

At a meeting of the Town Council holden in and for the Town of Gloucester on May 6,2021:

Councilor Forgue stated that pursuant to current R.I. Executive Orders this meeting is being teleconferenced via Zoom.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was Called to Order at 7:31 P.M.

II. Roll Call

Members present: Julian (Jay) Forgue, President; William E. Reichert Vice President; Walter M.O. Steere III; Stephen Arnold; and William Worthy , Jr.

Also Present: Jean Fecteau, Town Clerk; David Igliazzi, Town Solicitor; ;Christine Mathieu, Deputy Town Clerk; Ken Johnson, Bldg/Zoning Official; Adam Muccino, Finance Director; Gary Treml, Director of Public Works, Robert Shields, Recreation Director; Karen Scott, Town Planner; Melissa Bouvier, Senior Center Director

III. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Councilor Arnold reminded the Council that there may be some people joining this meeting by telephone or without video capability, therefore, Council members should identify themselves when speaking, particularly when making or seconding a motion.

Councilor Arnold went on to explain the procedure for the zoom meeting, how participants can be recognized when requesting to speak, and further stated that participants expressing inappropriate behavior or being disruptive may be removed from the meeting by the Council.

IV. Open Forum - For Agenda Items

Councilor Forgue stated that those wishing to speak on agenda items should raise their hand and Christine Mathieu will recognize those that wish to speak.

Brian Couch, resident, stated that he has read the application that is the subject of the public hearing and has looked at the site and wants to go on record that he is against as proposed. Councilor Forgue asked if B. Couch was an abutter and B. Couch stated no. Councilor Forgue stated that B. Couch could speak when the public hearing was opened.

V. Public Hearings

A. Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Discussion and/or Action

Proposed amendment: Amend Land Use Element to allow increased density in a Planned District of up to three (3) units per one (1) acre and to the Future Land Use Map designating Plat 10, Lot 116 as a Planned District.

Applicant: Overlook Ridge, LLC
23 Business Park, Smithfield, RI 02917

Owner: Bella Sand, LLC
23 Business Park, Smithfield, RI 02917

Councilor Forgue stated that the Proposed amendment is to Amend the Land Use Element to allow increased density in a Planned District of up to three (3) units per one (1) acre and to the Future Land Use Map designating Plat 10, Lot 116 as a Planned District for Applicant: Overlook Ridge, LLC, 23 Business Park, Smithfield, RI 02917, Owner: Bella Sand, LLC.

Councilor Forgue stated that this Public Hearing was advertised in the Valley Breeze Observer on April 22nd , 29th, and May 6th, 2021

Councilor Forgue DECLARED the Public Hearing OPEN

Councilor Forgue stated that our attorney for this item has requested we CONTINUE the Public Hearing until May 20, 2021

MOTION was made by Councilor Arnold to CONTINUE the Public Hearing, opened on May 6, 2021, for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment, for Applicant: Overlook Ridge, LLC/ Owner: Bella Sand, LLC to the Town Council meeting of May 20, 2021; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye

Councilor Worthy - Councilor Worthy stated he will Recuse from this matter.

Councilor Steere -Aye

Councilor Reichert -Aye

Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED

Councilor Forgue stated that anyone wishing to speak to raise your hand and you will be called on by the clerk; and, to please state your name and address for the record.

The Town Clerk stated that the Council has just continued the Public Hearing and stated if it is Council's intent to allow discussion they would need to reconsider the vote just taken.

MOTION was made by Councilor S. Arnold to RECONSIDER the motion to continue the public hearing and proceed with the Public Hearing; seconded by Councilor W. Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold - Aye
Councilor Worthy - Recused
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Discussion: B. Couch, resident of Gloucester, stated that he was not an abutter and wants to be on record as opposing this proposal as it is onerous and there is no hardship to the applicant.

J. Mancini, attorney for the applicant, stated that he is confused as to the process tonight as he is prepared to give a presentation with witnesses.

J. Fecteau, Clerk stated that the Town Planner is also prepared to speak regarding the application.

J. Mancini stated the Planner has already given her presentation and questioned how she had a position now. Councilor Reichert stated that the town learned today that the town's attorney could not be at the meeting and felt that representation was needed. J. Mancini stated the applicant should be given his due process. Councilors Steere and Forgue discussed as to whether or not to have the applicant's attorney make a presentation with witnesses . Councilor Steere stated that D. Igliazzi, attorney for Town Council, has been placed in a difficult spot as he can only speak to procedure and it would be better in his opinion to wait.

Councilor Forgue asked Councilors to also raise their hand to speak during the public hearing.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER the previous motion and proceed with the public hearing was made by Councilor Arnold ; seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Recused
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED

Councilor Forgue stated that anyone wishing to speak to raise your hand and you will be called on by the clerk; and, to please state your name and address for the record.

Discussion: Councilor Forgue stated that Council has an advisory opinion from Planning Board and read as follows:

Request to Amend the Comprehensive Plan
Plat 10, Lot 116
Advisory Opinion of the Planning Board
April 12, 2021

Overlook Ridge, LLC, applicant and Bella Sand, LLC, owner, is proposing an amendment to the existing Comprehensive Plan which was adopted on April 19, 2018 and amended October 1, 2020. An amendment is proposed to the text of the Land Use Element to allow density in a Planned District of up to three (3) units per one (1) acre and to the Future Land Use Map designating Plat 10, Lot 116 as a Planned District.

At their April 12, 2021 meeting, the following motion was made by Planning Member Mike DeGrange:

I make a motion to recommend that the Town Council does not adopt Amendment #21- 01 dated March 18, 2021, revised March 26, 2021 to Gloucester 2040, the Town of Gloucester's Comprehensive Community Plan and an amendment to Chapter 1. General Provisions, Article III Comprehensive Community Plan, of the Gloucester Code of Ordinances. The Planning Board finds that this proposed amendment is too broad and specifically the proposed density is too high and not consistent with the rural nature of the Town.

Information about this plan amendment was made available at Town Hall and has been disseminated to the public on the Town's website and at this public hearing. The public has had the opportunity to provide both written and oral comments on the proposed amendments. A public hearing was held by the Planning Board on April 12, 2021.

Pursuant to RI Executive Order #20-05 and #20-46 executed by Governor Gina Raimondo, this public hearing was teleconferenced via Zoom. Notice of the public hearing was given specifying the log in information for the Zoom meeting, date and time of the hearing, indicated that the adoption of an amendment to the comprehensive plan is under consideration, advised those interested where and when the matter under consideration may be examined or obtained, and stated that the plan may be altered prior to the close of the public hearing without further advertising. The notice was given in the Valley Breeze published on March 25, 2021, April 1, 2021 and April 8, 2021, providing at least 3 weeks of notice.

The motion was seconded by Planning Board member Lynn Furney. Ayes - (Calderara, Clifford, DeGrange, Delos, Folcarelli, Furney, Pitocco). Motion approved 7- 0.
(End of motion)

Councilor Forgue stated that anyone wishing to speak to raise your hand and you will be called on by the clerk; and, to please state your name and address for the record.

Discussion:

1. Attorney J. Mancini gave a presentation outlining the history of Bella Vista and the details of what the applicant was proposing. J. Mancini stated that he had two witnesses. Attorney Mancini stated the first witness was the engineer N. Piampiano.

2. N. Piampiano presented a summary explaining the location/site of the proposed 11.52 acre development which included information as to soil test, the water table, wetlands, and six wells. Mr. Piampiano explained the density was 2.95 units per acre, there would be 17 buildings, 68 parking spaces (two per unit), and 68 garage spaces. Mr. Piampiano stated all buildings would have 80 feet separating them as well as a minimum of 25 feet for backyards.

3. Atty. J. Mancini continued with questioning of Mr. Piampiano. Attorney Mancini asked N. Piampiano to describe the location of the wells. N. Piampiano stated there would be four wells on the west and two wells on the east. N. Piampiano stated in response to Attorney Mancini's question that there would be three affordable housing units and identified the locations. (Shared screen diagram-no verbal description) N. Piampiano also stated, in response to Attorney Mancini's questions: the topography of the site and the proposed landscaping would screen it from Bella Vista; that the main access would be from Victory Highway with a second gated access for emergency vehicles on Cross Road. When asked, Mr. Piampiano described the maximum height of the buildings would be 26-29 feet one level units. Mr. Piampiano described the commercial buildings that could be built; and agreed with Mr. Mancini that the landscaping required for a commercial building would be different than a residential use. Mr. Piampiano agreed with Atty. Mancini that commercial buildings would be a use allowed by right currently. Councilor Forgue asked about landscaping and N. Piampiano stated, possibly, a screening of 8 foot tall evergreens would be along the length of each residential building. Councilor Arnold asked about the screening on the highway side. N. Piampiano stated that he would need to look into that and take it case by case. Councilor Reichert asked about the density comparison with the density below. N. Piampiano stated that the density for the proposed development would be 2.95 units per acre and that the density for the existing development is 1.4 units per acre on the 50 acres. Councilor Reichert asked about the septic system. N. Piampiano stated that all wells and septic will be on the proposed development lot.

2. Christine St. Denis, resident at 4 Cross Road, stated that the proposed development should not be commercial. Mr. St. Denis stated it would be alright to be residential, but changing the density would make it like a housing project. Ms. St. Denis also stated that the developer had scavenged the land by removing all trees. Ms. St. Denis stated that there were septic pipes at the Cross Road end and she was concerned about her well. Ms. St. Denis expressed concerns about traffic issues already in that area. Ms. St. Denis was concerned about the density proposed. N. Piampiano stated that the pipes were drain pipes not a septic system. Mr. Piampiano also explained that the density was 1.4 on 30 acres and not 50 acres as was previously stated. Mr. Piampiano stated they will not be adding more traffic and that the entrance at Cross Road would be gated. Discussion followed on the surrounding property and roads. Mr. Piampiano stated the land was the same as in 2014. Ms. St. Denis agreed the land hasn't changed other than the scavaging of the property. Councilor Forgue stated Mr. Piampiano explained things very well. Councilor Forgue asked Mr. Piampiano if they do the commercial you would be able to do exactly what you are planning to do with the residential. Mr. Piampiano answered in the affirmative. Ms. St. Denis again expressed concerns about where the septic would be. Mr. Piampiano explained that has not been determined but that all regulations will be met as to wells; and that Bella Vista wants to be a good neighbor and landscaping of the green giants will be planted on that side.

K. Scott, Town Planner, referred to the site plan and the original motion stipulation which states “no building shall be constructed within three hundred and fifteen (315) feet of the southwesterly property line of Assessor’s Plat 10, Lot 116 as the same abuts Cross Road”. K. Scott inquired if the set back allowed on the original planned district was still be maintained. N. Piampiano stated in the negative. Councilor Forgue asked what the set back would be. N. Piampiano stated the closest building would be about 60 feet from the property line per his quick measurement. Councilor Forgue asked that the original set back was a 315 set back. Mr. Piampiano stated that was for the commercial development. Councilor Forgue asked about the parking area around the commercial and N. Piampiano stated he would have to look but it was probably less than 300 feet.

G. (Buster) Steere, resident and abutter asked about the water table as it had been filled in. N. Piampiano stated that the test holes were done on unfilled in land and are shown on the site plan. G. Steere asked if all septic systems were going in virgin land and not the filled in areas. N. Piampiano answered in the affirmative. G. Steere stated his concerns about the number of new wells and their effect on the neighbors wells. N. Piampiano stated that a hydrology study will be done and they will sink a few test wells to make an analysis. G. Steere stated he is concerned about the density because it is a little over the top. G. Steere asked about deed restrictions and how the restrictions read would stop similar density in other areas of town. Attorney Mancini stated that they are creating a process to enable responsible development with deed restrictions as to affordable housing and 55 and over. Mr. Mancini spoke of the developers rights to develop the property.

J. Mancini confirmed the number of buildings, 34 units, residential age restricted condominiums with no more than one or two bedroom, in the proposal in response to questions from L. Gaddis Barrett. J. Mancini stated that his next witness had prepared a fiscal analysis. L.Gaddis Barrett stated she has more questions related to the tax impact so would reserve her time until after that witness.

Christine St. Denis, resident, stated that she feels it is time for the legal representation and that the legal team for the town should be speaking for what the town needs and not just the legal team for the applicant. Councilor Forgue stated his appreciation for C. St. Denis’s comments but that the it is up to the Council and the people of the town to decide what the town wants and needs.

Attorney Mancini stated he is presenting the applicant’s position and the law.

Attorney Mancini’s second witness presentation was by Joseph Lombardo. J. Lombardo prepared a fiscal impact study which included that the 34 proposed units, based on approx. sale price of \$425,000 per unit, would generate approximately \$7,700 per unit per year, for a total of approx.. \$260,000 per year in revenue with additional amounts from the car tax as well as from building permits. Mr. Lombardo explained the financial benefits to a community of a restrictive neighborhood. Mr. Mancini questioned on the process. J. Lombardo described the difference between using a text amendment and the amendment to the land use map. J. Lombardo stated that the text amendment to the comprehensive plan provides more specificity as does including it on the land use map . J. Lombardo stated that by setting the text amendment up in the way proposed, it would give the Council the ability to review each case on a case by case basis. J. Lombardo stated that the Town Council has the authority under state law to prescribe conditions on this application and also to make changes to the comprehensive plan.

Jean Powers, resident and abutter, asked the price of the affordable housing units. J. Lombardo stated those prices are set by RI Housing. J. Powers stated she is concerned about her well and the density.

L. Gaddis Barret, resident, asked if J. Lombardo used the \$425,000 sales price for his study. L.Gaddis Barrett asked what other real estate sources were consulted in setting this price as it seems extreme .Councilor Forgue stated this was irrelevant. L. Gaddis Barret stated the reason she asked this question was because the net benefit to the town of the \$260,000 is based on the sales price of \$425,000. L. Gaddis Barret asked if the net benefit of \$260,000 is based on one year or over time. Councilor Forgue stated that is a fluctuating number. J. Lombardo stated that the benefit number is an estimate and may fluctuate over time as the over 55 people receive exemptions but that home values also increase over time so they may stay fairly constant. J. Lombardo stated that this estimate is based on if all of the units were built and occupied in 2021.

G. Steere stated that there should be more like 7 affordable housing units instead of the 3 shown to bring the town up towards the 10% required by law.

Attorney Mancini stated his explanation as to the benchmark number of \$425, 000 and how it was estimated. Attorney Mancini stated that the \$263,000 is an estimate of what the town should yield when all units are occupied.

Councilor Forgue stated that anyone wishing to speak to raise your hand and you will be called on by the clerk; and, to please state your name and address for the record.

Discussion: None

MOTION was made by Councilor Steere to CONTINUE the Public Hearing, to May 20, 2021 at 7:30 PM ; seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Recused
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED

B. Code of Ordinance, Chapter 350 Zoning Map Amendment- Discussion and/or Action

Proposal to amend an existing Planned Unit District - Commercial uses

To: A New Planned District - Residential uses.

Applicant: Overlook Ridge, LLC

23 Business Park, Smithfield, RI 02917

Owner: Bella Sand, LLC

23 Business Park, Smithfield, RI 02917

Location of Proposal: Victory Highway/Bronco Highway (Route 102) AP 10, Lot 116

Councilor Forgue stated that there is a Proposal to amend an existing Planned Unit District, from Commercial uses to a new Planned District - Residential uses, for Applicant: Overlook Ridge, LLC, Location of business: 23 Business Park, Smithfield, RI 02917; Owner: Bella Sand, LLC; location of Proposal: Victory Highway/Bronco Highway (Route 102) AP 10, Lot 116

Councilor Forgue stated that this Public Hearing was advertised in the Valley Breeze Observer on April 22nd, 29th, and May 6th, 2021

Councilor Forgue DECLARED the Public Hearing OPEN

MOTION was made by Councilor Arnold to CONTINUE the Public Hearing, opened on May 6, 2021, for the proposed Chapter 350 Zoning Map Amendment, to amend an existing Planned Unit District - Commercial uses, To: A New Planned District - Residential uses, for Applicant: Overlook Ridge, LLC/ Owner: Bella Sand, LLC to the Town Council meeting of May 20, 2021 at 7:30 PM; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: Councilor Worthy retracted his second.

MOTION was made by Councilor Arnold to CONTINUE the Public Hearing, opened on May 6, 2021, for the proposed Chapter 350 Zoning Map Amendment, to amend an existing Planned Unit District - Commercial uses, To: A New Planned District - Residential uses, for Applicant: Overlook Ridge, LLC/ Owner: Bella Sand, LLC to the Town Council meeting of May 20, 2021 at 7:30 PM; seconded by Councilor Steere

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Recused
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED

C. Gloucester Code of Ordinance - Discussion and/or Action

Councilor Forgue stated that there is a Proposed Amendment to Chapter 350, Attachment 2, Table of Dimensional Regulations - the proposed amendment represents changes to sections A4, A3 and R2 Zoning regarding lot coverage

Councilor Forgue stated that this Public Hearing was advertised on April 8th, 15th, and 22nd, 2021 in the Valley Breeze Observer.

Councilor Forgue DECLARED the Public Hearing OPEN

Councilor Forgue stated that this recommendation was first brought forward by the Building/Zoning Official and that a first reading was held on April 1, 2021.

Councilor Forgue stated that Council has received an advisory opinion from the Planning Board and read as follows:

To: Town Council Members
From: Karen Scott, Town Planner
Date: May 3, 2021
RE: Advisory Opinion, Amendments to Table of Dimensional Regulations- Lot Coverage

At their May 3, 2021 special meeting, the Planning Board voted to send the attached Advisory Opinion which included recommended revisions to the lot coverage requirements as originally presented. These recommendations are included in the attached Advisory Opinion and are hereby forwarded to the Town Council for consideration. I plan to attend the May 6, 2021 meeting to answer any questions you may have.

(End of memo)

Councilor Forgue read the Planning Board Advisory Opinion as follows:

Amendments to Table of Dimensional Regulations, Building Coverage Advisory Opinion of the
Planning Board

At their May 3, 2021 meeting, the following motion was made by Planning Board member Michael DeGrange:

After careful consideration and discussion at the April 26, 2021 and May 3, 2021 special meetings, the Gloucester Planning Board hereby does not recommend that the Town Council enact revisions to the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance as detailed in the attached Draft Attachment 2, Table of Dimensional, dated 3/16/21, attached hereto. Said revisions increase the permitted building coverage in all residential zones. The Board concluded the following:

1. Removing any building coverage requirements from conforming lots was too permissive and could lead to abuse.
2. The proposed building coverage requirements for legal non-conforming lots of record were too permissive.

The Board concluded that higher building coverage was appropriate on legal non-conforming lots of record but felt that it should be lower than that proposed by the attached draft dated 3/16/21: Property owners could still request a variance for higher lot coverage, but the neighbors would be notified and able to provide input on the project, which the Planning Board concluded was important.

The Board recommends the following revised language related to building coverage:

1. Keep the building coverage requirements for conforming lots the same as it is currently in the Table of Dimensional Regulations:
 - a. A-4 -4%
 - b. A-3-4%

- c. R-2- 5%
2. Amend the building coverage requirements for legal non-conforming lots of record:
 - a. A-4 and A-3
 - i. 43,561square feet and greater- 4%
 - ii. Between and including 43,560 square feet (1.0 acre)- 21,780 square feet (0.5 acres)- 10%
 - iii. Between and including 21,779 square feet- 10,890 square feet (0.25 acres)- 12%
 - iv. 10,889 square feet or less- 15%
 - b. R-2
 - i. 43,561square feet and greater- 5%
 - ii. Between and including 43,560 square feet (1.0 acre)- 21,780 square feet (0.5 acres)- 10%
 - iii. Between and including 21,779 square feet- 10,890 square feet (0.25 acres) - 12%
 - iv. 10,889 square feet or less- 15%

The Board's revised recommendation is based upon the following Findings of Fact Relating to Consistency with the Gloucester Comprehensive Community Plan and Purposes of Zoning per RIGL Title 45 Chapter 24, the Zoning Enabling Act of 1991 as noted below.

Findings of Fact

Consistency with the Comprehensive Community Plan

1. The proposed amendments are consistent with the following policy of the Land Use Element:
 - a. Protect, enhance and maintain the unique natural and historical features of Gloucester while allowing for appropriate development to occur.

Councilor Worthy continued the reading of the Planning Board advisory opinion as follows:

Consistency with the Purposes of Zoning

The Planning Board finds that the Planning Board's proposed zoning amendments are consistent with the following general purposes of zoning ordinances per RIGL § 45-24-30:

1. Providing for a range of uses and intensities of use appropriate to the character of the city or town and reflecting current and expected future needs.
2. Providing for orderly growth and development which recognizes:
 - (i) The natural characteristics of the land, including its suitability for use based on soil characteristics, topography, and susceptibility to surface or groundwater pollution; and
 - (ii) The need to shape and balance urban and rural development.
3. Providing for efficient review of development proposals, to clarify and expedite the zoning approval process.

In making this recommendation, the Board has considered the following:

1. Discussions held at the April 26, 2021 and May 3, 2021 special meetings.

Based on the above findings, I hereby make a motion to not recommend that the Town Council enact revisions to the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance as detailed in the attached Draft Attachment 2, Table of Dimensional Regulations, dated 3/16/21 and to instead recommend approval of the draft revised Zoning Ordinance revisions as proposed by the Planning Board and included in this Advisory Opinion the Gloucester Town Council.

The motion was seconded by Planning Board member Lynn Furney. Approved 5- 0. Ayes - Calderara, Clifford, DeGrange, Furney, Pitocco.

(End of advisory opinion)

Discussion: Councilor Forgue stated that we have prepared a chart that shows the 1st reading recommendation by the Building/Zoning Official and the Planning Board recommendation side by side.

Councilor Forgue asked the Clerk to share her screen. Councilor Forgue stated that the first reading version is in red and the Planning Board recommendation is in blue.

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue stated that anyone wishing to speak for or against this ordinance amendment please raise your hand and you will be acknowledged.

Discussion:

John Mullins, 117 Spring Grove Road, stated he is against increasing this ordinance because there will be too much building per lot and bigger buildings on smaller lots would take away from the area.

Maureen Kershaw, 102 Spring Grove Road, wants to go on record asking if the board changed the density.

K. Johnson, Building Official, stated that most lots on Spring Grove Road are non conforming and that the only thing changing is that lots under an acre will have 10% coverage and gave an example.

Councilor Arnold thanked K. Johnson , Building Official and K. Scott, Town Planner for their time and energy on this proposal. Councilor Arnold asked if the changes would make it more standard

K. Johnson, Building Official, stated that a 1/4 acre lot can currently have a 400 sf house but with the septic systems of today it allows for a larger home; and that changing the ordinance would relieve zoning and planning. K. Scott, Town Planner, stated that the Planning Board came up with their own recommendations and that many of the variance requests come from the small lake lots that were only 600 to 700 square feet. Councilor Steere asked if the lot coverage was to the footprint or the size of the house. K. Johnson stated that it was the footprint and that building set backs still must be met. Councilor Steere stated his concerns that even with the footprint, the house could be built up so having to go to zoning for a variance is the process that protects the town and neighbors. K. Scott stated that there is a protection of a maximum building height of 35 feet.

Councilor Forgue DECLARED the Public Hearing CLOSED

Discussion: D. Igliazzi, Attorney, summarized the three options for the Council: Amending with the Bldg/Zoning Inspectors recommendation; amending with the Planning Board’s recommendations; or deny the zone change.

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to AMEND Chapter 350, Attachment 2, Table of Dimensional Regulations, Lot Coverage as proposed at a First Reading, of the Town Council, on April 1, 2021, said amendment effective upon passage; seconded by Councilor Arnold

Discussion: Councilor Reichert questioned the motion . Councilor Worthy retracted his motion and Councilor Arnold retracted his second.

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to AMEND Chapter 350, Attachment 2, Table of Dimensional Regulations, Lot Coverage as proposed by the Planning Board in their Advisory Opinion, as voted, at the May 3, 2021 meeting of the Planning Board, said amendment effective upon passage; seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

- Councilor Arnold -Aye
- Councilor Worthy -Aye
- Councilor Steere -Aye
- Councilor Reichert -Aye
- Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- VI. Consent Items - Discussion and/or Action
 - A. Approval of Town Council Minutes: Regular meeting of April 15th & Budget Public Hearing minutes of April 22nd, 2021

MOTION was made by Councilor Arnold to APPROVE the Town Council minutes of the Regular meeting of April 15th and the Budget Public Hearing minutes of April 22, 2021; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

- Councilor Arnold -Aye
- Councilor Worthy -Aye
- Councilor Steere -Aye
- Councilor Reichert -Aye
- Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

VII. Unfinished Business

A. Boards and Commissions

1. Appointments - Discussion and/or Action

a. Parade Committee

1. Alternate position # 1
2. Alternate position # 2
3. Positions #7,8,and 9

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to TABLE the appointment to Alternate position #1, Parade Committee; seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Alternate position # 2

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to TABLE the appointment to the Alternate position #2, Parade Committee; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Positions # 7, 8, and 9

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to TABLE the appointments to Position #7; Position #8; and Position #9 on the Parade Committee; seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- b. Tax Assessor’s Board of Assessment Review
 - 1. Position # 3 term to expire 12/31/2024

Councilor Forgue asked A. Muccino, Finance Director, if he had any recommendations. A. Muccino stated he is still working on it.

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to TABLE the appointment to Position #3 on the Tax Assessor’s Board of Assessment Review; seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- c. Historic District Commission-
 - 1. Position # 1 - Term to expire 11/1/2023

Councilor Forgue stated that the Chair has requested this item be tabled.

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to TABLE the Appointment to the Historic District Commission , Position #1 to May 20, 2021; seconded by Councilor Arnold

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

VIII. New Business

A. Covid-19 Updates/Discussions/Actions

1. EMA Update - Discussion and/or Action

Councilor Steere stated that G. Mosca, EMA Director, was unable to attend tonight's meeting. Councilor Steere stated that G. Mosca recommends keeping the Emergency Order in place till June 3rd. Councilor W. Steere informed the Council that the town will be holding a COVID clinic on May 15th for people 16 and older .

2. Emergency Declaration Status, Extension, and/or Amendments
(Currently in place until May 6,2021) - Discussion and/or Action

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to EXTEND the Emergency Declaration to June 3, 2021 ;seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: Councilor Steere stated that volunteers are needed for the May 15th clinic, and asked those interested so please contact G. Mosca. Councilor Forgue thanked all the volunteers.

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye

Councilor Worthy -Aye

Councilor Steere -Aye

Councilor Reichert -Aye

Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Senior Center - Phase 3 reopening - Discussion and/or Action

Councilor Arnold stated that the Senior Center Director has submitted the following to Council and read as follows:

4-29-2021

To The Honorable Town Council,

I would like to discuss the full reopening of the Senior Center at the next Town Council meeting.

We would continue to follow CDC and DOH restrictions but would like the freedom to build our schedule of activities to suit the needs of our members. Some of the changes would be:

1. To increase the amount of members in the building to 100% capacity with a 3 foot social distancing and mask wearing policy.
2. To bring card games and fitness classes back to the Center, providing the ability to maintain a minimum 3 foot social distancing/mask wearing policy and providing hand sanitizer at tables for participants.
3. We would like the ability to build our activity schedule as we see fit following the policies agreed upon, but no longer having a limit to the number of activities per day.
4. We would continue with the boxed lunch program rather than offering the dine-in program. This would keep in line with our masks on at all times policy.

5. Pre-registration would still be required to gain entry into the building for activities or services. This would then only require a scan of their membership card as a check in because I will have already scheduled them into our software system to attend their activity. (no touch) This would also meet the requirements of collecting names and phone numbers of those we service in the event we would need to contact trace.

These changes would go into effect starting June 1st 2021.

Respectfully,
Melissa Bouvier
(end of memo)

Discussion:

M.. Bouvier, Senior Center Director, stated that she attended a directors association meeting yesterday where they discussed reopening . M. Bouvier stated that most of the seniors have been vaccinated and that the current approach has been working so she feels confident going forward.

Attorney Iglizzi stated that a motion was needed.

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to increase the amount of members into the building to 100% capacity with a 3 foot social distancing and mask wearing policy; to bring card games and fitness classes back to the Center providing the ability to maintain a minimum 3 foot social distancing/mask wearing policy and providing hand sanitizer at tables for participants; give them the ability to bring back their activity schedules as they see fit but no longer having a limit to the number of activities per day; to allow them to continue with the boxed lunches; require pre registration into the building for activities or services and allow to scan membership, as they already do; and, the changes to go into effect as of June 1, 2021; seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- B. Boards and Commissions
 - 1. Resignation - Discussion and/or Action
 - a. Zoning Board of Review

Position #4 - Term to expire 11/1/2021

Councilor Forgue stated that Council has received the resignation of Joseph Trunzo from the Zoning Board.

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to ACCEPT, with thanks, the resignation of Joseph Trunzo, Position #4, Zoning Board of Review; seconded by Councilor Steere

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- 2. Appointment
 - a. Zoning Board of Review - Discussion and/or Action
 - 1. Position #4 - Term to expire 11/1/2021

Councilor Forgue stated that the Chair has recommended the Alternate #1 member be moved up to this position.

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to APPOINT Rob Kelman to Position #4, Zoning Board of Review; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Alternate #1 - Term to expire 11/1/2021

Councilor Forgue stated that the Chair has recommended moving the Alternate #2 member to this position.

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to APPOINT Mike Martone to the Alternate #1 position, Zoning Board of Review; seconded by Councilor Arnold

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Alternate #2 - Term to expire 11/1/2021

Councilor Forgue stated that the Chair has recommended the appointment of Frank Anderson to this position.

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to APPOINT Frank Anderson to the Zoning Board of Review, Alternate #2 position; seconded by Councilor Arnold

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Adoption of 2021/2022 Budget - Discussion and/or Action

1. Final amendments to proposed budget prior to adoption

Councilor Forgue stated that Council has received a memo from the Finance Director.

Councilor Arnold read the memo as follows:

To: The Honorable Gloucester Town Council, Jay Forgue, President
From: Adam R. Muccino, Finance Director
Date: 05/06/2021
Regarding: Adoption of 2021122 Budget

Since the public hearing on the FY22 proposed budget, I have incorporated the changes voted on by the Council from that meeting into the FY22 proposal. Below is a listing of final adjustments that I am proposing to the FY22 budget for the Council to consider:

1. Adjust the special appropriation for Town Storm expenses from \$68,091 to \$28,091. The \$40,000 difference has already been approved by the Council and subsequently the voters of the Town for the FY20 budget cycle. This allocation will be presented to the Council to assign at a later meeting. For now, the \$28,091 represents the amount that was unspent in fiscal20 in the DPW operating storm account.

2. Adjust the special appropriation for Town Capital from \$242,297 to \$445,462. Given the changes to the budget at the Public Hearing as well as the change proposed in number 1, above, we need to adjust the special appropriation for Town Capital. The 2% set-aside requirement in the Town Charter is the driver for this change.

With the approval of these two changes the FY22 budget proposal is set to adopt to present to the voters of the Town of Gloucester.

Respectfully,
Adam R. Muccino
(end of memo)

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to ADJUST the special appropriation for Town Storm expenses from \$68,091 to \$28,091; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye

Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION was made by Councilor Worthy to ADJUST the special appropriation for Town Capital from \$242,297 to \$445,462; seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Adoption of Budget to present to voters

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to ADOPT the 2021/2022 Budget, as amended by Town Council, for presentation to the Financial Town Referendum to be held on May 25, 2021; seconded by Councilor Arnold

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Adoption of 2021 Ballot Questions

Councilor Forgue stated that the Clerk has prepared the Ballot Questions in final format for the Financial Town Referendum. Councilor Forgue stated that each Special Appropriation, numbers 2-7, were previously approved by a vote of the Town Council. Councilor Forgue stated that this action is to approve the ballot language:

Councilor Forgue stated that Question #1 is the result of the entire budget as amended and approved by Council:

MOTION was made by Councilor Forgue to ADOPT the language for Question #1 : Shall the Town Budget for fiscal year 2021/22 appropriate a sum of **\$32,051,979** which includes Municipal Services & Capital Expenses; Gloucester School Dept. Operating & Capital Expenses; Gloucester's share of the Foster/Glocester Regional Operating & Capital Expenses; and includes a Levy of Property Tax (not including Motor Vehicle taxes) of not less than **\$ 20,806,951** or more than **\$ 21,639,229?**

Seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION was made by Councilor Forgue to ADOPT the language for Question #2: Shall the Town Budget include an appropriation of **\$500,000** for Public Safety Infrastructure improvement in the form of a purchase of land for a new Public Safety complex **or** for land to expand at the existing Police Station site ; said appropriation shall include costs for engineering & architectural design for either option; this appropriation will come from existing surplus and will not increase the amount to be raised by taxes?

Seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION was made by Councilor Forgue to ADOPT the language for Question #3: Shall the Town Budget include an appropriation of **\$100,000** as a reserve for loss in state aid for Gloucester Public Schools; **this appropriation will come from existing surplus and will not increase the amount to be raised by taxes?**

Seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION was made by Councilor Forgue to ADOPT the language for Question #4: Shall the Town Budget include an appropriation of **\$\$445,462** from surplus for capital expenses; this appropriation will come from existing surplus and will not increase the amount to be raised by taxes?

Seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION was made by Councilor Forgue to ADOPT the language for Question #5: Shall the Town Budget include an appropriation of **\$28,091** from surplus for storm expenses; this appropriation will come from existing surplus and will not increase the amount to be raised by taxes?

Seconded by Councilor Arnold

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

- Councilor Arnold -Aye
- Councilor Worthy -Aye
- Councilor Steere -Aye
- Councilor Reichert -Aye
- Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION was made by Councilor Forgue to ADOPT the language for Question #6: Shall the Town Budget include an appropriation of **\$100,000** as a reserve for future student population proration for the Foster/Glocester region; this appropriation will come from existing surplus and will not increase the amount to be raised by taxes?

Seconded by Councilor Reichert

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

- Councilor Arnold -Aye
- Councilor Worthy -Aye
- Councilor Steere -Aye
- Councilor Reichert -Aye
- Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION was made by Councilor Forgue to ADOPT the language for Question #7: Shall the Town Budget include an appropriation of **\$100,000** from surplus for future operational expenses of Glocester Public Schools; **this appropriation will come from existing surplus and will not increase the amount to be raised by taxes?**

Seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

- Councilor Arnold -Aye
- Councilor Worthy -Aye
- Councilor Steere -Aye
- Councilor Reichert -Aye
- Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Authorization for signature: Federal Service Desk designating Finance Director as “Entity Administrator” for the Town’s System for Award Management (SAM) account. - Discussion and/or Action

Councilor Forgue stated that Council has received a memo from the Finance Director and Councilor Worthy read as follows:

To: The Honorable Gloucester Town Council, Jay Forgue, President
 From: Adam R. Muccino, Finance Director
 Date: 05/06/2021
 Regarding: Gloucester System for Award Management account (SAM)

The System for Award Management (SAM) is the central contractor registration e-procurement system for the Federal Government. In short, the Town is registered with SAM as a number of Federal grants as well as Federal Aid is managed through SAM. The Town's SAM registration needs to be reassigned from my predecessor to me, in order to for funding to continue to be received. Signature of the Town Council President on the attached memo to the Federal Service Desk, who handles user registration for SAM will start this process.

Respectfully,
Adam R. Muccino
(end of memo)

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to AUTHORIZE the Town Council President to sign the Designation of Entity Administrator letter, dated May 6, 2021, to the Federal Service Desk for an update to the Town’s user registration; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

- Councilor Arnold -Aye
- Councilor Worthy -Aye
- Councilor Steere -Aye
- Councilor Reichert -Aye

Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- E. Award - RFP 2021-01 - Discussion and/or Action
Professional Auditing Services/Agreed-Upon Procedures Services

Councilor Forgue stated that the Finance Director has submitted a recommendation to Council.

Councilor Arnold read as follows:

To: The Honorable Gloucester Town Council, Jay Forgue, President
From: Adam R. Muccino, Finance Director
Date: 05/06/2021
Regarding: Award of RFP2021-01

The Finance Office conducted an RFP process in accordance with the Town Purchasing Policy and under the oversight of the State Office of the Auditor General for Professional Auditing Services for the Town of Gloucester and Gloucester School Department. The most completed audit, the fiscal year 2020 audit, is the last year of the (3) year agreement with auditors Baxter, Dansereau and Associates (BDA). Advertisement of the RFP ran in the legal section of the Providence Journal on April 8 and April 9, 2021 as well as posted to the Gloucester Town Website.

All told, the Town received (1) response to the RFP from auditors Baxter, Dansereau and Associates. I have reviewed their bid thoroughly and reviewed their offering with Principal Paul Dansereau. The fee schedule for the (3) year agreement is as follows:

- FY 2021-\$35,000
- FY 2022- \$35,610
- FY 2023 - \$36,605

The Council should note that BDA reduced their FY 2021 fee to \$35,000 from \$35,610 matching the FY2022 budget proposal. The Gloucester Board of Contracts met on Wednesday, May 5 to review the revised bid and ultimately unanimously approved a motion to recommend that the Council award the bid to auditors Baxter, Dansereau and Associates. Therefore, it is also my recommendation to the Council that RFP 2021-01 be awarded to Baxter, Dansereau and Associates with the following fee schedule:

- FY 2021 - \$35,000
- FY 2022- \$35,610
- FY 2023 - \$36,605

Respectfully,
Adam R. Muccino
(end of memo)

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to AWARD RFP 2021-01 Professional Auditing Services/Agreed-Upon Procedures Services to: be awarded to Baxter, Dansereau and Associates with the following fee schedule:

- FY 2021 - \$35,000
- FY 2022- \$35,610
- FY 2023 - \$36,605

seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye
Councilor Worthy -Aye
Councilor Steere -Aye
Councilor Reichert -Aye
Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

F. Economic Development Commission

1. Update Council on Website content - Discussion and/or Action

A. Sarje, EDC Chair stated that she wanted to update the Council as to the website and that Dennis Cipriano of Midfield Technologies was present. A. Sarje stated that the contract with Midfield Technologies is on the agenda for May 20th; and, she thanked D. Cipriano for his work. Dennis Cipriano shared the proposed EDC website and stated that it was about 30% complete with navigation but no content yet. Councilor Forgue stated that the site looks good. Councilor Arnold stated that the site looks great, fresh and fun. Councilor Steere also stated that the site looks good and asked about facebook. A. Sarje stated that EDC wants their own facebook page and it would be content only with no comments allowed. Councilor Steere stated that facebook is a concern and that Council would need to discuss. A. Sarje stated that she is willing to gather information. D. Cipriano stated that if facebook was not used then perhaps an event section could be added instead. A. Sarje stated she would speak with the EDC liaison, Councilor Worthy, to determine how to bring to Town council at a later date.

No action taken by council.

G. Gloucester Land Trust - Update signage - Discussion and/or Action

A. Sarje, EDC Chair, stated that the EDC has collaborated with the Gloucester Land Trust regarding the maps that will be placed at the trail heads providing people with places to go in town as well as a code they can scan. D. Cipriano shared a sample map with the Council that showed the town's main street with buildings numbered and the space for the code. A. Sarje stated that D. Lovett painted the map. A. Sarje stated she is hoping the maps will drive people to town. Councilor Steere asked how the businesses were numbered. A. Sarje stated that D. Lovett compiled the list. A. Sarje stated that D. Lovett will create different maps for each of the three Land Trust areas.

No action taken by Council.

H. Dispatchers Union

1. Temporary Agreement - Allow carry over of vacation, compensatory time, & personal days for current fiscal year - Discussion and/or Action

Councilor Forgue stated that Council has received a request from the Dispatchers Union Rep. requesting an amendment to allow for carry over of time off for the current fiscal year only.

Discussion: A. Muccino, Finance Director, stated that the recommendation is almost complete but that he has a few questions for the Chief so he is requesting the item be tabled. A. Muccino also stated that D. Zimmerman, HR Consultant has reviewed.

MOTION was made by Councilor Forgue to table the Temporary Agreement to the next Town Council meeting; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Discussion: None

Councilor Forgue requested the Clerk poll the council:

Councilor Arnold -Aye

Councilor Worthy -Aye

Councilor Steere -Aye

Councilor Reichert -Aye

Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

IX. Town Council Correspondence/ Discussion

None

X. Department Head Reports/Discussion

None

XI. Bds. and Commissions Reports/ Discussion

1. S. St. Pierre, Chair Gloucester Land Trust, stated that the Land Trust had a meeting with EDC about putting up the maps on the kiosks. S. St. Pierre stated that he wanted Council to know that Land Trust is 100% in support of this project and will work closely with EDC.

No action taken by Council

XII. Open Forum

1. Councilor Reichert stated that he is 100% against changing the mascot at the high school. Councilors Forgue and Worthy agreed. Councilor Steere stated that Steve Mitchell gave an eloquent speech regarding not changing the mascot. All Councilors agreed.

No action taken by Council.

XIII. Adjourn

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to ADJOURN at 11:02 PM; seconded by Councilor Worthy

Councilor Forgue requested the clerk poll the Council

Councilor Arnold -Aye

Councilor Worthy -Aye

Councilor Steere -Aye

Councilor Reichert -Aye

Councilor Forgue-Aye

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY