

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 16, 2005
CITY CHAMBER
7:30 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: R. Johnson, G. Clark, N. Fosket, D. Sisson, M. Brandt,

Absent: E. Walters (excused) B. McClemens (Excused) C. McPherson (excused)

Staff: N. Voght, City Planner, N. Schuette, Secretary

Commissioner Johnson stated that under the first item of New Business, Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, we were informed prior to the meeting that some of the principals who will be explaining this issue will be late consequently we will need to move this item. Commissioner Clark made a motion to move this item to Item #3 of New Business (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 19, 2005

Commissioner Fosket moved to approve the minutes of October 19, 2005 (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried unanimously.

IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Steve Pierce, 118 S. Washington – asked to comment on the item of the Zoning Text Amendment since he has to participate in a DDA meeting also being heard this evening and would be unavailable for public input at the time this issue comes up on the agenda. The board agreed.

Mr. Pierce has read the Zoning Text Amendment as proposed and knows that Council will state that it is a good thing to do. However, he is deeply concerned about this amendment because of the unknown consequences that could happen. He believes it will impact people like the American Legion that are in the district. There is also another church on Pearl and it could potentially block other uses, especially in the upper floor areas in the downtown district where someone might want to set up a banquet meeting space, conference center and in fact, there is actually a plan at this time to do that with an organization that made a preliminary presentation to the DDA regarding the old Valencia gym. They want to create a meeting space and corporate space that could be blocked by this amendment. Before the board approves this, there needs to be a much further study and public input before moving forward on it.

V. OLD BUSINESS

1. 467, 469, 471 S. Hamilton

Commissioner Brandt moved to remove this item from the table (Support: N. Fosket) and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Johnson gave an update on this issue adding that at the last meeting, staff was directed to come up with some alternate plan and study of the whole area.

N. Voght, City Planner, stated that last month a public hearing was held to receive general feedback on two applications, a Master Plan and Rezoning Application submitted at the same time. As mentioned, the request is for adjacent parcels north of the Harriet Street Commerce Center to be both Master Planned differently and rezoned so it can be used for non-residential purpose. At that meeting, some comments were made by surrounding property owners or occupants, one of which was in favor of rezoning further to more of a commercial designation since it was difficult to sell her home because of the traffic situation.

Voght was directed by the Commission to look at the Harriet Street Corridor, specifically the block between Adams and S. Hamilton and has given some background information, copies of which were included in the packets. He reviewed three land use concepts with a recommendation for Concept B. At this meeting, we are looking at two action items – accepting a draft change to the Master Plan, distributing it for review within 55 days and then come back for formal public hearing and possible adoption of the Master Plan amendment. At the same time, a recommendation could be made on the rezoning. Mr. Kinley’s concern is future use of the Harriet Commerce Center since it was originally built partially for retail use and Voght’s concern about the way it was constructed is that it does not address the Harriet Street side to allow retail frontage. It does not mean that retail cannot survive there but calls into question the viability of commercial when there are few openings that face Harriet. This is the reason Voght suggested RO for the entire area. Maybe the board can consider RO just for the three subject parcels and the facing parcels on the other side of Hamilton, leaving

everything else the way it was. He suggested that Mr. Kinley could address this concern with his own comments.

Commissioner Johnson agreed that Concept B did address most of the issues.

Bill Kinley, Phoenix Contractors, Ann Arbor – stated that he is the manager and part owner of the property at issue. He has one disagreement with whether the intent of saying that this would be classified as a governmental building is exactly the letter of what was meant by a governmental building. Taking that argument to the extreme, no building in a B1 zone could allow any tenant to be classified as a governmental building – could not rent to a Secretary of State, DDA, City of Ypsilanti, etc. It happens that there are two tenants there that have a governmental intent, one being Washtenaw County and the other Washtenaw Community College. He questions when it was set out that there could not be a governmental building in this zone.

Mr. Kinley would like to consider keeping the original B1 zoning but go to RO on the three lots, which allows office and office parking use. It could be mirrored across the street to the residential parcels that are there and possibly start the process that one resident mentioned at the last meeting. One thing that Mr. Voght pointed out is very true that the businesses that were there originally and what are there now, are not oriented to Harriet although they could be, mainly because of no parking on Harriet Street. Mr. Kinley stated that he is available for further questioning, but it makes sense to him to take the Concept B with the modification leaving the lots to RO.

