



City of Ann Arbor

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Meeting Minutes City Planning Commission

Tuesday, February 8, 2011

7:00 ~~PM~~ North Main Street, County Administration Bldg. Board Room

PLEASE NOTE NEW TEMPORARY LOCATION

Commission public meetings are held the first and third Tuesday of each month. Both of these meetings provide opportunities for the public to address the Commission. Persons with disabilities are encouraged to participate. Accommodations, including sign language interpreters, may be arranged by contacting the City Clerk's Office at 734-794-6140 (V/TDD) at least 24 hours in advance. Planning Commission meeting agendas and packets are available from the Legislative Information Center on the City Clerk's page of the City's website (<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>) or on the 5th floor of City Hall on the Friday before the meeting. Agendas and packets are also sent to subscribers of the City's email notification service, GovDelivery. You can subscribe to this free service by accessing the City's website and clicking on the red envelope at the top of the home page.

These meetings are typically broadcast on Ann Arbor Community Television Network Channel 16 live at 7:00 p.m. on the first and third Tuesdays of the month and replayed the following Wednesdays at 10:00 AM and Sundays at 2:00 PM. Recent meetings can also be streamed online from the CTN Video On Demand page of the City's website (www.a2gov.org).

1 CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Eric Mahler called the meeting to order at 7:20 PM.

2 ROLL CALL

Wendy Rampson called the roll.

Present 9 - Bona, Pratt, Mahler, Carlberg, Woods, Derezinski, Briggs, Westphal, and Giannola

5 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Commissioner Derezinski, seconded by Commissioner Westphal to approve the agenda as presented. On a voice vote the agenda was approved.

3 INTRODUCTIONS

None

4 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

11-0057

October 19, 2010 City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council.

11-0058

November 3, 2010 City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council.

11-0060

December 7, 2010 City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council.

6 REPORTS FROM CITY ADMINISTRATION, CITY COUNCIL, PLANNING MANAGER, PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

a City Administration

None

b City Council

Derezinski reported that at the last City Council meeting, they worked on fine tuning the Medical Marijuana ordinance, noting that the Council is working carefully because of the newness of the subject. He explained that the City Attorney's office had approximately 20 revisions for the Council to review and the Council felt they needed another draft and more time before moving the item forward, therefore they postponed taking action.

Derezinski reported that the City Council had voted 9-2 to waive all but \$ 2,000.00 of the re-submission fee for Heritage Row Planned Unit Development proposal, since staff felt they were already quite familiar with the project and they wouldn't need as much review time. He explained that the project would return to the Planning Commission and then on to City Council for the review process.

Rampson added that staff had been able to put together a review schedule for Heritage Row that was slightly abbreviated, noting that most of the abbreviation was on the staff side and wouldn't affect the required public participation process. She explained that staff felt they would be able to review the changes that were made from the last version and build on their earlier review base.

Rampson noted that the Downtown Design Guidelines were adopted at the last City Council meeting. She explained that the resolution approved by Council adopted the Design Guidelines and outlined the design review process. The process would be voluntary until it could be codified. She said the Council charged the City Planning Commission to work on code amendments that would require a petitioner working on downtown proposals to go through to a Design Review Board in advance of a citizen

participation meeting. She explained that the results of the Design Review Board would be 'advisory' and there wouldn't be a need for additional requirements in the site plan review standards. She said that the resolution also named a 7-member committee that would serve prior to the appointment of the Design Review Board, with the intent of that committee at becoming the members of the Design Review Board at a later date.

Derezinski informed the Commission that the City Council had honored the widow of the late Peter Pollack through the presentation of an award of appreciation for all the efforts that Pollack had expended on the City, including the Design Guidelines. He explained that there was a standing ovation given and then the City Council passed the Design Guidelines.

c Planning Manager

Rampson reported that the Planning Department had received a call from a neighbor of the Arbor Dog Daycare who expressed his dismay that he hadn't been notified of the follow-up City Planning Commission meeting in December where the Arbor Dog Daycare was on the agenda after being posted at the October 2010 meeting. She explained that she followed up by reviewing the public sign-up sheet from the October meeting for names and email addresses of individuals who request future notifications on postponed agenda items but did not see this individual's name. In further review she did acknowledge that this same person had sent an email to the general Planning mailbox requesting to be notified, but the email had not been connected with the sign-up sheet. She said that the person stated that he plans on attending a future Planning Commission meeting to voice his concerns directly to the Commission.

Rampson brought the Commission's attention to the revised February meeting calendar, pointing out the Washtenaw Avenue Corridor Improvement Authority informational meetings to be held on February 23 and another on March 2. She stated that Jeff Kahan is the Planner on the project who has been working diligently to get all the State required meeting notifications completed in a timely manner, before the item moves on to the City Council for consideration.

Rampson explained that the R4C/R2A Advisory Committee held a public meeting on January 26 which resulted in helpful feedback from those in attendance.

Commissioner Bona asked for clarification on City Code requirements regarding citizen notification of Planning Commission postponed agenda items.

Rampson responded that the Code requires that there be a public notification made before items come to the City Planning Commission the first time. She said that if the item is postponed and there is a lapse of time greater than six months, the code requires the City to re-notify the public of that item coming back before the Commission. She explained that if an item returns before a six month period, there is no code requirement that the public be directly notified; however, she noted that the City still notifies the public through newspaper advertisements of the upcoming agenda items of each meeting as well as through the Legislative Information Center on the City website.

Rampson further explained that the City sends out a gov.delivery notice, which is a mass email notification, to those who subscribe to the service letting them know that the upcoming Commission packet is available on-line for their access. She stated that the Planning Department also has a sign-up sheet that they make available at every meeting for individuals who are interested in being notified directly of

postponed items when they return before the Commission.

Bona asked if the sign-up sheet was part of the notification requirements.

Rampson responded, no, that it was a courtesy that the Commission had decided they wanted to extend to the public for postponed agenda items.

Commissioner Briggs said that the public can always contact the City and the Planning Department to find out about scheduled items on their agenda.

Rampson agreed that the best way is for the public to call the department or send an email to the general Planning email and they would do their best to print it out and attach it to the postponed item's file and make sure that an oversight doesn't occur again.

11-0181

February Meeting Calendar

Received and Filed

d Planning Commission Officers and Committees

e Written Communications and Petitions

11-0185

Various Communication to the City Planning Commission

Received and Filed

7 AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (Persons may speak for three minutes about an item that is NOT listed as a public hearing on this agenda. Please state your name and address for the record.)

None

8 PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT BUSINESS MEETING

None

- 9 **REGULAR BUSINESS - Staff Report, Public Hearing and Commission Discussion of Each Item (If an agenda item is tabled, it will most likely be rescheduled to a future date. If you would like to be notified when a tabled agenda item will appear on a future agenda, please provide your email address on the form provided on the front table at the meeting. You may also call Planning and Development Services at 734-794-6265 during office hours to obtain additional information about the review schedule or visit the Planning page on the City's website (www.a2gov.org)).**

(Public Hearings: Individuals may speak for three minutes. The first person who is the official representative of an organized group or who is representing the petitioner may speak for five minutes; additional representatives may speak for three minutes. Please state your name and address for the record.)

(Comments about a proposed project are most constructive when they relate to: (1) City Code requirements and land use regulations, (2) consistency with the City Master Plan, or (3) additional information about the area around the petitioner's property and the extent to which a proposed project may positively or negatively affect the area.)

11-0182

Resolution to Adopt the 2011- 2015 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan (Adopted by the CPC on February 15, 2011 - 8 Yeas, 0 Nays)

Mahler read the Public Notice as published.

Jeff Kahan presented and summarized the staff report.

Amy Kuras summarized the PROS plan.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Public Hearing Opened at 7:48 PM.

Jonathan Bulkley, 1915 Scottwood Ave, President of Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy, read from a handout presented to the Commission, which outlined the efforts of the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy. He requested that the PROS plan remove the mention of Allen Creek Greenway in Section 8 of the plan and instead create a new sub-section (j.) under Section 8 with the title Major Parks and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment. He further requested that in sub-section (d.) three floodway portions of City-owned parcels be labeled parkland.

Ray Fullerton, 505 E. Huron Street, from the Board of Directors of the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy, invited everyone to visit their website and view the presentation of the proposed trail. He stated that they have looked at 18 other cities with similar trails and they hope to take the lead in promoting trails with visible park-like services.

Joe O'Neal, 1920 Scottwood Ave, from the Board of Directors of the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy, reiterated their requests, noting that they aren't asking for money or land. He said they are talking to donors such as the U of M, the Railroad, and others, and that it will be helpful with their discussion efforts if the Greenway were mentioned under a separate sub-section, since donors are more willing to give if the City is a part of the efforts. He stated that properties along the Greenway will

never be more available than today and now is the time to act. He also requested that the connections be labeled where the Greenway links to the trails.

Rita Mitchell, 621 Fifth Street, referenced her email that she sent to the Commission that contained comments on the draft PROS plan. She thanked Amy Kuras for her work on revising the plan in order to incorporate feedback that has been provided to the City. She provided a handout to the Commission regarding survey question 13.

Noting no public speakers, Mahler closed the Public Hearing at 8:02 PM.

11-0182

Resolution to Adopt the 2011- 2015 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan
(Adopted by the CPC on February 15, 2011 - 8 Yeas, 0 Nays)

Motion made by Carlberg, seconded by Pratt that:

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adopts the 2011-2015 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan as a citywide element of the Ann Arbor City Master Plan.

And

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt the 2011-2015 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan as a citywide element of the Ann Arbor City Master Plan.

11-0182

Resolution to Adopt the 2011- 2015 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan
(Adopted by the CPC on February 15, 2011 - 8 Yeas, 0 Nays)

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Bona referenced page 3, regarding acreage of parks in the Central Area. She asked Kuras to explain her perception of the difference between the downtown density vs. areas that are more spread out. She asked how they should be looking at the downtown related to density and what formulas they should be applying.

Kuras responded that there have been multiple discussions with many groups related to parks in the downtown. She said there is a sense that the downtown is a different area and they need to consider what brings people downtown to live as well as to recreate. She said the streetscape is considered a recreational amenity in the downtown, even though it's not technically parkland.

Kuras noted that it's a different type of open space in the downtown and that it's not necessarily a person to person ratio they can look at, but rather what is more desirable for a more dense area. She said the City has several parks at the perimeter of the downtown which are located within ¼ mile of the downtown. She said that in cities the size of Ann Arbor, one will see more streetscapes where planters and trees are considered the vegetation instead of large expanses of open grass.

Bona commented that the downtown as well as the greenway also offer easy connectivity to the recreational amenities since it's within easy walking distance.

Bona said that she wasn't sure that the plan says enough about the mentioned amenities that are offered in the downtown, and there is nothing to guide the Commission on how they need to look at the characteristics that define the downtown. She said it might be helpful to them to have some definitions that they could use to improve or enhance upon.

Kuras said that she had added some additional verbiage since meeting with the

Commission in January, but would take a closer look at the details.

Pratt asked what was included in the open space calculations. He asked for clarification as to whether university property, schools, parkland and golf courses were included.

Kuras answered that City parkland and golf courses are included but no U of M property or schools.

Pratt commented that the golf courses skew the calculations somewhat since one tends to think of open space as parkland and not necessarily a golf course. He added that the U of M property is a great amenity but it isn't used in the open space calculation. He agreed with Bona that it would be helpful to have some guidance on what the Commission should be including as valuable amenities.

Kuras said while the chart doesn't explain the whole picture, it's helpful to look at the county park maps that indicate and outline the schools and university properties throughout the county that offer open space and recreation areas beyond the City's park system.

Bona suggested adding a double asterisk next to the item in the chart so it can guide someone to an explanation, or maybe adding a separate number that would say "within ¼ mile", would be helpful.

Bona asked about items 3 and 4 in Mr. Bulkley's letter, noting that they were very specific, while the Major Parks and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment was more general. She asked if there were other items in the plan that were outlined as specifically as the items presented by the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy.

Kuras stated that she had already incorporated most of the items from the letter presented by the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy, but the comments had come too late to be incorporated in the Commissioner's packet.

Bona said she was concerned about consistency of the plan in taking certain items and detailed them while others were left vague. She said she was interested in hearing what other Commissioners thought about the specifics of items 3 and 4 of the letter they had received.

Carlberg referred to the chart on page 3, saying that it would be helpful to add another column that referenced Open Space provided by other entities, such as universities, schools, and county in each of the districts shown. She said it would greatly increase the amount of available open space in specific areas of the City.

Carlberg suggested adding the ratio of open parkland per 1,000 residents. She said that while there is a good description of the desirable number of parkland per person in the plan, it wasn't linked to a wider context or comparisons with other communities across the country.

Carlberg said she was interested in Rita Mitchell's comments about the budget information that would show what amenities are paid for by the General Fund and what amenities are paid for with park mileage dollars.

Kuras noted that Colin Smith put the information together for the section where the budget breakdown was outlined.

Carlberg requested that they take a closer look at the information provided to see if it's easy to deduct the various budgeted items, since she felt it was important in times of tense budgeting.

Briggs thanked Kuras for an impressive job on the plan. She suggested that the document be reformatted for easier on-line viewing since she found that graphs and charts were difficult to reference in the current version. Briggs said that maybe setting up the layout in 'landscape' view might be helpful and having someone less familiar with the document could prove valuable in the evaluation process.

Woods thanked Kuras for her thorough work and attention to detail in the plan. She asked what the process was when comments and suggestions were received. Woods questioned who would be the one to make decisions on what was to be included or excluded in the plan; PAC, the Planning Commission or staff.

Kuras said that when comments are received, she discusses them with staff and then they try to make sure that what is included is fair to all. She said there is a lot of effort put into removing subjectivity from requests because there might be some groups that lobby more for their special efforts than others, and if an effort is mentioned once in the plan they feel it is sufficient and doesn't need a separate bullet point or paragraph in order to be considered important. She said she struggles with such specific requests in an attempt to be fair.

Woods said she looks forward to being informed if and when the plan should change. She said she can see both sides of the issue.

Kuras responded that she too would like to discuss the requests received more in depth before commenting.

Woods referenced the chart and mentioned that it wasn't always easy to know what census data to use. She said in considering density it was also important to take into consideration that buildings are getting higher which might allow for more available open space.

Woods asked why minority composition was included in the chart.

Kuras answered that the City works hard to target minorities that are underserved in the community. She explained that in regards to available scholarships it is important to know how they can reach the groups that could benefit from the services. Kuras said it is important to know who they are serving.

Woods asked if there was any specific mention of the efforts by certain church outreach groups that have been helping with park efforts in the community.

Kuras said while outreach efforts were mentioned she didn't believe that churches were included in the plan.

Giannola stated that she felt that giving a group or effort a separate section in the plan would imply that they were more important than other groups or efforts. She referenced page 119, and asked if she was understanding the Parkland Acquisition Section to refer to existing or desired facilities, and if so, would it be appropriate to include the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy requests in that section if it hasn't been decided upon yet?

Kuras asked if she felt it should be in the Huron River Section.

Giannola said, yes, because it wouldn't be an existing facility, and implies that it is more important than the skateboard park or other desired amenities.

Kuras agreed and commented that the skateboard park wasn't mentioned in the Veteran's Park section.

Giannola asked if there was a recommendation from the Allen Creek Greenway Task Force on the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy request.

Kuras responded that the Task Force produced a report that outlined alternatives for the three City properties referenced in their request, noting that the report was never approved as a part of the master plan.

Giannola asked if the Task Force had recommended this specific request.

Kuras answered, yes, that they had recommended that the floodway on all 3 properties be dedicated as parkland.

Derezinski referenced the PROS Action Plan section and said that he noted there was a reference to privately funded amenities. He commented that there was a reference that the Skate Park would be privately funded by \$ 1 M. He asked about the Gallup Park Canoe livery that is slated for a major renovation in 2012 and if those improvements would come out of revenues.

Kuras responded, no, that all major renovations and infrastructure improvements are considered to be operating expenses and therefore come from the millage.

Derezinski asked if any of the facilities have considered raising their fees to help cover more of the operating costs associated with them.

Kuras said that they evaluate the fees every year and explained that there is a 'breaking point' where if fees are raised too high, they risk losing customers who use the facilities. She also noted that as part of public facilities it wouldn't make sense to raise the fees so high so that people couldn't afford to use the amenities. She said a part of the park system's mission is to offer services to residents in all income brackets.

Westphal agreed with Bona and Woods in regards to singling out one project over others.

Westphal asked about security issues and if there had been any incidences in parks and how that data was compiled and presented. He acknowledged that there would be more incidences in some parks than in others.

Kuras agreed and said that the parks closest to the downtown had the highest level of incidences of drugs and panhandling related issues. She explained that when the park ranger system had been dismantled, they looked at a lot of studies and worked with the police to identify necessary areas of patrol. She said they continue to rely on police services for security, but with the cutbacks in the police it remains a constant struggle.

Westphal said it would be helpful when making informed land use decisions if they could learn more about incidences and how they could be addressed through zoning and design guidelines.

Kuras said she has had multiple discussions with the police on what would be helpful

to them with patrolling parks as well as in future park design. She said they realized that it's easier to have clear vision into sites when buildings and plantings aren't obscuring the view into a park. Kuras asked if the Commission wanted her to include a description of the thought process for security in parks.

Westphal stated that either a description or reporting the incidences so that it could help the Commission with problem-solving issues since there are available planning tools that could help public as well as private initiatives without drawing on the City's resources.

Pratt thanked Kuras for her quality and effectiveness of the document. He thanked the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy for giving a clear request. Pratt said that he didn't remember the extent of their floodplain request in item # 3, and would like to take a closer look at the floodplain boundaries before including that item. He agreed that there wasn't a need for a separate section since he felt the plan already covered and prioritized the greenway efforts.

Pratt commented that he believes the efforts of the Allen Creek Greenway initiative go back to the 1970 or maybe even earlier as a result of the 1968 floods, so he was glad to see some movement in a positive direction on their efforts.

Pratt responded to correspondence that they had received regarding possible public/private partnerships involving advertisements in parks. He clarified that the Commission had certainly encouraged staff to bring ideas before the Commission. He noted that City Council would be the body that ultimately decides if these are good ideas and will be implemented.

Kuras said that whenever ideas involving public/private partnerships were incorporated in the plan, she had been careful to add language that the City would look at the ramifications of the ideas before they would be implemented.

Pratt said that he felt it was covered well and when he looks around the City he thinks about all the things that were built by and through private initiatives, and he appreciated all the investors that have done so much for our City to make it what it is.

Derezinski referenced Goal 3. Collaborative Efforts with Other Communities or other organizations in the community. He asked how much effort had gone into collaborative efforts with the Ann Arbor Public Schools and if there is a dialogue on-going.

Kuras responded, yes, that they work very closely together with the land-use operating agreements. She said that given the tight budget constraints it becomes a push/pull relationship. She mentioned that the Schools were involved in the Steering Committee in the past.

Derezinski said that he was interested in collaborative efforts, since in the efforts of the Fuller Road Station project they would need to work closely with the University. He also noted that there is a large County parks system as well as large parcels of open space that maybe should be talked about jointly.

Mahler commented on the Budget Section D 2. Projections. He noted that it looked like in Section D 2 A., that there is a reiteration of the 2006 Recommendation but there isn't a clear indication that the Guidelines moving forward in the intervening years have been updated. He suggested a lead-in sentence, if they were to adopt the same language again, that would state that 'the guidelines adopted in 2006 are incorporated by reference here'.

Mahler stated that since the proposed PROS plan is for 2011-2015 and while the approved mileage covers part of that timeframe [through 2012] it doesn't cover the whole time frame and there is no indication in the plan that there is a desire or intent to keep that mileage going throughout the life of the proposed PROS plan.

Kuras agreed that there would seem to be a gap that needs to be corrected since the mileage would need to go out before the voters before it could continue.

Mahler said that there needs to be some verbiage added to the Projections section that would clearly state what budgetary items are in place currently and how reductions will be supplemented throughout the remainder of the PROS plan. He said that the projections and trends were very well done and he appreciated that they were included in the back of the plan and suggested that even more projections could be added.

Woods suggested that on Page 18, that Kuras add that the City Planning Commission was "approved by City Council".

**Motion made by Carlberg, seconded by Pratt that:
The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby Postponed taking action on this item until the 2/15/2011 City Planning Commission meeting.**

11-0183

Update of Work Program

Rampson handed out a memo to the Commission and reviewed the updates with them. She explained that the work program included Commission initiatives and projects, as well as Council directed efforts, that Planning staff are currently working on.

- The Washtenaw Avenue Corridor Plan is related to the efforts of the Corridor Improvement Authority and will include incorporation of the plan into the City's master plan. The Master Plan Review Committee will be working with project lead, Matt Kowalski and Jeff Kahan on the tandem efforts.
- The State Street Corridor Plan got a good start with inventory efforts last fall when the department had help from intern, but has since stalled because of lack of staff [partly because Alexis is out on leave]. The department will seek input from the Commission about how they would like to proceed with these efforts.
- The Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan came before the Commission this evening and will continue through the process to adoption in March.
- The Sustainability Study is part of the Home Depot grant, with staff in Systems Planning leading the efforts. These efforts are just underway now and might be a few months before we receive reports on the progress. This will be a framework that all of the City's master plans can link to as they relate to sustainability; environment, economics and social equality.
- The Allen Creek Greenway Plan is on the work program and efforts over the next few months from a student project might assist with progress on the plan.
- Huron River Impoundment Management Plan has no implementation projects yet, but if the Commission would like to direct staff, they are open to suggestions.

- *A2D2 Evaluation will begin to move forward now that a year has passed since the zoning was adopted.*
- *Downtown Design Guidelines are complete and what remains is the administrative process making sure the code requirements and information to applicants are in place.*
- *Area, Height and Placement is complete and are providing incentives for some projects to proceed that were waiting to take advantage of the reduced setbacks.*
- *R4C/R2A Advisory Committee held a community meeting 2 weeks ago and will probably hold another 2 meetings. Staff will continue to report back to the Commission on recommendations they receive from the meetings.*
- *The Citizen Participation Ordinance Evaluation is progressing, and the Citizen Outreach Committee will review a process for the evaluation after the meeting tonight. She hoped that the evaluation would be all set in 2 months.*
- *Zoning Ordinance Reorganization (ZORO) project will probably be delayed until Alexis returns to coordinate review of the draft received from the consultants.*

Rampson also reviewed the number of staff reviews for development petitions, historic district applications, zoning permit applications and other staff activities.

Carlberg asked about the number of zoning reviews on building permits.

Rampson responded that the downturn in the economy has reflected in the number of building permits as well as the types of smaller residential projects that they have been reviewing. She explained that Planners spend considerable amount of time on site plan compliance issues and working with developers to assure that their site plans and development agreements are followed, as well as match the work occurring in the field.

Woods asked what is going on with the Glen Ann property.

Rampson responded that both the HDC and the City Council approved the extension of the site plan for 2 years. She noted that the City's Attorney and the petitioner's attorneys are now working to amend the consent agreement.

Derezinski asked about the progress of the Village Green [aka City Apartments on Washington and First Street] project.

Rampson explained that while they haven't brought in any revised plans yet, she understands they are working with the City Council to stay on course to begin construction on the project.

Rampson thanked the Commission for all their assistance on the projects.

Received and Filed

10 AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (Persons may speak for three minutes on any item.)

None

11 COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

None

12 ADJOURNMENT

Unanimously adjourned at 9:25 PM

A motion was made by Briggs, seconded by Westphal, that the meeting be Adjourned. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

**Eric Mahler, Chair
mg**