

**MINUTES
BAYFIELD COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC MEETING
JUNE 16, 2011**

1. **Call to Order of Public Hearing:** Chairman **Rondeau** called the public hearing to order at 4:00 pm.
2. **Roll Call:** **Jardine**-absent, **Maki**-absent, **Miller**-present, **Rantala**-present, and **Rondeau**-present.

Others present were: Director-Karl **Kastrosky**, Doug **Casina**-AZA, and Mike **Furtak**-AZA.

3. **Affidavit of Publication:** **Kastrosky** showed the audience the Thursday, June 16, 2011 4:00pm as noticed in Thursday, May 26th and Thursday, June 2nd edition of the County Journal affidavit of publication and the certified mailing receipts.
4. **Review of Meeting Format –** Chairman **Rondeau** explained the procedure of the meeting. He asked everyone who wished to speak to fill out a form; and stated they will be asked to come forward and speak into the microphone. Public hearing goes as follows; people will be asked if they are for or against proposal and then meeting will be adorned. It will then be moved into the business portion of the meeting and discussions will take place.

5. **Public Hearing:**

- A. **Town of Clover, owner and Jane Bucy, Town Chairman (Clover) – conditional use permit to relocate and establish a transfer station (solid waste) site** [2.29-acre parcel ID (# 04-014-2-50-07-08-1-00-322-03000), described as Lot 3, Robert Bartlett Jr 2nd Addition to Orchard City, less V. 107 P. 409 and V. 608 P. 193, Section 8, Township 50N, Range 7 W, Town of Clover, Bayfield County, WI]

Jane Bucy explained she was the Town Chairman of Clover and that all committee members should have received an updated packet that was sent to them. There is an issue where the town would like to move the transfer station from its current location to where the town garage is located now. One of the issues with the station is the way that the waste management truck travels on the Cemetery Road is detrimental to the pavement. When fully loaded the truck can weigh 70,000 to 93,000 pounds and the road was not build for the weight of this type of vehicle even though the road was resurfaced at the expense of \$20,000 to extend its life an additional 10 years the bed is still not strong enough to support this. Laying gravel on Lake Ave which is leading to the new location would cost about \$600 and is already in the budget. Cemetery Rd is steep and has many curves which cause people to slip off of it in the winter. Clover is a retirement community. **Bucy** referenced 2 letters. First letter from **Sally Bowers** a long time resident of Herbster explains that, the argument is the new station would smell, leak, or bears would get into the garbage containers, which are sealed and locked containers, they do not leak, nor do bears get into them at the present location. With the cuts in funding the cost to fix the present location would be rather spendy. She believes the town would be in trouble with OSHA's standards and by moving to the town's new proposed site, they would meet these specifications. No one has taken into consideration that the population of Herbster is getting older and the space by the garage would be easier and safer for most of them to use, and that includes me. Change is sometimes

necessary and good. **Bucy** went on to explain the other letter was from their attendant at the transfer station and he explains that he has voiced his concerns about the older population and the drive to the transfer station is not only a problem in the winter, but a moment of inattentive driving would have you off the side of the road before you could recover. Also consider people with health issues that won't allow them to lift garbage from a car to the dumpsters, if they were to fall there is no phone to call for help. There is a lot of opposition regarding the moving of the transfer station, some people have been told they would lose their job if it were moved others were told garbage would be thrown all over and harmful chemicals would be used to kill flies, none of these things are true. He is very much in favor of this move. **Bucy** goes on to explain that the existing shelter falling apart it is going to cost about \$3,000 to repair it, adding a propane heat source will cost about \$980. There are no toilets at the current location and it would cost about \$1,000 to add these. The state of Wisconsin is considering reducing the recycling grant. They currently get \$2,300 and could be reduced by half or all. It is simply less money to maintain one facility rather than two, i.e. a transfer station and a garage. In 2010 the station lost a little over \$2,000, and by raising our fees in 2011 the town hopes to break even by year end, but if not, raising recycling fees might be a consideration. Issues with bear, flies, orders, and leakage at our existing site do not exist. Trash dumpsters have locks on them and are emptied on a weekly basis. Flies are controlled by granules that have no health hazards; this is also used at the campground and is very effective. (A sample was brought in). This eliminates contamination to a nearby dry stream. Currently there are two restaurants in town that empty their dumpsters every two weeks, one struggle with bears because the container is not bear proof. The other dumpster sits at a very low spot next to the Cranberry River. No one has complained about either of these two dumpsters. The suggestion of fencing around the new station would cost about \$200 and **Bucy** is amenable to that. Right now the transfer station fully complies with the Wisconsin Administration Code 502.07 exemptions per **Mr. Robert Germer** and **Ms. Cheryl Otto** from the DNR who are Waste Management Specialist and warned the town of potential problems mentioned above and the possibility of people just leaving trash. The new site would have more supervision than the existing one and the purchase of a game camera will help with assistance in securing this area at minimal expense to the town. According to the attendant there is no problem at existing site and there should not be at this new site. Conversations with **Anne Marie Coy's, Bayfield County Environmental Sanitarian** inspection of the new site proposed no potential problems with drainage into a dry stream near the building. She also suggests that vegetation surrounding the building be left alone and not mowed. The town does not collect tires, furniture, or contaminated goods of any kind. There is no compaction of garbage by equipment of any kind and no plans to do so. Residents are concerned that the new site would ruin the aesthetics of down town Herbster, there are 4 businesses that have their dumpsters on Highway 13 and no one complains about them. Residents are concerned about property values dropping. There are no issues at current site and don't know why there would be issues at new site. It has been suggested that radios be installed for emergency purposes and a phone line. Ondossagan's collection station be used as a reference; it is located next to Whittlesy Creek Wildlife Refuge and there is no contamination issues with this collection station and there are residents closer to this station than there would be at the Herbster station. Lastly this proposed move will continue to achieve the towns' goals and objectives and comprehensive plan.

Rondeau asked if anyone else would like to speak in favor of this proposal, no one spoke. He then asked if anyone was in opposition.

Cecil Kavajecz spoke in opposition, stating that he lives in the downtown area of Herbster that is a small community with a beautiful swimming area and campsite with stream and what we do not want is a garbage collection site and would be detrimental to the community. He also stated that there are several people that are in opposition and asked them to stand (17 people stood) also had a letter with 87 people who opposed the move. **Jack Smith** spoke in opposition and submitted a letter and map of the stream. **Supervisor Rantala** asked how many signatures the petition had and **Smith** stated 90. **Smith** owns the Stove Works in Hayward and has a dumpster located 400 feet from the house and has had spillage from garbage trucks, leakage, and has had bear problems right in the city of Hayward. Rats moved into his warehouse within 20 feet of the dumpster, and problems with odor. He and his wife retired in Herbster, the proposed site is approximately 450 feet from his property and dumpsters would be less than 100 feet from an intermittent stream which flows through a culvert and within 30 feet of his house and then flows into the Cranberry River and wetland slough. **Smith** called **Bob Bremer** DNR waste materials specialist as he had concerns about the compaction of garbage. When **Smith** described the site and soil types to **Doug Casina** he stated he could get an EIA waived onsite. Pathogens and toxins could be spread by spillage and a contaminated backhoe bucket and possibly was into the stream. **Merv Shaefer** spoke in opposition and has been a property owner in Herbster. When the town garage was built it was built large enough to store everything inside. His concern is that the town is not taking care of the surrounding grounds now so how can they take care of it with a dump being there and not housed. There is a current problem with vacationers now who throw their garbage over the fence. As far as the road up to the dump **Shaefer** feels even though he has slipped on that road it is graveled very well and is not a problem in the winter. His concern is that it is not being maintained and is an eyesore. **Wes Wiggins** spoke in opposition stating he is a resident of Herbster and he is some distance away from the proposed site and does not want to see it moved. The road to the current site was built specifically for the site. Moving a transfer station from a place where there is little population and no complaints, to a place where there are closer neighbors, it seems logical to leave it where it is. There are other ways to solve the problems. There are 90 people that would like to keep the transfer station where it is. **Mary Agostine** spoke in opposition of the proposal. She lives in Herbster across from the proposed site. She feels it is odd that the town wants to move the transfer station into town while others are moving theirs out of town. **Agostine** stated that with **Casina** being on the board and working for zoning he should not be able to vote on this matter. **Rondeau** stated that he is not voting on this matter. **Ann Fallberg** spoke in opposition of the matter and stated that there are situations where people have to take into consideration the environment and the community impacts, over financial impacts. **Miller** asked if all the people on the petition talked about the extra expense of having the site outside of town versus in town, and are they willing to pay more per bag to keep the station outside of town. **Shaefer** stated that the price was increased from \$2 to \$3 a bag and does not know why it would cost more to leave the building where it is versus if it were moved and would probably be willing to pay more. **Fallberg** stated that there was discussion about contracting with Cornucopia and the people were willing to do that. **Gene Lines** is concerned about the zoning ordinances and that if it is specified that the containers be proofed that there might not be water pollution but there most certainly be odor problems. He occasionally gets to transfer stations around the state for his line of work and does see damage done by bears not that it could be prevented with adequate fencing that would have to be specified. Other concern is about compaction and how they propose to do that.

Rondeau asked if there was anyone else in opposition. No one came forward to speak. He then asked **Kastrovsky** to see the file. **File Report:** **Kastrovsky** stated to clarify that

Casina, Furtak, and himself do not have a vote on this matter. **Rondeau** stated that the Committee has all the information that is up to date on this matter. **Kastrosky** went on to state that the town board recommended approval of this plan and reviewed it for compatibility with the comprehensive plan. There is a letter from the **Murphy's** and **Jack Smith** in opposition as well as petitions. **Miller** asked how many people are in the village of Herbster and **Kastrosky** explains there is no line separating the village from the town. There is a letter from **Smith** and **Agostine** talking about the issues. Correspondence from **Bob Bermer** and attached is a pdf with regulations. Exhibit A is a staff report addressing those issues.

Discussion ended.

- B. A petition by James Krueger, Supervisor for the Town of Namakagon, is requesting a text amendment to the Bayfield County Zoning Ordinance, in the form of adding Section 13-1-67 for permissible uses only located in the town therefore creating an Overlay District. Section 13-1-67 specific to the town to allow for more restrictive permitting standards and requirements than those currently utilized under the Bayfield County Zoning Ordinance.**

Sec. 13-1-67 Town of Namakagon Overlay District.

- (a) General Provision. The Town of Namakagon Overlay District shall apply to and include all lands within the Town of Namakagon.
- (b) Intent of the Town of Namakagon Overlay District. The intent of this overlay district is to promote the public health, safety, convenience, and general welfare: to encourage planned and orderly land use developments: to protect property values and the property tax base: to encourage uses of land, water, and other natural resources which are consistent with the Town of Namakagon Comprehensive Land Use Plan: to maintain water clarity in lakes, rivers, and streams: to protect the beauty and amenities of landscape and man-made developments: and to provide healthy surroundings for recreation, tourism, and family life.
- (c) Part of the purpose and intent of the Town of Namakagon overlay shall be achieved by restricting all new off-premise signs except as listed as exempt in the Bayfield County Sign Ordinance. Permanent off-premise signs in the Town of Namakagon shall also be subject to the following requirements:
 - (1) All existing off premise signs may be maintained but must be brought into compliance with the County ordinance pertaining to size and setback by July 1, 2016.
 - (2) If the owner of the off-premise sign sells the business; the sign is considered property of the business.
 - (3) Existing off-premise signs may not be rented to any other business.
 - (4) All other County ordinances regarding signs will be enforced.

James Krueger explained the issue with the signs is that there were a couple billboards put up that created controversy and the town would like to be a little more restrictive in

the wording on the signs and is requesting a county overlay district be created. It is mainly off premise signs that are they are concerned with. The intent of the overlay district is to promote public health and safety and general welfare, encourage planned and orderly land use, and protect property values, which is consistent with the town comprehensive plan. There was a unanimous vote by the town board to support this plan. **Rondeau** asked if these signs are located on Highway D and **Krueger** explains yes, they are right as you turn off of M onto D. They are the first two billboards that were created in town, and they started an uproar, and the town would just like to be more restrictive on the wording of signage. **Rondeau** asked if this plan is just for the signs and nothing else, **Krueger** stated that they are working on another plan for the future but it is not ready.

Rondeau asked is anyone was in opposition. No one spoke. He then asked to see the file. **File Report:** **Kastrofsky** stated that it is in the town plan and interestingly there is zero correspondence from anybody on the issue. The two signs that started this are not from the area.

Discussion ended.

6. Adjournment of Public Hearing:

*Miller made a motion to adjourn, **Rondeau** seconded. **Motion carried.** Adjourned.*

7. **Call to Order of Planning and Zoning Committee Meeting:** **Rondeau** called the meeting to order.

8. **Roll Call:** **Jardine**-absent, **Maki**-absent, **Miller**, **Rantala**, and **Rondeau**—all present.

Others present were: Director Karl **Kastrofsky**, Doug **Casina**, AZA, Mike **Furtak**, AZA.

9. **Minutes of Previous Meeting(s):** **Kastrofsky** stated there are no minutes from previous meeting. **Rondeau** stated they will be approved at the next meeting **Miller** agreed.

10. Business:

A. **Town of Clover, owner and Jane Bucy, Town Chairman (Clover) – conditional use permit to relocate and establish a transfer station (solid waste) site** [2.29-acre parcel ID (# 04-014-2-50-07-08-1-00-322-03000), described as Lot 3, Robert Bartlett Jr 2nd Addition to Orchard City, less V. 107 P. 409 and V. 608 P. 193, Section 8, Township 50N, Range 7 W, Town of Clover, Bayfield County, WI]

Miller asked **Casina** whose idea was it to move the transfer station when the entire town is against this. **Casina** deferred the question to **Bucy**. **Bucy** explained that it came up as a cost containment issue and with grants being cut this would be a good way to fix it. **Miller** asked if the meeting was an open meeting with the town. **Bucy** explained that there were 2 meetings. **Miller** asked if there was opposition at the town board meeting and **Bucy** explained that there were 15 people at the meeting and the opposition has not asked any questions of the town board. The petition came about after the fact. **Kavajecz** explained that there were people in opposition before the meetings but not as many as today. He was at the meeting but was ignored because they already made up their mind. The town knew the petition was going around. **Miller** stated that it is a cost containment factor and the residents that signed the petition you have to be willing to step up to the

plate and pay the differences. **Kavajecz** stated that the cost will be greater if a new building were built at the new location as compared to adding the little costs at current location. **Rondeau** again asked if he sees any additional costs and **Kavajecz** stated no. **Rondeau** explained that the committee would not like to make the rule or recommendations for towns but rather the other way around as long as they follow our ordinances and rules that they have. Every once in a while the committee will get one of these that has a lot of issues. People don't see how serious this is and the decision that the committee will make. The committee puts a lot a weight into what the town board recommends and takes it seriously; the committee feels that the people should go to the town board meetings. As the chairman of this committee he wants to be fair to both sides, he states he has heard both sides of the stories, and as a committee member makes a recommendation to send it back to the town board, let them have another meeting on this, residents who are opposed should attend, the town will listen to their statements, arguments, and facts, then come back and make another recommendation to this committee. He states that he does not have a ton of information but sees that the people are passionate about their community, and in this situation to take the town board's approval would be inappropriate. **Miller** stated that in all the years on this board he has not been in this situation and does not have a problem with sending it back to the town board. **Rondeau** asked if the committee would like to make a ruling, send it back, or make a recommendation.

Miller motioned to post pone. Rantala seconded. No further discussion. Motion carried.

- B. A petition by James Krueger, Supervisor for the Town of Namakagon, is requesting a text amendment to the Bayfield County Zoning Ordinance, in the form of adding Section 13-1-67 for permissible uses only located in the town therefore creating an Overlay District. Section 13-1-67 specific to the town to allow for more restrictive permitting standards and requirements than those currently utilized under the Bayfield County Zoning Ordinance.**

Sec. 13-1-67 Town of Namakagon Overlay District.

- (a) General Provision. The Town of Namakagon Overlay District shall apply to and include all lands within the Town of Namakagon.
- (b) Intent of the Town of Namakagon Overlay District. The intent of this overlay district is to promote the public health, safety, convenience, and general welfare: to encourage planned and orderly land use developments: to protect property values and the property tax base: to encourage uses of land, water, and other natural resources which are consistent with the Town of Namakagon Comprehensive Land Use Plan: to maintain water clarity in lakes, rivers, and streams: to protect the beauty and amenities of landscape and man-made developments: and to provide healthy surroundings for recreation, tourism, and family life.
- (c) Part of the purpose and intent of the Town of Namakagon overlay shall be achieved by restricting all new off-premise signs except as listed as exempt in the Bayfield County Sign Ordinance. Permanent off-premise signs in the Town of Namakagon shall also be subject to the following requirements:

- (1) All existing off premise signs may be maintained but must be brought into compliance with the County ordinance pertaining to size and setback by July 1, 2016.
- (2) If the owner of the off-premise sign sells the business; the sign is considered property of the business.
- (3) Existing off-premise signs may not be rented to any other business.
- (4) All other County ordinances regarding signs will be enforced.

*Miller motioned to approve the overlay district that is in conjunction with the town comprehensive plan, **Rantala** seconded. No further discussion. **Motion carried.***

C. John & Julie Meline (Barnes) – special use (mobile home for storage) [15-acre parcel (ID# 04-004-2-45-09-24-102-000-20000, located in W1/2 NW1/4 of NE 1/4, Section 24, Township 45N, Range 9 W, Town of Barnes, Bayfield County, WI. Less 5 acres parcel in NW corner in V.23, P.336]

Kastrosky explained the town has not met on this issue yet. The request is for a mobile home to be used as storage, gut it out and use for storage. **Furtak** explained that the mobile home was originally used for **Mr. Meline's** son, he moved away, and now they don't want to move it or use as a rental and would like to use it as storage. **Miller** asked if there were any problems with it. **Furtak** responded no and that it is a 20 acre parcel and in good shape and the property is cleaned up. Barnes will meet next Thursday on the issue.

*Miller motioned to approve the special use (mobile home for storage) if the town approves it and it goes along with the comprehensive plan. **Kastrosky** asked if **Miller** wanted any conditions to be placed on it. **Miller** responded with any conditions that the town will place on it. **Rantala** seconded. No further discussion. **Motion carried.***

D. Discussion and Possible Action regarding text amendment for allowing holding tanks as a system of choice instead of mounds.

Bonnie King spoke in opposition and stated she owns property north of Bayfield on County Highway J., wanted to use the land as a place for their RV and possibly build after retirement. Upgrades including a new driveway and electric were added in 2009. Her main goal is to maintain the land and impact the vegetation as little as possible. She wants the land to be passed on to her children. The property is about 15 acres and does not want to remove trees where the land is level that would impact the future use of this land. Her husband is a veteran and removing the tank from the RV to dump the 60 gallon tank is a burden therefore access to a holding tank is the most practical option. The imposed early retirement has limited their options and a holding tank would be the most cost effective since it would be for 2 people with one bathroom. She does not understand the rule and is hoping for a waiver in her case.

Kastrosky questioned if there was any soil tests done and if they need a mound versus a holding tank. **King** replied with there was no soil test done. **Furtak** explained that the purpose if this amendment is to allow a holding tank instead of a mound which costs \$15,000 and a conventional system needs on site treatment and costs \$7,000 or \$8,000. **Miller** asked if the vote is to amend this or to vote on a request from these people.

Kastrosky explained they are not voting on anything it is just a discussion. **King** explained that it is unclear as to what they want to do in the future with the land and if they need to do something it might negate what they can do in the future. **Furtak** stated that if just an RV is there a vaulted privy would work. **Kastrosky** said that his office would need to meet with **King** to discuss options. He also explained that every year there is a plumbers meeting and it is always asked why plumbers have to make people put in mounds. At the time there was no maintenance or tracking system on holding tanks and they were getting pumped at night, or when ever and no restrictions as to where they were dumped. Now there is a good maintenance and tracking program in place. If you would like we could prepare an ordinance amendment that says a holding tank could be a system instead of a mound. Not instead of conventional system. The owner would have to sign an agreement that it would be pumped regularly. If we allow holding tanks instead of a mound it should be set up to be turn into a mound if need be. **Miller** would like to see that if a new home was put in then they would have to follow the rules. **Furtak** explained that an affidavit would have to be signed stating that if the land was a seasonal use you can do this but if it is a permanent home you have to put the mound system in. **Miller** stated that if they are not willing to sign this agreement then he figures the property owners have plans of changing things in the future.

No further discussion.

E. Discussion and Possible Action on zoning district text and map amendments regarding municipality zones.

Kastrosky is trying to clean up past ordinance amendments that have gotten tabled; this is why this is on the agenda. This committee had issues with this, there were no prescribed setbacks. After 6 months of review he was going to propose a 10 foot setback and did not want to draft that until the committee agreed it was a good starting point. **Rondeau and Miller** think it is a good starting point.

No further discussion.

F. Review camping unit transfer container language.

Kastrosky asked if the committee seen the draft language. Committee stated yes. **Casina** stated that they are proposing for portable restrooms for use in conjunction with the residence, as well as the camping and transfer containers, they are 200 gallon units that are buried in the ground and can be used in conjunction with an RV.

No further discussion.

G. Discussion and Possible Action regarding classification of use (warming building on County land in an F-2 zoning district) – Public Use

Kastrosky explained the American Birkebeiner would like to put a warming station on zoned Forestry 2 land. Based on ordinance the only thing that is allowed on an F-2 district is a wayside rest area. The birke is important but he is not comfortable in either issuing or denying it. This issue needed to be consulted with the committee. The Forestry Committee, in their meeting, approved the concept of the warming building but it would need to be open to the public. **Furtak** stated that Forestry Committee approved this and he doesn't know if the county allows an organization to build structures on county land. **Miller** stated that the Forestry Committee has been doing a lot of stuff on

county land and made the motion to approve without knowing the zoning, and knowing what he knows now he would like to make a motion to deny this.

Miller motioned to deny the warming building on county land zoned F-2, **Rantala** seconded. **Kastrosky** asked for potential solutions, **Bill Pierce** might look for a rezone or conditional use. **Miller** asked if the warming house that was issued 10 years ago was on an F-1 zone **Kastrosky** stated that he did not have time to research the issue properly. He would like some potential solutions. **Rondeau** explained that it would be the foundations responsibility to come up with solutions. **Furtak** explained that it is necessarily not allowed and it's not addressed in the zoning. **Kastrosky** asked who would own the building and answered with the Birke. **Bill Pierce** with the American Birkebeiner Ski Foundation came forward and explained that he was manager with the foundation and would like to address that the terminology that is used in the wayside rest area is almost illegal and it is very old language. He would like a solution for the foundation on their warming house. There are two buildings in Sawyer County, on forestry land, that is owned by the foundation, and open to the public. **Kastrosky** would like the information forwarded to him and **Pierce** agreed. **Rondeau** explained that these issues will need to be looked at more and **Pierce** agreed that the foundation is not in any rush to build and it is a 5 year plan. **Kastrosky** asked if this building would be almost on Timber Trail and **Bill** stated yes.

Rondeau stated that there was a motion and a second on the floor to deny the request at this time. No further discussion. **Motion carried.**

H. Discussion and Possible Action regarding NR 115

Kastrosky stated he finish guide book and it will go public.

I. Discussion and Possible Action regarding Comprehensive Plan

Kastrosky stated planning is complete and 8 townships still need to adopt the plan.

11. Monthly Report

Nothing mentioned.

12. Budget and Revenue

Discussion with the Town of Bell, Casina stated that the people from the Town of Bell were here and would like to talk about the municipality district and give them some insight on the proposed zoning district. **Kastrosky** stated he is not prepared to answer a lot of the questions but there was a public hearing on it 6 months ago with definitions on what a municipal district is and that it talks about any governments, schools, libraries, playgrounds, town halls, EMS, county garage etc., these are scattered in Ag, Forestry, and Residential zones. Because they pre-existed any land use planning and zoning districts, the comprehensive plan expresses they need to have a municipal district so people know there is municipal activities there. It has been problematic if the county wanted to build a salt shed, there are under current regulations that they have to have a special use permit and come to the committee and get permission. They are trying to set some standards to alleviate the problems and expedite the process. There is a setback of 10 feet in the commercial properties. The committee should work collectively to have an overlay for the Town of Bell to reduce the commercial size. Lot sizes and commercial

will stay the same unless petitioned for an overlay. **Rondeau** stated that the committee needs to develop the standards if a commercial zone is to be created. **Kastrosky** explained that they are creating a municipal zone that could be an option for the Town of Bell.

No further discussion on budget and revenue.

13. Adjournment

Rondeau called adjournment at 5:30PM.

Prepared by kmh on 7/7/11

Approved by KLK on

Final Approval on

cc: (after final approval)- (8) Supervisors, Cty Admin./Clerk, DNR, Web

k/zc/minutes/2011/#6June