

**CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
MEETING
MAY 25, 2011**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Stevens, Chairman
Kate Albers, Charles Council, Carol Perry,
Vic Poitras, Gloria Sepanik, Ed Viola

MEMBERS ABSENT: Norman Ashworth

OTHERS PRESENT: Teri Tubbs, Zoning Official; David Levin, City Attorney; Randy Wright, Dawn Lewis, Maricela Perdomo, Code Compliance Officers; Lisa Hannon, Zoning Coordinator; David McCarty, Code Compliance Coordinator; Herbert Remer, Mark Draper, Mr. Montague

CALL TO ORDER/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Roll Call
- B. Next Scheduled Meeting – June 22, 2011

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Meeting of April 27, 2011
 - Mr. Council MOVED, Mr. Viola SECONDED approval of the April 27, 2011 minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW BUSINESS

- Mr. Stevens provided a detailed review of hearing procedures, explaining the Board had no authority to change existing laws but rather was charged with enforcing same.
- Recording Secretary Kelly swore in all participants.
- A. Request for Re-hearing
 - 11-42883 – CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER – RANDY WRIGHT
 - Respondent: Brandsource, Inc.
 - Pursuant to Florida Statutes, Title XI, Chapter 162, Sections 162.06(4) and 162.09(2)(a), for an irreversible and irreparable violation of the Punta Gorda Code, Chapter 26, Section 26-11.6(c); and Chapter 26, Section 26-11.2(g); and Chapter 26, Section 26-11.8(d)(2), Placing numerous non-permitted signs in the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Stevens confirmed the respondent was not present.
 - Ms. Teri Tubbs, Zoning Official, announced the Board had imposed a \$1,500 fine against both Florida Championship Wrestling (FCW) and Brandsource, Inc. at their April 27, 2011 meeting. She advised the owner of Brandsource had since informed staff they were only the sign printer, they did not have a contract with FCW nor did they participate in any hanging of the signs but rather had simply sold same to FCW. She

explained Brandsource had requested their name be removed from the Board's fine order, expressing no objection to same.

- City Attorney David Levin added staff had been unaware of the involvement of Brandsource at the time the violation was alleged. He acknowledged sign printers typically included their name on any product which they produced. He noted Brandsource indicated they had mailed a written request to be removed from the case prior to the previous hearing; however, staff had not received same in a timely manner. He requested a dismissal of the case and a rescinding of the fine against Brandsource.
- Ms. Sepanik confirmed the fine and order would stand against FCW.
- Ms. Perry confirmed the City had received no response from FCW.
- Ms. Sepanik MOVED, Mr. Viola SECONDED to dismiss the case and rescind the fine against Brandsource, Inc. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. 11-43047 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - RANDY WRIGHT

Respondent: Herbert I. & Maryanne M. Remer

Address of Violation: 4099 San Massimo Drive

Violation of Chapter 26, Section 26-8.26; and Chapter 26, Section 26-8.14(b), Plastic storage container located on the side of the house.

- Mr. Herbert Remer, respondent, entered a plea of not guilty.
- Mr. Randy Wright, Code Compliance Officer, submitted into the record several photographs of the subject property, located within City limits, stating on April 5, 2011, he observed a Rubbermaid type container stored beside the home. He announced a Notice of Violation/Order for Corrective Action was issued and subsequently received by the respondent on April 7, 2011, noting same required removal of the container within 5 days of receipt. He continued the container remained in place as of an April 12, 2011 inspection; thus, an Affidavit of Violation/Notice of Hearing was issued and received by the respondent on April 22, 2011. He concluded the violation remained as of May 24, 2011.
- City Attorney Levin asked Mr. Wright to clarify the alleged violations.
- Mr. Wright explained the container was considered outside storage, which was not permitted in any Special Residential Overlay (SRO) zoning district.
- Mr. Poitras clarified the container was located against the rear of the house.
- Mr. Council asked if any types of outside storage were permitted by City Code.
- Mr. Wright replied playground equipment, generators and pool equipment were allowed.

- City Attorney Levin clarified the specific nature of the violation, stating the container was located within a required side yard setback.
- Ms. Sepanik MOVED, Mr. Poitras SECONDED the City had presented a prima facie case. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Mr. Remer submitted into the record two photographs, thanking the Board for this opportunity. He stated the container was not visible from the front or side of the house but rather was only visible from the rear, adding it would not be visible at all except for a nearby vacant lot. He noted the container had been in the same position since prior to Hurricane Charley in 2004 and was neither damaged nor dislocated as a result; thus, it was very secure. He stated he understood dock boxes were allowed and had been traditionally permitted, adding he confirmed same with the City; however, no ordinance specifically addressed same. He advised numerous dock boxes were located through the City. He continued dock boxes were not defined anywhere in City Code nor were their required locations specified. He displayed a photograph of the container as seen from the street which fronted the above mentioned vacant lot, noting its close proximity to his boat and dock. He concluded nothing in the City Code prohibited him from having a dock box or dictating its location and/or proximity to the dock.
- City Attorney Levin expressed sympathy with Mr. Remer, acknowledging some instances of outside storage were quite unsightly, which was not the case on the subject property; however, City Code was very specific as to its prohibition of outside storage. He noted the ordinance did not differentiate between aesthetically pleasing and unsightly types of storage, adding the validity and wording of the ordinance was not within this Board's jurisdiction. He agreed the City had a recognition of customary uses on docks for equipment storage, stating dock boxes were customarily permissible on docks; however, they were not permitted to be located within required yard setbacks. He pointed out City Council had not issued a blanket exception relative to the location of dock boxes. He summarized this was a clear violation of the literal terms of City Code as same related to storage in the SRO, which had heightened, aesthetic, appearance restrictions; thus, unless and/or until City Council modified the ordinance to allow for attractive, outside storage containers within the required setback, this was a clear violation of City Code.
- Ms. Sepanik clarified dock boxes were allowed, albeit not within required setbacks.
- City Attorney Levin advised dock boxes were addressed in Chapter 6 of the City Code, which included language such as "on the water side of seawalls."

- Mr. Remer interjected City Attorney Levin was quoting an authority he did not have as there was no ordinance which addressed dock boxes.
- City Attorney Levin responded the Zoning Official had traditionally recognized the ability to have dock storage, acknowledging “dock boxes” did not appear in Section 6–7 of the City Code provision; however, he pointed out the absurdity of interpreting same to read dock boxes were prohibited. He then read into the record a portion of Section 6–7 regarding the responsibility of residents, noting it was reasonable to associate dock boxes with docks.
- Mr. Stevens noted the respondent was not charged with violation of Chapter 6.
- City Attorney Levin agreed, explaining he was simply responding to Mr. Remer. He clarified if the subject container was located on the respondent’s dock, Mr. Remer’s argument would have merit.
- Discussion ensued with regard to City Code language as same related to dock boxes.
- Ms. Sepanik asked if the Board could recommend City Council revisit the applicable section of City Code.
- City Attorney Levin suggested the Board allow the respondent 30 days to come into compliance, thus providing Mr. Remer the opportunity to approach City Council with a request for an ordinance amendment.
- Mr. Remer responded he would be leaving the area in one week and would not return until after the summer, stating a 30 day time period would be very inconvenient.
- City Attorney Levin recommended the respondent relocate the container until he returned to the area, at which time he could address City Council.
- Mr. Remer requested he be allowed to maintain the container in its current position until City Council made their decision.
- Mr. Poitras explained existing law prohibited the container in its current location.
- Ms. Perry MOVED, Mr. Poitras SECONDED to find the respondent guilty, to issue a Cease & Desist Order for any future violations and to require the violation to be eliminated within 30 days of receipt of the Order subject to a fine of up to \$250 per day.
- Mr. Council commented relocation of the container would not impose irreparable harm on the respondent.
- VOTING AYE: Albers, Council, Perry, Poitras, Sepanik, Viola.
- VOTING NAY: Stevens.
- MOTION CARRIED.

Note: Items C, D and E were heard following Items F and G.

C. 11-42849 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - DAWN LEWIS

Respondent: Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

Address of Violation: 270 Delido Court

Violation of Chapter 9A, Section 9A-17, Failure to submit a Distressed Real Property Registration Form.

- Mr. Stevens noted the respondent was not present, confirming there was no objection to entering a not guilty plea on their behalf.
- Ms. Dawn Lewis, Code Compliance Officer, attested to her April 15, 2011 Affidavit of Violation and Notice of Hearing, as delineated in the agenda material. She further adopted the findings of fact presented in the aforementioned Affidavit as her testimony this date.
- Ms. Sepanik MOVED, Ms. Albers SECONDED the City had presented a prima facie case. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Mr. Council MOVED, Mr. Poitras SECONDED to find the respondent guilty, to issue a Cease & Desist Order for any future violations and to require the property to be brought into compliance within 7 days of receipt of the Order subject to a fine of up to \$250 per day. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. 11-42914 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - MARICELA PERDOMO

Respondent: Susan D. Temple

Address of Violation: 312 Durrance Street

Violation of Chapter 9A, Section 9A-12(d), Unlicensed vehicle.

- Mr. Stevens noted the respondent was not present, confirming there was no objection to entering a not guilty plea on her behalf.
- Ms. Maricela Perdomo, Code Compliance Officer, submitted into the record several photographs of the subject property, located within City limits, and of the alleged violation, stating on March 15, 2011, she observed an unlicensed vehicle parked in the driveway. She noted she advised the respondent, Ms. Susan Temple, the vehicle must be registered or removed from the property within 10 days, adding Ms. Temple had expressed her understanding of the applicable portion of City Code. She further stated Ms. Temple had mentioned the vehicle was also in need of some repairs. She announced as of an April 5, 2011, inspection, no corrective action had been taken; thus, a Notice of Violation was issued and subsequently received by the respondent on April 7, 2011. She continued the violation remained unchanged as of an April 14, 2011 re-inspection. She concluded an Affidavit of Violation/Notice of Hearing were

issued and received by the respondent on April 16, 2011, confirming the violation remained as of May 24, 2011, and displaying a photograph attesting to this fact.

- Ms. Sepanik MOVED, Ms. Albers SECONDED the City had presented a prima facie case. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Mr. Poitras MOVED, Ms. Albers SECONDED to find the respondent guilty, to issue a Cease & Desist Order for any future violations and to require the property to be brought into compliance within 7 days of receipt of the Order subject to a fine of up to \$250 per day. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

E. 10-40995 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - RANDY WRIGHT

Respondent: Celtic Ray Pub, LLC
c/o Kevin Doyle

Address of Violation: 145 East Marion Avenue

Violation of Chapter 26, Section 26-10.1; and Chapter 26, Section 26-10.2(d); and Chapter 9A, Section 9A-9(g), Safety bollards not installed in the parking lot.

- Mr. Wright requested a continuance to the Board's next meeting.
- Mr. Viola MOVED, Ms. Perry SECONDED to continue Case #10-40995 to the Board's next meeting. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Note: Items F and G were heard following Item B.

F. 11-42793 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - MARICELA PERDOMO

Respondents: National Employee Leasing Agents, Inc.
C2C Schools, LLC

Address of Violation: 115 West Olympia Avenue

Violation of Chapter 26, Sections 26-17.5(c) and 26-11.2(g), Signs installed without obtaining a permit.

- Mr. Mark Draper stated he was an attorney representing Mr. Robert Gomes, respondent. He then entered a plea of not guilty on behalf of Mr. Gomes. He noted he and Ms. Perdomo had discussed a continuance of this hearing for at least 30 days; however, he advised he would proceed in accordance with the City's wishes.
- Ms. Perdomo submitted into the record several photographs of the subject property, located within City limits, stating on March 4, 2011, she received a complaint relative to the signs depicted in the displayed photographs. She confirmed the photographs provided a true and accurate portrayal of the violation, explaining the sign had been installed without first being permitted, adding due to a change in use, she directed the respondent to contact Ms. Lisa Hannon, Zoning Coordinator, to clarify sign permit requirements. She announced no application had been submitted as of April 20, 2011,

nor had any corrective actions been taken; thus, a Notice of Violation was issued via certified mail and received on April 29, 2011, by Ms. Tamra Gomes, requiring either the signs' removal or proper permitting. She continued an April 20, 2011 inspection found the violation unchanged. She stated on May 19, 2011, Mr. Draper advised a sign contractor had been retained but had failed to obtain the required permit. She summarized the sign had been removed as of May 24, 2011; however, the base of the sign remained in place but must be removed, and the area painted and/or maintained. She stated Mr. Draper was present to request adequate time to pull a sign permit or complete the necessary maintenance.

- Ms. Sepanik questioned the amount of time necessary to pull a sign permit.
- Ms. Hannon estimated same at roughly seven days provided the application was complete.
- Ms. Albers MOVED, Ms. Sepanik SECONDED the City had presented a prima facie case. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Mr. Draper explained his client, Mr. Gomes, paid a sign contractor an amount which had been purported to include a permit fee, adding Mr. Gomes had been led to believe the sign complied with City Code; however, he and Mr. Gomes had since learned the sign contractor had other complaints filed against him. He stated the sign contractor had been effectively persuaded to remove the non-compliant sign and to ensure all permitting was secured prior to installation of another sign. He commented he and Mr. Gomes were cautiously optimistic but not convinced. He requested Mr. Gomes be allowed 30 days to achieve compliance.
- Ms. Sepanik MOVED, Ms. Perry SECONDED to continue Case #11-42793 to the Board's next meeting. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

G. 11-42649 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - MARICELA PERDOMO

Respondent: Virginia Montague Trustee

Address of Violation: 2835 West Marion Avenue

Violation of Chapter 26, Section 26-8.11(a), More than 20% percent of the roof is discolored and mildewed; and Chapter 26, Section 26-8.11(c), Wild overgrowth of plants, weeds and underbrush in the rear of the property; and Chapter 26, Section 26-8.11(e), Dead and dying palm fronds on the palm trees.

- Mr. Montague entered a plea of not guilty.
- Ms. Perdomo submitted into the record several photographs of the subject property, located within City limits, stating on February 18, 2011, she observed the violations depicted on same. She noted Exhibits 1 through 5, as delineated in the agenda

material, accurately depicted the conditions at that time, adding a 21 day Courtesy Notice was issued. She stated Mr. Montague contacted her on March 8, 2011, to advise he was on crutches and thus unable to clean the roof nor did he have sufficient funds to hire a contractor. She stated she then informed Mr. Montague he had 30 days to complete all of the work necessary to bring the property fully into compliance. She reported the violations remained as of an April 7, 2011 inspection; thus, a Statement of Violation/Notice of Hearing was sent to the respondent by certified mail, adding the property was posted as well. She then announced as of May 24, 2011, the roof had been cleaned, and the overgrowth over the canal had been removed. She noted only the violations related to landscaping and dead palm fronds remained. She concluded Mr. Montague had indicated he planned to ask the Board for additional time in order to complete the work.

- Ms. Albers MOVED, Mr. Poitras SECONDED the City had presented a prima facie case. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Ms. Sepanik questioned the amount of additional time needed to complete the work.
- Mr. Montague first displayed a photograph of his home in its current condition, stating the roof color was actually off-white/grey with a marbled appearance. He reported the palm fronds had been trimmed; however, he pointed out numerous palm trees located on City properties appeared to be quite overgrown, submitting several photographs depicting same into the record. He explained health issues allowed him only two hours per day without crutches, thus the basis for his request for additional time.
- Ms. Perdomo advised only minor issues remained unresolved.
- Ms. Sepanik MOVED, Mr. Viola SECONDED to continue Case #11-42649 to the Board's next meeting.
- Ms. Sepanik confirmed Mr. Montague would not be required to appear at the Board's next meeting if all violations were eliminated.
- MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Note: Unfinished Business & Member Comments were heard following Item E, New Business.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Hearing for Recommendation to City Council to begin Special Assessment Process
10-41127 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - DAWN LEWIS

Respondents: Anthony Cardiello and Bessey Law, P.A. (counsel for Bruce and Barbara Laishley, ACCU Funding Corporation, Charlotte Equities, Inc. and Countrywide Mortgage)

Address of Violation: 24368 Airport Road

Violation of Chapter 9A, Section 9A-12(a), Storage of junk and debris; and Section 9A-12(b), Storage of other debris; and Section 9A-12(g), Dangerous, blighted condition; and Section 9A-12(i), Chapter 7; and Section 9A-12(k), Chapter 10; and Section 9A-12(p), Chapter 26; and Chapter 10, Section 10-1.1, Grass and overgrowth; and Chapter 26, Section 26-8.11(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g), Property maintenance; and Chapter 26, Section 26-8.14(b), Storage; and Chapter 26, Section 26-12.10, Prohibited invasive species; and Chapter 7, Section 7-32(a), No permit; and Chapter 7, Section 7-35(d), Address numbers.

- Ms. Lewis displayed several photographs depicting the subject property's condition, stating the Board had ordered certain corrective actions on January 26, 2011. She confirmed the Board's Order was posted on January 27, 2011, and was received by the respondent on January 28, 2011; however, the property remained out of compliance at subsequent re-inspections on April 18, 2011, and May 24, 2011, submitting several photographs into the record attesting to same. She requested the Board recommend City Council take action to abate this public nuisance.
- Mr. Council asked if any of the parties involved in this property had considered demolition of the structure.
- Ms. Lewis replied her only contact had been with Mr. Anthony Cardiello, respondent, who had advised the property would likely be foreclosed.
- Mr. Council asked if City Council would consider demolition during their deliberations.
- City Attorney Levin replied City Council would determine the least costly method of attaining compliance. He explained the special assessment remedy provided the City the ability to enter the property and take action to improve its appearance. He commented there may be an opportunity for negotiation with prospective owners of the property in the event a foreclosure took place.
- Ms. Albers asked who currently owned the property.
- Ms. Lewis replied Mr. Cardiello was listed as the owner by the Charlotte County Property Appraiser's Office.
- Ms. Sepanik questioned the amount of liens on the property.
- Ms. Lewis expressed uncertainty regarding same. She mentioned there were several mortgage holders.
- Ms. Albers MOVED, Mr. Council SECONDED to find the respondent in violation of the Board's Order and to recommend City Council begin the Special Assessment process for the property. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. 10-42090 – CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER – RANDY WRIGHT

Respondent: Bernice A. Rountree

Address of Violation: 322 East William Street

Violation of Chapter 9A, Section 9A-12(a)(d); and Chapter 26, Section 26-8.11(g), Numerous pieces of wood and pieces of blue tarp material on the roof of the house; and Chapter 10, Section 10-1.1; and Chapter 26, Section 26-8.11(c), Tall grass and/or weeds over 12 inches in height and overgrown trees and landscaping; and Chapter 26, Section 26-12.10(a)(3), Brazilian Pepper trees growing on the property; and Chapter 26, Section 26-8.11(a)(b); and Chapter 9A, Section 9A-12(g); and Chapter 7, Section 7-38, Entire roof on the house structure is damaged and in a state of disrepair, and a small building in the rear of the property with a collapsed roof.

- Mr. Stevens noted the respondent was not present, confirming there was no objection to entering a not guilty plea on her behalf.
- Mr. Wright submitted into the record several photographs of the subject property, located within City limits, stating on December 9, 2010, he observed the following items located throughout same: pieces of wood; pieces of blue tarp on the roof; two inoperative vehicles; wood and pieces of awning in the front yard; grass and weeds throughout the property; overgrown landscaping; side yard filled with Brazilian Pepper trees (prohibited species); structurally damaged roof. He pointed out one photograph of an accessory structure where same was almost invisible due to overgrown vegetation, adding the roof on same had collapsed. He announced a Notice of Violation/Order for Corrective Action was issued and received by the respondent, Ms. Bernice Rountree, on December 11, 2010, providing her with 20 days to eliminate the violations. He advised a March 14, 2011 re-inspection found all of the same violations; thus, an Affidavit Violation/Notice of Hearing was issued and received by Ms. Rountree on March 17, 2011. He reminded members they had continued this case from their previous meeting, concluding all conditions remained the same.
- Ms. Sepanik MOVED, Ms. Perry SECONDED the City had presented a prima facie case. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Ms. Sepanik asked why the case had been continued.
- Mr. Wright replied the respondent had written a letter which detailed her efforts to accomplish the required work on the property; however, he noted there had been numerous issues with Ms. Rountree over several years, adding the result was always the same. He explained conditions continued to worsen.
- Mr. Council stated the home appeared to be vacant.

- Mr. Wright countered Ms. Rountree resided in the house. He mentioned the respondent also owned a home located behind the subject property which was in much better condition; however, Ms. Rountree refused to relocate. He noted he had arranged for work to be done by Habitat for Humanity as well as several church organizations and certain family members starting six months after Hurricane Charley in August 2004; however, Ms. Rountree had ordered everyone off the property.
- Mr. Viola questioned the amount of time these conditions had existed.
- Mr. Wright replied since 2004.
- Ms. Sepanik maintained a welfare check should be conducted.
- Mr. Wright confirmed same had already been done.
- Mr. Stevens asked if any relatives of Ms. Rountree were local.
- Mr. Wright replied affirmatively, stating he had spoken with all of them to no avail.
- Ms. Lewis clarified the respondent was extremely competent and had all of her faculties.
- Ms. Sepanik MOVED, Mr. Poitras SECONDED to find the respondent guilty, to issue a Cease & Desist Order for any future violations and to require the property to be brought into compliance within 60 days of receipt of the Order subject to a fine of up to \$250 per day. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Hearing Imposing Penalty

11-42383 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - DAWN LEWIS

Respondent: GMAC Mortgage, LLC

Address of Violation: 902 Elizabeth Street

Violation of Chapter 9A, Section 9A-17, Failure to submit a Distressed Real Property Registration form.

- Ms. Lewis reported an additional 43 days of non-compliance from April 12, 2011, to May 24, 2011.
- Mr. Poitras MOVED, Ms. Sepanik SECONDED to impose a fine of \$10,750 for 43 days of non-compliance. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. Hearing Imposing Penalty

11-42380 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - DAWN LEWIS

Respondent: Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

Address of Violation: 7380 Satsuma Drive

Violation of Chapter 9A, Section 9A-17, Failure to submit a Distressed Real Property Registration form.

- Ms. Lewis reported an additional 43 days of non-compliance from April 12, 2011, to May 24, 2011.
- Mr. Poitras MOVED, Ms. Sepanik SECONDED to impose a fine of \$10,750 for 43 days of non-compliance. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

E. Hearing Imposing Penalty

10-41812 - CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER - DAWN LEWIS

Respondent: Branch Banking & Trust

Address of Violation: 33 Tamiami Trail

Violation of Chapter 9A, Section 9A-17, Failure to submit a Distressed Real Property Registration form.

- Ms. Lewis reported an additional 43 days of non-compliance from April 12, 2011, to May 24, 2011.
- Mr. Poitras MOVED, Ms. Sepanik SECONDED to impose a fine of \$10,750 for 43 days of non-compliance. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MEMBER COMMENTS

- Mr. Viola commented on Case #11-42883, stating he did not feel the container located in the respondent's side yard could be considered a dock box.
- City Attorney Levin stated perhaps dock boxes should be clearly defined in the City Code.
- Ms. Sepanik concurred, pointing out Punta Gorda was a boating community.
- City Attorney Levin maintained the respondent's argument that the container should be considered a dock box was not valid in any way.

ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting Adjourned: 10:57 a.m.

Jim Stevens, Chairman

Mary Kelly, Recording Secretary