

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
June 17, 2010
Council Chambers

Present: Vice Chair Marilyn Rooper, Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members, Tom Ayres, Julia Dwello, Tim Krupa, Jenee Pearce, and Jay Raskin

Staff: Planner Rainmar Bartl, Building Official Mark Brien, and Administrative Assistant Stephanie McGuire

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Vice Chair Rooper called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the agenda; Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: Dwello, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(1) Consideration of the Minutes of the Design Review Board Regular Meeting of April 15, 2010.

Motion: Johnson moved to approve the minutes of April 15, 2010. Krupa seconded the motion.

Vote: Krupa, Johnson, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; Pearce and Dwello abstained. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Consideration of the Minutes of the Design Review Board Regular Meeting of May 20, 2010.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of May 20, 2010. Raskin seconded the motion.

Vote: Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; Dwello abstained. The vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(3) Consideration of Condition of Approval of DRB 10-09, Oyala Application for the Construction of a New Commercial Building, 139 West 2nd Street.

Rooper stated that this item is a result of action taken by the Board on DRB 10-09 at its meeting of May 20, 2010, and asked for a staff report.

Bartl summarized the staff report.

Rooper asked if any additional correspondence had been received. There was none.

Rooper asked for testimony from the applicant.

David Vonada, 5926 SW Riverridge Lane, Portland, OR, 97239, reviewed the elevations of the proposed revision and stated that the visual impact was reduced by the elimination of the parapet and the incorporation of the affected area into the overall roof design. The proposed shed roof will be similar to those used on other portions of the project.

Rooper asked for testimony from proponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for testimony from opponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for additional staff response. There was none.

There were no additional statements.

Vice Chair Rooper closed the public hearing.

Consideration of Condition of Approval of DRB 10-09

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the revised design eliminating the parapet as presented; Raskin seconded the motion.

Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper stated that they were pleased with the removal of the parapet.

Vote: Dwello, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; Krupa abstained. The vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(4) Continuation of the Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-07, City of Cannon Beach Application, Pedestrian Trail from East Second Street to East Monroe Street, at Elm Street.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. Regarding conflicts of interest, Raskin and Krupa stated that they had testified at the City Council hearing on the conditional use application and stepped away from the dais. Pearce stated that she is on the Public Works Committee and that reports on the trail status had been heard, but she stated that she could be objective regarding the trail. As ex parte contacts, Pearce indicated that she had visited the site.

Ayres arrived at 6:12 p.m.

Bartl summarized the staff report. With regard to the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criterion D is not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, and N are not applicable. Landscape criteria B, C, D, G, I and L are not applicable. Rooper stated that she did not think site criteria K, pertaining to mechanical equipment, and M, pertaining to lighting, were applicable. The Board agreed.

Johnson asked if the trail surface was ADA accessible. Bartl stated that the concrete and the gravel areas create a firm and stable surface in conformance with the ADA. Johnson asked if the storage structure at 316 E. Monroe was on private property. Bartl stated that the structure was located in the public right-of-way, and that there is a City process for structures that are determined to be in a street right-of-way.

Rooper asked if any additional correspondence had been received. There was none.

Vice Chair Rooper opened the public hearing and stated that the pertinent criteria were posted; testimony and evidence must address those criteria or other applicable criteria; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to permit the decision makers to respond to the issue would preclude appeal based upon that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any party may request that the hearing record remain open for at least seven days for the submission of additional testimony or evidence.

Rooper asked for testimony from the applicant.

Mark See, Director of Public Works, PO Box 368, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, reviewed the history of the pedestrian trail project. He introduced Public Works Street Specialist, Tracy Sund, PO Box 368, Cannon Beach, OR, who presented the details of the proposed project via a Power Point presentation.

Rooper asked if the aggregate surface material would be placed up to the fence. Sund stated that the aggregate would be placed down the center of the six-foot trail area, with a mowing strip on either side of the aggregate. Rooper asked if a trash receptacle would be placed near the pet waste station near the Elm Street right-of-way.

Sund stated that one trash receptacle was proposed at the mid-point of the trail, near the south end of the existing wastewater treatment facility. The location provides for easy maintenance by City staff and should prevent the use of the trash receptacle for transient garbage. Pearce asked if the slope of the trail is at an appropriate grade for use by a motorized scooter or a wheel chair. Sund reiterated that the maximum grade proposed is less than the 8.3% allowable by the ADA for a recreational trail. Rooper asked about the purpose of the lowered fences. Sund stated that the lowered fences were to promote wildlife and viewing, while keeping domestic pets out of the lagoons.

Pearce asked if the existing viewing platform was ADA compliant. Sund stated that the platform was deemed non-compliant during an ADA audit. However, the audit provided that the existing platform could be maintained if an equal alternative was constructed. City staff constructed an ADA approved viewing area last year; it is adjacent to the platform.

Rooper asked for testimony from proponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for testimony from opponents.

Martin Schmidt, 316 E. Monroe Street, Cannon Beach, OR, stated that he owns the shed in the right-of-way. He complimented Sund on the courteous and cordial discussions that they have had regarding the project. Schmidt stated that he would prefer any decision pertaining to the possible installation of screening materials, such as fencing and/or vegetation, as well as activity pertaining to the shed, be delayed for a period of time to determine the number of users the trail will generate. Schmidt stated that he would like to work with Public Works staff regarding privacy screening materials, if they become necessary.

Rooper asked for a staff response. Bartl stated that Mr. Schmidt's proposal to delay any decision on fencing or vegetation is not necessary. This matter can be processed as a determination of whether such a change is a major or minor modification to the approved plan. Ayres asked who would be building the fence. Bartl stated that if the City built the fence or installed the hedge, the DRB process for a plan modification would be followed. If the homeowner chooses to install a fence or plant vegetation on his property, there would be no additional City review, except to ensure that the fence was in compliance with Zoning Code standards.

There were no additional statements.

Vice Chair Rooper closed the public hearing.

Consideration of DRB 10-07

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the site plan; Johnson seconded the motion.

Johnson asked if the body of water for the decanting station would disappear. Sund stated that the area around the decanting station has been planted with conifers. Johnson stated that he thought that the creation of a viewpoint to the west, across Little Pompey Wetlands, would enhance the project. Johnson proposed the installation of a bench closer to where the lagoons divide, creating a viewpoint looking to the west. Johnson stated that there was a location, where with the removal of a few alders, a view to the west can be created. Bartl recommended that caution be exercised before removing any trees. Johnson stated that he would like to see a view to the west from the trail. Ayres thought that a westward viewpoint may be an enhancement to the trail design. Johnson stated that there was a bump out area near the location where the grade traveled upward that may be an appropriate bench location. Bartl stated that slight modifications to exact locations for viewing areas would be a "field fit" by Public Works staff. Johnson noted that there was a wet area approximately 30 feet from the Elm Street right-of-way and he wondered if the proposed trail material would accommodate the wet area, or if a culvert should be installed. Bartl stated that the Public Works staff felt that they could mitigate the wet area without the addition of a culvert. In response to a question by Johnson, Bartl stated that the proposed concrete to be used was standard concrete with a broom finish.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the site plan; Ayres seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued regarding the addition of a bench, facing west, in the vicinity of where the northwest lagoon

and the old aeration pond abut. Pearce stated she would be willing to amend the motion to accommodate a second bench. Johnson said that he didn't necessarily want a second bench, but was proposing a viewing area to the west, close to the transition area of the lagoon and former aeration basin. Johnson stated that there were shrubs and three small alder trees, approximately four inches in diameter, and an alder, approximately one foot in diameter, which could be removed to open up views of the wetland to the west. Pearce said that she did not want to cut any more trees. She asked if removing the trees would open a view corridor to Spruce Street; she did not want to increase any views of the street. Pearce stated that she had walked the proposed trail and was pleased with the project and did not want to amend her motion. Rooper called for the question.

Vote: Pearce vote AYE; Ayres, Dwello, Johnson, and Rooper voted No. The vote was 1/4, and the motion failed.

Motion: Johnson moved to approve the site plan, with the addition of a viewing area in the vicinity of the old aeration basin and the northwest lagoon. The viewing area location would be a "field fit" in an existing area that could be expanded by judicious pruning and minimal shrub and/or alder tree removal. The motion was seconded by Ayres.

Vote: Ayres, Dwello, Johnson, and Rooper voted AYE; Pearce voted no, and the vote was 4/1 in favor and the motion passed.

Motion: Ayres moved to approve the architectural plan; Pearce seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Johnson, Bartl clarified the type of kiosk proposed.

Vote: Ayres, Dwello, Johnson, Pearce, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Motion: Ayres moved to approve the landscape plan; Johnson seconded the motion.

Johnson asked about the alders to be removed. Bartl stated the removal of the alders is required create a trail that conforms to the maximum permitted grade for a recreational trail pursuant to the ADA. Discussion ensued regarding the formation of a subcommittee to review the alders proposed for removal. The consensus of the Board was that a subcommittee was not needed because the alder trees to be removed are delineated on the drawings.