Commissioner Sisson moved to close the public portion of the hearing (Support: N. Fosket) and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the board should consider the Master Plan Amendment first. Commissioner Brandt stated her concern on the three properties on West Hamilton and the possibility of spot zoning. Voght explained why this would not be considered spot zoning, if the Master Plan were carefully reviewed and updated too. If we were to update the Master Plan as shown on Concept B and not rezone the westerly homes and then in the future, someone would come in and ask for rezoning, that would not be a spot zoning since it would be in accordance with our Master Plan. It would be spot zoning if it were not planned for, someone comes in and nothing around it is zoned B1 but the person wants B1 but since we planned for it, it would be OK to do it on a case-by-case basis rather than to pro-actively rezone the three homes.

Commissioner Sisson added that what precipitated taking a closer look at this was recognizing that the Harriet Street Center is being used in a more intensive way than B1 really allows for, perhaps B2 might be more appropriate, although he does not think this area is right for B2. He would be hesitant to say that we want to rezone the existing B1 area to make it anything but B1 since the use is consistent with the area. He also stated that he would not like to downzone it.

After much discussion, Commissioner Sisson moved to consider a Master Plan Amendment for the three subject parcels, the three parcels on the west side of S. Hamilton Street and the orphan parcel on S. Adams Street changing the Master Plan designation for the six properties on S. Hamilton to Mixed Residential Commercial and the one property on S. Adams St. to go from Two-family to Local Commercial. This is based on the following findings:

- 1) High traffic volume and speed on Hamilton Street
- 2) The presence and changed condition of the new business across the street, Cannon Warehouse
- 3) The current use of the Harriet Street Commerce Center
- 4) Need for additional parking due to growth and success of the Workforce Development Center
- 5) Mixed Residential Commercial is appropriate to provide a buffer between existing residential areas and existing B1 business areas allowing future residential and commercial use of that area without having the high density of B1 or B2 but not to update the Master Plan for the Harriet Street Commerce Center

N. Voght added that this is not an adoption but approval of a draft change in order to distribute the proposed change out for comment and then have a public hearing in 2-3 months after which the change could be adopted.

The motion was supported by N. Fosket and a roll call vote was taken with a vote of 4:1. Commissioner Brandt voted against the motion and the motion carried.

Commissioner Johnson stated that it has been suggested that rezoning only involved the three parcels on S. Hamilton, directly behind the Harriet Commerce Center to RO.

Commissioner Sisson moved to recommend a rezoning of the three subject parcels 467, 469, and 471 S. Hamilton from R2 One and Two-Family to R/O, Residential-Office based on the following findings:

- 1) The proposed change is consistent with the goals, policies and proposed change to the future land use map of the City of Ypsilanti Master Plan.
- 2) The proposed use of residential and office will act as a buffer between the B1 zoning and single family uses to the north.
- 3) City utilities and services are sufficient to accommodate the uses permitted in the proposed zoning designation.
- 4) The proposed uses are appropriate because it is located on a major thoroughfare.
- 5) Boundaries are reasonable and the site is adequate to provide parking and office uses and will meet all of the R/O requirements.
- 6) The R/O district is fairly low impact and will provide a good buffer.
- 7) Amending the R2 district to accommodate office uses is not more appropriate than rezoning to R/O.

- 8) Rezoning will not create a spot zone because we have considered the Master Plan Amendment and it will help to further the goals of, and be consistent with the Master Plan.

The motion was supported by N. Fosket and a roll call vote was taken. The vote was 4:1 with Commissioner Brandt voting in opposition. The motion carried.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

1. 2140-2164 Washtenaw

N. Voght presented his staff report stating that this is a rezoning application for a parcel on the north side of Washtenaw, northeast corner of Bellevue. Current designation is R/O residential-office and B1 Neighborhood Business is requested. The Master Plan is Mixed Residential Commercial which can accommodate a variety of districts including the proposed district. It is approximately 0.75 acres of land, an existing office, multi-tenant building with 7-8 different spaces, each fairly small under 1000 s.f.

