

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
OFFICIAL MINUTES
March 4, 2013**

Members Present:

Michael Gallagher
Andrew Ozuna
Frank Quijano
Edward Hardemon
Helen Dutmer
George Britton
Brian Smith
Jesse Zuniga
Mary Rogers
Paul Klein
Maria Cruz

Staff:

Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner
Tony Felts, Planner
Paul Wendland, City Attorney

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. and Texas Flags.

Mr. Gallagher, Chairman, called the meeting to order and called roll of the applicants for each case.

Mr. Smith arrived a 1:05 pm.

CASE NO. A-13-004

Applicant – Alfonso Moreno
Lot 20, Block 3, NCB 13165
3803 Longridge Drive
Zoned: “R-5 AHOD” Residential Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a 4-foot 3-inch variance from the 3-foot maximum height allowed for a fence that is less than 70% open to allow a 7-foot 3-inch fence in the front yard

Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of denial of the requested variance. She indicated 29 notices were mailed, one was returned in favor and six were returned in opposition and no response from the Sunset Neighborhood Association.

Alfonso Moreno, applicant, stated he did not know the fence was going to exceed the height. He also stated there are other fences around the area. He further stated the fence would keep his dogs in the yard. He did not realize the fence would exceed the height.

No citizens appeared to speak.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-13-016 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Mr. Ozuna**. Re Appeal No. **A-13-004**, variance application for **Mr. Alfonso Moreno**, subject property is **Lot 20, Block 3, NCB 13165**, physical address of **3803 Longridge Drive**, the variance application request is for a **4-foot 3-inch variance from the 3-foot maximum height allowed for a fence that is less than 70% open to allow a 7-foot 3-inch fence in the front yard**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding Appeal No. **A-13-004**, application for a variance to the subject property as described above, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship. Specifically, we find that such variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the applicant provided prior testimony to us thru pictures of other properties within the surrounding neighborhood that had fences and/or retaining walls which the applicant claimed were similar to what he proposed and constructed on his property**. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **the applicant again provided testimony due to the slope of the property necessitated the construction of the fence to maintain a level fence height and the end of the property resulted in a 6-foot height**. The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **the granting of this ordinance would represent equal application of the ordinance to all citizens**. Some testimony presented to us earlier today showed that other property owners had "retaining walls" situated on their property and the applicant was merely building a retaining wall to help him deal with some of the retaining and slant of his property. Such variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the subject property is located in that **the requested variance will not authorize the operation of a use on the subject property other than those specifically permitted in the R-5 AHOD zoning district**. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located in that **the applicant provided some testimony and the response cards that were mailed out by the city showed that the neighbor to the left supported the variance that was sought today in the building of the fence**. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial, and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located in that **the applicant is request's is driven partly by the unique topography of the property in which it has an extreme slope requiring the wall to maintain a continuous level necessitated it to be 6-feet on one side and 3-feet on the other side that was not created by the owner**. The motion was seconded by **Mr. Quijano**.

AYES: None

NAYS: Ozuna, Hardemon, Klein, Dutmer, Zuniga, Britton, Quijano, Cruz, Rogers, Gallagher

ABSTAIN: Smith

THE VARIANCE WAS NOT GRANTED.

Board members recessed for 10 minutes.

CASE NO. A-13-019

Applicant – Lucia D. Oyervides

Lot 1, Block 18, NCB 11458

5102 Hemphill Street

Zoned: “R-5 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to allow a four-year renewal of a special exception for a one-operator beauty shop in a single family.

Tony Felts, Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of approval of the requested special exception for a four-year period. He indicated 25 notices were mailed, 6 were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition and no response from the Culebra Park Neighborhood Association.

Lucia Oyervides, applicant, stated she is requesting this special exception to provide a service to neighbors. She also stated she is satisfied with the allowed hours of operation. She further stated she did not realize that the sign was to be displayed on the structure not the fence.

No citizens appeared to speak.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-13-019 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Ms. Cruz**. In case **A-13-019**, special exception for **Ms. Lucia D Oyervides**, location **5102 Hemphill Street, Lot 1, Block 18, NCB 11458**, located at **5102 Hemphill Street**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicants request regarding Appeal No. **A-13-019**, application for a Special Exception for the subject property s described above, because the testimony and evidence presented to us and the facts that we have determined show that this Special Exception meets the requirements listed in UDC 35-399.01. Specifically, we find that the following conditions have been satisfied. The special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter in that **the requested special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter in that the proposed one-operator beauty salon will follow the specified criteria established in Section 35-399.01 of the Unified**

Development Code. The public welfare and convenience will be substantially served in that **public welfare and convenience will be served with the granting of this request as it will provide a valuable and needed public service to the residents of the neighborhood and it will not negatively impact surrounding properties.** The neighboring property will not be substantially injured by such proposed use in that **the subject property will be primarily used as a single-family residence. The beauty shop will occupy only a small part of the structure, and the fact that a beauty shop is being operated from the home will likely be indiscernible to passersby. As such, neighboring properties will not be substantially injured.** The special exception will not alter the essential character of the district and location in which the property for which the special exception is sought in that **the requested special exception will not alter the essential character of the district as the use will likely be indiscernible to passersby.** The special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district or the regulations herein established for the specific district in that **the purpose of the zoning district is to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the city. The granting of this special exception will not weaken these purposes, nor will it weaken the regulations established for this district. The hours of operation will be forty hours per week, Tuesdays, Wednesday, Thursday, Fridays and Saturday from 9:00 until 5:00 pm.** The motion was seconded by Ms. Dutmer.

AYES: Cruz, Dutmer, Klein, Britton, Rogers, Hardemon, Ozuna, Quijano, Zuniga, Smith, Gallagher

NAYS: None

THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION WAS GRANTED.

CASE NO. A-13-022

Applicant – Lucia D. Oyervides
Lot 1, Block 18, NCB 11458
5102 Hemphill Street
Zoned: “R-5 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a 4-foot, 8-inch setback variance to allow a carport within 4 inches of the side property line.

Tony Felts, Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of denial of the requested variance. He indicated 25 notices were mailed, six were returned in favor and none was returned in opposition and no response from the Culebra Park Neighborhood Association.

Lucia Oyervides, applicant, stated she is requesting this variance of this carport for a security and safety reasons. She also stated this would provide security for her customers. She further stated the carport in the front of the house would be more accessible for her customers.

No citizens appeared to speak.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-13-022 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made **Mr. Ozuna**. Re appeal No. **A-013-022**, variance application for **Ms. Lucia D Oyervides**, subject property is **Lot 1, Block 18, NCB 11458**, address **5102 Hemphill Street**, the variance request is for a **4-foot, 8-inch setback variance to allow a carport within 4 inches of the side property line**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding Appeal No. **A-013-022**, application for a variance to the subject property as described above, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship. Specifically, we find that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **building setbacks are designed to maintain orderly and safe development, and ensure access to air and light**. In this case, we have the right of way of Edgecliff which provides a 25-foot setback from the center line of the street which provides adequate light and a safety buffer in case of a fire of the structure. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **if we were to enforce the ordinance the applicant would need to remove the garage and relocate it to the backyard**. In this case she's built the garage for protection and safety of both the patrons of her beauty salon and also for her vehicles and her personal self as she enters. She was a close proximity of the carport to the house for safety reasons. The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **the spirit of the ordinance is observed in the fact that there is adequate setback with the Edgecliff right of way**. Such variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the subject property is located in that **the existing R-5 AHOD zoning will remain and there is no proposed changes to the zoning district**. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located in that **is not anticipated to substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties as carports are predominate in the neighborhood and we saw no opposition from adjoining property owners**. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial, and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located in that **the circumstances here are that the applicant was trying to provide safety and security for her personal self and for her vehicles and necessitated the construction of the carport which is mitigated by the 25-foot buffer as mentioned that the street Edgecliff provides**. The motion was seconded by **Ms. Dutmer**.

AYES: Ozuna, Dutmer, Klein, Britton, Rogers, Hardemon, Cruz, Quijano, Smith, Gallagher

NAYS: Zuniga

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

CASE NO. A-13-020

Applicant – Martin Cantero
Lots 11, & 12, Block 6, NCB 3042
3122 Buena Vista Street
Zoned: “MF-33 AHOD” Multi-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a special exception to allow a 6-foot ornamental wrought iron fence in the front yard.

Tony Felts, Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of approval of the requested variance. He indicated 21 notices were mailed, 4 were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition and no response from the Prospect Hill Neighborhood Association.

Betsy Cantero, applicant, stated the fence would provide security for their property. She also stated they have had numerous break-ins. She further stated the existing was deteriorating and construction was stopped because they were informed they needed to obtain a permit.

No citizens appeared to speak.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-13-020 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made **Mr. Klein**. Re Appeal No **A-13-020**, this is an application for a **special exception to erect a 6-foot Ornamental-iron front yard fence**, the applicant is **Martin Cantero**, the location is **3122 Buena Vista Street**, the legal description is **Lots 11 & 12, Block 6, NCB 3042**, the zoning is **“MF-33 AHOD” Multi-Family Airport Hazard Overlay**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant’s request regarding this appeal, for a Special Exception for the subject property as described above, because the testimony and evidence presented to us and the facts that we have determined show that this Special Exception meets the requirements listed in UDC 35-399.04. Specifically, we find that the following conditions have been satisfied. The special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter in that **the requested plan, meeting all of the design requirements established in Section 35-399.04 of the UDC, is in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter.** It’s also noted that **the applicant has not constructed the fence, has sought out the input from the Development Services Division the City of San Antonio in regards to the design requirements for a fence that will qualify for a special exception.** The public welfare and convenience will be substantially served in that **this will allow the applicant to securely protect the property.** The applicant has provided evidence of police reports of burglaries on the property and particularly noted that Buena Vista is a very busy street and high traffic either in pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The neighboring property will not be substantially injured by such proposed use in that **by granting the special exception that will not happen.** The design of the fence will not encroach on the neighboring properties or cause any undo hardship. The city staff has confirmed that it will not present any visual

obstruction at the intersection of SW 18th Street and Buena Vista. Other properties in the vicinity of the subject property already have front yard wrought iron fences and so this is common in the neighborhood. The special exception will not alter the essential character of the district and location in which the property for which the special exception is sought in that **there are several examples of ornamental-iron front yard fences, of varying heights, within the surrounding neighborhood. By granting the applicant's request for a special exception, the proposed fence will maintain the harmony and character of the district.** The special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district or the regulations herein established for the specific district in that **the requested special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the "MF-33" Multi-Family Residential zoning district. Again, my motion is as advertised and as shown on the plot plan that was submitted, should the applicant choose to do less that is there option should they choose to perhaps in the future do more, which is in conforming with the motion, they have the ability to do so.** The motion was seconded by **Mr. Hardemon.**

AYES: Klein, Hardemon, Cruz, Quijano, Rogers, Dutmer, Zuniga, Britton, Ozuna, Smith, Gallagher

NAYS: None

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

CASE NO. A-13-021

(5:05:11)

Applicant – Summit Hospitality V, LLC

Lots 36 & 37, NCB 12100

8505 Broadway

Zoned: "C-3 AHOD" Commercial Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a **1)** a 90-foot variance from the 100-foot minimum setback for a freestanding sign within 500-feet of an expressway and **2)** a 10-foot variance from the maximum 50-foot sign height to allow an existing freestanding sign that is 60-feet tall, with 300 square feet of sign area to be relocated from the right of way onto private property with a 10-foot setback.

Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of approval of the requested variance. She indicated 10 notices were mailed, none were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition.

Jerry Clark, representative, stated if the sign is not relocated, the owner will not be able to construct their business and have their own sign. He also stated the variance height would allow for visibility from the highway.

No citizens appeared to speak.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-13-022 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made **Ms. Rogers**. Re Appeal No. **A-13-021**, variance application for a **90-foot variance from the 100-foot minimum setback for a freestanding sign within 500 feet of an expressway and a 10-foot variance from the maximum 50-foot sign height to allow an existing freestanding sign that is 60 feet tall, with 300 square feet of sign area to be relocated from the right of way onto private property with a 10-foot setback**, subject property description address being **8505 Broadway, Lots 36 & 37, NCB 12100**, the applicant being **Summit Hospitality V, LLC**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding this appeal for a sign variance to the subject property as described above, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship. Specifically, we find that the variance is necessary because strict enforcement of this article prohibits any reasonable opportunity to provide adequate signs on the site, considering the unique features of a site such as **in this particular case the business is so far back on the property**. The board also finds that granting the variance does not provide the applicant with a special privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated and granting the variance will not have a substantially adverse impact upon neighboring properties **due to its location**. Granting the variance will not substantially conflict with the stated purposes of this article. The motion was seconded by **Mr. Quijano**.

AYES: Rogers, Quijano, Cruz, Smith, Britton, Zuniga, Dutmer, Ozuna, Hardemon, Gallagher

NAYS: Klein

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

Board members recessed for 10 minutes.

CASE NO. A-13-023

Applicant – Pape-Dawson Engineers
Lots 5, 6, 7, A-B-8, A-8, A-9, Block 25, NCB 821
723 Brooklyn Avenue
Zoned: "FBZ T5-1 RIO-2 AHOD" Form Based Zone Transect 5-1, River Improvements Overlay, Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a 1) a variance from a prohibition of parking in the first and second lot layer to allow parking between the building and the property line, 2) a variance from the requirement to mast parking by a street screen to allow parking which is visible from the public way and 3) a 6.5-foot variance from the required 12.5-foot sidewalk with to allow a new 6-foot sidewalk.

Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of partial approval of the requested variance. She indicated 36 notices were mailed, 2 were returned in favor and one was returned in opposition and no response from the Downtown Resident's Association.

Gary Smith, applicant, stated this variance would provide improvements and enhancements to the existing parking lot. He also stated they would like to pave the gravel area to avoid mud that is formed when it rains. He further stated they will be provided landscaping.

No citizens appeared to speak.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-13-023 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made **Mr. Klein**. Appeal No. **A-13-023**, the applicant is **Pape-Dawson Engineers**, the owner is the **Junior League of San Antonio**, the location is **723 Brooklyn Avenue**, the legal description being **Lots 5, 6, 7, A-B-8, A-8, A-9, Block 25, NCB 821**, the zoning is **"FBZ T5-1 RIO-2 AHOD" Form Based Zone Transect 5-1, River Improvement Overlay, Airport Hazard Overlay Districts**, this is a variance fro three variances as advertised **1) a variance from the prohibition against parking in the first and second lot layer to allow parking between the buildings and the property line; 2) a variance from the requirement to mask parking by a street screen to allow parking which is visible from the public way; and 3) a 6.5-foot variance from the required 12.5-foot sidewalk width to allow a new 6-foot sidewalk on Brooklyn Avenue**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding this appeal for variances to the subject property as described above, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship. Specifically, we find that such variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the Bright Shawl and the Junior League of San Antonio have been interval at this location for many years. This is a long needed improvement which has again been discussed between various city departments including the HDRC and the applicants request is in keeping with the area. It will not be contrary to the public interest given the testimony provided and that has come from the community**. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **in particular a variance would be necessary. In moving forward with the form based zone requirements, the profile of the sidewalks surrounding this contiguous piece of property would be required to be altered which is not necessarily in the city's best interest. Again in proposing a well thought out and planned development for**

the city block, the owner has provided a significant input to the board, to the HDRC, and to various city entities to indicate that this is an acceptable solution that meets all requirements of both the owner and the city. The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **substantial justice will be achieved through taking various components and input from various departments related to the form based zoning, river north overlay, the unified development code, blending it in to a plan which is placed before the board now will undergo further scrutiny thru the permitting process and will result in a true improvement to a landmark of San Antonio.** Such variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the subject property is located in that **the requested variances will not authorize the operation of a use on the subject property other than those specifically permitted in the FBZ T5-1, RIO-2, AHOD zoning district.** Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located in that **rather these improvements will be tremendously accepted, perhaps serve as a catalyst for adjoining areas.** It should also be noted that **this particular property is surrounded by city thoroughfares and does not directly impact an adjoining property owner.** The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial, and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located in that **the applicant is requesting variances from the form-based code to allow reconstruction of the site parking. Site parking is necessary for safe and convenient use of the property and this again has been stated previously. This project has been underway for a number of years, having received a certificate of appropriateness from the HDRC in December 2010 and does meet the requirements for approval of the variances. The site plan that has been provided to us is a part of this variance and must be followed.** The motion was seconded by Mr. Quijano.

AYES: Klein, Quijano, Cruz, Smith, Rogers, Hardemon, Zuniga, Dutmer, Ozuna, Britton, Gallagher

NAYS: None

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

CASE NO. A-13-024

Applicant – DSW Investors 1, LLC
Lots 20 & 21, NCB 14939
9806 IH 10 W and 9411 Wurzbach
Zoned: “C-2” Commercial Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a **1)** a 3-foot variance from the 50-foot maximum height allowance for a free-standing freeway sign to allow the existing 53-foot Drury Hotel sign, **2)** a 14-foot variance from the maximum 37.5 foot maximum height allowance for additional signs to allow the existing 51-foot Ruby Tuesday Sign, and **3)** a 5-foot variance from the maximum 37.5 maximum height for additional signs to allow the exiting 42-foot free-standing sign to be refaced for Best Western.

Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of approval of the requested variance. She indicated 16 notices were mailed, none were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition.

Rick Drury, representative, stated when the existing signs were built they were in compliance and in conformity. He also stated as the area has been redone which caused elevations to change and the right of way change. As a result of these changes, the sign have been out of proportion. The sign ordinance has also changed. He further stated they want to take the Best Western face down and put Best Western Plus on it.

No citizens appeared to speak.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-13-024 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made **Mr. Ozuna**. Re Appeal No. **A-013+024**, variance application for **DSW Investors 1, LLC**, property description is **Lots 20 & 21, NCB 14939**, located at **9806 IH 10 W and 9411 Wurzbach**, the variance request is for **1) a 3-foot variance from the 50-foot maximum height allowance for a freestanding freeway sign to allow the existing 53-foot Drury Hotel sign; 2) a 14-foot variance from the maximum 37.5 foot maximum height allowance for additional signs to allow the existing 51-foot Ruby Tuesday sign; and 3) a 5-foot variance from the maximum 37.5 maximum height for additional signs to allow the existing 42-foot free-standing sign to be refaced for Best Western**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding Appeal No. **A-13-024**, application for a sign variance to the subject property as described above, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship. Specifically, we find that the variance is necessary because strict enforcement of this article prohibits any reasonable opportunity to provide adequate signs on the site, considering the unique features of a site **given its proximity to the freeway and the tightness of the site plan and the information about the platted lots that resulted in the sign being off-premise necessitating the variance**. A denial of the variance would probably cause a cessation of legitimate, longstanding active commercial use of the property in that **again the applicant has provided testimony as a franchise for the Best Western of the impact that the lack of signs has caused with financial and access to the property which could cause a cessation of legitimate use of the property, clearly an impacted value of the property such that would create a slight significant hardship**. After seeking one or more of the findings set forth the board finds that granting the variance does not provide the applicant with a special privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated; and granting the variance will not have a substantially adverse impact upon neighboring properties; and granting the variance will not substantially conflict with the stated purposes of this article. The motion was seconded by **Mr. Hardemon**.

**AYES: Ozuna, Hardemon, Cruz, Quijano, Klein, Dutmer, Rogers, Britton, Zuniga,
Smith, Gallagher**

NAYS: None

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

Approval of the Minutes

The February 4, 2013 minutes were approved with all members voting in the affirmative.

Mr. Britton departed at 4:34 p.m.

There being no further discussion, meeting adjourned at 4:36 pm.

APPROVED BY: Michael R. Gallagher OR _____
Michael Gallagher, Chairman Andrew Ozuna, Vice-Chair

DATE: 3-18-13

ATTESTED BY: [Signature] DATE: 3-20-13
Executive Secretary