the permit application and evidence for a Wind Energy Facility submitted by Timbermill contain the required items set forth in 907.27B(1)? The Board discussed each of the following items and determined that this condition had been met by the Applicant with some further discussion on possible additional conditions to satisfy item f.
  - a. Does the permit application and evidence contain a narrative describing the proposed wind energy facility, including an overview of the project? *Citing page 3 of the narrative and Clarion report, the Board agreed that it did.*
  - b. Does the permit application and evidence contain the proposed total rated capacity of the wind energy facility? *Again, citing page 3 of the narrative, the Board agreed that it did.*
  - c. Does the permit application and evidence contain the proposed number, representative types of height or range of heights of wind turbines to be constructed, including their rated capacity, dimensions and respective manufacturers, and a description of ancillary facilities? *Citing pages 3 and 4 of the narrative, the Board agreed that it did.*
  - d. Does the permit application and evidence contain the identification and location of the property or properties on which the proposed wind energy facility will be located? *Citing the Clarion report and Section 4 of application, the Board agreed that it did.*
  - e. Does the permit application and evidence contain a site plan showing the planned location of all wind turbines, property lines, setback lines, access roads, substation(s), electrical cabling from the wind energy facility to be substation(s), ancillary equipment, building(s), transmission and distribution lines? (The site plan must also include the location of all occupied buildings, residences, and other features sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the setbacks required by the ordinance.)? *Citing Section 18 of the application and updated information in Exhibit 2, Tab 3 of Don Giecek's testimony, the Board agreed that it did.*
  - f. Does the permit application and evidence contain any environmental assessment(s) required by state or Federal law? *Commissioner Leigh had some questions about this item. The Board cited David Phillips and Tracy Butler's testimony and the Clarion report. There was some questions about the required reports during their cross examination about reports not being available prior to receiving the CUP approval. Commissioner Nelson made a comment regarding the fact that there would be some permits that would be there or might not be there prior to the approval of the CUP. Mr. Nelson further stated that, without considering a more detailed plan, certain state and Federal permits would not be required until after the CUP is approved. Commissioner Jones agreed with Mr. Nelson and feels that, to the extent that they can obtain permitting, the applicant has done that. Commissioner Leigh said that this discussion cleared some questions she had about this requirement. Mr. Nelson further stated that this may not be the time that the Board needed to discuss adding something that may require the applicant to do to better satisfy this condition. Mr. Muzzulin concurred with these comments. Chair Cole stated that it looks like the Board agrees that this has been completed but feels that additional conditions may be required. Therefore, the Board agreed that it did but will discuss further requirements later if the CUP is approved.*
  - g. Does the permit application and evidence contain decommissioning plans that describe the anticipated life of the wind energy facility, the estimated decommissioning costs in current dollars, the salvage value of the equipment, and the anticipated manner in which the wind energy facility will be decommissioned and the site restored? *Citing Kendra Kalevig-Childers' testimony and Exhibits 24/25 Tab 5, the Board felt that this condition has been met.*
  - h. Does the permit application and evidence contain documentation of agreement between participating landowners and the applicant, facility owner, or operator? *Reviewing Tab 7 of application and Exhibit 19, the Board felt that this has been met.*
  - i. Does the permit application and evidence contain the signature of the applicant? *Per Tab 1 of the application, the Board feels that this condition has been met.*
  - j. Does the permit application and evidence provide for the establishment of an escrow account in the name of Perquimans County in the amount set forth by the Board of County Commissioners in separate fee schedules? *Citing the Clarion report, the Board agreed that this condition has been met.*
3. Does the permit application and evidence meet the setback requirements for a large facility set forth in 907.27B(4)? Reviewing Exhibit 9, Tab 18 and Tracy Butler's testimony, the Board agreed that this condition had been met by the Applicant.

4. Does the permit application and evidence meet the requirement in 907.27B(5)(a) that audible sound from a large wind energy facility shall not exceed fifty-five (55) dBA, as measured at any occupied building or residence on the property of a non-participating landowner? Clarion report did mention that it was their opinion that the information was included in the application. Reviewing Mark Bastasch (Timbermill Exhibits 12-18) and Robert Rand's (Opposition Exhibits 7-10) testimony, the Board agreed that they were accepted as experts witnesses in their field so Chair Cole began by comparing their qualifications. With regard to qualifications, Mr. Bastasch had better qualifications than Mr. Rand. Commissioner Nelson said that Mr. Bastasch gave compelling testimony and was not impressed that there was no solid proof that there would not be any side effects with the noise from the turbines. Mr. Nelson further stated that he was not impressed with Mr. Rand's testimony. There were some questions about his co-author. He just has some concerns about the accuracy of Mr. Rand's testimony. He feels that the applicant did comply with this condition. Commissioner Muzzulin agreed. Chair Cole also said that she had problems with Mr. Rand's testimony and his demeanor during his testimony. Commissioner Leigh felt that Mr. Bastasch's testimony was more concrete. It was the consensus of the Board that the applicant satisfied this condition.
5. Does the permit application and evidence meet the requirement in 907.27B(5)(b) that shadow flicker on any occupied building or residence on a non-participating landowner's property caused by a large wind energy facility must not exceed thirty (30) hours per year? Chair Cole said that this was covered under Mark Bastasch and Robert Rand's testimony. Commissioner Nelson made several comments and said that he would like to consider a condition to use available technology to cut off the turbines during heavy shadow flickering times on non-participant properties and feels that the Perquimans County Land Use Plan supports this condition. Commissioners Muzzulin stated that this report is based on the wind turbines operating continuously. With the cloud cover today, there would be no shadow flicker. He closed his remarks with stating that he would also like to see an additional condition to address this issue. Commissioner Leigh concurred with Commissioner Nelson to add a condition to cut off turbines during heavy shadow flickering times on non-participant properties. Chair Cole said that the Board would come back to address these issues after they had completed their review of the other conditions. They do feel that they met the burden of proof but would like additional conditions.
6. Does the permit application and evidence meet the installation and design requirements set forth in 970.27B(6)? Citing Tracy Butler's testimony, the Board feels that the applicant has satisfied this condition.
7. Does the permit application and evidence meet the decommissioning requirements set forth in 907.B(7)? Upon reviewing Kendra Kalevig-Childers' testimony and her exhibits, the Board feels that this condition has been satisfied.
8. Does the permit application and evidence contain a **Noise Evaluation Report** for each of the proposed wind turbine locations and any alternative wind turbine locations at the proposed site any alternative sites in accordance with the noise control regulations established by the Perquimans County Zoning Regulations? The Board discussed each of the following items and determined that this condition had been met by the Applicant.
  - a. Does the Noise Evaluation Report contain a detailed description of the potential noise levels that would be generated by the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and any alternative sites (*Tab 9, Mark Bastasch's Exhibits 15 & 16 – complies to this condition*), including, but not limited to, existing sound levels at the proposed site and any alternative sites, projected sound levels to be generated by the operation of the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines (*Mark Bastasch's Exhibit 16 – complies to this condition*), the methodology used to monitor and evaluate sound levels (*Mark Bastasch's Exhibit 16 – complies to this condition*), the wind turbine manufacturer's technical documentation of the noise emission characteristics of the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines (*Mark Bastasch's testimony – Where available, the applicant complies to this condition*), and an analysis of compliance with the noise control regulations established by Perquimans County (*Mark Bastasch's testimony – complies to this condition*)?
  - b. Does the Noise Evaluation Report contain calculations in accordance with the noise control regulations established by Perquimans County for the projected maximum cumulative sound levels generated when the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines are in operation at the proposed site and any alternative sites measured at nearest existing occupied building, project maximum day-time and night-time sound levels generated when the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines are in operation measured at the nearest occupied building, and projected maximum levels of infrasonic sound, ultrasonic sound, impulsive noise and prominent discrete tones generated when the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines are in operation at the proposed site and any alternative sites measured at the nearest occupied building? *Citing Exhibit 14 and Exhibit 16 beginning on page 2, the Board agreed that the condition has been satisfied.*
  - c. Does the Noise Evaluation Report contain a study area map for the proposed site and any alternative sites depicting the noise analysis study area radius, site boundaries, sound level monitoring locations and nearest occupied building? *Citing Exhibit 15 and Tab 9 of the application, the Board agreed that it did.*
  - d. Does the Noise Evaluation Report contain an identification of any potential mitigation measures to minimize sound levels at the nearest occupied building, including, but not limited to, utilization of best practical noise control measures in accordance with the Perquimans County Zoning Regulations? *According to Mark Bastasch's August 24<sup>th</sup> testimony on page 131 line 23-24, there are none needed so the Board agreed that they have satisfied this condition.*

At this moment of the meeting, the Board discussed the testimony of Mark Bastasch, Timbermill witness, and Robert Rand, Opposition witness. Commissioner Jones felt that Mr. Bastasch's testimony was competent and felt that Mr. Rand's testimony could not rebut it. Commissioner Nelson agreed that Mr. Bastasch's testimony was more compelling and Mr. Rand's testimony was not compelling at all. Commissioner Muzzulin agreed. Commissioner Leigh said that Mr. Bastasch's testimony was more sound and concrete. Commissioner Jones referred to a tweet from Mr. Rand, not entered into evidence, where he stated that he was baffled that no public health agency in the U.S. has contacted him about the wind turbine motion sickness. This image caused Mr. Jones not to give as much weight to Mr. Rand's testimony as he would have Mr. Bastasch's testimony. Chair Cole said that Mr. Bastasch was cross-examined about the amplitude modulation, the whoosh, whoosh sound, but that was a rare happening. There being no other comments, the Board move to condition No. 9.
9. Does the permit application and evidence contain in **Ice Drop and Ice Throw Evaluation Report** for each of the proposed wind turbine locations and any alternative wind turbine locations at the proposed site any alternative sites? Citing Robert O'Neal's testimony including Tab 10/11, Exhibits 27/28, and the discussion of each of the following items, the Board determined that this condition had been met by the Applicant. Commissioner Nelson stated that he believes that the evidence provided the Board was credible. He said that, if his memory is correct, the maximum ice throw was 1235 feet and the nearest occupied dwelling is 1943 feet. The maximum blade throw was 742 feet and the nearest occupied dwelling is 1943 feet. He did ask that we need to set an additional condition to state that, to mitigate any ice throw or blade throw onto a non-participating property, it needs to remove any wind turbine within 1300 feet of any non-participating property owner. This is allowed by the Perquimans County Land Use Plan. This would be another item to come back to after our deliberation.
  - a. Does the Ice Drop and Ice Throw Evaluation Report contain a detailed description of the conditions at the proposed site and any alternative sites that may cause ice to be dropped or ice to be thrown, or both, from the wind turbine blades of the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines, the methodology used to evaluate and assess the risk of ice drop or ice throw, or both, and the wind turbine manufacturer's technical documentation relating to recommended ice drop and ice throw setback distances and installed ice monitoring devices and sensors? *Citing Robert O'Neal's testimony including Exhibit 28, page 2, the Board agreed that the condition has been satisfied. With regard to the technical documentation, that would be included on the bottom of page 1 of Exhibit 28. Thus, the Board agreed that the condition has been satisfied.*
  - b. Does the Ice Drop and Ice Throw Evaluation Report contain calculations in feet of the maximum distance that ice could be dropped from the wind turbine blades for each proposed wind turbine and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and any alternative sites when the wind turbines are stationary and calculations in feet of the maximum distance that ice could be thrown from the wind turbine blades for each proposed wind turbine and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and any alternative sites when the wind turbines are in operation? *According to Exhibit 29 – pages 3-4, the maximum distance for ice drop would be 900 feet and the maximum distance for ice throw would be 1235 feet. Therefore, the Board agreed that the condition has been satisfied.*

- c. Does the Ice Drop and Ice Throw Evaluation Report contain a study area map for the proposed site and any alternative sites depicting the ice throw study area radius, site boundaries and locations where ice could be dropped or locations where ice could be thrown from the wind turbine blades, or both, of each proposed wind turbine and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and any alternative sites when the wind turbines are stationary and in operation? *According to Exhibit 29, Epsilon Figure 1 and Tab 11 of the application, the Board feels that this condition has been satisfied.*
- d. Does the Ice Drop and Ice Throw Evaluation Report contain an identification of any potential mitigation measures to minimize the risk, occurrence and impact of ice drop or ice throw, or both, from the wind turbine blades of each of the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines, including, but not limited to automatic and remote manual shutdown of the wind turbines? *Citing Exhibit 28 – page 4, second paragraph, the Board agreed that this condition was satisfied.*
10. **Does the permit application and evidence contain a Blade Drop and Blade Throw Evaluation Report for each of the proposed wind turbine locations and any alternative wind turbine locations at the proposed site any alternative sites?** Chair Cole stated that this falls along the line of the Ice Drop and Ice Throw Evaluation Report. Again, citing Robert O’Neal’s testimony, Exhibits 27 and discussing the following issues, the Board determined that this condition was satisfied with additional language that might need to be added.
- a. Does the Blade Drop and Blade Throw Evaluation Report contain a detailed description of the conditions at the proposed site and any alternative sites that may cause blade to be dropped or blade to be thrown, or both, from the wind turbine blades of the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines, the methodology used to evaluate and assess the risk of blade drop or blade throw, or both, and the wind turbine manufacturer’s technical documentation relating to recommended blade drop and blade throw setback distances and installed blade monitoring devices and sensors? *Citing Robert O’Neal’s testimony including Exhibit 27, the Board agreed that the condition has been satisfied.*
- b. Does the Blade Drop and Blade Throw Evaluation Report contain calculations in feet of the maximum distance that blade could be dropped from the wind turbine blades for each proposed wind turbine and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and any alternative sites when the wind turbines are stationary and calculations in feet of the maximum distance that blade could be thrown from the wind turbine blades for each proposed wind turbine and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and any alternative sites when the wind turbines are in operation? *According to Epsilon Report pages 4-5, the Board agreed that the condition has been satisfied.*
- c. Does the Blade Drop and Blade Throw Evaluation Report contain a study area map for the proposed site and any alternative sites depicting the blade throw study area radius, site boundaries and locations where blade could be dropped or locations where blade could be thrown from the wind turbine blades, or both, of each proposed wind turbine and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and any alternative sites when the wind turbines are stationary and in operation? *According to Robert O’Neal’s testimony, the Board feels that this condition has been satisfied.*
- d. Does the Blade Drop and Blade Throw Evaluation Report contain an identification of any potential mitigation measures to minimize the risk, occurrence and impact of blade drop or blade throw, or both, from the wind turbine blades of each of the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines, including, but not limited to automatic and remote manual shutdown of the wind turbines? *According to Robert O’Neal’s testimony, the Board agreed that this condition was satisfied.*

At this moment of the meeting, Chair Cole asked the Board if they had any further comments or discussion on Robert O’Neal’s testimony. There being none, she moved on to condition No. 11.

11. **Does the permit application and evidence contain a Shadow Flicker Evaluation Report for each of the proposed wind turbine locations and any alternative wind turbine locations at the proposed site any alternative sites?** The Board discussed each of the following items and reviewed Mark Bastasch and Robert Rand’s testimony. The Board agreed that this condition has been satisfied with the addition of a condition mentioned earlier.
- a. Does the Shadow Flicker Evaluation Report contain a detailed description of the conditions of the potential shadow-flicker producing features of each of the proposed wind turbines and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and any alternative site, including, but not limited to, an analysis of conditions that may cause shadow flicker, the methodology used to evaluate shadow flicker and the manufacturer’s technical documentation relating to shadow flicker, if available. *The Board agreed that this condition has been satisfied.*
- b. Does the Shadow Flicker Evaluation Report contain calculations from each proposed wind turbine and any alternative wind turbines at the proposed site and alternative sites to each off-site occupied structure location within a one-mile radius, include, but not limited to, the following: (A) Distance in feet; (B) Shadow length and intensity; (C) Shadow flicker frequency; (D) Specific times shadow flicker is predicted to occur; and (E) Duration of Shadow flicker measured in total annual hours? *Information located behind Tab 8 provided sufficient evidence to allow the Board to agree that this condition was satisfied.*
- c. Does the Shadow Flicker Evaluation Report contain a study area map of the propose site and any alternative sites depicting the shadow flicker analysis study area radius, the site boundaries, locations of the proposed wind turbines and locations of any alternative wind turbines, locations of off-site occupied structures, and areas of shadow flicker occurrence identified according to total annual hours? *Information located behind Tab 8, Figure 1 provided sufficient evidence to allow the Board to agree that this condition was satisfied.*
- d. Does the Shadow Flicker Evaluation Report contain an identification of potential mitigation measures to minimize the impact of shadow flicker, including, but not limited to, vegetation, screening and fence construction? *Information located behind Tab 8, paragraph 8 provided sufficient evidence to allow the Board to agree that this condition was satisfied.*

At this time, Chair Cole requested a break in the meeting until 6:20 p.m.

After the break, Chair Cole returned to discussing the general conditions for review and consideration for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in Section 903 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**GENERAL CONDITIONS FOR REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 903 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE**

- That the use will not materially endanger the public health or safety, if located according to the plan submitted and approved.** *According to the testimony of Tracy Butler – design & setbacks; Robert O’Neal – Ice Drop/Ice Throw & Blade Drop/Blade Throw; Mark Bastasch – sound & shadow flicker; Kendra Childers – decommissioning; Christopher Ollson – environmental & health issues; and Robert Rand – sound, shadow flicker, and health issues, the Board agreed by a vote of five (5) to zero (0) that this finding was satisfied.*
- That the use meets all required conditions and specifications.** *After reviewing the above Specific Conditions as set forth in Section 907.27 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Board agreed by a vote of five (5) to (0) that this finding was satisfied.*
- That the use will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property, or that the use is a public necessity.** *The testimony of Charles Moody and Mike McCann provided the evidence needed to evaluate this finding. Commissioner Nelson had concerns about the testimony and analysis used by Mr. Moody. Specifically, Commissioner Nelson found that Mr. Moody used a faulty assumption that people in the community were aware of the project in 2013 and 2014. Commissioner Nelson concluded that the applicant did not meet its burden on this factor. Commissioner Nelson also found that the expert testimony of Mr. McCann followed a more logical approach than that utilized by Mr. Moody. Commissioner Jones stated that both experts had a difficult task. Commissioner Jones did not find the testimony of Mr. McCann to be as credible as the testimony of Mr. Moody. Commissioner Leigh did not find Mr. Moody’s testimony to be very convincing. Commissioner Leigh concluded that the testimony and report offered by Mr. McCann contained more information and was more credible on the issue. Commissioner Muzzulin was not impressed with either Mr. Moody or Mr. McCann but concluded that the applicant met its burden on this issue. Chair Cole agreed with Commissioner Muzzulin that both Mr. Moody and Mr. McCann were poor witnesses. Chair Cole specifically concluded that Mr. McCann was not a credible witness on the issue. Chair Cole found that Mr.*

*Moody had more experience in North Carolina and was satisfied enough with Mr. Moody's testimony to conclude that the applicant met its burden. Three members of the Board voted that the applicant met its burden on this issue. Commissioners Nelson and Leigh voted in the negative finding that the applicant failed to meet its burden on this issue.*

- 4. **That the location and character of the use, if developed according to the plan is submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located and in general conformity with the Perquimans County Land Use Plan.** *The Board has discussed all the witnesses except for John Hecklau. Commissioner Jones said that he was surprised to find that a large portion of his information was from Chowan County. He did not give that information a lot of weight. He further stated that he took note of Ms. Scaff, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Elliott's testimony on how they currently use their property and the character and use of their property and that their evidence was compelling. Based on all of the evidence presented, Commissioner Jones concluded that the project would not be in harmony of the area in which it is to be located. Commissioner Nelson spoke on the harmony component and considering where a good percentage of these wind farms are located in rural agricultural areas. This suggests to him that wind farms are permitted usages for these properties. He further spoke to the fact that a prior board approved the Amazon Wind Project to be in harmony with the Perquimans County Land Use Plan. Commissioner Muzzulin and Chair Cole concluded that this project would satisfy this finding. Four members of the Board voted that the applicant met its burden on this issue with Commissioner Jones voting in the negative finding that the applicant failed to meet its burden on this issue.*

**CLOSED SESSION: CONSULTATION WITH ATTORNEY**

Pursuant to NCGS #143-318.11(3), Edward R. Muzzulin made a motion to go into Closed Session to consult with their attorney. The motion was seconded by Fondella A. Leigh and unanimously approved by the Board.

The Closed Session was adjourned and the Special Called Meeting reconvened on motion made by Edward R. Muzzulin, seconded by Wallace E. Nelson.

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CUP-16-01**

As a result of the Board's previous action, Kyle Jones made a motion to deny the Conditional Use Permit No. 16-01 for a large scale wind farm project because the applicant has not met his burden on all of the General and Specific Conditions of the Zoning Ordinance. The motion was seconded by Fondella A. Leigh. The motion was approved by a vote of three (3) to two (2) with Commissioners Cole and Muzzulin voting against the motion. Chair Cole asked if anyone wanted to be heard regarding the motion. Commissioner Jones said that he would defer his comments until November 21, 2016.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further comments or business to discuss, the Special Called Meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m. on motion made by Edward R. Muzzulin, seconded by Fondella A. Leigh.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Janice McKenzie Cole, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk to the Board

\* \* \* \* \*