

**CITY OF WALTHAM
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

April 12, 2016

The Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing at 7 P.M., Tuesday, April 12, 2016, in the Public Meeting Room of the Arthur Clark Government Center, 119 School Street, Waltham, MA.

In attendance were Chair Barbara Rando, and members Glenna Gelineau,, Mark Hickernell, Marc Rudnick and John Sergi.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7 P.M.

Mrs. Rando: Tonight we have two continued cases before us, Case No. 2015-21, Petition of Elizabeth Gartz, 67 Ash Street and that is for an application for a Variance, and Case No. 2015-26, Pasquale Torcasio, 41 Williams Street and that is for a Special Permit.

I don't believe we have any minutes to approve, so I would ask the clerk to please read the Petition in Case 2015-21.

The clerk then read the Petition of Elizabeth Gartz, Personal Representative of the Estate of Elizabeth Miller in an application for a variance to qualify property for the construction of a two family residential dwelling following the destruction of a single family home by fire. Location and Zoning District: 67 Ash Street, Residence B Zoning District.

Mrs. Rando: May we hear from the petitioner or the petitioner's representative, please?

William Sack, Esquire, 1000 Franklin Village, Franklin, MA and Ms. Elizabeth Gartz, 15 Hammond Street, Hopedale, MA came forward.

Mr. Sack: This is the fourth hearing on this application, just to summarize where we are.

The property is shy only two and a half feet of frontage from falling within the so-called Old Lot Exception of the Zoning Ordinance. If the property did fall within that exception, there would be no zoning relief to rebuild this destroyed home as a two family home and the location there and would comply fully with full current and actual requirements of the zoning ordinance.

At the first hearing we were asked to provide a more detailed plan and it was with the application of what a new home would look like because the board wanted to make sure that we would not need any other zoning relief. And we did so, and we presented at the second hearing a plan prepared by Bibbo Brothers with more detail on what the proposed layout footprint would look like of a new two family home. This plan was accepted by the board, this rendering, at the second hearing. However, the board stated that the plan did not comply with the parking requirements and at that hearing I stated that I didn't know that and that I would speak with Mr. Bibbo and come back at the third hearing, and the second hearing was continued to the third hearing to deal with the parking.

We also read into the minutes at that second hearing, we read into the record a quote from the Fire Chief that the location of the house at the rear of the lot was a major contributing factor to the loss of life from the fire that occurred. A majority of the board at that hearing, the second hearing, said that it certainly established hardship but it could not accept the plan that violated the parking requirements.

At the third hearing, we were joined by Mr. Bibbo who had with him a letter from the building department certifying that this plan that he prepared complied with all dimensional requirements of the Zoning Ordinance including parking. He used the wrong section for parking that had been brought up at the second hearing and that was cleared up at the third hearing.

At that third hearing, the board said they were still not satisfied with the rendering and wanted more detailed plans of the proposed home. The board said that maybe my client was trying to do things on the cheap, which I assure you is not her intention at all. She just simply did not think that the detailed plans were necessary in the context of this kind of a zoning application. Nonetheless, at some more considerable expense, we had more plans prepared due to the board's request at the last hearing. (Mr. Sack presented new plans to the board for their review.)

So the hearing was continued to tonight to give the applicant a chance to submit these more detailed plans.

Just to review the criteria for a variance, a hardship. This had already been established at the second hearing by the majority of the board but without zoning relief, the house would have to be rebuilt in the exact same unsafe location at the rear of the lot and the nonconformity with several dimensional requirements.

What we are proposing is a structure that complies with all dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance and in a much safer location consistent with the other properties on the street as well.

Substantial Detriment to the Public Good. The applicant has agreed to erect a privacy fence on both sides. You will remember one abutter was thinking that it might be snow that would be pushed on to his line. They are putting a fence on the right along the

entire length of the lot line. That would prevent that. Our neighbor to the left, Antonio, I think he's here tonight. He wanted arborvitae along the eastern lot line and to provide more screening. He also wanted trees to be removed. We agreed to all those requests. In fact, I have an email from Antonio back on January 19th where he says, "Bill, I am in favor of it. I just want to see that the trees are removed and the hedges planted." And we agreed to do that. We agreed to remove the trees and plant arborvitae along that eastern side, along his boarder.

Regarding Nullification or Derogation from Intent or Purpose of the Zoning Ordinance, it's actually quite to the contrary. We are shy two and a half feet on forty feet. That's a 6.25% reduction in the variance and if we fell in the old lot exception which is what we are asking the variance for, a new structure will comply fully with all ordinances. All dimensional requirements will be met. And as the board knows, finally, where we understand that every property is unique, every property is different. The board knows that there is very recent precedent for frontage variances and dimensional variances.

For instance on Old County Road, recently a hundred foot dimensional requirement was reduced to twenty feet; on 678 Trapelo Road a rear yard variance was granted to thirty feet. Now the six feet is a much greater percentage than what we are asking for, a 6.25% variance from the forty feet to thirty-seven and a half. That's all we are requesting and we feel that we have met all the requirements especially in the recent decisions by the board and our structure is going to comply, fully comply with all of your requirements and I would think that that's something that the Zoning Board would be interested in and not relocate the same structure on the same unsafe location and have the same dimensional nonconformities that they had before.

Would you like to add anything?

Ms. Gartz: I would just like to add that the way that the setup was with my mother's house and I know that the neighbors were trying to say that it didn't hinder them getting to the house, but it did. My mother and my brother died in that fire and it was because they couldn't get the equipment up to where they were. They couldn't get behind the house because the house is only five feet from the back fence and it breaks my heart to think that the house could go back and something like that could happen again to another family.

Mr. Sack: The variance on Trapelo Road, one of the things cited by the board was safety and we think the same exact situation is here and if not more that this can be much more safe to have the house moved forward to frontage on the street.

Ms Gartz: And today would be my brother's fifty first birthday

Mr. Sack: We thank you for your consideration and we really feel we have met the criteria for the variance on this case. We have done everything the board has asked. We've come back, this is our fourth time. Each time we come back with more detailed plans that the board has asked for and at a great expense to my client.

Mrs. Rando: Thank you for citing all the cases but we do look at every case differently.

Mr. Sack: I understand and I say that everything is unique.

Mrs. Rando: Again, would you mention what the hardship is?

Mr. Sack: The hardship is the fact that because there's a fire and that we don't comply with the Old Lot Exception because we are two and a half feet short of that of the forty feet. The only thing we can rebuild is the same footprint in the same location in the

back of the lot. We can't move one foot forward because the grandfather status is only to put back what was there. So that is why we are before this board. Without a variance, all we can do is rebuild in the same unsafe location.

Mrs. Rando: Mr. Sergi, do you have any questions at this time?

Mr. Sergi: No.

Mrs. Rando: Mr. Hickernell, do you have any questions?

Mr. Hickernell: No questions, just some minor variations on the project.

Mrs. Rando: Ms. Gelineau?

Ms. Gelineau: No.

Mrs. Rando: Ms. Rudnick?

Mr. Rudnick: No.

Mrs. Rando: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to stand up and be in favor of this petition?

Seeing none, would anyone like to stand up and be in opposition?

**Nancy Caruso, 65 Ash Street, and Paul Medeiros of the same address came forward.
(Mr. Medeiros wanted to review the plan.)**

Ms. Caruso: I did just ask someone that was in the fire department about that being built back further and they said it didn't make much difference, really, like whether it was up or back. He actually said to me because he knows where I live, he said, a lot of houses are that far back, okay. So that didn't make a difference and I don't know how the fire started. I'm not going to get into that part but I just know if it's right next to us it's going to be a problem and I just feel that it's going to be too close, and one thing about the fence is, if they do put the fence, I would be happy with that but when we put the fence, we put it over more for her because she didn't have enough room for a bulkhead, so I mean I can already see this is going to be a problem with a two family when there was a problem with this one but I guess when they do a fence I would like to have it back on our line. We were being nice and we pushed it over twelve inches for her so she could use her bulkhead. So there's not going to be enough room for a two family. I guess I am just not really for it and we are going to lose a parking spot on the street on a one-way street because there's not going to be a spot in front of it. I don't know, I just feel like it's going to be right up on us.

Mrs. Rando: Did you mentioned something about snow last time.

Ms. Caruso: Yes. There was snow all around the house. That's the reason they couldn't get there but they used our yard which we had cleared and so I mean we used to help them with their snow. And now, I don't know where their snow is going to go either. I can't even see that. That's why I want a fence because it has to go somewhere and I think everything is going to go in our yard.

Mr. Medeiros: I know the water table is kind of high in that area so whatever they do, I want to make sure it doesn't run off to my driveway. That's how the last driveway got screwed up because they had the pump going all the time and the water just got on the driveway and just kind of took all the sand away.

It's going to be a two family still?

Ms. Caruso: I'm sorry. He's hard of hearing that's why he sat up in the front. He went on line and saw it was going to be a single family on the old print. On line it says they are selling it as a single family and it's going to be on the old print, so that's why he's confused.

Mr. Medeiros: Okay, as long as they go back. I don't want them on top of my house. It's going to be like ten feet away from my house to their house.

Ms. Caruso: If it's almost the same size they couldn't use the bulkhead.

Mr. Medeiros: The bulkhead was on my property for them to get to their own basement so when I put the fence up, I lost about a foot which is no big deal, but if there's a two family then we are going to have a problem.

Mrs. Rando: All right, thank you. Anyone else in opposition?

(Two people raised their hands in opposition, so there were four people in all in opposition.)

Mrs. Rando: Is there anyone seeking information? Seeing none, Attorney would you like to come up and answer their questions?

Mr. Sack: Mr. Bibbo said there's room for snow storage on our property. There's not going to be any snow going on to the neighbor's property. There's going to be a privacy fence all along the right side. I quoted the Fire Department last time that the Fire Chief said it was a contributing factor so . . .

Mrs. Rando: Do have that letter with you?

Mr. Sack: No. I brought it in the last time. So it was definitely a contributing factor, and she knows it was, my client.

They say they don't want anybody on top of us. Well, every house is situated in the same exact location except ours, our old one. Every house is sitting on top of another house. Every house on this street, on our side of it, except for one is a multi family, either two or three families. So I am not changing the character of the neighborhood. Two families are permitted as of right in this zone. All we want to do is move it back and the new house, by the way, is going to be slimmer than the old one. It's going to have more side yard than the old one. It's going to comply completely with all side yard requirements. The other one didn't. The other one didn't comply with rear yard, This is going to comply with rear yard. So again, all we are seeking is the old lot exception. We are two and a half feet short of that and we don't really think it's such a major variance request under the circumstances. Especially under the circumstances of the fire that led to this situation.

Mr. Sergi: Where would you put the snow if you had to clear those parking spaces? Where would the snow go?

Mr. Sack: Mr. Bibbo said that there was room, probably in the front or there's five feet to the zoning requirements that require five feet of empty space between the house and the parking spot. So there's five feet right there at the end of the parking spot.

Mr. Sergi: So you would be pushing it forward toward the house?

Mr. Sack: It could be, its a location. (Mr. Sack went over the plan with Mr. Sergi.)

Mrs. Rando: Mr. Medeiros, how many feet between your house and the house next to you?

Mr. Medeiros: Six feet.

Mr. Sergi: So it's six feet plus the driveway. So it's probably more like sixteen feet.

Mrs. Rando: All right. Any questions from board members? (There were no questions.)

All right. You may continue with your Proposed Findings of Fact.

On motion of Mr. Hickernell, seconded by Mr. Sergi, the Board voted to waive the reading of the Proposed Findings of Fact since they have been on file in the law department.

Mrs. Rando: You may continue with your Proposed Decision.

On motion of Mr. Hickernell, seconded by Mr. Sergi, the board voted to waive the reading of the Proposed Decision since it has been on file in the law department.

Mrs. Rando: Do I have a motion on the Proposed Findings of Fact?

On motion of Mr. Hickernell that the Proposed Findings of Fact become the Findings of the Board.

Mrs. Rando: Do I hear a second?

Mr. Rudnick seconded the motion.

Roll being called: Mr. Sergi, no; Mr. Hickernell, I guess I will ask for an amendment to the Proposed Findings of Fact if they are inaccurate in any way. I'll vote yes.

Mrs. Rando: Would anyone like to read over the Findings of Fact or are they ready to vote now?

All right, on the Proposed Findings of Fact, I have a no from Mr. Sergi, a yes from Mr. Hickernell.

Mrs. Rando: Ms. Gelineau?

Ms. Gelineau: Yes.

Mrs. Rando: Mr. Rudnick?

Mr. Rudnick: Yes.

Mrs. Rando: And the Chair votes yes.

Roll call: Mr. Sergi, no; Hickernell, yes; Gelineau, yes; Rudnick, yes and the chair yes.

Mrs. Rando: Now, do I have a motion on the Proposed Decision as amended?

Mr. Hickernell: Can I just run through the amendments right now?

Mrs. Rando: Yes.

Mr. Hickernell: That the structure be built and maintained in conformity with the plans submitted at the hearing on March 8th and April 12th.

Second, that the Petitioner plant and maintain arborvitae on the border of the property with 71 Ash Street as shown on those plans.

Third, that the petitioner build and maintain a privacy fence on the border of the property with 65 Ash Street, on the border and not over.

Mrs. Rando: Do I have a motion on the decision as amended?

On motion of Mr. Hickernell that the decision, as amended, be adopted as the board's decision,

Mrs. Rando: Do I have a second? There was no second to the motion.)

Mrs. Rando: Do I hear a second?

Mrs. Rando: I'm sorry, we have no second.

Mr. Hickernell: I point out to the board that if you second it you are not required to vote for it.

Mrs. Rando: So, it didn't pass.

Mr. Sack: I would like to withdraw the application.

On motion of Mr. Hickernell, seconded by Mr. Sergi, the board voted to allow the petitioner to withdraw without prejudice.

Roll call: Mr. Sergi, yes; Mr. Hickernell, yes; Ms. Gelineau, yes; Mr. Rudnick, yes and Mrs. Rando, Yes.

At 7:28 P.M., on motion of Mr. Rudnick, seconded by Mr. Sergi, the board voted to take a five minute recess.

The board reconvened at 7:35 P.M.

Mrs. Rando: Would the clerk please the Petition in Case No. 2015-26.

The clerk then read the petition of Pasquale Torcasio in an application for a Special Permit - Alter non-conforming lot. Petitioner proposes to alter his existing non-conforming lot situated at 41 Williams Street. Location and Zoning District: 41 Williams Street; Commercial Zoning District.

Mrs. Rando: May we hear from the petitioner or the petitioner's representative, please?

Joseph M. Connors, Jr., Esquire, 404 Main Street, Waltham came forward.

Mr. Connors: Mr. Torcasio is sitting in the third road here.

This is a continued case and we have been here a couple of nights. (Mr. Connors submitted a supplemental brief containing cases that were cited relative to this petition to the board.) He then went over his brief with the board.

So it's our contention that it's an alteration of a nonconformity without limited by the ten percent enlargement because again we are not enlarging the nonconforming use.

We are eliminating the residential use and we are not affecting the lot area. The lot area remains constant static. It's not changing, it's not being reduced. So we feel that the only relief we need is the special permit from this board upon us showing that the proposal is not substantially more detrimental and there are two existing nonconformities; one, is a residential use in a commercial zoning district which is being eliminated and, two, we have an undersized lot. The undersized lot today is situated (Mr. Connors went over the plan with the board.) It has a full driveway which is utilized for the parking of vehicles for Mr. Torcasio's business and this was something allowed, and to enclose it and convert the residence for an office.

I've cited, you know, why I think that it's an alternative theory and alterations are limited by the ten percent mutually exclusive and I have provided some cases that talk about that.

We feel that this is an appropriate use in a commercial neighborhood. It will eliminate a residential use which is somewhat problematic down there because we have a mix of residential uses and commercial uses. This will allow the entire lot to be utilized for what's permissible there and allow whatever vehicles that are stored in the driveway to be enclosed and closed up at night and safe and secure. So, I've also submitted a brief and I did submit a supplemental brief on March 18th and I know the board wanted time to review that, so if there's any questions with that, I am certainly willing to respond. Thank you.

Mrs. Rando: Im a little confused here. You're asking under 3.7223 to change a nonconforming use which is the house.

Mr. Connors: Right. There's two nonconformities. One is a residential use in a commercial zone.

Mrs. Rando: But I'm under 3.7223.

Mr. Rudnick: No, 222.

Mrs. Rando: 222? But you're going to change it to ten percent.

Mr. Connors: No, we are going alter it.

Mrs. Rando: Alter it by ten percent.

Mr. Connors: No, I'm not going to alter it by ten percent. If I was limited in my alteration by ten percent, then I couldn't do what I wanted to do. So, I'm saying it's alter or enlarging that use no greater than ten percent of the ground floor area, land area of use. So, I'm saying that it's strictly an alteration that meets the required setbacks altogether. I am not enlarging that use. I'm not enlarging the nonconforming residential use. I can't enlarge the lot. The lot remains as it is, undersized, but it's a static number, it's going to remain the same.

So, it's my position that it says alter or enlarged in that use, so I'm simply saying it's an alteration. The alteration conforms to all the required setbacks in the zoning district. The use will conform to all the use requirements of the zoning district. So, I'm not introducing a nonconforming use. I'm eliminating a nonconforming use and I'm introducing an addition to what will be now a commercial building which meets all the required setbacks.

Mrs. Rando: Mr. Sergi, any questions at this time?

Mr. Sergi: No. I thought it was well drafted.

Mrs. Rando: Mr. Hickernell?

Mr. Hickernell: I appreciated the supplemental brief and I think your analysis has the merit of making some sense of Section 3.7222.

Mrs. Rando: Ms. Gelineau?

Ms. Gelineau: No, not at this time.

Mrs. Rando: Mr. Rudnick?

Mr. Rudnick: I have to admit, I read this seventy-five times after reading your brief. I wasn't convinced. It was really well done. It came as close to being convinced and I have always had a real problem with the way this 3.7222 is written. But you're depending an awful lot on that word "or" and it's separating the concepts of altering and enlarge and frankly I don't see it. I took your advice to look at this in the plainest english language where you could and, of course, when I change it to say "and" instead of "or" which is essentially your argument and making it's not "and" its "or", so that's altered and enlarge with a completely different concept.

Your argument that "or" creates altering and enlarging as alternatives, I agree with. I don't see that the sentence excludes the phrase "in that use" to be connected only to enlarge and not to alter as well. To me this says altered in that use or enlarged in that use. It doesn't say altered, period, enlarged in that use. This is an argument between us about two different views of the same language. I tried very hard to be convinced but I think the intention here was that the changes are meant to be in the existing use rather the changes of alterations or enlargements. So I do think that altering also means that it's not to exceed ten percent of the ground area of the building because that is what you're altering in my view. I hear your argument that you are altering the use of the lot and I accept that but I

don't see that you are not altering the building. So, I'm sorry but I wasn't convinced. I mean, try and convince me more.

Mr. Connors: I agree. We are altering the building. There's no question about that, but I'm saying I'm not enlarging in that use. I'm not enlarging the nonconforming use so I'm not affecting the lot area. The lot area remains static. And I'd say that Nichols case, that was a case where they didn't do anything other than just convert the interior of the building but, again, they said that it was an alteration and they needed approval. So I'm altering but for the fact, I mean, and I think that the Nichols case also says that because I have a building on there, we are entitled to protection. If I didn't have a building, then I'd be really out of line. But we have a building there, so it says that you have protection under Chapter 40A, Section 6 and so I'm saying it's an alteration that then conforms to the limitations of the zoning ordinance. It met all the setback requirements for that lot and the proposed use will conform as a by right use so, I know it's an interpretation issue and it's not easy. That's why there's been a lot of cases written about nonconformities and nonconforming uses but I think that it's a one or the other and this alteration will conform one hundred percent to the requirements of the ordinance, so I don't know if I convinced you but that's my effort. I think it's a historical ramification to the word, it's an "or" and it's not an "and" and our alteration will meet the required city ordinance. Thank you.

Mrs. Rando: Is there anyone in audience in favor of this petition? Seeing one, is there anyone in opposition? Seeing none, is there anyone seeking information? Seeing none, does anyone else have any questions? No questions from board members.

Mrs. Rando: What did Attorney Learned say that you needed a variance for in her opinion?

Mr. Connors: I think she was suggesting that I would need a variance for the lot area.

(Mrs. Rando read an excerpt from Attorney Learned's letter: "The answer to the second half of your first question is: there are no exceptions (other than a variance, which could be sought if property meets the requirements for the issuance of such a variance from the City's lot area zoning requirements for undersized lots in a commercial zone.")

Mr. Connors: So, I think she was suggesting that I needed a variance because the lot is undersized, but I respectfully disagree with her because I mean I think the Nichols case states and actually not only the Nichols Case but the other cases that I cited, I think it was DeFelice. DeFelice said that there was an example and the judge said what if you build a house on a lot that's 6000 square feet which is legal and they changed the lot requirements to 10,000 square feet so now you have a house on an undersized lot which is pre-existing nonconforming and there was a commercial building, and the clerk said, does that mean that a neighbor can now complain he had to tear down the commercial building next door because it's undersized? And they said no. So that was the language that I used and it was a hypothetical that was talked about in the DeFelice Case. So the court, I think in DeFelice said which is different than what Michelle Learned says, that if you have a building on an undersized lot you have protection. You don't need a variance. You may need a special permit but you don't need a variance. I think she's suggesting that I need a variance. I respectfully disagree and I think the DeFelice Case says that exactly. DeFelice said neither Section 6 of the by law especially protects an undersized non-residential lot but, however, both do so by necessary implications. Section 6 states that a by law shall not apply to pre-existing structures and then I set up the example. Suppose a building on a commercial lot and later increasing lot size requirements so that the lot becomes too small and I had the neighbor argues that it shall not apply to structures, protects only dimensional aspects of the structure itself, side yards, type and that since the lot has become too small, the building must be demolished. Surely that idea does not apply even without the benefit of Section 7 MGA, Chapter 40A. So that was the court talking. So I think that I don't need a variance for an undersized lot because I have a building on it. If I had a vacant piece of

land and it was not a ten thousand square foot lot in a commercial zone, I need a variance for an undersized lot.

Mr. Rudnick: So you disagree with the attorney and you also disagree with her statement that the City of Waltham permits a ten percent or enlargement. You disagree with that?

Mr. Connors: You know we are attorneys and we have disagreements.

Mrs. Rando: Does anyone have anything to add? (No questions from the board.)

You can continue with your Proposed Findings of Fact. Have you changed the Proposed Findings of Fact?

Mr. Connors: No.

On motion of Mr. Sergi, seconded by Mr. Hickernell, the board voted to waive the reading of the Proposed Findings of Fact since it has been on file in the Law Department.

Mrs. Rando: You may continue with your Proposed Decision.

On motion of Mr. Sergi, seconded by Mr. Hickernell, the board voted to waive the reading of the Proposed Decision since it has been on file in the Law Department and Counselor has not made any changes to the decision.

Mrs. Rando: Mr. Torcasio, you have trucks parked outside. Will they all go inside this garage?

Mr. Torcasio: Yes.

Mrs. Rando: All of them. Now are you also parking trucks outside on Bright Street? Is it Bright Street or Willow?

Mr. Torcasio: No.

Mrs. Rando: So, no residential parking trucks. But all your trucks are going to be inside.

Mr. Torcasio: Yes, inside the property.

Mr. Connors: So either in the building or enclosed in the fenced in area. So any heavy truck will have to go in the building otherwise he can't keep it there.

Mrs. Rando: I would like to make that a condition.

Mrs. Rando: So all heavy equipment inside or on the property.

Mr. Connors: All the heavy will be indoors.

Mrs. Rando: And the fence will be maintained by him.

Mr. Connors: Yes.

Mrs. Rando: All right. I am ready to entertain a motion on the Proposed Findings of Fact.

On motion of Mr. Sergi, seconded by Ms. Gelineau, the board voted to accept the Proposed Findings of Fact to be the Board's Findings of Fact.

Roll call: Mr. Sergi, yes; Mr. Hickernell, yes; Ms. Gelineau, yes; Mr. Rudnick, no and Mrs. Rando, yes. The vote was 4-1 in favor.

Mrs. Rando: Do I have a motion on the decision as amended?

On motion of Mr. Sergi, seconded by Ms. Gelineau, to adopt the Proposed Decision, as amended, to be the decision of the board.

Roll call: Mr. Sergi, yes; Mr. Hickernell, yes; Ms. Gelineau, yes; Mr. Rudnick, no and Mrs. Rando, no. The vote was 3-2 and the motion did not carry.

Mrs. Rando: So it is denied. I am sorry.

One more motion is in order.

On motion of Mr. Sergi, seconded by Ms. Gelineau, the board voted to adjourn at 8 P.M.

Barbara Genote, chair
4/26/16