

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission, Boulder Town

February 7, 2011, 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners present: Ray Gardner, Alyssa Thompson, Bobbie Cleave, Loch Wade, and BJ Orozco. Also present was Clerk, Peg Smith and Town liaison Tom Jerome. Members of the public who were present for all or part of the proceedings included: Sergio Femenias, Boz Bosworth, Rod Torgerson, Alan Scott, Ellie Pollock, Sean Treves, Aaron and Autumn Bauman, David and Susan Heaton, Mark Nelson, Jim Catmull, Brenda Catmull, Camille and Doug Hall, Skye and Craig Copeland, Denise Pennington, Cheryl Cox, Tom Jerome, Anselm Spring, Dan Reeder, Bill Muse, Dennis Bertucci, Sam Stout, Judy Drain, Tina Karlsson, Peter Benson, Josh Ellis, Colleen Thompson, Kelly Wade, Jim Demay, Wulf Barsch, Judi Davis, Mike Nelson, Gladys LeFevre, Brynn Brodie, Mary Jane Coombs, Mikhaal Chillier, and Randy Catmull. If anyone else was present, they didn't sign in.

Loch moved to open the meeting, Bobbie seconded the motion; BJ called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. Loch moved to approve the Jan10 minutes, and Bobbie seconded. All approved.

Hear Conceptual Plan for Full Moon Subdivision

[Rod Torgerson had submitted materials by 1/28/2012 on behalf of Rachel Thatcher for Full Moon and Springhill subdivisions.] Rod said he understood the access road had previously been an issue, and he understood that matter to be resolved and that two building permits for Springhill lots 1 and 2 had been issued. He said there was still a question of whether the concept plan would include an amendment to the Springhill subdivision, or where they would want to look at vacating lots 3 and 4 of Springhill. Alan Scott, an owner in Springhill, said the benefit of amending the subdivision is it wouldn't require an application; Springhill would consist of only lots 1 and 2. He said their attorneys should recommend a course of action.

To Alyssa's question, lots 1 and 2 are still recorded as part of Springhill subdivision.

Alan wants to review Rachel's plan. He said he hasn't seen the road layout and doesn't know how the new building envelopes would impact their view. He is withholding support until he can examine the plan. He asked if Springhill and Full Moon owners would be sharing a road. He asked about the location of the building envelopes. He asked about what CCRs would be applied, such as whether large homes would be allowed.

The answer was "no" to Rod's question of whether CCRs are reviewed by the Town. Alan said they had bought into a subdivision that consisted of four lots. It had been planned so the building sites on each lot weren't visible. Now, he said, there is a new subdivision that includes part of original Springhill, and consists of two lots to five lots and might change the character of the area. He also noted there is a difference between five cabins and five mansions being built.

Rod said the current plan shows a road going through Springhill that would bisect lot 4. That was his main question: is that allowed by code.

Bill Muse stated the access roads to Springhill were recently completed and the Fire Marshall had signed off on the grade and the building permit.

Anselm said there still could be a legal issue; he has a still-unsettled deal with Rachel Thatcher involving one acre that needs to be settled before any plan could be completed. Rod has been unaware of that and will look into it.

Action 1: the Planning Commission has to get back with Rod regarding a road cutting through a lot.

Rod asked about lot widths. The ordinance does not allow lots sized more than twice as deep as they are wide. He wondered if that meant the measurement at the road, an average across the lot, or other.

Loch said even if it were an average measurement, the lots looked too long for their width.

Rod also asked about cul-de-sacs. The Town ordinance does require the proper diameter for emergency vehicle turnaround.

Peg asked Rod to provide (with the preliminary application) the names and addresses of property owners within 300 feet, per ordinance requirement.

Bill asked if existing Arrowhead Drive would be used, or would Rachel be putting in new road. Rod said Rachel isn't yet sure. Bill said he would need to confer with the Scotts because of the road usage issue.

Randy said the Scotts would need to approve either a subdivision amendment or a lot vacation.

Eric Feiler asked if Boulder Irrigation Company owns a water easement through the subdivision.

Bill said there is a prescribed easement 15 feet on each side of the canal. Eric said there was another road easement into the Wilson's property.

Those concluded the questions on the Conceptual Plan. (See plans for next meeting)

Begin General Plan Talks; Plans for Next Meeting

Bobbie said issue of low income housing was a big issue and suggested a subcommittee to work toward creative solutions. She said there are people in the community who have expertise in this area, and we should look to them, as well as research what's been done elsewhere.

BJ brought up the subject of annexation and whether that should be looked at. Another topic, maintaining dark sky, continued being important to residents. Loch asked if the survey results indicated any major shift from previous years, but it doesn't seem so.

Randy asked about annexation. Peg said the survey does not show any strong trend whatsoever: nearly equal numbers of people favor, oppose, or "don't know" which way to go. However, according to Utah League of Cities and Towns, actual annexing and having an "Annexation Plan" are two different things. It would be in Boulder Town's best interests to have an Annexation Plan in place. This is a state-regulated document that a town uses to indicate "areas of interest" contiguous to its current boundaries. The Plan includes mapping, tax implications, services, etc. Once the town has a Plan, that plan can sit on a shelf for 50 years without anything necessarily happening. An Annexation Plan must be already adopted before any annexation activity could begin, but putting the plan together does not initiate any type of annexation activity. Although a town *can* annex an area, a petition for annexation typically comes from the residents of an outlying area. Here, neither of the two contiguous residential areas (the Draw and Black Mesa) that would be potentially eligible has indicated any desire to do so.

Besides having the information that would be included in an Annexation Plan, the designation of these "areas of interest" means the town would have a voice if the county wanted to develop

anything in part of those areas. Randy said the county has already said they'd inform Boulder about development outside town limits. But Peg said an Annexation Plan would ensure more than just a courtesy call; it would provide Boulder the legal leverage to gain a seat at the table.

BJ suggested starting looking at such a plan. Loch had asked about cost. Peg thought there could be surveying costs if areas had to be detailed, but that would be all.

All agreed the first priority of projects this year would be General Plan, then the Annexation Plan. The Commissioners agreed to starting two meetings a month to get the General Plan off the ground. The next regular meeting is March 13; the first General Plan discussion meeting will be March 27, 7 p.m.

Plans for the March 13 meeting so far:

- content requirement of an annexation plan
- where to start on General Plan revisions
- Joe Parker borrow pit site plan is to be submitted
- Full Moon/Springhill preliminary application?
 - Road going through lot---is legal or not (Bobbie)?
 - Allowable width>depth ratio and means of measurement (Alyssa)
 - Clarify cul-de-sac approval (Bobbie)
 - Irrigation easement? (BJ)
 - Due: in two weeks: email results to each by **Tuesday, Feb 21.**

Loch moved to adjourn until 7 p.m., Alyssa seconded, and BJ adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Conduct Public Hearing on Jack Pollock's CUP application

Alyssa moved to open the public hearing on Jack Pollock's application for conditional use permit to open a bed and breakfast in Lower Boulder. Bobbie seconded, all approved, and BJ started the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

All comments are welcome at a public hearing. Persons who wish to comment are to state their names (for the tape), speak to the issue at hand, and keep their remarks as concise as possible. No debates, no disrespectful comments will be allowed.

Ellie Pollock said the B&B would include two bedrooms, and they would like to open it in April. Bobbie asked them to look at the B and B standards (BBIU) on the Web. She said that site sets the professional standards for B&Bs across the country. She said, "We'd like the assurance that you would live up to those standards.

Tom Jerome: I've been a neighbor of Pollocks. We've traveled in Europe and stayed in B&Bs. They're quiet and in residential areas I have no objections.

Anselm Spring: I favor it. I know the economic struggles, and I think it will help Boulder.

Eric Feiler: *It is* on the Table of Uses, right? [yes]

Denise Pennington: Is a business license issued through the town for this? Ellie: yes.

Judi Davis: Since the BBIU standards aren't part of our ordinances, will the Pollocks be held to them? Bobbie: No, BBIU standards are just accepted guidelines for B&Bs.

Tina Karlsson: I was involved in the first B&B that was put in and a street sign, Boulder's only, was requested, so heads' up.

Mark Nelson: As a CUP, you need to look at questions that haven't been asked.

Barsch: What are the requirements? BJ: the submitted application and map covered everything.

Loch moved to close the public hearing, Bobbie seconded and all approved. Bobbie moved to re-open the meeting, Loch seconded, all approved.

BJ called for a motion to approve the application for the CUP. Loch so moved, Alyssa seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

Alyssa moved to close the public meeting and open the public hearing on the ZO change request from Randy Catmull. Ray seconded the motion, all approved. BJ opened the ZO change request hearing at 7:10 p.m.

Conduct Public Hearing on Randy Catmull's Sign Section Revision

[Randy Catmull had submitted a request for change to the Zoning Ordinance, section 1018, dealing with signage. In addition, the Town Council, at its last meeting, authorized the Planning Commission to consider the sign section in its entirety and recommend changes it feels are necessary. This public hearing was held specifically to deal with Randy's change application.]

[Note from clerk: Comments below are not transcripts. They are intended to provide the substance of commentary by each speaker.]

Randy: This isn't a request for additional signage. It's a request for an increase of size. For nine years, I've been the only person using it [co-location directional sign at the corner of Burr Trail and Hwy 12]. It's not a billboard; billboards are illegal. My request would increase the sign from 16 inches x 5 ft to 3ft x 4ft (12-sq ft.).

Mark Nelson asked about the scope of changes submitted in Randy's application. BJ read the text of the requested change. Kelly asked the Commission to give priority to Boulder residents' comments. BJ said all public comment is welcome, but agreed that "we want what's best for those who live here."

Peg Smith read each letter submitted to the Planning Commission. Letters were received from Keith Watts, Lisa Varga, Geneen Haugen, John Wolfer and Kathy McCance, Gibbs Smith, Blake Spalding, Van Lewis, Julie Robinson and Dave Hensel, Scotty Mitchell, Karen Terry, Ashley Coombs, Catherine Smith, Constance Lynn and Matt Cochran. Ten of those letters basically objected to the application regarding larger/more signage in Boulder; one spoke in favor of the application, and two suggested modifications to the requested signage modification.

Anselm: When it comes to beauty there are other sore spots. With respect to billboards, size doesn't matter. The beauty is more important. I personally like the pole. .. These signs could be beautiful, attract people. People would stop to photograph them, where other signs would turn people off. Many people won't even go to a restaurant that didn't show good taste... Maybe the Boulder Arts Council could discuss the signs.. Let artists have an impact on this matter.

Judy Drain: I work at the restaurant. All we want is for people to know we're down there. When people come from the south, they see it. .. As long as it's not "us and them," let's work it out. Lots of people come in and say they wouldn't know we're here if they hadn't been coming down the Burr Trail.

Mary Jane Coombs: When that sign was first put there I went by 12 times before I figured out what it said. I was really trying, but the lettering was too small. I'd never know what it said as a tourist; the letters are too small. It needs to be changed so when tourists go by they can clearly see where to go. Randy runs a wonderful restaurant, as do the others, and they do the senior

citizens' dinner and birthday parties. His location is a disadvantage from the others. It needs to be fair.

David Heaton: I agree with Anselm. There could be nice ways to make signs. [The competing businesses] don't have big signs, they're right on the highway... People stop by the Lodge and ask where the Burr Trail is. Maybe the town itself needs to do that. We need to encourage businesses to thrive here, not die off.

Dan Reeder: I concur with last few comments. It's important to encourage business to thrive. If that's what needed, a larger sign, we should do what we can to support them. I manage the Robison ranch. Just for the record, we've never complained about ranch signs, we like ranch signs.

Mark Nelson: I think the sign ordinance is fine the way it is. Signs aren't Randy's problem, it's his location. ..He's asking for an off-premises sign, not a directional sign. We're not here to compensate for people's bad locations. It's not our role. It sounds tonight like we need another directional sign to the new B&B. *[Mark passed photos to the Commission taken in Parowan.]* These directional signs in Parowan are actually smaller than what's currently allowed, but they really work. They're not artistic but people can see them. I think if you need to change, try something different. Bigger isn't necessarily better. It's fine the way it is, don't make changes. It's a directional sign, not meant to be an off-premises advertising sign.

Bill Muse: I support change for a 3x4 ft. sign. This is for one sign, the directional sign. Since it sounds like Gibbs wouldn't allow another, then it's [just going to be] the one sign. In 2003/4, this was discussed at length. The council voted unanimously to allow a sign at the Burr Trail. I don't know what we're all so afraid of...this keeps coming up. Fear of becoming another Moab or Vegas. We only have two billboard signs, and they're grandfathered. We need to work in today's world. Let's work with what we need now, and adjust in the future. I fully support this directional sign and feel it should go both directions.

Camille Hall: When my dad built the dairy queen, the fear was this was going to ruin the town. I appreciate you letting me stay. Whenever change comes up, we have to talk about it, but not in a way that's based on fear. There have been some good comments that maybe Randy will take into consideration. Some of the letters were kind of mean. We don't need to be mean to resolve this. As a community we can resolve this. Back to the dairy queen, people thought there was going to be all this trash from it. Look at it now. I hope it's an asset to the community. I wouldn't be here if I didn't have the business. When you're in business you'll do anything to get one more car to pull in, just so you can make it. I wish Boulder Mountain Lodge could have a bigger sign; we have to give a lot of directions to people [who can't see the signs.] They can't see Kelly's down the road. Lots of people stop to ask where Anasazi State Park is. I don't think a sign is going to ruin the community. I wish the businesses had the support of the community. We're trying to make a living. It's not that easy.

Eric Feiler: Having been involved in the previous sign meetings, and coming up with the sign ordinance, I think having a directional sign at the corner helps people and is fine. I especially don't think the sign size should have to change. There should just be one standard size. Also I find this hypocritical. It's not just the sign ordinance. To be arguing about this without taking care of [ordinances] on the book is a little crazy.

Wulf: I taught design for 40 years at the university. There's lots of research on [effective] signs. The current ordinance, properly enforced, would do fine. People always want to push the envelope. The laws are for a specific purpose--- to protect the community.

Bill: This whole discussion has been on all the signs. But we're here to discuss one particular sign. Looking at the last 10 years, we've done OK, what are we so afraid of? Ordinances can be changed, whenever we want to change them. They're organic things. Randy has made the request through proper channels.

Eric: This is called the *Planning* Commission. It's supposed to *plan* for the future. That's its job. "Wise use" would be another way to look at it. That's the whole point of subdivision ordinance.

Sam Stout: I support Randy having a larger sign. When he first put his roof sign there, Gibbs didn't have all the trees planted, but you can't see the sign now. He needs the directional sign. The easier you can make it to get business the better. I do support this request.

Anselm: Why not trade the roof sign that's now covered for a bigger sign as the directional sign?

Mikhaal Chillier: I'm adding voice to those who oppose the change. I think I'd like to avoid seeing clans or groups fighting each other. It is difficult to have a business going here. It's true it's not as visible. I believe even though I'm worried about making things bigger, I've seen a lot of places become ugly. We just think we need to be careful with an eye on the changes and what we promote. Maybe can work out something to make Randy more visible in other ways. I hear complaints about so many signs that are more than they should be. Maybe we should decrease the number of signs, and make them more visible. It may not be matter of size but appearance. I think restaurants build their reputation by the quality of their food. I'm not saying [Randy's] doesn't. I just think there are other ways.

Randy: First, everyone is talking about "bigger." This is one sign. I'm guilty of having an "open" sign on the Burr trail sign. There's only one street sign in town. You can't find anything in this town as far as directions go. To say I have all these illegal signs is crap. Since 1996, I've been here. I was grandfathered in, totally legal. The only thing is the open sign. I'll take down the flag. The sign down there is double-faced, town-approved sign. The town is being totally stubborn and not meeting the needs of the community.

Brynn: One, tourism does support our community a lot. Not like to see a lot of tourists, but it keeps a lot of people afloat. Dollars spent get passed around town about three times. Randy's is a less expensive restaurant and it rounds things out. I'd like to suggest the town retain its beautiful quality. The town has done a good job of maintaining that. If people make their way here, they appreciate that quality. From what I see in a lot of small towns, maybe we don't appreciate what we have here. We'd be shooting ourselves in the foot if we weren't vigilant about maintaining that quality. It sounds like Randy is in danger of losing his business. Maybe there are other ways of advertising, or maybe the town can help advertise. When you invest in property, location is a huge thing. You make a decision when buying a property. Every business owner knows that's part of equation. It would be great to keep Randy's business viable, with possibly another way to help him. I do not support changes to the sign ordinance.

Bill: [reading from the ordinance] The main point is that we're only talking about the one directional sign allowed in town. Not billboards, just the directional sign. I've heard [here] that you're not enforcing the ordinances.... It was determined Randy's signs were grandfathered in. His roof sign was legal. We'd have a hard time taking down sign now. I ask anyone in this room, where is there an illegal sign. All the signs were legal when we voted last year.

Wulf: I was on the Town Council when the first sign ordinance written. Randy admits his open sign was illegal, as well as Burr Trail sign. Neither were approved by the Town Council.

Jim Demay: Didn't I hear that people who don't live [in town] shouldn't have something to say? I'm wondering why there are so many people who are anti-business in this town. Or people who

are against people having a business having a sign. [Regarding Randy's,] How many can handle buses? How many are capable of having senior citizens in this town. All he's asking for is a directional sign when he's the only one who needs one. People here who don't have a business per se, but they do business. The artists, the heritage festival, these are good examples of everybody getting together, not stabbing each other in the back. Let's support the businesses. There's nothing that can't be changed or added.

Judy Drain: We've tried to do stuff on the internet. Having the town support all the businesses is a good idea. A lot of Boulder people don't do the internet. Lots of senior people driving through don't do the internet, and they don't know where to go. I don't think people realize how much people rely on signs. This is something the whole town needs to address. I have people driving into my driveway all the time looking for the Burr Trail because the sign points right at my house. You shouldn't have to have a business downtown, on Main Street in order to survive.

Sam: I'm curious. Hwy 12 is on a super-elevated turn by the Burr Trail, and the state right of way is 200 feet wide. How many signs are actually legal there at all?

Denise: People come into the Lodge and they can't find anything. We need better signage to move people through town.

Wulf: I thought state law said all towns have to have street signs. Why doesn't Boulder have them? (Bill said it's being worked on.)

Aaron Bauman: We're talking about changing one specific item in the ordinance.

BJ: Actually two things. We're talking about changing the actual size of the vertical sign and part d, the size of the co-located signs.

Tom: The reason I wrote that in was Randy's desire to make sure people who wanted to add to the sign could be accommodated. I wrote that to meet the request of the applicant.

Randy: We talked about this. I don't want [to occupy] the whole sign there, just be visible. No one in nine years has wanted their sign there. If both signposts are filled up on both sides, I'd be willing to reduce size of my sign. I wasn't looking to make extra burden on anyone else. I don't want to spend more money, but would be willing to do it. If the Planning Commission doesn't like it, I'll take it out, put the old back in. If that's the sticking point, then take it out. Bring it back to one issue.

BJ: So you're willing to drop section d to focus on the main part?

Randy: I'd be willing to work with the rest of the community so the town doesn't have to have another signpost. Just let me increase the size of the sign. That's the main thing.

Autumn Bauman: I think 3x4 is a totally reasonable size. It's important to support downtown businesses. It's also important to make [signs] pleasing, artistic even. As long as it fits the rest, it's not neon, even with five signs both ways, it could still look classy.

Mark Nelson: 3x4 is not a directional sign. Directional to me is a road sign [indicating] something in this direction. It's not an advertising sign. You're talking about finding a loophole of calling an advertising sign a directional sign when it's not. Signs can be visible and do the job.

Josh Ellis: I'm indifferent to the sign. But the house on the corner is an eyesore.

Peter Benson: I'm also indifferent. Randy could probably do better if there were fewer letters in his restaurant's name.

Judi read the definition of a directional sign.

Anselm: Will the billboard thing be discussed? We have to discuss the issue of billboards one of these days. Leave the directional sign as is.

Judi: I would like to see the first introductory paragraph in the actual ordinance left as is---it clarifies that even though off-premises signs are not allowed one directional sign is allowed.

Loch moved to close the public hearing and open the public meeting, Bobbie seconded. All approved.

Discussion on Public Hearing on Sign Section Change

BJ said it sounds like section D had the most variable stuff-- we could eliminate that. We could focus on item A as the only area with changes, keeping the first paragraph. Alyssa asked Randy if he would be negotiable on the requested size change. Randy said it now equals 6.4 sq ft.

Mark said 18 inches x 18 inches—as a directional sign--would be effective. Ray wondered what the speed limit was on the street Mark mentioned. He said our speed limit is 40, and at a turn, he doesn't know how tourists can see anything.

Tom said part of his involvement comes from traveling on the Burr Trail every day. There's a business on corner with an exit on two sides, and a speed limit. The UDOT road sign pointing to the Burr Trail is poor. As to the directional sign, he said he could not read the sign without stopping at the signpost and looking at it. Is there a safety issue here? Other towns slow their traffic down to 20 miles an hour through town. That's part of the issue: the ability to read the sign at the speed I'm going.

Randy said even for the people turning onto the Burr Trail, the sign isn't visible.

Ray said lowering the speed limit would entail more signage. Maybe a turning lane to pull off onto the Burr trail would be safer than slowing everyone down. But going around the turn, he thought people need to be paying attention to driving not services on signs.

Judi said UDOT had been asked years earlier about lowering the speed through town and the answer was not positive. Something about maintaining prevailing speed...

Loch said the UDOT signs are quite a bit bigger than the 16 x 5 that we're allowing—but not as big as Randy is asking. Little decals show the business and a prominent arrow directing to that business. The effectiveness is the sign itself, its design characteristics, not the size

Randy said he'd get a big hand arrow.... "Not food... not an advertising sign. I understand it's a directional sign." Loch said, "I can't see Randy's sign. I can't see what it's pointing to. If he wants a big finger or arrow, I don't have a problem with 12 sq ft.

BJ thank everyone for great public input. He said with public feeling being pretty even, it basically boils down to a vote on item A of that section (the size). He thought the Commission should wait until next meeting to take a vote.

Randy asked why postpone it for another 30 days.

BJ said that the Planning Commission needs to take in what it's heard. Even though the bottom line decision is on a small item, it is big enough that a wait would be prudent.

Judi said whatever the recommendation, it will take another 30 days (for the town council to hold its own public hearing and vote.)

Loch said he'd like to vote now. Bobbie said she'd like to wait, but would go with the majority.

Alyssa said the effectiveness of the sign is essentially more important than its size. "I'm open to a compromise on the size but I like the signs Mark showed. They're effective. I'm OK with taking a vote."

Mark said there was no reason to jump into judgments---the PC isn't required to jump based on public clamor. Maybe the board needs time to review. When you change ordinances up you can't go back. "I advise caution."

Ray said he was more comfortable letting the information digest.

Bobbie said there were two letters that addressed colors and design. That's not something we can look at quickly. That's the kind of thing we can take time to consider. I don't feel it's that clear. Our job is to get consensus from town. It's not clear.

Bill asked if letters would still be welcomed if the time were extended. (No, not officially.)

Sam said to take into consideration the people who live in town, pay taxes in town.

Bobbie said the Planning Commission could meet on Feb 21.

BJ said he thought the Commission should vote now on what they've heard. They're making a recommendation only. Randy said the recommendation has to be clarified, that it's not just a straight up yes or no.

Mark agreed. "You're supposed to submit findings, so that your decision is not based on clamor. If no, you have to say "why." Same for "yes," so it's not politics.

BJ noted one particular change: the directional sign size goes from 5'x16" to 3'x4'. There is no change to section d. Loch so moved, Ray seconded the motion.

Randy: If you're leaving it as it is, just change b and c. You're just swapping numbers.

BJ moved to change Zoning Ordinance 1018 #5, to change the size of directional size from 5' x 16" to 3' x 4' (sections b and c on current sign ordinance.) Ray seconded the motion. Ray, Loch, and BJ voted "aye." Alyssa voted "no." Bobbie abstained. The ayes have it. The Planning Commission approved the recommendation to modify the sign section of the Zoning Ordinance.

Discuss Next Meeting and March 13 Business

Topics for March 13 include: drafting an annexation plan, discussing how to start reviewing General Plan, discuss the borrow pit revegetation plan, and possibly start with a preliminary subdivision application from Full Moon subdivision. BJ asked for last thoughts.

Ray said he felt it was more important to deal with businesses need here rather than worrying about signs making us become an undesirable community. We deal with this on a daily basis. The opinions of those who live and work in Boulder have to be given more weight than those of visitors or even occasional property owners. Alyssa moved to close the meeting, Bobbie seconded, and all approved. BJ adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Peg Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Date

Approved: _____ Date: _____