This section of Washtenaw was previously reviewed back in 1965, when it was rezoned from B1 to R/O and has been R/O for 30-40 years. The entire block from Bellevue to Cornell on the north side of Washtenaw is reserved for Mixed Residential Commercial, the RO zoning being one of the possible zoning designations that implements the Master Plan designation. He has provided a current zoning map with an aerial view.

Voght reviewed the generally accepted criteria for evaluating a rezoning request with his responses to each. He provided some text from our Master Plan that articulates, very specifically, about uses between Whittier and Washtenaw that these uses be designed very carefully and special attention be paid to the access for these commercial uses, greenbelts, landscapes, etc. This particular building does not face Washtenaw, it faces Bellevue and some of Voght's concerns in regard to this request relate to the orientation of the building to a side street.

Voght recommended that this request be denied because the proposed rezoning for the subject parcel from R/O to B1 is not consistent with the Master Plan, which calls for lower intensity office and residential uses adjacent to the University Estates single-family neighborhood between Bellevue and Courtland. The Master Plan further identifies potential land use conflicts with commercial uses backing up to Whittier, which is adjacent to single-family uses on Whittier.

Commissioner Clark moved to open the public portion of the hearing (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried.

Tom Daniels, Atty, 1349 S. Huron, Suite, Ypsilanti – was in attendance to represent the owner. He stated that Dr. Hamid had owned the property for five years and recognizes that

he submitted the application on his own, possibly without enough planning information. Photographs may have been helpful as well as his rental history. Mr. Daniels just saw the staff report today and recognized in reviewing this report and speaking briefly with Mr. Voght, the Master Plan issues that have been raised. He also recognized the concern about retail that would be permitted with B1 may not be appropriate. Dr. Hamid would never want that to occur in any event. He presently rents to three lawyers' offices, an import business, a hearing aid servicing entity, non-profit agency, one vacant unit which has been vacant for 18 months.

Mr. Daniels feels that he has not had enough time on behalf of Dr. Hamid to assess the arguments made by staff and would like to ask that this item be tabled to give him an opportunity to put photographs, etc. together to present to the board. He is asking permission to have this item tabled and come back before the Commission with a more focused request, possibly asking for Zoning text amendment to expand the scope of the special uses that might be permitted on a limited basis. Dr. Hamid is interested in the possibility of a hair salon and Mr. Daniels noted that the salon owner is someone in the audience who is interested in this site.

Ken Shannon, 2038 Whittier – his property faces the existing businesses. He brought some pictures for the board to review. Mr. Shannon stated that the greenbelt had deteriorated and there are open waste containers with no effort to hide them. The footprint of the property is very large and spans the entire property line except for about 20 ft off Whittier, which is big concern of his. The parking is in plain view. It seems that most of the owners consider Whittier as being the "back side" so dumpsters can be located there. This has an adverse impact on the view by their property. While he does not want to discourage business in Ypsilanti, he just does not feel that this request is justified.

Commissioner Brandt moved to close the public portion of the hearing (Support: G. Clark) and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Johnson stated the language in the Master Plan does not explicitly say never to be B1 but it certainly is a strong suggestion that R/O be preferred over B1 and feels that the staff report is very compelling on that issue. With regard to a narrow list of entities allowed in R/O, he asked Voght if there was much room to expand on it. Voght responded that this is obviously an application for zoning map amendment so they would have to re-apply as a text amendment. Voght is concerned that a text amendment may result in an unintentional way to circumvent the rezoning process through a special use permit process. Another possibility is contract zoning, which is very new, and allows communities to accept voluntary conditions in return for a rezoning. We do not have a process in place for this type of zoning but he would be glad to have further discussion with the applicant.

Commissioner Clark stated that in the process of working with the PUD for Walgreen's, we spent a lot of time and looked very carefully at the transition along Bellevue into the neighborhood behind. As this property existed, the board felt it was the perfect buffer and he would be very reluctant to change that. He would be willing to table the item for further

discussion, but he reiterated his opinion that it was the perfect transition as is and would be reluctant to change it.

Commissioner Sisson stated that a lot of the issues on this site are more to do with the building and the shape of the site facing Bellevue. In his mind, he does not feel this is a zoning issue.

Commissioner Clark moved to table this issue so the applicant can have an opportunity to discuss options with the City Planner, N. Voght (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Commissioner Sisson to move the item of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment under New Business that was previously third to second (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the written text amendment was distributed to each board member last month to allow time study and note any comments.

Karl Barr, Asst. City Attorney, was accompanied by Guy Conti, a recent graduate of Ave Maria School of Law who had been sworn in today by Judge Shelton. Mr. Conti is the lawyer who has been doing all the work on this ordinance consequently he will be the person giving the report. Mr. Barr added that he is in attendance because Mr. Conti is technically not an Asst. City Attorney since the order has not gone to the State Bar. Mr. Conti can brief the board on the history of this issue and how we got to this point since he has done an extensive amount of research on it, the reason for the change and what the change is.

Commissioner Brandt moved to open the public portion of the hearing (Support: D. Sisson) and the motion carried unanimously.

Since there was no public comment, Commissioner Sisson moved to close the public portion of the hearing (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Conti stated that he is employed by John Barr, City Attorney and is presenting his report under the supervision of Karl Barr, Asst. City Attorney.

The resolution and the ordinance emanates from a situation that we have in the City where we have churches, at least one church, in the Central Business District B-3 in violation of B-3's permitted uses. This one church has been ordered under N. Voght's signature to vacate those premises because they are in violation of the zoning. This church has brought up to the City and the City Attorney's office their concern that the B-3 zone in our Zoning Ordinance may be (a) unconstitutional or (b) in violation of a federal statute known as the Religious Land Use and Institutional Persons Act (RLUIPA).

Mr. Conti gave a brief description of RLUIPA and some of the applicable provisions of the Michigan Liquor Control Board. The Michigan Liquor Control Code prohibits retail liquor establishments (the sale of retail liquor) within 500 ft. of a church or a K-12 school. In B-3, we do have retail liquor sales going on and in fact, based on his reading of the rationale behind B-3 in the Zoning Ordinance itself, this is actually a desired outcome in B-3, i.e. pubs, restaurants, etc. By State law, if you have K-12 or churches, you may not be able to bring in a retail liquor establishment. If they are grandfathered, they may have trouble expanding,, changing or moving.

RLUIPA is a statute enacted by Congress which essentially has two prongs to it. The first is that no land use regulation may be instituted that inflicts a substantial burden on the practice of religion. Case law has defined what a substantial burden is – which is, if you tell believers in a particular faith outside of general laws of criminality that they cannot practice their faith or set up a church anywhere within our borders, that would be a substantial burden. Case law is very clear that financial burden is not a substantial burden. If a church is in the wrong zone and they have to move and it will cost them money to do that, it is **not** a substantial burden. We are generally not dealing with substantial burden in this particular case but it does come into play when he brings the Liquor Control Code back in and explain why we're doing the ordinance the way we are doing.

The particular problem that we do have is with the second prong of RLUIPA which says that you may not treat religious institutions in land use regulations on a less than equal basis with similarly situated secular institutions. For our purpose, defining this would be an institution that promotes assembly. Although he may not agree with everything Federal Law says on this, he feels we are stuck with the law as is. What this means is that B-3 allows banquet halls, social clubs, activities that promote secular assembly.

In the suggested resolution, it removes, page two, private and community services clubs, lodges, banquet halls and meeting halls. These are all uses that would be considered under the RLUIPA case law to be secular assembly organizations and the reason why we are suggesting that these be crossed out from the use is because if we don't cross them out, what may happen is in any potential litigation, the point will be that we don't allow churches but we do allow these secular assembly institutions and whether the City would prevail in such a litigation is really dependent upon what the U.S. Appeals Court feels is their focus. Suffice it to say that the 6th Circuit has not ruled on this yet, therefore, it is really a question on whether or not we would have exposure on this.

What we are looking do is to say if the City does not want to have churches in the Central Business District right next to a bar or K-12 schools, which is what the Liquor Control Code says cannot be done, the only way to ensure that this does not happen is to make sure that the secular assembly organizations are also not in the Central Business District. There is also one more reason to do this is going back to the substantial burden, even though we are not faced with it right now, what the statute says is that if we do impose a substantial burden, we still can, as a City, impose that substantial burden if we have a compelling interest to do so.

Compelling interest is a legal definition but what we are trying to do is to craft this resolution so that it brings the City into total compliance with the Liquor Control Code so in any future action where a church says we are substantially burdening them, the City at least will have a defense and our compelling interest is that we are complying with the State Law Liquor Control Code.

We do not want to close down churches – what we want to do is insulate the City from any potential future lawsuits and any lawsuits that emanate from the given situation that we have right now. Without being specific, we have received correspondence from some very large civil rights organizations that could end up costing the City a lot of money if we don't fix this.

Commissioner Brandt asked if the Liquor Control Act has anything to do with where a business can be located, i.e. not within 500 ft of a school, church, etc., regardless of the zoning and Mr. Conti responded that is correct. In the interest of being complete, Mr. Conti stated that the Liquor Control Authority may issue variances.

Commissioner Johnson asked what other cities are doing and Mr. Conti responded that he has not seen where another city has this specific problem. Many other cities in Michigan have a problem with RLUIPA. It is a prevalent problem and a favorite target of litigation for a lot of organizations. There have been mixed decisions in Michigan, not necessarily applicable to us. This is a pretty active area of law at the present time although he has not run into another city with our particular problem. Commissioner Johnson asked what this particular problem is and Mr. Conti responded that we have a situation where we have a small church in the Central Business District in violation of zoning. They have been flagged and notified by Planning Department and they have objected to having to vacate the property by raising First Amendment or RLUIPA objections. Mr. Conti added that since we are not in closed session, he hesitated to give further particulars on the specific property.

The City does have some exposure on this, treating the churches on less than equal basis. The reason is there is no allowance for churches in B-3 but secular organizations are allowed in B-3. He pointed out that churches are allowed in R1, R2, R3, R4 and RO upon Special Permit and the secular assembly institutions are not allowed. If you had a court that looked at the whole plan, we would be OK because on balance everything is equal but if you have a court that only looks at B-3, they are going to say churches are not allowed, clubs are allowed and since the 6th Circuit has not looked at this yet, he does not know where they would come down on this and it would be a very expensive proposition to find out what the 6th Circuit would say.

Commissioner Johnson asked if we are setting ourselves up for unintended consequences and Mr. Conti responded that could be a consequence of this action but when dealing with churches, you end up with issues, constitutionally and statutorily that you do not have with other organizations.

Commissioner Brandt stated that since RLUIPA is new and there is very little case law, it seems to her that this is created by our very conservative and very publicly religious administration, that possibly when the administration leaves office, it will be overturned or will be overturned in court. She is concerned about us changing our law immediately when there has been no case law or had any argument against this but yet we are going to change our law with potentially unintended consequences, many that we cannot even foresee. Commissioner Fosket added that the other problem is if we allow the church to stay, then we take the chance of the Liquor Control Board coming in and pulling the liquor license of Haab's and other businesses. Commissioner Johnson responded that this is not the case. If they are already located there and a church comes in, they are entitled to stay there. However, the footprint cannot change.

Mr. Conti responded to Ms. Brandt's statement that there is very little case law in the 6th Circuit here. There is extensive case law in Federal Law. RLUIPA is the result of the previous act called the Religious Freedom Restoration Act which was passed and enacted by Congress and the President but the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional. In response to the Supreme Court's ruling, Congress then passed RLUIPA which, so far, has met no constitutional challenge in the courts, although it has not gone to the Supreme Court yet. Commissioner Brandt stated that this is so new that it has not yet been challenged. Commissioner Clark added that there is only a possibility that we may be sued although we have no idea, but yet the board is being asked to change the ordinance. Clark continued that we have plenty of designations of where churches can go. Mr. Conti stated that it is his opinion that we will be sued if we don't fix this. Clark asked by whom and Mr. Conti responded that he could divulge this information in closed session only. Commissioner Brandt suggested that it would be easier to let churches into the B3 rather than remove the various clubs, etc. Mr. Conti responded that if we do allow that organization in, the City will run into problems eventually with the Liquor Control Code and that is what we are trying to avoid.

Commissioner Sisson asked Mr. Conti that if we did allow churches into B3, he is unclear on the problems that would arise. If a bar was already in place, would we be able to tell churches that they could not locate there or would there be legal issues involved. Mr. Conti responded that the case law is unclear if a church decided to locate next to a bar whether or not our zoning ordinance demands 500 ft. or not but it could affect the possibility of a bar wanting to expand. It was the opinion of Commissioner Brandt that we are overreacting to a potential problem that doesn't exist and has potential numerous unintended consequences.

Mr. Conti responded that any specific case that we need to defend under RLUIPA will be held in Federal District Court and if we were to prevail, it will end up in the Court of Appeals. Generally, most cases that go before these courts run about \$250,000 in legal fees. The Attorney's Office could, in closed session, give more information on the parties involved, and he assures the board that we will have a lawsuit. Commissioner Clark feels that this sounds like a threat to him and if the City has to spend \$400,000 to defend something, it is bound to do so.

Mr. Voght added that it was his opinion we are getting too far away from the land use questions here. We are only dealing with the zoning change and the intent of our downtown zoning, and whether the change to the Zoning Ordinance is appropriate, which he discussed in more detail.

After further discussion Commissioner Brandt moved to reject the entire ordinance (Support: G. Clark). A roll call vote was taken with a vote of 2:3. The motion failed. Commissioners Johnson, Fosket and Sisson opposed the motion. Commissioner Clark stated that his vote to reject the ordinance was due to lack of enough information to make an appropriate assessment or being able to vote on something he is comfortable with.

Commissioner Clark moved to table this item to have an opportunity to schedule a closed session to have a better understanding of the ramifications of any changes (Support: M. Brandt). A roll call vote was taken with a vote of 4:1. Commissioner Sisson voted against the motion and the motion carried.

3. City Owned Properties – Public Hearing for Adoption of Master Plan Amendments

N. Voght stated that this is an update to the Master Plan. This has been previously reviewed in detail, gone through a rezoning process and gone to City Council. City Council has approved on first reading the rezoning of these parcels. This applies to the properties on Superior Road, approximately 5.3 acres, 10 S. Prospect, 0.67 acres with 2,157 s.f. building and vacant property on W. Michigan, 0.69 acres. Voght continued by stating that this is the final step for a Master Plan amendment. A public hearing is held, then make a motion made.

N. Voght added that the City will consider the possibility of an easement to protect public access to the river for the Superior Road property and Commissioner Johnson stated that this could be added into any motion that was made.

Commissioner Clark moved to open the public portion of the hearing (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried unanimously.

Since there was no public comment, Commissioner Clark moved to close the public portion of the hearing (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Fosket disagreed that easements should be allowed for public access since it is her opinion it would make the property more difficult to sell. Property owners would not want the public to stand in their yard.

1. Commissioner Sisson moved to adopt a Master Plan Amendment to change the vacant property on the NW Corner of Huron River Drive and Superior Road from Public Land to Single Family. This is the most appropriate designation due to surrounding land uses,

which are predominantly low density residential (Support: M. Brandt). A roll call vote was taken and carried unanimously.

2. Commissioner Brandt moved to adopt a Master Plan Amendment to change the property at 10 S. Prospect from High Density to General Commercial. The existing facility was formerly an office use and is now a drop-in center. The Michigan Avenue frontage designated for General Commercial to the north is shallow and would benefit from an enlargement of this parcel and for these reasons, a General Commercial designation is more appropriate (Support: G. Clark). A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.
3. Commissioner Brandt moved to adopt a Master Plan Amendment to change the vacant property directly east of 615 W. Michigan, which is the westerly 70' of said property from Public Land to Mixed Residential Commercial (Support: D. Sisson). The Mixed Residential/Commercial designation is the most appropriate given that the W. Michigan corridor is designated the same. A roll call vote was taken and carried unanimously.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business, Commissioner Clark moved to adjourn the meeting (Support: M. Brandt) and the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:50 p.m.