

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
GREAT FALLS PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD/ZONING COMMISSION
May 14, 2013**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Great Falls Planning Advisory Board/Zoning Commission was called to order by Chair Pro Tem Nate Weisenburger at 3:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Civic Center.

ROLL CALL & ATTENDANCE

Planning Board Members present:

Mr. Nate Weisenburger (Vice Chair)
Mr. Marty Byrnes
Mr. Scot Davis
Ms. Cheryl Patton
Ms. Sophia Sparklin
Mr. Wyman Taylor

Planning Board Members absent:

Mr. Thor Swensson (Chair)
Dr. Heidi Pasek
Mr. Mark Striepe

Planning Staff Members present:

Mr. Craig Raymond, Interim Director Planning & Community Development
Ms. Jana Cooper, Planner II
Ms. Galen Amy, Planner I
Ms. Ida Meehan, Comprehensive Planner
Mr. Andrew Finch, Sr. Transportation Planner
Ms. Phyllis Tryon, Sr. Administrative Assistant

Others present:

Mr. Dave Dobbs, City Engineer

Mr. Raymond affirmed a quorum of the Board was present.

MINUTES

Chair Pro Tem Weisenburger asked if there were any changes to be made to the minutes of the public hearing and regular meeting held on April 9, 2013. The minutes were approved as submitted.

Action Minutes of the Planning Advisory Board/Zoning Commission. Please refer to the audio/video recording of this meeting for additional detail.

Resignation of Board Member and Chair, Thor Swensson

Staff provided copies of Chairman Thor Swensson's resignation letter dated May 14, 2013, to the Planning Advisory Board. Chair Pro Tem Weisenburger called for a motion to accept Mr. Swensson's resignation. Mr. Davis made a motion to accept the resignation, seconded by Mr. Byrnes. All being in favor, the motion passed. The Board will appoint a new Chair at the next regular meeting. Chair Pro Tem Weisenburger expressed the Board's appreciation for Mr. Swensson's service.

BOARD ACTIONS REQUIRING PUBLIC HEARING

Skyline Heights Apartments – Annexation/Zoning 36th Avenue Northeast and 14th Street Northeast

Jana Cooper, Planner II, reviewed the staff report for the application by property owner Damon Carroll for annexation of ± 1.1 acres generally located east of the proposed 14th Street Northeast extension and south of 36th Avenue Northeast, and the abutting portion of 14th Street Northeast consisting of ± 0.2 acres, into the City of Great Falls, and establishing City zoning of PUD – Planned Unit Development zoning district. The applicant is proposing to build the Skyline Heights Apartments, a 24-unit multi-family housing development. Ms. Cooper entered the staff report into the record.

In conjunction with this application, the City is proposing annexation of the City-owned water tower site located on the eastern adjacent lot and consisting of ± 0.52 acres. The City is proposing annexation in order to incorporate the City-owned property.

Mr. Carroll previously submitted an application which came before the Planning Advisory Board/Zoning Commission on February 12, 2013 for a 36-unit multi-family housing project with R-6 zoning. The Planning Advisory Board recommended denial, and Mr. Carroll withdrew that application.

The subject property is currently located in Cascade County and is zoned SR-1 Suburban Residential 1 and B-2 General Business. The areas to the north, east and west have the same zoning. The area to the southwest is within the City and is zoned R-2 Single-family medium density. The applicant is proposing a three-story building located on the south and east portion of the property with two entrances, one off of 36th Avenue Northeast and one off of 14th Street Northeast. The subject property shall be zoned PUD – Planned Unit Development, which is a special type of zoning district proposed by the developer to account for a desired mix of uses. Each district is unique and therefore has its own set of development standards which are documented in the approval. The applicant is proposing an underlying zoning of R-5 multi-family medium density with the same permitted uses as R-5 zoning and the same development standards. The only difference in the zoning is that the R-5 zoning district restricts buildings to two-stories; the proposed PUD would allow a three-story building on the subject property.

The applicant owns the undeveloped property to the west and has committed to filing a restrictive covenant on this land that would not permit multi-family development in perpetuity on

this property. The City does not have a way to enforce this, but the applicant has stated he will file the covenant if he receives approval on this application. The applicant will improve 36th Avenue Northeast across its frontage from 14th Street Northeast to its eastern property boundary. The timing of this roadway improvement has not been determined, because the entire roadway needs to be improved. The City received escrow money as part of the Watertown Park Addition to improve 14th Street Northeast to City standard; the street will be completed in conjunction with this project. The City water main (8") and sewer main (8") will be extended in 14th Street Northeast from their existing location to 36th Avenue Northeast. The applicant will need to extend the storm drain north from its existing location as required by the City Public Works Department. The proposed development will have impervious surfaces of more than 15,000 square feet; therefore, the developer is required to provide a stormwater management plan in compliance with the City of Great Falls Storm Design Manual.

Ms. Cooper described the traffic analysis as presented in the staff report. A development of this size is expected to generate an average of 6.59 trips per occupied dwelling unit on a weekday for a total estimated 238 daily trips. Traffic generated by the development during "peak hour" – that is, the hour of the day generating the highest traffic – is expected to be 11 vehicles for a one-hour period between 7 and 9 AM. Assuming vehicles are dispersed throughout the hour, there would be little to no observed impact upon congestion at the intersection of 36th Avenue Northeast and Bootlegger Trail. The proposed access driveway on 36th Avenue North is more than 350 feet from the intersection with Bootlegger Trail, allowing for adequate stacking room at current volumes. Future growth in traffic may necessitate the construction of a dedicated east-bound left turn lane, or other intersection improvements to reduce congestion that may occur as the area north of 36th Avenue Northeast grows and expands. Staff recommends the cost for sidewalks along 36th Avenue Northeast be escrowed by the developer and constructed at the same time as the street improvements are made.

The applicant presented information on the proposed project to Neighborhood Council #3 on March 7, 2013. The Council voiced concerns about the possibility of increased traffic and more vehicles parked on the side streets; that parking might be lost on the subject property if 36th Avenue Northeast was widened; that the property to the west could also be developed as multi-family housing; that the neighborhood is currently mostly single-family homes; and that the proposed zoning would be spot zoning. The Council suggested other locations for a multi-family development, but none worked for the applicant. There was discussion about putting a deed restriction on the properties to the west. There was no vote at the Council meeting about the project. Staff received additional comments after the staff report was written about traffic concerns and questions on how this development might affect property values.

With the redesign of the proposed project, the applicant has taken steps to respond to compatibility concerns of the community, and the project will provide more diversity in housing stock in the community. The City has a disproportionate amount of aging housing stock, and the proposed project will help meet the need for multi-family housing.

Ms. Cooper reviewed the Conditions of Approval as listed in the staff report and offered to answer any questions from the Board. Mr. Byrnes asked about setback requirements. Ms. Cooper stated that the front yard setback is 10 feet, side yard setback is 8 feet, and rear setback is 10 feet, or 15-feet for lot-depth of 150-feet and over. Mr. Byrnes asked about the location of the proposed building on the lot. Ms. Cooper said there had been two buildings on

the previous application, and since there is only one on this application, there is open space where the second previously proposed building was located.

Mr. Byrnes asked if parking space was increased, and Ms. Cooper stated that there is a minimum number of 2 parking spaces per unit for this application, whereas there was 1.5 parking spaces per unit in the previous application.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Damon Carroll, 215 Russell Ranch Lane, applicant, said that after the last meeting, he was disappointed and wanted to utilize the land under current County zoning by putting some trailer homes on the subject property. He said he felt his previous proposal was a sound project and he had done due diligence to present it to the Neighborhood Councils. However, despite his discouragement, he said he has lived in Great Falls his whole life and was not giving up on a project. He then attended another Neighborhood Council meeting and heard their concerns about the possibility of more apartment buildings being built on the adjacent lot in the area, which he owns. He said he is going to put a restrictive deed on the other lot, and he moved the current proposed building east on the subject property so that it wouldn't border the single-family home directly south of the property. He increased the number of parking stalls to 54 and added a children's play area on the subject property. He said that Great Falls needs decent apartment rentals, and that he has done all he can to make this proposed project work. He requested the Board's approval of this application.

