

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 24, 1989

Mayor Walsh convened the regular meeting at 8:00 p.m. following a closed session regarding personnel matters, and regarding pending litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(a), (Town of San Anselmo v. Church of Divine Man, Kaufman v. Town of San Anselmo, and Ansari v. Town of San Anselmo), and pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(b)(1); and following interviews at 7:45 p.m. with applicants to the Tree Advisory Committee and Tax Equity Board. Present were Councilmembers Chignell, Colteaux, Zaharoff and Sharp.

2. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION

Marlene Kawahata, 84 Berkeley, expressed concern about the acute drainage and dry rot problems and a potential health hazard associated with the property at 94 Berkeley. She noted that this topic was not part of agenda item number 4 but asked the Council if the Town could take action to ensure the safety of the property.

Russell Kawahata, 84 Berkeley, was concerned about the stability of the hillside because of the drainage problem at 94 Berkeley.

Assistant Director of Public Works Braun, said that staff has closely monitored the progress at 94 Berkeley and has determined there is no immediate health or drainage problems at the site. In addition, erosion control has been installed at 94 Berkeley and there should be no problems from silt.

Chignell and Colteaux suggested that staff continue to monitor the situation and report back to Council if there are changes.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

- (a) Approve Minutes: September 26, 1989
- (b) Announce vacancy and expiration of term: Board of Review
- (c) Continue discussion regarding disclosure of litigation costs to November 28, 1989
- (d) Waive reading and adopt ordinance rezoning property at 46 Mariposa Avenue, a/P 7-284-29, from Specific Planned Development for 12 low income elderly persons to Specific Planned Development for a residential care facility for 24 elderly persons
- (e) Acknowledge and file reports on approval of warrants
- (f) Acknowledge and file report on legal services warrants.

M/S Chignell, Sharp, to approve the consent agenda. Motion unanimously passed.

M/S Colteaux, Chignell, to hear Item 8 out of order. Motion unamously passed.

8. ORAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE TO LANDSCAPE A SCENIC SAN ANSELMO (C.L.A.S.S.)

Frank Olson, C.L.A.S.S., was pleased to announce that the trees had been planted in the median strips at the HUB. He wanted to express his thanks to George Johansen, Street Superintendent for all his hard work. In addition he wanted to thank Beth Pollard, Administrative Assistant for her time and guidance. Their next project was to start a

fund raiser for next year but he wanted to donate a check in the amount of \$2,000 to the Town to cover the costs of the Town crew's labor for the work already performed.

Sharp thought a round of applause was in order fo Mr. Olsen.

4. 94 BERKELEY AVENUE: RECONSIDERATION OF NUISANCE ABATEMENT CONDITIONS

Colteaux to abstain.

Abe Blumfield, attorney representing Mr. Ansari, was present.

Assistant Director of Public Works Braun, presented the staff report which included a background on the property. During the Town Council meeting of June 13, 1989, the Town Council adopted Resolution of Intent #3091 declaring that the subject property was a public nuisance. The Council determined that all of the items listed in the Staff Memorandum prepared for the June 13, 1989 meeting were a public nuisance that required abatement. Based on new information, application submittals, and revised engineering it is prudent to reconsider the nuisance abatement at the subject property. Braun discussed the abatement issues.

1) Planter boxes have been constructed on the deck railing located along the rear of the house;

Staff does not feel the planter boxes are in violation of the approved variance because the property owner has stated that the ends of the deck joists were shortened in order to remove dryrot. Staff has determined that the outer most projection of the planter box is located approximately 4.5 feet from the exterior wall of the house. The variance application shows the outer most projection of the deck is 6 feet from the exterior wall of the house. Therefore there is less of a projection of the deck toward the property line than was approved in the variance. Staff therefore recommends that this item be removed as an abatement item.

2) Planter boxes constructed around the carport deck perimeter which extend beyond the approved setbacks

Only one of the planter boxes on the carport guardrail extend beyond the approved setbacks. This single planter box is less of an encroachment toward the property line than the planter boxes located on the rear deck of the house. Removal of this planter box would result in a non uniform look to the guardrail of the carport. This planter box encroaches into the setback 1 foot or less. Staff recommends approval of this planter box on the basis that it is a incidental architectural feature and that the Municipal Code allows incidental architectural features to encroach within setbacks up to two feet. If Council chooses to abate this item, it may require removal or that the owner immediately apply for an amendment to the existing variance to allow this feature to be retained. Staff recommends removal of this item as an abatement issue.

3) Carport shear wall, located next to the driveway, was framed between the intermediate platform and top deck in a manner that is not per the approved plans. This wall may also be a violation of the approved variance.

When this shear wall was constructed, it was framed up full height, contrary to the approved plans. Staff recommends approval of the carport shear wall on the following basis:

a) The structure still technically qualifies as an open structure; b) shear walls are superior to posts and cross bracing for resisting wind and earthquake forces; c) given that the other 3 sides of the carport are open, staff believes that we have adequate control of the unauthorized conversion of the carport into a second living unit; d) The location of the wall is such that it is not readily viewable by the neighbors and the property owner is proposing to paint the carport shear wall a dark earthtone color in order to blend in with the hillside; e) The property owner has submitted revised plans from the structural engineer showing that the shear wall as constructed meets all of the building code requirements.

4a, 4b, 5a, 5b, and 5c) Various projections of beams and joists from the carport deck and intermediate platform are not per the approved plans and in violation of the various setbacks.

The property owner has agreed that these items are to be removed from the carport, but has requested that they remain in place until the carport is painted. The purpose of the projection is to hang scaffolding in order to facilitate the painting of the carport. Staff recommends that these items be withdrawn as abatement issues provided that we obtain a written agreement from the property owner to remove the projections within a reasonable amount of time, say 60 to 90 days. Staff also recommends that this agreement should allow the Town to enter on the premises and remove the projections should the owner not remove them within the allocated time. Staff further recommends that the property owner post a refundable bond in the amount of \$500 to cover the cost of having the Town remove the projections if necessary.

4c) Deck and joist ends extending toward the house on the carport deck level are not per the approved plans.

The property owner obtained prior approval from the Planning Department prior to the construction of this item. Staff recommends this item be removed as an abatement issue as there are no violations of the Town's codes.

6) Deck at ground level near #98 Berkeley Avenue built without a building permit and built within the setbacks.

The height of this deck exceeds 2 feet and is subject to the building and planning permit requirements. The owner has made applications to secure the necessary permits to legalize this construction. Staff recommends that this item be removed as an abatement issue. This may need to be an abatement issue in the future, should the owner fail to secure the necessary permits.

7) Fence at rear and side property lines exceeds 6 feet.

The height of this fence exceeds 6 feet and is subject to the building and planning permit requirements. The property owner has submitted plans and made applications to secure the necessary permits to legalize this construction. Staff recommends that this item be removed as an abatement issue. This may need to be an abatement issue in the future, should the owner fail to secure the necessary permits.

8) Platform at ground level below carport not per the approved plans and also in violation of the approved variance.

The owner has submitted plans and made application to the Planning Department to legalize the construction. The owner has also submitted engineered plans which show the

deck conforms to all of the requirements of the building code with one exception. The exception is that the lower platform is not capable of supporting the code required loading for storage. Assuming that the Planning variance was approved, staff could only recommend that a building permit be issued conditioned upon an agreement or deed restriction stating that the lower platform must not be used for storage. Staff recommends that this item be withdrawn as a nuisance abatement item pending the outcome of the variance application. Staff may need to reconsider abatement at a later date depending upon the outcome of the variance applicaton.

Ed Blumfield, was encouraged by the several meetings he has had with staff and the Town Attorney to resolve the issues. He felt a 90 day extension would be preferable for Mr. Ansari to remove projections, however would be agreeable to staff's recommendation as long as the concept is agreed on.

Marlene Kawahata, 84 Berkeley, stated that the staff report recommends dropping certain abatement items but the new resolution speaks about a 120 day clause. She wondered which takes precedent. She applauded staff about the comments on the cantilevered beams and for their recommendation that a 60 to 90 day timeframe be placed on Mr. Ansari for the removal of the beams and joists from the carport deck. She was still concerned about the planter boxes because if they fall over they could hurt her children. She stated that she has not opposed everything that Mr. Ansari wants to do. With regard to the deck under the carport, she is glad that is going back to the Planning Department and requests detailed drawings. The fence has been denied by the Planning Commission and Town Council and yet the fence still exceeds 6 feet. She requests that staff notify the neighbors at any time in the future if Mr. Ansari requests building permits. She feels that sometime in the future Mr. Ansari will still try to enclose the parking deck without our knowledge.

Braun said that the resolution takes precedent, noting that for those three items that are still pending will still remain abatement items. If after 120 days, the necessary approvals have not been obtained then the items would remain abatement items.

Greg Smith, 97 Berkeley, said the fence has already been denied twice and there should be no need for further discussion on this matter. The fence should be cut down to 6 feet. He does not want the lower parking deck to be built. He feels there should be specific requirements and drawings associated with the motorized gate because Mr. Ansari does not seem to follow directions.

Jean Whelan, 90 Berkeley, presented photographs of her backyard and how it is impacted by 94 Berkeley. She wondered if there has been a survey of 94 Berkeley, because she thinks he has build part of the fence on her property. She also objected tot he storage on the lower deck.

Larry Stack, 4 Alice Way, noted there had been structural problems with 94 Berkeley and asked if there were any structural drawings associated with the planter boxes to ensure they are built safely.

Braun said that staff has inspected the planter boxes and meet at least the minimum Uniform Building Code requirements and did not feel structural drawings were necessary for planter boxes.

Marie Hoch, 51 Sunview, did not really have any objections with staff's recommendation although should would like to see an end to this project.

Russell Kawahata, 84 Berkeley, said the Council and Planning Commission have already denied the building of the fence to exceed 6 feet and there should be no future discussion on this issue. The platform and shear wall was built in violation of the building codes and now the Council is referring this item back to the Planning Commission. He did not feel the Town should allow the applicant to proceed when the work was originally done without permits.

Mr. Blumfield did not feel it necessary to address each item now. He has worked hard with staff and the Town Attorney to get this project completed. He feels that the Resolution is the right approach.

Sharp was generally inclined to follow staff recommendations but does not advocate work being performed without permits. He did feel that the fence should not be removed from the abatement. With regard to the 60 to 90 days in Item 4, wanted to add the words "...or within five calendar days after completion of painting, which ever comes first...".

Chignell wanted the fence, planter boxes and shear walls abated and therefore does not agree with staff's recommendations.

Zaharoff echoed Sharp's comments.

Walsh had nothing to add.

Mr. Rubinstein said there is a variance application in process to be heard sometime in November. He was hoping that this issue could be included and that the time frame for abatement could be after the Planning Commission hearing.

M/S Sharp, Zaharoff, to approve Resolution No. 3105, modifying Resolution 3091, which declares certain portion of the building at 94 Berkeley Avenue to be a Public Nuisance and orders the demolition thereof with the following conditions: 1) Delete Item Number 7; 2) Add to Item number 4 the additional time constraint on the removal of the cantilever projections "...or within 5 calendar days after the painting is completed, whichever occurs first..."

Ayes: Walsh, Zaharoff, Sharp
Noes: Chignell
Abstain: Colteaux

94 BERKELEY: APPEAL OF PLANNING DIRECTOR'S DECISION TO APPROVE A VARIANCE FOR A MOTORIZED GATE AND A PEDESTRIAN GATE IN THE FRONTYARD, AND AN ACCESS GATE IN THE SIDEYARD.

Braun reported that the Town Engineer has the authority to administratively approve the construction of a fence not to exceed six feet, upon the consideration of the terrain and topography of the land involved, the volume of vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and the safety factors required to keeping good visibility at intersecting corners of streets, sidewalks, and driveways. The Town Engineer found nothing about this application that would create a significant adverse safety impact. Further, the privileges of a six foot fence is common in the Town and denying the application would be depriving this property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the Town and therefore inequitable. While the specific motor for the gate was not made part of the application, electric motors are typically quiet. It is difficult to envision a scenario whereby the noise of the operation of this gate either by it self or

when combined with frequency of operation would be in conflict with the Town's noise ordinance.

Sharp commented that the Municipal Code seems somewhat vague in addressing the specific issues regarding motorized gates and side gates.

Greg Smith, 97 Berkeley, felt the application was not specific enough to know what exactly is being requested and the drawings were vague. Is the applicant asking for another driveway, and will this take away from the on-street parking?

At this time Braun said the applicant does not have approval for more than one driveway leading to his property and therefore the access area is not technically a driveway and people could park in front of it.

Marie Hoch, 51 Sunview, was concerned about safety for cars parked by the lower gate. Cars also turnaround in the frequently intersection and she feels the access area proposed is unsafe. The drawings do not show details of what is being proposed

Marlene Kawahata, 84 Berkeley, would like to see this go to the Planning Commission for review. She wanted to know how much noise the gate would create, where will the motor be and how the noise would be monitored. A portion of the fence is under nuisance abatement and she wondered how that affect this application.

Russell Kawahata, 84 Berkeley, stated that currently the neighborhood uses the on-street parking and Mr. Ansari will be taking away one parking space.

Larry Stack, 4 Alice Way, thought the application was vague and wondered how staff could make decisions regarding safety issues when plans were so incomplete. In addition the fence has been abated and wondered how that now affects the gate. He felt the application should at least go before the Planning Commission.

Sharp and Chignell were inclined to see the application go with the Planning Commission.

Zaharoff felt the Municipal Code was clear and that the Town Engineer had the authority to make a decision on the application. However if the Council decides it should go to the Planning Commission it should be heard at the same time as the other items pending.

Mr. Rubinstein felt this was a very non controversial item and no need to go to the Planning Commission. The Town has many motorized gates and fences. The drawings clearly show that the items do not to exceed six feet with the exception of the posts. These are routinely approved items by staff.

M/S Sharp, Chignell, to refer the appeal of Planning Director's decision to approve a variance for a motorized gate and pedestrian gate in the frontyard, and an access gate in the sideyard to the Planning Commission with the suggestion that it be agendized with the other items already submitted to the Planning Commission.

Ayes: Zaharoff, Chignell, Sharp, Walsh
Abstain: Colteaux

5. ORAL REPORT ON CONDITION OF LIBRARY BUILDING

Librarian Wingate reported on the general condition of the library after the earthquake, noting that the library was

closed for two days to access the stability of the structure and do a general clean up of books that had fallen off the shelves. The elevator is still not in working condition.

Braun said the damages was limited to surface cracking however there have been previous discussions about the safety of library relating to it being unreinforced masonry building. Staff recommends a maximum of five years to retrofit the library under the reinforced masonry program but if the funding were available today, it would take approximately one year to complete. Because of the Town Budget, another consideration would be to preform the retrofiting in stages. In the short term he did feel it was a good idea to install panic hardware on all exit doors.

Administrator Camuglia said that a decision was made to close the library so Assistant Director of Public Works Braun and Consultant Engineer Holm could access the situation and determine the building to be structurally sound for its intended use. Pictures were taken and time spend on the building documented in the event the Town is able to apply for FEMA.

Cynthia Barrows, requested a copy of the report performed by the engineers for the Library Advisory Board.

Colteaux asked if other Town buildings had been checked for damage after the earthquake, specifically the safety of Robson. He suggested that staff study the Town owned buildings to ensure they meet earthquake safety standards.

Camuglia suggested that staff perform a preliminary review with cost estimates of what needs to be done to each Town building and report back to the Council.

6. REPORT ON BUILDINGS CLASSIFIED AS UNREINFORCED MASONRY, AND AUTHORIZATION TO DRAFT AN UNREINFORCED MASONRY BUILDING ORDINANCE

Braun said John Holm has been hired to complete the inventory of the buildings classified as unreinforced masonry buildings. The inventory is now complete and a total of 24 buildings have been identified as unreinforced masonry. The owners have been notified and have been given the opportunity to present information demonstrating that their building is not unreinforced masonry. Staff recommends that a draft mitigation ordinance, based upon the guidelines which the State has provided, be prepared.

John Holm presented a demonstration of what an unreinforced masonry building could do during an earthquake. He noted that the mitigation measures being proposed are not complete mitigations and they did not attempt to define seismic deficiencies. The San Francisco Theological Seminary has been classified as an unreinforced masonry building and they have decided to abandon the three buildings in question until the retrofiting is complete.

Christopher Lee, 46 Mangolia, felt the character of the Town would change if property owners were forced to tear down buildings and start over. He asked if the Town could financially help in any way.

Vic Canby, 22 Crescent Lane, thought the Town should consider a Historical Preservation Ordinance to protect the buildings in town.

Chignell was concerned about the two buildings that have been classified as unreinforced masonry but have not responded to staff's correspondance. He hoped that staff

could make additional attempts to contact the owners, perhaps by telephone.

M/S Colteaux, Zaharoff, to direct staff to prepare an Ordinance for Council approval. Motion unanimously passed.

7. PUBLIC HEARING ON RESOLUTION TO CONFIRM AND APPROVE EXPENSES FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE STRUCTURE AT 1615 SAN ANSELMO AVENUE.

Sharp to abstain.

Braun said that the subject structure was declared a public nuisance and the Town crews demolished the structure during July 1989. The total cost to the Town for the demolition of this building was \$7,128.00. Staff recommends that the costs associated with demolishing the structure be confirmed by the Council, and that a lien be placed on the subject property and the amount added to the next succeeding tax bill in accordance with SAMC Section 0-1.409. Correspondance has been sent to the property owner but there has been no response to date.

M/S Zaharoff, Chignell, to approve Resolution No. 3106 to confirm and approve expenses for the removal of the structure at 1615 San Anselmo Avenue.

Ayes: Colteaux, Chignell, Zaharoff, Walsh
Abstain: Sharp

Motion carried.

9. ORAL REPORT FROM LONG TERM FINANCES COMMITTEE

Ken Anderson said they have met with all the department heads and the consensus is that there is a financial problem in San Anselmo. They are going to need a breakdown of the revenue sources for the Town and then will make a determination how much is needed for each department and the funding available to meet the needs. If necessary it may have to go to the voters.

Sarah Nome, 77 Alder Avenue, felt all other avenues should be explored before going to the tax payors.

Sharp suggested that the Administrator's office have a list prepared regarding the revenue sources.

10. CONSIDERATION OF ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY AT 22 MAGNOLIA AVENUE

Administrator Camuglia recommended that the Council authorize staff to proceed with the purchase of property at 22 Magnolia Avenue with several available options. 1. Re-sell the property to a San Anselmo parking assessment or business improvement district, if formed. The offer could be made with a six month expiration option, at which time the town could re-sell the property, or retain and develop the property for a use of the Town's choice. 2. Retain ownership of the property and establish a cost recovery use. 3. Retain ownership of the property for future use if a new revenue source to cover its cost can be identified. Funding is available through ABAG at 6% to 7% which would be approximately \$10,000 per quarter for the first year.

Walsh met with the Cities of San Rafael and Sausalito because they are familiar with the process of an assessment district. She was told there is a minimum six month process. The merchants are very interested and want to purchase the property but understand that it could only be purchased through the assessment district.

Sarah Nome, 77 Alder Avenue, thought the Town should take advantage of the opportunity.

Mr. Lee, 46 Magnolia, said many of the residents of Magnolia were not noticed about this hearing but all are concerned about the impact traffic would have on the already small street that is significantly congested by traffic from customers of Caffe Nuvo. He did not think that 32 additional parking spaces for the Town was worth the amount of money the Town was willing to pay for the property.

Bert Hem, 32 Magnolia, felt any use of the property would impact the residents of Magnolia. He was hoping that if the Town turns the property into a parking lot, traffic could be redirected away from Magnolia. The residents of Magnolia will take an active role in any development of the site.

Jo Julin, Santa Barbara Avenue, supported the acquisition of 22 Magnolia and advocates it being managed by the Town. If the property is turned into a parking lot, landscaping could be planted to adequately screen it from the neighbors and measures could be taken to redirect traffic away from Magnolia. The design could be tastefully done to blend in with the neighborhood.

William Jelinek, 53 Florence, said the Town should not rely on the assessment district to purchase the property.

Dan Goltz, Holtstein Road, felt this was a good opportunity for the Town.

Colteaux was against the purchase, stating that the Town was not prepared to go higher than \$200,000 for the original purchase and is certainly not able to pay approximately \$24,000 more. There would also be additional costs to demolish the structure. He noted that there is only about \$17,000 left in the contingency fund and did not feel this was the time to purchase the property.

Zaharoff thought the Town could benefit by having additional parking. Magnolia Avenue could be protected by speed bumps or by redirecting the traffic. On the other hand the Town does not have the money to purchase the property. If the burden of the project could be taken off the shoulders of the Town then she would agree to the purchase. Her recommendations were that: 1. Staff should continue to look for funding from ABAG; 2. The Town enter into an agreement with the merchants regarding the proposed assessment district; 3. The property is to be sold and all costs incurred be charged to the merchants if the assessment district does not materialize.

Sharp approved the purchase at \$200,000 but could not approve at \$229,000. There was no guarantee that there would be an assessment district and if the property went up for sale, there would be no guarantee that it could be sold. He would love to acquire the property for desperately needed parking but cannot approve because of the economics of the Town.

Chignell said he was concerned about the cost in light of the Town's financial situation, but he would support the acquisition of property with the conditions as outlined by Zaharoff. He said it was very important to keep the neighborhood informed and wanted assurance that they would be noticed regarding any public hearings on this issue. Additionally, the approval should be based on the fact that no structure will be constructed on the site.

Walsh was delighted to have the opportunity and proud the merchants are behind the assessment district.

M/S Chignell, Zaharoff, to approve staff to attempt to acquire property at 22 Magnolia Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) that a parking assessment district to be in place within six months; 2) that surface parking only be available and this precludes a parking structure; 3) the assessment district be charged for any "out of pocket" costs incurred by the Town; and 4) that the financial arrangements be determined through the ABAG Plan.

Ayes: Zaharoff, Chignell, Walsh
Noes: Colteaux, Sharp

Motion carried.

Colteaux asked that staff obtain clarification as to whether or not the Town can purchase the building for \$31,000 over the appraised value.

11. APPOINTMENTS:

(a) Tree Advisory Committee (7 seats)

Administrative Assistant Pollard presented a background stating that the Committee is being established to review and make recommendations on the Town's ordinances and procedures regarding trees. Staff recommends that the Council appoint seven applicants to the Tree Advisory Committee, with the following charge: 1. Review the current San Anselmo ordinances pertaining to trees, and their administration; 2. Take testimony and research the effectiveness of the ordinances; 3. Review the ordinances of other towns in Marin for useful suggestions that might improve San Anselmo's system; 4 Make recommendations tot he Town Council.

M/S Colteaux, Zaharoff, to approve the following appointments to the Tree Advisory Committee: Peter Brooks, Ed Hulme, Ben Berto, Paul Purdom, Willilam Jelinek, Barbara Geisler, and Dan Goltz. Motion unamously passed.

(b) Tax Equity Board (1 seat)

Pollard said that interviews were scheduled prior to the beginning of the Town Council meeting for the vacancy in a three-year term on the Tax Equity Board.

M/S Chignell, Zaharoff, to approve the appointment of Peter Breen to the Tax Equity Board. Motion unamously passed.

(c) Open Space Committee (Applications)

Pollard said the terms of Jonathan Braun, Jerry Draper and Gus Kanis on the Open Space Committee are expiring this moth. Mr. Braun and Mr. Draper have expressed interest in seeking reappointment and Mr. Kanis is not seeking reappointment. Two applications have been received and one of the applicants, Cathleen Evangelista, was interviewed by the Council for appointment to the Committee in June. Staff recommends that scheduling of interviews with the incumbents and one or both applicants at the next regular meeting.

M/S Colteaux, Chignell, waive the interviews of Jonathan Braun and Jerry Draper and reappoint them, and schedule interviews with the applicant that has not been interviewed yet. Motion unanimously passed.

12. COUNCIL REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS, COMMENTS AND DIRECTIONS TO STAFF; STAFF MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Forbes Avenue parking: Complaints have been made of cars parked on the sidewalk on Forbes Avenue and obstructing pedestrian traffic. Chignell asked if staff could research this.

The Alameda paving: There has been interest from one property owner on The Alameda to meet with the Council regarding paving of The Alameda.

13. ADJOURNMENT

The Town Council adjourned at 11:15 p.m. to the next regular scheduled meeting of November 14, 1989.

BARBARA CHAMBERS
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY