

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE SHOW LOW PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD ON SEPTEMBER 22, 2020 AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 181 NORTH 9TH STREET, SHOW LOW, NAVAJO COUNTY, ARIZONA**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Bishop called the meeting to order 7:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Bishop, Vice Chairman Hephner, Commissioner Wilson, Commissioner Roberts, Commissioner Jon Adams, and Commissioner Josh Adams

**COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:** Commissioner Bess

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** Justen Tregaskes, Planning and Zoning Director; Morgan Brown, City Attorney; Katie Fechtelkotter, Planner and Linda Haynes, Administrative Assistant

**GUESTS PRESENT:** Nancy Garera, Sharon Stone, Betty Cash, Twana Alexander, Susan Wagley, Robert Wagley, Sandra Goodrich, Christine Brady, Walter Hutte, Rodney Rothert, Norma Reed, Sharon Fox, Kevin Lowery, Kristina Cooper, Buryl Cooper, Gary Wolfrum, Laura Singleton, Pete Kemp, Kim Kemp, Sandy Choate, Al Dynes, and Curt Fernau

**3. INVOCATION**

Commissioner Jon Adams gave the invocation.

**4. Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Wilson led the Commission and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance

**5. OLD BUSINESS**

NONE

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Consideration of approval for a Conditional Use Permit 602-04-232 submitted by Sunquest Financial, LLC, to allow for a 110 foot Mono-pine Cell Tower on property located at 591 N. Clark Road/3980 W. Cooley, that being A.P.N. 309-52-027B.

Ms. Fechtelkotter read the staff summary.

Sunquest Financial, LLC has submitted a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow for a 110-foot mono-pine cell tower located at 591 N. Clark Rd./3980 W. Cooley, that being A.P.N. 309-52-027B. The subject property is considered Tract A of Fairway Park Center, is currently vacant and is zoned C-2 (General Commercial). Per City Code, any new cell towers require a CUP. The property is 2.9 acres in size and is approximately 350 feet by 465 feet at the widest parts. It is an unevenly shaped property, which can be accessed off of either N. Clark Rd. or W. Cooley. There is a 20-foot wide sewer and utility easement running through the property. The subject property is adjacent to commercially zoned property except along the west property line.

According to the applicant, the reason for the tower is a gap of coverage in the area. The applicant has stated that the 110-foot height is necessary due to the trees and elevation changes of the surrounding properties. The existing trees in the vicinity of the proposed tower are approximately 60 to 70 feet tall. The applicant is proposing a 110-foot tall mono-pine tower, which will be approximately 40 feet taller than the surrounding trees. For reference, the two most recently approved towers were 80 feet tall.

City Code Section 15-1-69(G)(2)(d)(1) states, "Towers must be set back a distance equal to 125 percent of the height of the tower from any adjoining lot line, but may be reduced by the commission if the goals of this ordinance would be better served thereby." Based on this requirement the setback for a 110-foot tower would be 137.5 feet from all property lines. The applicant has proposed the following setbacks; 93.8 feet to the north, 200.8 feet to the east, 158 feet to the south, and 124.7 feet to the west. Due to the dimensions of the property, it is impossible to place the tower outside of the 200-foot visual corridor protection area and meet the 137.5-foot setbacks from all property lines. Also, City Code Section 15-1-69(G)(2)(e)(1) states; "Separation from all residentially zoned properties shall be a minimum of two hundred (200) feet, but may be reduced by the commission if the goals of this ordinance would be better served thereby." To meet the 200-foot roadway visual corridor protection area, the tower will only be set back 124.7 feet from the residentially zoned properties to the west of the subject property.

The applicant is requesting that the Planning and Zoning Commission allow a 75.3-foot reduction to the 200-foot set back from a residential zone, which would be 124.7-feet. Also, the applicant is requesting a 43.7-foot reduction of the 137.5-foot setback to the north property line, which would be 93.8-feet.

The property was posted and letters were sent to all property owners within 300-feet of the subject property. Staff received a phone call and email from a resident identifying himself as a representative of the Fairway Park Home Owners Association (HOA). He expressed concerns of visual aesthetics, health effects, and declining property values due to the proposed tower. An email from this individual has been attached for your review.

Ms. Fechtelkötter read the findings of facts.

Current zoning of the surrounding properties include;

North: C-2 (General Commercial) and C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial)

South: R1-7 (Single-family residential, seven thousand square feet) and C-2 (General Commercial)

East: C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial)

West: R1-7 (Single-family residential, seven thousand square feet)

The current land uses of the surrounding properties include;

North: Dollar General

South: Fairway Park Center Subdivision, Circle K

East: Vacant commercial

West: Fairway Park Center Subdivision

Transmittal memos were sent to all affected agencies. Applicable comments received include;

Airport Manager: A 7640 form shall be filled with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The FAA has issued a determination of No hazard to air navigation, therefore lighting is not necessary.

Building Official: The monopole cell tower requires a building permit and shall meet all building codes including footings and wind loads.

Public Works: Has requested that a maintenance plan for the tower to be submitted to the Public Works Department.

The property was posted and letters were sent to all property owners within three hundred (300) feet of the subject property. Staff received a phone call and email from a resident identifying himself as a representative of the Fairway Park Home Owners Association (HOA). He expressed concerns of visual aesthetics, health concerns and property values due to the proposed tower.

Since preparation of the staff report, staff has received numerous phone calls voicing opposition to the proposed tower.

Ms. Fechtelkötter read the staff recommendations.

After reviewing the Zoning Ordinance, Standards for Review, Findings of Fact, discussions with the applicant and public the Planning and Zoning Commission may;

**APPROVE** Conditional Use Permit 602-04-232 submitted by Sunquest Financial, LLC to allow for a 110 foot mono-pole cell tower located at 591 N. Clark Rd./3980 W. Cooley, that being A.P.N. 309-52-027B subject to the following conditions;

1. All development shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local requirements, including; Federal Communications Commission (FCC), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and building permit requirements.
2. The antenna and supporting structure shall not exceed 110 feet.

3. The tower shall be in substantial conformance with the submitted site plan and submitted Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation. No further height extensions are allowed unless approved through future Conditional Use Permits.
4. A maintenance plan for the tower shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Department.

-OR-

**DENY** Conditional Use Permit 602-04-232 submitted by Sunquest Financial, LLC for a 110 foot mono-pine cell tower located at 591 N. Clark Rd./3980 W. Cooley, that being A.P.N. 309-52-027B (*stating the reason(s) why*).

Commissioner Josh Adams asked if the tower was not in compliance why are we making an exception for this tower. Ms. Fechtelkotter advised that the Commission is allowed to approve reductions and setbacks for towers as permitted through code.

Commissioner Josh Adams asked for setback clarification on the tower. Ms. Fechtelkotter stated that there is a 125-foot setback to prevent it from falling on anyone's property. This setback is 125% of the height of the tower.

Commissioner Wilson asked for clarification on how many calls is considered numerous calls. Mr. Tregaskes said he received about ten calls in addition to any calls received by Ms. Fechtelkotter and Ms. Haynes.

Commissioner Wilson asked how many properties are affected by the reduction. Ms. Fechtelkotter said within 300 feet there were about 42 properties, but probably six are actually immediately adjacent to the tower.

Commissioner Wilson asked if the residents are full time or seasonal. Ms. Fechtelkotter stated she did not know as they did not mention that to her.

Commissioner Wilson asked if any provision prohibits the tower from coming in and being extended in the future. Ms. Fechtelkotter said in the staff recommendation it states they would need a Conditional Use Permit for an extension of additional height.

Applicant, Nancy Garera, at P.O. Box 737 Queen Creek, AZ was called to the podium.

Commissioner Jon Adams stated that all towers that have been approved in the past have been 80 feet and have worked well, so was wondering why they need the extra height. Ms. Garera stated they need 30 feet above the top of the tree line. The trees are 82 feet tall and not sure if residents would want the trees trimmed due to aesthetics. The top of the tower would be 110 feet.

Vice Chairman Hephner asked why the tower was coming in. Ms. Garera stated it is for phone call volume and lack of data capacity.

Commissioner Roberts asked how accurate the proposed illustration will be as it looks like it is compatible with the trees that are there. Ms. Garera said that it is compatible and if needed, can put more branches to match trees of surrounding area which will hide antennas more. They can do a minimum of 2 1/2 branches per foot to help conceal the tower.

Vice Chairman Hephner asked if they would be cutting trees. Ms. Garera said no.

Commissioner Wilson asked if there will be lighting on the tower. Ms. Garera said no.

Commissioner Wilson asked what the radius is of the tower on the map. Ms. Garera said all items in red on the map are what the proposed tower will cover.

Commissioner Wilson asked if they looked at other areas to pursue a new tower or just this property. Ms. Garera said they did look at other areas but if it's too far south then it does not meet the objectives of offloading the towers and then the other properties they looked at were too hard to meet the 200 foot setback criteria.

Commissioner Wilson asked if the tower would be affected by storms or lightning due to its height. Ms. Garera said it does have a lightning rod in the top 3 branches to help offset it. If it does get struck it has a ring to help protect it. Wind does blow it around, but it is structurally made to meet the building codes for wind standards.

Commissioner Wilson asked about their experience with cell towers placement in residential areas. Ms. Garera said that if they want a 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> carrier then they work with the carriers on putting that in, however she has not seen them extend the towers, except for in metropolitan areas.

Commissioner Wilson asked if the height of the tower will make it better than other towers. Ms. Garera said that is to help make the tower co-locatable so that you do not have multiple towers in the area.

Commissioner Roberts asked what the current count for census of permanent residence is. Mr. Tregaskes said the 2010 census was 10,660 for year round residents. Every year beyond that the state does an estimate and approximately we have grown about a 1,000 residents, so as of 2019 the City had about 11,700 residences.

Commissioner Wilson asked if there is any data on having a cell tower in a residential area showing that a 125 feet tower would decrease their property value. Mr. Tregaskes said he is not aware of any studies that says it does or doesn't, but has had many concerns communicated to him about that from the phone calls he has received.

Ms. Garera said there has been research done that states having internet service can increase the value of your home by \$5,400 which would be the same as a fireplace or bathroom. They also found that having cellular service is another high importance for buyers.

Commissioner Bishop asked if the lack of coverage and capacity is from engineers or a customer driven issue. Ms. Garera said it is from both customers and engineers.

Buryl Cooper, 4401 W Rogers Drive in Fairway Park, stated he is the HOA President in Fairway Park and he has talked to many of the residents and a lot of people are opposed of the tower due to health issues, property values and whether it is actually needed.

Kevin Lowery, 680 N. 43<sup>rd</sup> Drive, said he would like to propose to decline the Conditional Use proposal due to having to reduce the 200 foot setback from a residence and also due to the concerns about the aesthetics of the tower, the health concerns and the decrease of property values. Mr. Lowery provided a list of other alternate sites to the commission showing ten other places that are within 10 miles from the proposed site as adequate options and locations.

Commissioner Roberts said the applicants engineer has looked at other locations and they felt due to geometry of the land and the landscape and trees, that this location is the only one that would be satisfactory.

Sandy Goodrich, 601 N. 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, expressed her concerns with health issues with having the tower in this area.

Christine Brady, 820 N. 43<sup>rd</sup> Drive, expressed concerns with health issues and the issues of changing the setbacks to accommodate the tower.

Susan Wagley, 400 N. 40<sup>th</sup> Circle, said she has concerns of them cutting trees to make it suitable for building and feels the tower could increase cancer.

Curt Fernau, 1060 N. 47<sup>th</sup> Drive, said that he is surprised that there is no other location for the tower. He suggested Joe Tank Road as an option for the tower and asked if placement of this tower would prohibit additional development of the property. Mr. Tregaskes said that the location of the proposed tower would not include the rest of the property, as there is still a large portion of the property that would remain available in development for the future.

Mr. Cooper said he has concerns with safety on the property and fencing and wanted to know if the land will be purchased or leased.

Sharon Fox, 4380 W. Adair Drive, expressed her concerns about health, safety and security concerns.

Kristina Cooper, 4401 W Rogers Drive, expressed her concerns with safety with fencing around the tower.

Betty Cash, 521 N. 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue, stated she has concerns about the tower being so close to her property, since the tower will back up to her property.

Al Dynes, 4280 W. Burke, asked how much area will be covered by the proposed tower location.

Commissioner Jon Adams asked how close the tower will be to the homes. Mr. Tregaskes clarified that the proposed tower location would be approximately 124.7 feet to the nearest residential property.

Vice Chairman Hephner asked about the city code clarification. Mr. Tregaskes said that city code states that a tower cannot be placed on a residential property and it has to be a commercial zone. All commercial zoning is done along highways and most properties are not very deep. This makes it difficult when looking for a cell phone tower location because city code does give the commission the ability to reduce the setback, but not to reduce the visual corridor from the highway.

Mr. Tregaskes said that he looked over the list provided by Mr. Lowery and some of the locations are out of city and in the county and cannot comment whether they are suitable or not and the others on the list do not contain a good description to know where they are, but most properties when you say they have to be 200 feet from the highway, do not meet that requirement.

**COMMISSIONER ROBERTS MOVED TO APPROVE CUP 602-04-232 SUBMITTED BY, SUNQUEST FINANCIAL, LLC, TO ALLOW FOR A 110 FOOT MONO-PINE CELL TOWER ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 591 N. CLARK ROAD/3980 W. COOLEY, THAT BEING A.P.N. 309-52-027B, SUBJECT TO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS. COMMISSIONER HEPHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION FAILED 4 TO 2 WITH VICE CHAIRMAN HEPHNER AND COMMISSIONER ROBERTS VOTING IN FAVOR, AND CHAIRMAN BISHOP AND COMMISSION MEMBERS JOSH ADAMS, JON ADAMS AND WILSON CASTING THE DISSENTING VOTES.**

Mr. Tregaskes said at this point the motion has not been approved, but it has not yet been denied. What can happen now is to have more discussion, more questions, and a new motion to approve with changes of conditions.

Vice Chairman Hephner stated there are no studies showing that health issues are related to towers or that property value would decrease due to a tower. There is a need for another cell tower in that area and this would benefit the downtown area which would help improve cell phone usage.

Commissioner Roberts asked about Joe Tank Road and if it is in the City. Mr. Tregaskes said that once it is past the cattle guard it is out of the City limits.

Commissioner Jon Adams stated he has concerns about the 200-foot setback reduction change and also having the tower so close to a house.

Chairman Bishop said his concerns are the setbacks and until we know definitely that there are no other locations that the tower could go into, he is not comfortable approving it.

Commissioner Wilson said she has concerns about the 200-foot setback as well and the fact that the tower could be extended in the future.

Commissioner Josh Adams also said he has concerns about the 200-foot and overriding the city code

Vice Chairman Hephner said that he is okay with approving the tower due to the fall zone and needing the coverage in that area.

Ms. Garera stated that they looked at other commercial properties in area, but some of those properties did not meet setbacks and other properties barely meet the setback, but did not offer a wider range of service. When they looked further south, it was too far and it takes away from the purpose of the tower to service the area that. She looked at multiple areas and worked with Mr. Tregaskes on meeting setbacks and even looking at properties a quarter mile was too far and would not have an effect on service. Putting the tower in this location would fill in gaps and allow minimal towers as possible.

Chairman Bishop asked if the applicant is the owner of the property. Ms. Garera said she works for Young Design Group and the property is owned by Sunquest Financial. Chairman Bishop asked for clarification on whether the applicant is working with Verizon to find a location and not a property. Ms. Garera stated that she is not only working for Verizon, but to help community as well.

Commissioner Roberts said the 110-foot becomes critical for approval. Ms. Garera said that they could come down to 100 feet but it would not extend service as far.

Ms. Garera said that the towers are built with a caisson and goes 30 to 40 feet in the ground depending on the structural requirement and then the equipment would be put in and it would be surrounded by an eight foot fence. They could increase the fence to 10 feet and if needed they could add a stipulation to not increase the height of the tower in the future.

Mr. Tregaskes read and reviewed the goals of the Wireless telecommunication towers and antennas ordinance from city code Sec. 15-1-69. The purpose of this ordinance is to establish general guidelines for the siting of wireless communications towers and antennas. The goals of this ordinance are to:



1. Protect residential areas and land uses from potential adverse impacts of towers and antennas;
2. Encourage the location of towers in non-residential areas;
3. Minimize the total number of towers throughout the community;
4. Strongly encourage the joint use of new and existing tower sites as a primary option rather than construction of additional single-use towers;
5. Encourage users of towers and antennas to configure them in a way that minimizes the adverse visual impact of the towers and antennas through careful design, siting, landscape screening, and innovative camouflaging techniques;
6. Consider the public health and safety of communication towers;
7. Avoid potential damage to adjacent properties from tower failure through engineering and careful siting of tower structures; and
8. Protect airport approach corridors.

Commissioner Josh Adams asked if there are any situations where the Commission has approved less than 124 feet from a residence. Mr. Tregaskes said the Commission approved the tower for Cellular One on White Mountain Road and it was a similar situation as it was a shallow property. They did not meet the adjacent setbacks for 200 feet and due to topography the Commission determined the goals of ordinance would be met by allowing them to move it further back. Mr. Tregaskes said the distance between the tower and residence was several hundred feet. There was a vacant lot behind the tower but no comments were received by the property owner.

Commissioner Jon Adams stated he knows they approved Cellular One, but that was due to the hill hiding it, but this location is different compared to that site.

Chairman Bishop stated it looks like the applicant looked at other properties and this might be the only place it could be put in and understands the setback changed needed for this property.

Commissioner Wilson expressed concerns of neighbors seeing the tower from their back window. Ms. Garera said that the tower would be located higher and would be surrounded by trees and they would not see it.

Mr. Lowery expressed concerns on having the tower so close to Ms. Cash's property.

Commissioner Jon Adams asked if the tower could go anywhere else on the property. Mr. Tregaskes said it has to meet the 200 foot visual corridor setback and there is no way to meet visual corridor and 200 foot fall zone on this property.

Ms. Garera said that is not as simple as putting it on Federal or State Land as it's about service and location in operating towers. Ms. Garera read the engineer study and referenced that there were 13 properties they looked at and this property met most of the requirements and most of the others did not. The centerline needs to be greater than 20 feet above the trees to meet the needs in the area due to complaints and studies and without the clearance the signal would have performance issues. The idea is to try and meet all the needs and minimize the number of towers. Chairman Bishop stated those are the City goals as well.

**CHAIRMAN BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE CUP 602-04-232 SUBMITTED BY, SUNQUEST FINANCIAL, LLC, TO ALLOW FOR A 110 FOOT MONO-PINE CELL TOWER ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 591 N. CLARK ROAD/3980 W. COOLEY, THAT BEING A.P.N. 309-52-027B, SUBJECT TO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS. VICE CHAIRMAN HEPHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION FAILED 3 TO 3 WITH CHAIRMAN BISHOP, VICE CHAIRMAN HEPHNER AND COMMISSIONER ROBERTS VOTING IN FAVOR, AND COMMISSION MEMBERS JOSH ADAMS, JON ADAMS AND WILSON CASTING THE DISSENTING VOTES.**

Attorney Brown said that when they have a tie vote, then the motion fails for a lack of majority vote.

Commissioner Hephner asked if this is commercial property and if someone could come in and put a building on that property. Mr. Tregaskes said it is zoned C-2 and that building setbacks would be 20 feet or height of the building whichever is greater and in a commercial you could go 45 feet tall and 45 feet from the property. There is a fence already there and the residence was originally zoned commercial, but when rezoned to residential they were required to build a fence.

Vice Chairman Hephner wanted to motion to table the item. Mr. Tregaskes said the item could be continued one time for up to 30 days and at the scheduled meeting the Commission would be required to make a decision.

Ms. Garera asked with the fall zone concerns, if the Engineer could make it work by 10 feet shorter and add a stipulation to not to extend the tower would the Commission approve. Chairman Bishop said that might be better as they would not have to change the setback.

Mr. Lowery said it does not meet the 200-foot setback. Chairman Bishop advised that was the Visual Corridor setback requirement. Mr. Tregaskes clarified the three different setbacks.

Mr. Lowery said that this is not the only option and has suggested other properties that would have less negative effects. Chairman Bishop said the Commission is not considering other properties, and was only focusing on this property.

Commissioner Jon Adams stated that lowering the tower height helps him with the idea of a tower and can see the need for a tower. If they put a building there it would be more of an eye sore than a tower.

**VICE CHAIRMAN HEPNER MOTIONED TO TABLE THE ITEM TO THE NEXT COMMISSION MEETING ON OCTOBER 13, 2020. COMMISSIONER JOSH ADAMS SECONDED THE MOTION. PASSED 6 TO 0 WITH, CHAIRMAN BISHOP, VICE CHAIRMAN HEPNER AND COMMISSION MEMBERS WILSON, ROBERTS, JOSH ADAMS AND JON ADAMS VOTING IN FAVOR.**

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC – Any citizen desiring to speak on a matter that is within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission may do so at this time. Comments may be limited to three minutes per person and shall be addressed to the Planning and Zoning Commission as a whole, and not to any individual member. Issues raised shall be limited to those within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission. Pursuant to the Arizona Open Meeting Law, the Planning and Zoning Commission cannot discuss or act on items presented at this time. At the conclusion of the call to the public, individual Planning and Zoning Commission members may (1) respond to criticism made by those who have spoken, (2) ask staff to review a matter, and (3) ask that a matter be put on a future agenda.**

None.

## 8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting of August 25, 2020.

**VICE CHAIRMAN HEPNER MOVED TO APPROVE THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES ON AUGUST 25, 2020. COMMISSIONER WILSON SECONDED THE MOTION. PASSED 6 TO 0 WITH, CHAIRMAN BISHOP, VICE CHAIRMAN HEPNER AND COMMISSION MEMBERS WILSON, ROBERTS, JOSH ADAMS AND JON ADAMS VOTING IN FAVOR.**

## 9. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS

## Commission Members

Commissioner Josh Adams thanked the Commission members for being here tonight.

Commissioner Roberts encouraged social distancing and to be careful.

Commissioner Jon Adams said that it is exciting to get together as community to get everyone involved even if they don't agree and appreciates everyone on the Commission.

Commissioner Wilson thanked the public for being involved and stated it would be nice if more public got involved in Commission meetings. The City of Show Low is changing their trash pickup and has updated their website showing the new trash days.

Vice Chairman Hephner thanked everyone on Commission and was glad everyone could discuss issues with civil conversations.

Chairman Bishop thanked the Commission and public for their comments as well.

## Planning and Zoning Director

Mr. Tregaskes said the deadline to respond for the 2020 census is September 30<sup>th</sup>. Go to [My2020census.gov](https://my2020census.gov) to respond. The Census benefits the community for a long time and the more accurate the population the more accurate the answers will be for future questions.

## 10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought before the Planning and Zoning Commission, CHAIRMAN JOHNSON ADJOURNED THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE SHOW LOW PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2020 AT 9:18 PM.

### ATTEST:

### APPROVED:

---

Justen Tregaskes  
Planning and Zoning Director

---

Eric Bishop  
Chairman

## CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING** of the Planning and Zoning Commission of Show Low held on September 22, 2020. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.

---

Linda Haynes  
Administrative Assistant