Mr. Byrnes asked about the playground. Mr. Carroll said there were comments by those opposed to this project was that there was no children's play area, and that there was no overflow parking. He said he addressed those concerns with this proposal. He said in order to make this project work, he is now using asphalt versus concrete on the parking lot, and he is downsizing the square footage of the units a little.

PROPONENTS

Christine Carroll, 1700 First West Hill Drive, said she was supporting the applicant, who is her son, but is also in support as a tax-paying property owner. She said she is owner of the James Carroll 12-plex at 5100 4th Avenue North. She said they pay \$9,000 in taxes annually on this property, as well as \$12,000 annually in utilities, and make repairs and improvements regularly to the property. As landlord and manager of this 12-plex, she said Great Falls needs clean, safe and well-maintained housing for families and people in all walks of life in the area. She said they have had only one incident in five years of theft or vandalism to vehicles or property. She said all of their buildings are secure and require a pass code to enter. Off-street parking has 24-hour monitoring. She said they receive 5 to 10 inquiries within 48 hours when a unit is vacant, they carefully check applicants for qualifications, and they do not allow tenants to deface property.

Ryan Carroll, 928 10th Avenue Northwest, said he is a brother of the applicant and a local businessman. He said that Sheila Rice has stated there is a lack of rental units in Great Falls. He said he is a hotel owner, and he hears from visitors that there is nothing decent and affordable in Great Falls to rent. He said there are a lot of old units in Great Falls and in order to buy a home, you have to have 20% down. He said Damon has done all he can to accommodate the neighbors with this proposed project. He said there is a need for quality rental housing and

that the process of building of this project will bring \$2 million to Great Falls residents in wages and business.

Lee Janetski, 83 Sun River Road, said we should be saying, "Let's make this project work." He said Great Falls drifts along because people don't want change and growth. He said the steel mill is going to hire 200 people who will need a place to live, and the need is obvious. Traffic from the proposed project will flow right onto 36th Avenue Northeast and not through neighborhoods. He asked the Board to find reasons to make this project work.

Merrill McKamey, 564 Ten Mile Road, Cascade, said he can attest to the limitations on rentals in Great Falls as well as to the high quality of project that the applicant represents. He said the applicants units are very secure and of very good quality.

Ted Mattfeld, 215 11th Street Northwest, said he owns Electric City Concrete and that the applicant does quality work. Electric City Concrete employs nine people, and he said this project will put people to work. He said this proposed project is only an asset to Great Falls and he is in support of it.

Adam Nadeau, 912 8th Avenue North, said he has been an employee of the applicant for six years, that the buildings are nicely built and the landscaping looks good. He said he has spent years trying to find decent places to rent.

Colin Schwartz, 921 5th Avenue South, said he is a local contractor and that local contractors need all the work they can get. He said Mr. Carroll hires locally, and the money stays in Great Falls.

Terry Roark, 905 5th Avenue North, said he also works for the applicant and that before Mr. Carroll finished his last two projects, people were moving in and the buildings were all rented. He said there is no comparison between other rentals and what Mr. Carroll builds. He said people coming in to Great Falls need a place to live, and the nicer the place is to live in, the longer they will stay and spend money here.

OPPONENTS

Bill Albrecht, 1012 33th Avenue Northeast, thanked Mr. Carroll for trying to make this work. He said his concern is about traffic. He said he is a business owner who wants to do things correctly. He referenced page 4, Exhibit B, the aerial photo, of the staff report, and said that opening up 14th Street Northeast is a problem. He had concerns about where traffic will flow, and said he would be in favor of a two-story building, not a three-story building. He said this proposed project was spot zoning.

Susan Babbitt, 1108 35th Avenue Northeast, said that when they built their home, there were no homes all around them, but now there are. She said she chose not to live where there were apartment buildings. She said traffic has gotten worse in the last seven years. She goes to work at 9:00 a.m. because she would not be able to get out of her street at 8:00 a.m. She said the water tower leaks and the area becomes a giant ice rink when it's cold. She said she would rather look at storage units than a three-story apartment complex.

Spencer Adams, 3501 11th Street Northeast, said his property backs up to the subject property. He said the question is not whether we need another apartment complex in Great Falls, but where it should be built. He expressed concern about traffic flow and asked if the traffic study was recent. Staff confirmed the study was a 2012 traffic count of about 3500 vehicles per day on 36th Avenue Northeast. Mr. Adams said traffic will flow through the neighborhoods. He asked when the deed restriction will be in place on Mr. Carroll's other property. Mr. Carroll said it was contingent upon Board approval of this project. Mr. Adam's asked if the applicant was complete, and Ms. Cooper said it was. He said he would like to see 14th Street Northeast remain blocked off to through traffic.

Randall Babbitt, 1108 35th Avenue Northeast, said that none of Mr. Carroll's supporters live in the neighborhood where this project is proposed. He said the neighborhood is in agreement that this project should not built at this location. He said if you can change zoning, what are the rules for?

Carey Hamrick, 1108 41st Avenue Northeast, said he and his wife chose to live at this location because they wanted to be in an area of residential homes and away from rental units. They said this proposed project was not in the best interest of where they live, although they can appreciate what everyone is trying to do with this project.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ron Gessaman, 1106 36th Avenue Northeast, said he is opposed to this project because he does not think this is a good area for the project, and he disagrees with the staff report that this is in line with the City's Growth Policy. He said there is no self-containment associated with the development, it does not reduce automobile dependence, and does not foster a strong live, work, play pattern. He disagrees with the traffic analysis in the staff report on page 6, and said that peak hour traffic is the most important traffic item. He noted that the number of vehicle daily trips is stated as 268 in the staff report but should be about 160 if you do the math. He disputed 11 vehicles during the morning rush hour coming from that complex, and said there will be 40 – 50 vehicles from this project during the morning rush hour. He talked about traffic jams at 36th Avenue Northeast and Bootlegger Trail. He complimented Mr. Carroll for coming to Neighborhood Council meetings, and said other developers should do the same.

Sam McPherson, 3505 14th Street Northeast, said his property is adjacent to this proposed project. He thanked Mr. Carroll for addressing issues that neighbors were concerned about, and requested a 6-foot privacy fence along their adjoining property, from the corner of the lot where storage units are out towards 14th Street Northeast.

PETITIONER'S CLOSING

The Petitioner did not wish to close.

PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD DISCUSSION & ACTION

Chair Pro Tem Weisenburger asked for any discussion from the Board. Ms. Patton inquired of staff as to the plans for 36th Avenue Northeast. Dave Dobbs, City Engineer, said that the rural section of that road, which is narrow, will be surveyed for widening. Further out, he said there are plans to improve the Bootlegger intersection in the future, but that probably will not change

traffic congestion a lot. Plans to open up 14th Street Northeast have been in the works for about 5 years, and he said that will hopefully happen this year.

Ms. Sparklin said the request for a privacy fence was reasonable. The Petitioner said he absolutely would be willing to put in a fence. Mr. Byrnes said that the previous proposal for this property was a request for R-6 zoning, which was higher density. He said he is comfortable with the current application since the building is moved toward the west and there is a green space buffer between the existing residential area. He said that parking spaces have increased with this application and it does not appear there will need to be any on-street parking. As far as traffic, he said any development in that area will increase traffic. Ms. Sparklin agreed and also said that due to the location of the proposed project, traffic impact will be minimized as traffic will not need to go through the neighborhoods to get to Bootlegger Trail.

Ms. Patton said the City does need additional rental properties which are not necessarily geared to low income. She said the developer has addressed concerns which she had about the previous application, and she will probably be in favor of this application.

MOTION: Recommendation I: The Planning Advisory Board recommends that the City Commission approve annexation of the subject property as legally described in the staff report and the abutting portion of 14th Avenue Northeast, subject to the Zoning commission adopting Recommendation II and the applicant fulfilling the listed Conditions of Approval, and including the condition of a 6-foot privacy fence as described by the Petitioner.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final build-out of the project shall be in substantial compliance with the final approved site plan documents and drawings as approved by the City Commission.
2. The final engineering drawings and specifications for the required public improvements to serve Skyline Heights Apartments shall be submitted to the City Public Works Department for review and approval prior to any building permits being issued by the City.
3. A Grading Plan, State Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities Permit, and Stormwater Management Plan shall be developed to City standards and shall be submitted to the City Public Works Department for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits.
4. Applicant shall submit proposed project drawings including architectural, landscape, signage and lighting plans as required for review and approval by the Design Review Board prior to submittal of permit plans.
5. A geotechnical investigation and report prepared by a Professional Engineer with recommended building foundation design shall be submitted to the Planning and Community Development Department for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits.
6. An Annexation Agreement shall be prepared containing terms and conditions for development of the subject property including, but not limited to, agreement by application to:
 - a. Install within two years of the date of final City Commission approval, the public improvements referenced in Paragraph Two above; and

- b. Indemnify the City for any damages attributable to adverse soil or groundwater conditions.
 - c. Escrow money for future sidewalks on 36th Avenue Northeast if they are not built in conjunction with this project.
7. Install a 6-foot privacy fence along the southern boundary of the property adjacent to any residential use.

ZONING COMMISSION DISCUSSION & ACTION

MOTION: Recommendation II: The Zoning Commission recommends the City Commission approve rezoning the subject property as legally described in the staff report from the existing County Suburban Residential 1 and B-2 General Business to PUD – Planned Unit Development and PLI – Public Land and Institutional, subject to the Planning Advisory Board adopting Recommendation I.

Made by: Ms. Sparklin
Second: Mr. Byrnes

VOTE: All being in favor, the motion passed.

Ms. Cooper advised the applicant on the next procedural steps.

Land Development Code Updates Cost to Notice and 2013 Legislative Updates

Ms. Galen Amy presented the staff report on Land Development Code updates for the Cost to Notice, and the 2013 Legislative Amendments. Ms. Amy entered the staff report into the record. Ms. Amy explained that Title 17 of the Official Code of the City of Great Falls is the Land Development Code (LDC), which is designed to guide and regulate land development activities. The LDC is revised and refined over time to address changing conditions and issues that arise in the course of day-to-day planning activities, and to respond to changes to the Montana Code Annotated (MCA). The proposed changes relate to the Cost of Notice for action requiring public notice, and updating subdivision review requirements to be consistent with 2013 Legislative changes to the Montana Subdivision and Platting Act.

Ms. Amy said that the City of Great Falls, like other cities throughout Montana and the U.S., has seen the need for improvements in how certain fees associated with development are treated. While this amendment will have an impact to applicants, it will bring immediate fiscal benefits to the City and will create a more equitable application of fees. Rather than establish a set fee for the cost of public notice, the Planning & Community Development Department is proposing the applicant be responsible for contacting the *Great Falls Tribune* and be billed directly for their ad, which staff will draft for them. This model creates more ownership of the process because the applicant will be required to be committed to moving forward and be responsible for staying on schedule by investing more into the process.

Currently, the LDC Section 17.16.4.030 – Cost of Notice states: “The City shall pay for all notices required under this article which is recouped through the associated application fees.” Staff is recommending the language be amended to read: “The City shall pay for public notices

required under this article for City-initiated actions. Applicants shall pay for public notices required under this article for all other actions. Public notice costs range from \$106-\$303 per ad each time the ad is run, more commonly close to \$130-\$158. Ads generally run two to three times, but depending on delays, can run up to six times. The Department's expenditures were \$4,502 in Fiscal Year 2012-12, and \$7,369 so far for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The Planning & Community Development Department is partially supported by the General Fund, so eliminating the cost of public notice will improve the General Fund bottom line. Ms. Amy reviewed some particular fees for various applications to the Planning Division and the cost of legal ads associated with those applications.

Ms. Amy then reviewed the proposed changes to the LDC in relation to Montana Senate Bill 40, which was signed into law on March 28, 2013, and applies to subdivision applications on or after July 1, 2013. The law enacted straightforward changes to the Montana Subdivision and Platting Act regarding subdivision review, and revises the procedures for submission of subdivision applications. SB 40 gives direction about receipting, but encourages each office to have receipting methods that work best for them, provided they meet the basic guidelines of the bill. Ms. Amy said the specific impact to our LDC is added language as follows: The date of submittal shall be the date of delivery of the application to the Planning & Community Development Department, accompanied by the correct and full fees. Staff has not received any public comments regarding the proposed Code amendments.

Ms. Amy concluded her review of the staff report and offered to answer any questions from the Board. There was a question on whether the amount listed for public notice for AgriTech Park was for the ads for both hearings before the Planning Advisory Board or for only one hearing. Ms. Amy stated it was for all the ads that staff ran related to the project.

PROPOSERS

There were no proposers.

OPPOSERS

There were no opposers.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ZONING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Ms. Patton stated the proposed amendments seemed very reasonable.

MOTION: The Zoning Commission recommends the City Commission adopt the proposed amendments to Title 17 – Land Development Code of the Official Code of the City of Great Falls.

Made by: Mr. Davis
Seconded: Ms. Patton

All being in favor, the motion passed.

Ms. Amy advised the Board of the next procedural steps.

BOARD ACTIONS NOT REQUIRING PUBLIC HEARING

Growth Policy Update – Progress Report

Ida Meehan, Comprehensive Planner, presented a progress report on the Growth Policy Update. Ms. Meehan explained that the City's Growth Policy helps guide land use decision making, is a guide for coordinating services for the City, establishes a vision for the City, and is also a "To Do" list which helps guide City departments. The current update planning horizon is through the year 2025. Ms. Meehan said that the Growth Policy is a requirement of Montana State Law, but is not regulatory of itself. Resolution 9951, which passed City Commission in 2012, directed this update.

Ms. Meehan stated that the following projects have been realized and were included in the previous Growth Policy: the 2000 River's Edge Trail plan, the 2004 Missouri River Urban Corridor Plan, the 2007 Great Falls Medical District Plan, and the 2011 Downtown Master Plan.

Ms. Meehan reviewed the public outreach efforts for the current Growth Policy update, which included two open houses, a public participation survey, 40 public presentations including the Neighborhood Councils, City website updates, and Working Group meetings. She said the completed Growth Policy Update will be broken into four main sections which are an overview of different aspects and challenges for the community: social, environmental, economic, and physical. She gave a brief overview of what is covered in each section. Within the social section of the update, a concept called Healthy by Design includes the idea that land use should include design that considers the health of our community. Ms. Meehan said the ideas therein are not mandated but recognize the current activity already occurring in Great Falls and positions the City in a positive vein for future grant opportunities.

Under the environmental section, Ms. Meehan said that a goal of the previous Growth Policy which was not reached and is reinstated in this update is to obtain a Brownfield Assessment Grant. She said economic opportunities were the number one concern among citizens of Great Falls.

Ms. Meehan reviewed a series of maps which describe development activity, the City's five tax increment finance districts, development constraints, county enclaves and bordering county subdivisions. She said that it appears reasonable for the City to continue to grow as it has through annexation, but that there are also opportunities for infill development.

Ms. Meehan said a draft copy of the proposed Growth Policy Update is available now on the City website. The entire process will continue to be posted on the website. The Planning Advisory Board will receive a complete report on the Update by June 1.

Ms. Meehan concluded her review of the policies and offered to answer any questions from the Board. Ms. Patton asked if there were incentives for infill development. Ms. Meehan said there is a revolving loan fund administered by the Great Falls Development Authority for Brownfields within the City. Ms. Patton asked if the City was considering any tax incentives, and Ms.

Meehan said she did not think they were. Ms. Amy said there are tax benefit programs available for historical redevelopment and for industry expansion. She said two were in process to go to the City Commission. Ms. Patton asked if there were any incentives for residential properties, and Ms. Meehan said the Community Development Block Grant program is one. Mr. Raymond said that one of the applications Ms. Amy mentioned that is going to City Commission is mainly a residential project. Ms. Meehan said that except for historic feasibility studies, she thought the money for those projects comes from the State.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion. Chair Pro Tem Weisenburger closed the item.

COMMUNICATIONS

Next Meeting Agenda – May 28, 2013

- No Applications

Upcoming Planning Board Projects

- Farran Group Apartments
- Growth Policy Update

Project Status:

- 6th Street NE Closure – on hold by applicant
- West Ridge Addition Phase VI – Final Plat to Planning Advisory Board in June
- Great Bear Addition No. 2 – Preliminary Plat to City Commission May/June

Petitions & Applications Received

- None

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Davis motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Patton. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Pro Tem Weisenburger at 4:49 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

SECRETARY