Vote: Ayres, Dwello, Johnson, Pearce, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Johnson asked when construction on the pedestrian trail would begin. Bartl reviewed the various likely timelines.

Krupa and Raskin rejoined the Design Review Board at the dais.

(5) Consideration of FS10-02, Freestanding Sign, Driftwood Restaurant, 179 N. Hemlock Street.

Bartl presented the staff report, noting that three color options were proposed for the sign support structure. Ayres asked if the panels would be replaced and if the structure would remain the same. Bartl stated that a variety of treatments were proposed, but the existing structure would be utilized.

Rooper asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Paul Nofield, PO Box 896, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, introduced Bob Pershing, from Ramsey Signs, to make the presentation.

Bob Pershing, Ramsey Signs, 9160 SE 74th Avenue, Portland, OR 97206, stated that the open sign has been

incorporated into the sign panel so that the sign complies with the maximum sign size of 24 square feet. In response to a question by Raskin, Pershing stated that the applicant preferred the black posts with black panel option. Rooper asked if the brown color would match the building. Pershing replied, yes. In responding to Board questions, a fourth option evolved, similar to Option #1, except that the lower panel would be dark brown, as well as dark brown posts. Raskin noted that an Option #4 had just been defined. Rooper stated that the lettering was small on the words *Restaurant and Lounge*, and wondered if it would be readable. Pershing reviewed the letter sizes and the distances at which they could be read. Rooper asked if the fish would be outlined to give it definition. Pershing displayed the fish design that would be used.

Pearce said that she preferred the black posts.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve Option #2, the all black option.

The motion died for lack of second.

Raskin stated that he preferred Option #4 as described by Pershing.

Motion: Johnson moved to approve Option #4; Ayres seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Dwello, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(6) Consideration of FS10-03, Freestanding Sign, Surya Healing Arts, 115 Sunset.

Bartl presented the staff report.

Rooper asked for a presentation from the applicant.

John Sowa, PO Box 927, Cannon Beach, OR, provided a representation of the sign as well as a sample of the redwood and the hemlock, illustrating the outer edge of the sign. Sowa stated that an artisan sign was selected because he wanted a sign in keeping with the rustic nature of the building. The existing freestanding sign frame will be used; the proposed sign will be attached inside that frame. In response to a question by Ayres, Sowa clarified that the sign will be two-sided, the lettering will be carved out of ebony and mounted onto the sign. Raskin asked how the wood would be finished. Sowa stated that a finish would be applied to prevent the redwood from turning grey. Johnson asked for clarification on the sign frame. Sowa stated that the two heavy planks at the bottom of the existing sign will be removed, but the cross board at the top will remain. He also described in more detail the two locations where the sign would be attached to the supporting structure.

Raskin and Rooper stated that they liked the sign. Ayres stated that he appreciated the originality of the sign.

Motion: Raskin moved to approve the proposed freestanding sign; Pearce seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Dwello, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(7) Consideration of FS10-04, Freestanding Sign, Castaways Tini Tiki Hut, 316 Fir Street.

Bartl presented the staff report. Rooper stated that she thought that the existing sign was closer to four feet in height, not the seven feet stated in the staff report. Bartl concurred.

Rooper asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Josh Tuckman, PO Box 1163, Cannon Beach, OR, stated that the proposed sign carries out the tropical theme of the restaurant. Rooper asked if the tikis would withstand the elements. Tuckman stated that a finish would be applied to the tikis. In response to a question by Johnson, Tuckman reviewed the color palette. He also stated

that in his opinion it would be best to apply the tikis to the sign and not the building

Rooper stated that there were no dimensions noted on the drawing. Pearce stated that the letter sizes were noted on the sign rendering. Tuckman said that the *C* would be smaller than the *T*. Rooper asked about the dots for the *i*'s. Tuckman said they would be painted, outlined in black and look like a compass point. Light black would show the definition of the sign. Ayres and Rooper said that they would like to see a scale drawing of what the sign will look like. Krupa asked about the suggested height of the remaining letters. Tuckman said they would be 6". Krupa agreed that a scale drawing was needed.

Motion: Pearce moved that the applicant return to the Design Review Board with a graphic representation, in scale, of the proposed sign; Ayres seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Dwello, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(8) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-11, Douglas Wood Application, on behalf of the Community Presbyterian Church of Cannon Beach, Major Modification to An Approved Plan for the Location and Size of a Steeple Addition to the Existing Church Building, 132 East Washington Street.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. No one declared a conflict of interest. As ex parte contacts, Board members indicated they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. Bartl noted that the applicant is asking for a modification to the conditions of approval of to DRB 10-10 regarding the location and the size of the steeple. The church wishes to place the steeple as originally proposed. With regard to the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development and landscape criteria are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, K, and L are not applicable.

Vice Chair Rooper opened the public hearing and stated that the pertinent criteria were posted; testimony and evidence must address those criteria or other applicable criteria; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to permit the decision makers to respond to the issue would preclude appeal based upon that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any party may request that the hearing record remain open for at least seven days for the submission of additional testimony or evidence.

Rooper asked if any additional correspondence had been received. There was none. However, the applicant distributed additional information prior to the hearing.

Rooper asked for testimony from the applicant.

Douglas Wood, Applicant, PO Box 774, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, stated that he is the Building and Grounds Elder for the Presbyterian Church. Wood stated that he had conducted considerable research on bell towers on rural wooded churches. He directed Board members to the exhibit that indicated the location of bell towers in a Google search of images. He highlighted the fact that 36% of the samples had the bell tower in a center-flush position, which is what the church is proposing. He also noted that Pastor Robinson had reviewed images of rural churches in books available at Powell's Books in Portland. This research indicated an even higher percentage of center-flush bell towers, perhaps 40%. Wood displayed a model of the church with an enlarged bell tower, showing the flush mount of the tower above the west shear wall of the church. Wood stated that historically, bell towers were located over the shear walls, and stated that the applicant wanted to place the tower in a typical and traditional location. Wood stated that the traditional placement accommodates the weight of a bell as well as the ropes that dangle down the sides of the wall to operate the bell. The flush center position of the bell tower above the shear wall provides structural integrity for the 1200 to 1500 pounds of the bell tower. Cost considerations for a traditional mount are lower, as well as structural concerns. Additional costs to an installation that is not over the shear wall could include reinforcement of roof trusses and a redesign of the project. Wood stated that he created a similar view of the bell tower from the street level using the model, and noted that moving the bell tower to the east, in alignment with the prayer room, would decrease the visibility of the bell tower from the street. Wood displayed and reviewed photographs of traditional church bell towers, as well as the existing elevations of the church. Wood reiterated that he would prefer the traditional location of the bell tower over the shear wall. In

response to a question by Johnson, Wood stated that all of the structural attachment of the bell tower will be inside a roofing space and will not disturb the sanctuary. Johnson asked about a sound system. Wood stated that there were two speakers located in the louvers. In response to a question by Rooper, Wood stated that the horizontal dimensions of the steeple are proposed to be increased to six feet by six feet, in conformance with the Design Review Board condition of approval. Raskin asked if the primary purpose for the bell tower was visual enhancement or to house a bell system. Wood said that the primary purpose for the tower is for visual enhancement. Raskin asked which historical design in the submitted photographs Wood preferred. Wood stated that there was general agreement and approval among the church's congregation for the design that is presented, which is mounted over the shear wall; therefore, that is Wood's preference as well.

David Robinson, PO Box 1265, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, stated that part of the motivation for the design is theological, and not architectural. Theological design is an expression of faith through sacred design. Church architecture is intended to point people to God, and churches are often icons in a community. This church is reflective of traditional Scottish designs prominent in Presbyterian heritage. Verticality, symbols, lighting, the proportion between seating and non-seating areas, and the use of the sacred space assist in pointing people to God. Robinson stated that the motivation behind the proposed location is theological, and Robinson cited author Michael Rose's book, *Ugly as Sin: Why They Changed Our Worship Spaces into Meeting Spaces and How We Can Change Them Back*. Robinson outlined the three theological factors Rose cites that pertain to verticality, permanence (through mass, durability, and traditional placement), and iconography.

Rooper asked for testimony from proponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for testimony from opponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for additional staff response. There was none.

There were no additional statements.

Vice Chair Rooper closed the public hearing.

Consideration of DRB 10-11

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the architectural plan and location as proposed, including the increased bell tower dimensions of six feet by six feet. Krupa seconded the motion.

Raskin said that he has been looking at the bell tower examples provided by Wood. He said that he agreed with Robinson's analysis regarding the verticality, but thought that the design proposed might not be vertical enough. Raskin stated that the original bell tower that was adjacent to the building was more reflective of an English Norman church design. Raskin expressed his view that the bell tower is more of an urban design issue and how the design fits within the community. This church serves as a gateway to the downtown. Raskin stated that he was not satisfied with design, locating the bell tower over the shear wall, or locating the bell tower over the prayer room. Raskin stated that he would like to see a nicer and larger steeple, but might like to see a smaller steeple placed over an entrance, either the center entrance or the east entrance, noting that bell towers are almost always over an entrance to the church.

Krupa stated that it was important to remember that the function of the Design Review Board is *design review* and not *design*. Krupa stated that a redesign stretches the mandate of the Board and noted the number of people in the audience that came to support the design that was being presented. Krupa said that a larger design would present other problems, such as size, urban integration, etc. Pearce agreed with Krupa's statements.

Johnson said that placing the bell tower over the prayer room would provide a more sturdy design and thought that placing the tower over the shear wall gave it an appearance of instability, as it is located on the edge of the building.

Ayres said that he would prefer that the tower were placed back from the shear wall, and he did not think that placing it back interfered with the objective of creating verticality. Ayres said that he thinks the placement farther

back creates a more balanced design, but he was softened somewhat because the tower location is a minor design element to him and that there is a desire by the people of the church to place it over the shear wall. Ayres stated that either location was relatively minor in the grand scheme of the town, stating that the building is a handsome building whether the steeple is placed forward or back.

Rooper said that the Design Review Board members receive their appointments by the City Council because of their experience and community reputations as architects, artists, landscape designers, etc., and that their function is to render aesthetic judgments on applications. Rooper stated that she preferred the steeple location placed over the prayer room.

Krupa said that there are many opinions on what good design is and what makes it so. Beauty is very subjective and the Board must remember its role. Krupa said that the applicant heard the Board's discussion, considered it, reviewed it, prayed about it, and returned with a modification requesting the original location.

Pearce agreed and stated that the applicant had agreed with a portion of the Board's original decision to increase the steeple size, but that the applicant prefers a steeple location over the shear wall.

Raskin reminded the Board that it often makes decisions pertaining to a change in the size or location of a feature and cited the commercial application that was heard earlier in the evening. Further, he reiterated that he still viewed the design as a "missed opportunity" and that he was inclined to ask for a different design for the steeple, including relocating it over the central entrance to the church, or the east entrance. Pearce stated that a new design would be costly. Raskin said that cost is not part of the Design Review Board criteria. Rooper reminded the Board that they were a design review committee, not an economic review committee. Ayres acknowledged that the Board's views are subjective, but again stated that neither the shear wall location, nor the location over the prayer room would have an impact on the town as a whole.

Vote: Dwello, Krupa, and Pearce voted AYE; Ayres, Johnson, Raskin, and Rooper voted NO; the vote was 3/4 in opposition to the motion and the motion failed.

Bartl stated that he would recommend that a motion be made to tentatively deny the application, subject to the preparation of the final findings for consideration at the next meeting.

Pearce asked if the steeple was moved over the prayer room, would the church be able to begin construction immediately. Ayres asked if the applicant decided to build the steeple to the increased size and locate it over the prayer room, would the applicant have to return to the Design Review Board for any further action. Bartl stated in the above scenario, the church would not have to return to the Board because its action would be in conformance with the action the Board took on DRB 10-10, the original application.

In response to a question, Bartl reviewed the basis on which he would prepare the final findings. He stated they would reflect the views of the majority of the Board members. Raskin asked if there was a clear path for the church to move forward on a design. Bartl stated there would be.

MOTION: Pearce moved to tentatively deny the application because of the proposed steeple location, subject to the approval of the final findings of fact by the Design Review Board. Johnson seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Krupa, Bartl said the final findings would reflect how the design failed to meet the applicable criteria.

Vote: Ayres, Dwello, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE, Krupa abstained. The vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Rooper questioned the appropriateness of Krupa's abstention because he had not declared a conflict.

(9) Authorization for the Chair to Sign the Appropriate Orders

Motion: Raskin moved to authorize the Chair to sign the appropriate orders; Pearce seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Dwello, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(10) Staff Reports

Bartl introduced Julia Dwello, the new member, to the Design Review Board.

(11) Good of the Order

Raskin stated that he had been approached by City staff who inquired if members of the Design Review Board would review where art work and photographs are hung in City Hall. Rooper thought it was a good idea. Rooper, Johnson and Raskin volunteered to work on the project.

Rooper asked about the exterior paint at the Cookie Company. Johnson stated that he had reviewed it and determined that it was a minor modification. Bartl clarified that the City does not have an approved color palette. Repainting a building is either a major or a minor modification, and the Design Review Board Chair can make the determination.

Johnson asked about clearing the brush at the east side of Hemlock, near the south Cannon Beach entrance/exit. Bartl directed Johnson to the Public Works Director, Mark See.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Rooper adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant