



Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 26, 2024 - 9:00 A.M.
Final Agenda

MARCH 26, 2024 - CHATHAM COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

This is a quasi-judicial proceeding. All those wishing to give testimony during these proceedings will please sign in. Witnesses will be sworn-in prior to giving testimony. All proceedings of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals are recorded.

Decisions of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Challenges to the decisions of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals must be filed through the Superior Court of Chatham County.

Note: All persons in attendance are requested to so note on the "Sign-In Sheet" in the meeting room on the podium. Persons wishing to speak will indicate on the sheet.

I. Call to Order and Welcome

[1. Call to Order and Welcome](#)

Mr. Coursey called the meeting to order. he explained that this is a quasi-judicial proceeding. He asked that ll those wishing to give testimony during these proceedings please sign in. Witnesses were sworn in prior to giving testimony. All proceedings of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals are recorded. Decisions of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Challenges to the decisions of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals must be filed through the Superior Court of Chatham County.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

[2. Pledge of Allegiance](#)

the Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.

III. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

IV. Petitions Ready for Hearing

V. Approval of Minutes

[3. Approve February 27, 2024, Meeting Minutes](#)

📎 [February 27, 2024 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Chatham County Zoning Board of Review does hereby approve the February 27, 2024 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robert Vinyard

Second: Ashley Field

James Coursey

- Aye

Meredith Stone	- Aye
Robert Vinyard	- Aye
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Aye
Kewaan Drayton	- Aye
Ashley Field	- Aye

VI. Item(s) Requested to be Removed from the Final Agenda

VII. Consent Agenda

VIII. Old Business

IX. Regular Agenda

[4. Variance | 7 Highwater Court | Request for a reduction to the riparian buffer from 35ft to 10ft |ZBA-0324-000454](#)

- 📎 [ExhibitA_LandSurvey_Page_08.jpg](#)
- 📎 [ExhibitB_BetzCreek_Page_09.jpg](#)
- 📎 [ExhibitC_LandSurvey_Page_10.jpg](#)
- 📎 [ExhibitD_ProposedPlotPlan_Page_11.jpg](#)
- 📎 [ExhibitE_BuildingSection_Page_12.jpg](#)
- 📎 [AERIAL-SITE MAP ZBA-0324-000454.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Report_ZBA-0324-000454_abm.pdf](#)
- 📎 [FIRMETTE_7HighwaterCourt.pdf](#)
- 📎 [7HighwaterCourt_SiteVisitPhotos.pdf](#)

Ms. Anna McQuarrie presented the Staff report. Ms. McQuarrie stated the nature of the request was a variance reducing Chatham County's riparian buffer from 35 feet to 10 feet to construct a residential single-family structure on the lot property which is about .25 acres. The property is located within a one family residential Environmental Overlay Zoning District 7, at High Water Court. According to surveys submitted by the Petitioner, the current buildable lot area is approximately 281 square feet. The requested variance will allow for approximately 2884 square feet. The property is on Wilmington Island adjacent to the salt marsh. Ms. McQuarrie explained that the Coastal Marshlands Protection Act, jurisdictional limits surveyed in 2021 was shown on the diagram. There is a State riparian buffer required at 25 feet and then Chatham County's buffer, which is 35 feet. If the variance submitted by the Petitioner were put in place there would be a 10-foot buffer with the proposed structure in place with a 25-foot front yard setback. The schematic building section shows it would be elevated.

The Petitioner, on behalf of the property owner, requested to reduce this buffer due to the available developable area. The property is in the R1 E zoning district, which requires a 35-foot buffer as measured from the Department of Natural Resources, Jurisdictional Marsh Line, established by the CMPA. The Betzs Creek subdivision was created in 2001. The existing homes of the subdivision that are on the ground were built in 2003, they don't meet the current environmental standard. This lot is .25 acres requiring the following setbacks: front yard setback requirement is 55 feet; side yard is 5 feet, and the rear yard is 35 feet. The proposed lot plan situates the dwelling at a 25-foot front yard setback and 10 feet from the salt marsh jurisdictional line. There is a 10-foot utility easement on the east side of the variance. This proposed plan would also require a front yard setback.

The purpose and the intent of the Environmental Overlay, is to establish supplemental standards to bolster those currently in the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to protect and enhance community character, provide for safe and orderly development, protect Environmental Quality, especially the estuarine system that surrounds the community. The proposed structure will be raised, but it does not meet the 35-foot buffer requirement.

The state buffer is provided by Georgia Code 1276 and so with that there it does provide an exemption with this building to the salt marsh. For lots platted prior to December 31st, 2015, if roadways, bridges or water and sewer lines have been extended to such lot prior to 2015 in the platted law otherwise available for development, provided that adequate erosion control measures are incorporated into the project plans and specification and such measures are fully implemented. Highwater Court extends to the cul-de-sac where 7 Highwater Court is located. Two parcels are fully developed, with one in construction, and one fully constructed. This cul-de-sac is served by City of Savannah Water and Sewer and Chatham County Storm Water. The State code also states that nothing contained in this chapter shall prevent any local issuing authority from adopting rules and regulations, ordinances, resolutions which contain stream buffer requirements that exceed the minimum requirements in this section. Therefore, Chatham County is allowed to adopt its 35-foot buffer.

The Coastal Marshlands Protections Act says Georgia's coastal marshlands have long been recognized by the General Assembly as a vital natural resource system, a vital area of the state and essential to maintain the health, safety and welfare of all citizens of the state. Chatham County has approximately 228 square miles of wetlands. The Environmental Overlay District is intended to protect them.

There are reports specifically for the Georgia coast on vegetated buffers in the coastal zone describing coastal squeeze, which can cause additional flooding. Wetland buffers maintain and protect the poorest vegetative connections between wetland and upland areas, and they preserve vital wetland ecological functions. The additional flooding caused by an increase in sea level can drown the vegetation at the seaward edge, converting it to open water. If there are no barriers, upland edge converts to marsh and the entire area moves inland. If there is no area available for this migration to occur, marshes loss due to a decrease in the intertidal area and a phenomenon known as coastal squeeze. Coastal marshes are particularly susceptible to this loss because they have gradual slope. Ms. McQuarrie further outlined the flooding potential and mentioned the *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council* in her discussion of coastal protections and governmental regulation of coastal waters.

She further explained that 7 Highwater Court is approximately 7feet of elevation with the back of the parcel at 5-6feet. The highest point of elevation for the two properties that were built in 2003 is approximately 8feet. Wilmington Island is expected to face sea level rise and that the properties may experience a phenomenon known as coastal squeeze. The application of this chapter, this particular piece of property does create a hardship, but it is a necessary one. This is to protect the property owner and their belongings, in addition to protecting the ecosystem. This parcel is in a high-risk flood zone. This property was purchased in 2005. The overlay standards were updated in 2010 and the standard has been in place for approximately 14 years. The CMPA recognizes the protecting the function and value of coastal marsh lands is part of the public interest. Having that buffer between the salt marsh not only protects the salt marsh, but it protects the property owner. MPC staff recommends denial of the request for the variance to reduce Chatham County's riparian buffer from 35feet to 10 feet.

Mr. Coursey stated that he didn't care about Lucas, nor should the Board. Whether there is precedential authority at the Supreme Court, or other level, was not for the Board to consider. He reminded that Board that they are to determine what the law is and apply the facts to the law. And in this case, if there's a reasonable reason to do a variance, we will consider that. He asked if there any questions for Staff.

Ms. Ashley Field asked when you were out there, you were stated if they build out it will be impermeable, and the marsh will have nowhere to go causing the water to flow in, is it detrimental to the homes around it? Will it affect their flood levels as well?

Ms. McQuarrie said as we look at the sea level rise maps for this entire area, I would anticipate that all the properties at this subdivision will be impacted by sea level rise.

Ms. Ashley Field said I'm asking is if this this was granted and the owner builds, they're going to have an impermeable concrete base where their cars sit. So, when the marsh starts to come in with that sea level rise, it has nowhere to go, that flow of water. How will it affect the houses around it? Will it also cut into their marsh buffer as well because it has to go somewhere.

Ms. McQuarrie said I would anticipate that it's not going to be absorbed. It will sit there. If you have impermeable surface, it's not going to have that absorption. We have the storm water systems there,

there will be some drainage, or it just may take a longer amount of time. That water will have to go somewhere.

Mr. Coursey stated that he has been on the Board for a number of years and does not remember granting an easement on the property at 6 Highwater Court. He asked if it met the 35foot buffer mark.

Mr. Morrow stated at the time these lots were platted, these regulations were not in place. It is possible if looking at aerial site map, it would reflect what was appropriate at that time.

Mr. Robert Vinyard said 7 Highwater Court is a new house so wouldn't it be under the current rules? I do not remember granting a variance for them to build and they would certainly be under the same rules and regulations as the house next door.

Mr. Morrow stated that Staff was not able to locate a variance that was granted for that lot but would investigate how it was permitted.

Mr. Robert Vinyard asked if Staff could tell when the environmental overlay was actually approved by the County.

Ms. McQuarrie stated in 2010.

Mr. Coursey stated that the subject property is only 1/4 of an acre and the standards for R1 development for a home which is served by public water and sewer, the minimum lot area required is 6000square feet. Does the property meet that?

Ms. McQuarrie said yes.

Mr. Coursey said there is a minimum lot width of 60foot, do we meet that?

Ms. McQuarrie stated that since this was already platted, it does not meet 60 feet at the front. But as you go further back, it does.

Mr. Morrow stated on a permanent dead-end, you're permitted to have a 20% reduction in that frontage. It has to meet the lot width at the building envelope. The actual width is measured from the building envelope, but you can permit it with that 20% reduction on the cul-de-sac itself.

Mr. Coursey said the answer then is that it does meet the 60feet. Can you go over the side yard setbacks.

Ms. McQuarrie said there was a 10foot utility easement on the east side. The west side was unknown based on the survey. The survey proposed plan shows the front yard setback at 25feet.

Mr. Coursey said the front yard setback will require a variance. We have the issue of involving the riparian buffer. They're asking for a variance from 35feet down to 10 feet from the DNR jurisdictional line. Is this a question of statutory interpretation? Does the Georgia regulation not apply here?

Ms. McQuarrie said with the state riparian buffer of 25 feet, there is an exemption for lots platted prior to 2015. If the requirement to maintain a 25-foot buffer would consume at least 18% of the high ground of the platted lot otherwise available for development and you have roads, sewer, and water services, then it is exempted from that rule.

Mr. Coursey asked if the petitioner meets the prior to 2015 planning required.

Ms. McQuarrie said yes. Chatham County is allowed to have more strict requirements which is noted in section C. It allows local issuing authorities to adopt more requirements, they cannot adopt less stringent requirements.

Ms. Fields asked if 3 and 5 Highwater Court were built prior to the Chatham County ruling.

Ms. McQuarrie said they were built in 2003. There was only the 25-foot requirement at that time.

Ms. Fields asked if there were any rules about granting variances that go into that riparian buffer that is has to have X amount of impermeable surface?

Mr. Morrow said generally there is a maximum of 40% lot coverage. The standards vary, things that have roofs, impervious is not a direct aspect of that lot coverage provision, but generally speaking, that's what we're looking at when we're developing a single lot.

Mr. Robert Portman, Barnard architects, stated he was appearing on behalf of both the owner of this property as well as potential buyers the Pearson family who are looking at building on this lot and raising their family on it in this cul-de-sac. Staff has shown the photograph and aerial of Highwater Court in the cul-de-sac 3,5,7,6, and an empty lot crossed by a Ridge to access it. We have marsh all the way around Highwater Court. In 2001 MPC and Chatham County Engineering approved the plat for 4 Highwater Court. The homeowner, Jackie Mueller, purchased this property with the dream of building on it, that didn't occur over the years, but he was here today with the with the new family who wishes to build.

He stated he lives about a mile away in Copperfield Plantation. We have a small lake and a large lake now. Small Lake is fed by its title Betz Creek, it's brackish. The runoff from our roads goes into storm sewer and go into this lake and it's fed into Betz Creek. We have concerns over the marsh buffer, but what about the road? The 35foot marsh buffer on this property is approximately 3100 square feet. We are asking for a reduction to 10feet which is 1,308 square feet. We are asking for about 2000 square feet encroaching into the 228 square miles that surrounds Chatham County. We understand projected sea rise. We feel that staff has singled out this lot, but it is not just this lot, it is the entire coast. Everyone that lives on Wilmington Island will be affected. The other thing that's important to point out is that this lot. If it did flood, it's going to flow underneath the house. This lot is required to meet the new V Zone design certificate. Lots 6 and 7 have to meet this as well. This means that when it's constructed, it will be almost equivalent to and or equal to construction of a Tybee house. It will be required to meet the wave action that is anticipated to hit the structure. The sediment is reduced because Chatham County Engineering will not allow us to dig into the ground. There will be a slab underneath where they will park. What we did at Horsetown Creek and in a lot of our houses, is having a living area and then having our bedrooms underneath the roof. It keeps the roof down below the required 36 feet. We're at 31 feet of elevation right now based on the schematic. The other feature that we're showing on our proposed plan is the back deck and its structure will not touch the buffer, neither will the stairs. It will float over top of it, the 10 feet of buffer will remain vegetated. The homeowners, like any homeowner who wants to build a house on the marsh, they want to have a view and we would give that to them with this balcony or porch. We have a lot that that has extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to piece of property in question because of its size, shape, and topography. We would hope going forward, we could build this single-family house on this property and enjoy it just like all the other neighbors in Betz Creek. I think the original intent of Chatham County Engineering, Chatham County, FPC and the developers was to have a cul-de-sac with homeowners.

Ms. Stone said you mentioned that the slab won't be undercutting any of the soil. You had a four-inch slab on your section, is the case as the lot gets closer into the marsh your slab is going to get thicker?

Mr. Portman said no. As an architect, we had to come up with an idea of the size and scope. This would stop at the 10-foot County marsh set back line, it would not extend over.

Mr. Coursey said your presentation in my opinion deals with the mitigation and the equities of the situation. Factual equities. The Staff report suggested to me that there may be a challenge to the County's environmental overlay 35-foot riparian requirement. Is it the Petitioner's position that the 35-foot environmental overlay requirement is the law in Chatham County, is there a challenge coming? The reason I say that is you heard my comments about the Supreme Court decision a few minutes ago and I have looked, and I've seen no other challenges in Chatham County to that riparian 35-foot environmental overlay requirement. I just want to make clear so the Board will understand, this is not a challenge to the environmental overlay. You're here this morning to discuss the equities of why you should be allowed to encroach upon that 35feet.

Mr. Morrow said based on this drawing here, we see that this this segment here represents 45 feet and then you have the 10-foot line. At the tree line tree easement, it is roughly 55 feet.

Mr. Coursey asked if the plans as proposed would satisfy the 55feet.

Mr. Morrow said it appears to meet it.

Mr. Nick Beatty, member of the public, after being sworn in, said these lots were a part of a planned unit development and my understanding when we bought, and we started building that one something as part of planned unit development that if the marsh buffer encroaches more than takes away more than I think it's 18%. But I could be wrong on that percentage, but there's a percentage. That if the marsh buffer takes away from it, it makes the lot unbuildable due to that that the lot is buildable, that you must provide a variance to allow for the lot to be used for its plant, you know, intense as this was a planned unit development. So that's something I think should be considered here. Our lot didn't require that variance because it didn't encroach the way ours is situated. But I know that both lots on either side of US deal will have to deal with this problem and only. My only observation that I've made living there for the past six months is that. There are people looking at these lots almost every day, so they're highly sought after lots and there are people who own these lots that are either trying to sell them. Right now, they're both for sale and if they can't build on it, what's going to happen? What is going to happen with these lots if they can't be built on because a variance isn't granted?

Mr. Coursey said that goes back to the Lucas Supreme Court decision and whether the owner would want to challenge it based upon a taking under the Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution. Which is the basis of that decision. We're not here to decide that this morning, very clear about that. There's been no court, certainly not in Chatham County, to my knowledge, that has considered this issue. When did you buy your lot?

Mr. Beatty said June of 2022.

Mr. Coursey asked at that time, were you told that the 18% of the high ground, platted lot, was the law?

Mr. Beatty said I was told that as part of my due diligence during buying my life that there is an ordinance variance that is guaranteed that if the marsh buffer encroaches on more than a certain percentage of your lot, my understanding was 18%. But I can't. I can't. That there was a percentage that, if it encroaches to where it makes the lot unbuildable that a variance is automatically granted. Now this was during my due diligence I don't have any facts in front of me. I don't have anything to base that on, I was just asking questions. I am in support of the neighbors being able to purchase and live next to us. I don't see it anymore damaging than what we currently have.

Mr. Coursey said there is an 18% requirement within the statute the Georgia Statute. By virtue of an enabling section, section C allows Chatham County to go forward and enact its own ordinance, and essentially trump state law. That is my reading of it and I think that's what the staff is telling us. We are looking at the Environmental Overlay statute here in in Chatham County and whether it applies and should be varied from.

Jacqueline Mueller, property owner, after being sworn in, said my husband and I purchased the lot in 2004 not 2005 from Lopez construction. It was developed in 2001. We did have all intention of building on the lot. Unfortunately, he passed away in 2005. I at that time decided to sit on the lot, hopefully building on it once I retire. Unfortunately, I was not able to do that. I thought I'd save it for my son so he could build on the lot, but he relocated and he's not coming back to Chatham County. I'm just asking for consideration so the new homeowners can enjoy that lot.

Mr. Coursey asked if there were any other comments from anyone at this time.

Mr. Morrow said he would like to officially enter the Staff report into the record at this time.

Mr. Coursey said so admitted.

Ms. Wilson, Executive Director, after being sworn in, said I want to make it clear that this is not a taking. I know that you referenced that, but I want to make it clear that this is not.

Mr. Coursey said this is a decision for a court or a jury as to whether it would be. That is the standard the Supreme Court has set. We are not coming out and saying this is or is not a taking under the Fifth Amendment clause of the US Constitution. Let me make that very clear. That is for the Superior Court of

Chatham County to decide if anyone. Any discussion by the board?

_____ said I wanted to say to you I do appreciate the diagrams and everything that you've presented today, given the concerns that were expressed about the creeping of the marsh, I'm a bit concerned about a monolith slab being impervious for the environment. I believe by a design standard that there may be something that you can do to help accommodate that this is in a wetland area and may have potential growth of the environment coming inward, and perhaps they'll keep it buildable. Have you considered those things, or would you be willing to consider those things?

Mr. Portman said the structure the main structure will be concrete piers. There will be foundations and footings, then everything else between those footings could be gravel. We could do half of this just for the cars, for parking. And then the other half could be impervious surface, it could be pavers, the whole ground level as pavers. There's some economics involved with pavers but yes that is something that we could consider providing additional percolation of expected water to rise and cascade over the slab, and underneath the building.

_____ said I came here this morning thinking I felt one way. But as always when you listen to the evidence, things change. Like the homeowner and the lot owner, I live on an island which is totally surrounded by water. I live 300 feet from the Intercoastal Waterway. My house isn't in the flood zone for some unknown reason. It appears that without a variance this lot would be unbuildable. You're not going to build a house on 256 square feet. I am concerned about the size of the of the variance being asked for. There are numerous places which are next to the water and by lagoons. These regulations apply to those, and they come in here and ask for variances. More often than not, I must say this Board has not felt amenable to voting for those because we are all in this County concerned about protecting our salt marsh. If we have a storm, it helps alleviate any type of flooding. With all that said I'm amenable to doing this, but I would like to hear from my fellow members of the Board before I make my final decision.

_____ asked Is there any reason why you didn't ask for a variance in front as well as the back to split the difference? Pulling the house forward because it would seem like that would resolve a lot of the issues everyone has with impeding into this buffer.

Mr. Portman stated we were prepared for a compromised solution. If the Board wishes to hear. We've studied this at 15 feet as well as 22 feet. This would impact the front yard setback.

Mr. Beatty stated that the cul-de-sac is not large, and I think bringing the house forward is something that the other neighbors would want to hear and understand is being considered before being voted on and it's something that I would want to consider as well. It will be very different looking on that street with everyone else at 25. Even moving it four or five feet will make it protrude forward as you come on to that area. I think that if that's considered, I'm just asking that to be reconsidered and that the other homeowners that we get a chance to review that.

Mr. Vineyard stated that is not before us. They would have to apply for another variance and come back before the Board. It looks like the further you move it up, there is a risk of having to ask for a variance on the sideline because the house meets everything now other than the rear. That's the only question we have before us. We are not here to make deals.

Mr. Coursey stated we have before us a variance request from 35feet down to 10 feet. With the owner and developer willing to go back to the drawing board and do something different.

Mr. Portman stated with respect to the slab to the lower level, to maintain a pervious surface that the house is sitting on I believe was this discussion.

Mr. Coursey stated it was his opinion that this is just too much of a bite into the marsh for me to accept. My vote will have to be no on the variance when a vote comes up. But are there other alternatives procedurally wise since we do not have a variance request on the front side of this lot. There's nothing I can consider. In terms of, as Mr. Vineyard says, no compromising or negotiating. So, it's either withdraw the request completely at this point for a variance or we vote on it as proposed.

_____ asked if there was any habitable space over this 10-foot extension that is called out as the deck or is it just pure deck? Is the deck what you are asking a variance for?

Mr. Portman stated it is pure deck, there is nothing habitable there. This is not the variance request. The variance is for the size of the house. Understanding that Chatham County's E ordinance trumps the State. The 10-foot subtraction came of 35feet and 25feet. The 25feet is exempt from this property for the record.

_____ said I agree with Mr. Coursey with the whole scenario. Regardless, it is not what they originally designed to view from the front. I do know from living on a marsh environment and Causeway you come over to get to where I live. When the marsh starts to move, the water starts to move. That water can come in, and it may come into the back of this lot, but it also may push into the lots next door, so it may blow out any concrete or any pavers or anything in the back of your lot as that water comes forward without a marsh to protect it. It would be hard for me to vote to approve for those reasons. I feel like the houses next to it are being put into detriment with this actual proposal.

Mr. Portman asked if he could take a moment with his clients before the Board voted.

Mr. Vineyard moved that for the reasons outlined by the Petitioner and his representative in that this lot would be unbuildable without variances and that the Board of Zoning Appeals of Chatham County grant the variance as requested.

Mr. Coursey asked for a second. There was none made, therefore that motion failed. Mr. Coursey asked for another motion.

Ms. Field made a motion to deny the variance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Polote.

Motion

Denial of the request for a variance to reduce Chatham County's riparian buffer from 35ft to 10ft to construct a residential single-family structure on the lot.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ashley Field

Second: Benjamin Polote, Jr.

James Coursey	- Aye
Meredith Stone	- Nay
Robert Vinyard	- Nay
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Aye
Kewaan Drayton	- Aye
Ashley Field	- Aye

X. Other Business

5. 2024 Nomination of Officers

Nominations of officers

Mr. Coursey stated the last matter on the agenda is the nomination of officers. He asked if there were any nominations.

Mr. Polote nominated Mr. Coursey as Chairman and Mr. Vineyard as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Ms. Field. The vote passed unanimously.

Motion

Nominate of Officers, James Coursey for Chairman. Robert Vinyard for Vice-Chair.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Benjamin Polote, Jr.
Second: Ashley Field

James Coursey	- Aye
Meredith Stone	- Aye
Robert Vinyard	- Aye
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Aye
Kewaan Drayton	- Aye
Ashley Field	- Aye

XI. Adjournment

6. Adjourned

Meeting was adjourned.

Motion

Meeting was adjourned.

Vote Results (Voting)

Motion: Kewaan Drayton
Second: Benjamin Polote, Jr.

James Coursey	- Not Present
Meredith Stone	- Not Present
Robert Vinyard	- Not Present
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Not Present
Kewaan Drayton	- Not Present
Ashley Field	- Not Present

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.