

**City of South Lyon
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
January 14, 2021**

Approved: _____

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Scott Lanam at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Commissioner Steve Mosier, Present, South Lyon, Michigan
 Commissioner Tyler Finnegan, Present, South Lyon, Michigan
 Commissioner Wayne Chubb, Present, South Lyon, Michigan
 Commissioner Michael Joseph, Present, South Lyon, Michigan
 Commissioner Erin Kopkowski, Present, South Lyon, Michigan
 Chair Scott Lanam, Present, South Lyon, Michigan

Absent: Commissioner Jason Rose

Also in attendance: Kelly McIntyre – CIB Planning
 Lisa Hamameh – City Attorney
 Judy Pieper – Deputy Clerk

**Motion to excuse Commissioner Rose
Motion by Mosier, Second by Joseph**

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
 Nays: None

Motion Approved

Motion to approve Agenda - as amended
Motion by Mosier, Second by Chubb

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

Motion Approved

Motion to approve Minutes from 12/10/2021 - as amended
Motion by Mosier, Second by Chubb

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

Motion Approved

Public Comments (Non-Agenda Items):

Old Business: Rezoning #20-001

Kelly McIntyre, CIB Planning – McIntyre states that this item was tabled at the November 12th meeting. She advises the Commission that this is a request for a Conditional Rezoning Request for 34.42 – acre parcel of land on Dixboro Road. The application is to conditionally rezone the property from Light Industrial I-1 to Single Family Residential R-3 and to use an Open Space Preservation Development Option. The applicant is proposing with the conditional rezoning to allow 59 detached single-family units. The parcel in question is surrounded to the south and to the east by industrial property, residential to the west in the Township and to the north residential as well.

She states, with the conditional rezoning, a site plan is proposed as part of the rezoning and is tied to it. The applicant can offer material benefits to the city as part of the rezoning request. As you will note from last time, one of the material benefits that the applicant is proposing has to do with the continuation of a sidewalk along 10 Mile, tied in from their property to Hagadorn.

This property was previously zoned residential, R2. In 1989, the current property owner requested to have the property rezoned to Light Industrial, which it is today. Thirty some years later, the property owner is seeking to re-zone this to back to Residential.

McIntyre goes on to explain that when they look into a Conditional Rezoning, there is certain criteria that they must adhere to. This criteria has been established and laid out by standards from the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act. McIntyre states that she is not recommending the approval of the re-zoning based upon the following reasons:

1. The single-family residential designation is not consistent with the City's Master Plan: the parcel is planned for Industrial.
2. That residential land use in the city exceeds 65% of the land and that less than 5% of the city land is zoned and not just planned for industrial.
3. Rezoning the property single-family residential does not meet the land use need or goal of the Master Plan.
4. Also, evidence has not been provided that demonstrates that the property can be used for any of the permitted and special land uses in the current I-1 zoning district ;and
5. That the proposed use is not compatible with the surrounding uses to the east and to the south.

A site plan is submitted with the Conditional. McIntyre reviewed the site plan, in the event the Commission recommends approval of the rezoning.

The applicant is proposing to use the Open Space Preservation Option to development the site with single family homes. She goes on to say, in order to find the density for this property under the Open Space, the applicant is required to do a conventional plan which establishes the number of units that could be placed on the site. The applicant has done sot; the conventional plan shows that they can have 72 lots and the applicant is proposing 59.

McIntyre states that she reviewed the criteria based on the standards of Zoning Ordinance and she found that the Preliminary Site Plan does demonstrate that the site can be developed meeting the R3 and Open Space Preservation standards. She states that there are a number of engineering issues that need to be addressed and these will need to be resolved before taking them to City Council for review.

At the last meeting, the Planning Commission had a lengthy discussion and tabled the request in order for the applicant to come back to the city with additional information. The applicant provided information in writing stating that the property is not marketable as Industrial, revised open space calculations, and new evaluations: the applicant has provided market information from Thomas Duke, they provided 3 new elevations for the Planning Commission

McIntyre states that the applicant did go a little further and did some adjusting to the property and removed 6 lots to lower the density. They also changed their desires to use a new road and they are now proposing to use the existing road.

McIntyre states that there was a question last time that was asked by a member of the Planning Commission about the available vacant industrial property in the city. McIntyre then shares her screen and points out the existing industrial pieces of properties in the city that are currently vacant. She shows the 2 properties on Mill Street, a property on S. Mill Street and a property on South Street. The total of all 4 of the parcels are not quite 4 acres.

Finally, McIntyre states that if the Planning Commission is inclined to re-zone the property, she would recommend approval of the site plan, with the open space preservation, as it does meet the requirements.

Again, she adds, she is not recommending the rezoning for the reasons that she pointed out.

Michelle Spencer, Powell Engineering, 4700 Cornerstone, White Lake Township, Michigan.

Spencer states that she is here on behalf of Thomas Schroder with Cornerstone Development who is the central developer of this property. She states that while she appreciates the very thorough report done by Kelly, the reason that she is not recommending approval for this is because this came before you 4 years ago with a request to re-zone to multiple and the 4 points that Kelly is using to not recommend the approval of this re-zoning is the exact reasons that were given 4 years ago to not rezone this.

Spencer states that client has gone back and made revisions, and has kept the proposed single-family further from that southern property line. He has “bent” on everything he was asked to “bend” on. He has more than doubled the amount of open space and that did not even include any of the wetland area.

Spencer states that she does disagree that industrial surrounding this property to the west there is single-family, to the north there is single-family and multiple, to the east there is actually only single family even though the report shows that it is industrial. It is all wetland between this property and the neighboring, there is absolutely zero developable property that is industrial between this property and to the east because it is 100% wetlands.

Spencer states that this property was not re-zoned by the city. This was brought to the city by a petitioner to re-zone it industrial from residential a couple of decades ago. It was then sat on and tried to sell industrial with absolutely no bites. After a number of years, the people that requested the re-zoning decided to try to develop it. They developed it as a site condominium for industrial more than 2 decades ago. After that, they put it back up on the market, as industrial, ready developed pieces, road, sanitary, storm water, water mains ready to go industrial pieces and it sat for 20 years. The property is currently up for sale as industrial at one quarter of the cost of what other industrial properties that are along the I-96 corridor are requesting. And they still haven’t gotten one request for industrial. This property is coming before you after years of sitting, and after being turned down for a multiple residential by the City. The applicant is requesting the Planning Commission to look at the history of this property, and look at the current condition of this property. It has become an eye sore, people have dumped old tires, stolen manhole covers, it is in disarray.

Spencer advises the Commission that this is coming before them now as a conditional rezoning is that the only thing that can be built on this property is what is before you today. Spencer states that since the last time they met, they went back to the drawing board and they have removed the lots that were encroaching on the south property and they have added additional open space. She states that they do meet letter of the ordinance for a single-family cluster home. Spencer goes on to say that her request and the petitioners request is that the Commission would approve this site so that they can go on to City Council.

She states that the items that are on the engineering letter are absolutely engineering items, construction items that include video camera existing storm sewer to verify that it is clean and will meet the requirements, it is meeting the required ordinance for the width of the roadway and the sidewalks that are being proposed have to meet the ordinance. She goes on to say that the items on Mr. Darga's letter are exactly what they would expect to require construction plans for this piece of property.

Spencer states that they do believe this is the best option and a benefit for the city. The developer is looking to put in pathways to the existing pathways, all the way to the downtown.

Tom Schroder, 13757 12 Mile Road, South Lyon, Michigan
Mr. Schroder introduces Mark Szerlag and asks him to speak.

Mark Szerlag, Thomas Duke Company

Mr. Szerlag goes on to talk about the history of the property and the commitment of the owners trying to make this work on an Industrial basis. They have done extensive research on the competitive market on properties within a 7-mile radius. He states, this is not a case of greed, we are offering this property at a price that is 25% of what other properties are being marketed for.

Szerlag states that he respects Kelly's report at the beginning of the meeting, but one of her statements was that we have not proven this property can't be developed on its existing zoning. He goes on to say that 4 different brokerage company's over the last 15 years has put their time, effort, and money in to marketing this property.

Again, McIntyre clarifies the zoning of this property (sharing her screen with the Commission) and states that the property to the east is zoned industrial. Spencer states that along 10 Mile, on the east side of the property, this is all wetlands. McIntyre states that she agrees, however, it is zoned industrial. Spencer states that she understands that, but as wetlands, this could not be developed as industrial.

Chair Lanam states that under mitigation, it could be, so you can't really say that it could never be done. But it depends how bad you need it.

Chair Lanam asks if anyone else has any questions.

Commissioner Joseph – No

Commissioner Kopkowski – No

Commissioner Chubb verifies with McIntyre that the recognizable material benefit that is being proposed is the open space concept as well as pathway along 10 Mile. McIntyre states that any frontage on a street must have a sidewalk. That is required by the ordinance. The benefit offered is to continue the sidewalk to Hagadorn, which is not their frontage.

Schroder states that the sidewalk is a benefit to all that will be using it.

Chubb states that the way he is reading this is that we are not permitted to negotiate or ask, what is offered is what we are voting on. He adds that it is a shame that this will not connect to the pedestrian path down Dixboro. Spencer states that they had actually offered that as their first offering, but the Multiple at the corner has given that as part of their conditional rezoning.

Commissioner Mosier – No

Commissioner Finnegan – No

Chair Lanam questions if there is anything else that they may have that goes beyond the scope of the project.

Schroder states other than the obvious blighted looking industrial area that was never able to sell by anybody, he put up “beautiful little houses,” which the Commission has pictures of, a vibrant community. Lanam states that will be the case whatever the zoning is and anything that is developed will be an improvement over what is there. Schroder states that we know that we have been trying industrial for 18 years, so if we can go with the conditional re-zoning with pretty little houses and new residents in the area. He goes on to say that the first thing he did when he went to the property was get a dumpster and begin cleaning up the area. This has looked bad for a long time. A nice pretty community of new homes and the extension of the sidewalk and all the people in the apartments will be walking and riding bikes and making the downtown much more vibrant.

There is a clarification on the 650 Linear feet of off-site path, which is in addition to the on-site sidewalk, which is required.

Chubb questions if there has been any communication with the Tube Mill. McIntyre states that she is not aware of any phone calls that were received by the city. The public hearing notices were mailed out advising that the property is being proposed for a re-zoning.

Suzann Martin, 602 W. Lake Street, remotely from South Lyon, Michigan. Ms. Martin states that she is still in opposition to building the homes on West Lake Street that are still on the plans. She is also opposed to building over any wetlands. It is the entry point to the city and the buffer between our home and Michigan Seamless Tube. She states that there is a green area there now and wants to know if they have heard anything from the State or Federal regarding the Wetland Protection Law. As a property owner, somebody should have received a notice from the state since that is over 5 acres. She concludes by saying the market ability of this property is not the City's problem.

Chair Lanam states that the wetlands are being preserved. Spencer states that a lot of the vegetation that was approved to be removed as the industrial park is remaining because we are clustering the site.

Robert Matthews, one of the property owners, 9612 Silverside Drive, remotely from South Lyon, Michigan

Mr. Matthews states that as Mark Szerlag pointed out, we had great dreams of building an industrial park and seeing it succeed. But, as it was mentioned, we marketed this thing forever. He states that it wasn't the City that wanted industrial there. Matthews states that it just didn't work. He has not had one phone call for industrial. It has been sitting vacant and the tax base that the city is missing out on is huge. To pass on that would be a shame for the city.

Motion to deny approval of the rezoning of parcel #21-31-126-003 based on the Planners reasons that were stated at the beginning of the meeting

Motion by Kopkowski, Second by Mosier

Commissioner Mosier – Yes

Commissioner Kopkowski – Yes

Commissioner Chubb – No

Commissioner Joseph – No

Commissioner Ferguson – questions if he can abstain due to being new to the Commission and not having the history as the others do. Chair Lanam states that he cannot.

Commissioner Ferguson – No

Chair Lanam – Yes

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: 3

Nays: 3

Motion Tied - Discussion continues

Commissioner Chubb asks Commissioner Kopkowski if she can give any more to her explanation besides the Master Plan.

Commissioner Kopkowski states that what is left in the city that is industrial isn't enough of a collective group of properties where we could actually do something with it. A developed industrial site is a benefit to the city. More of a benefit than more residential and we just really don't have the area to put something that large in. This is by far the biggest industrial piece that we have left in the city. She states that she doesn't think that the residential is going to be the best thing for it. She adds that when sitting previously on Council, she knows how many of the residents in the area complain about the Tube Mill and you just can't block that noise and she just doesn't think that this is the best fit. She adds that we put a lot of effort into our Master Plan.

Commissioner Mosier adds that they talk about how they tried to develop this. He states that the original owner has a successful industrial park just a mile west of this location and the only thing that was done differently was that he had put up buildings and rented and sold the buildings. Not sure why this was not done for this property. He adds that all the work that was done on the Master Plan over the years and he does not want to go against the Master Plan.

This is very close to 10 Mile, and there is an Apartment Complex that we just approved and to him, it just makes more sense. It seems like we are trying to be a stick in the mud because we zoned this at one point and forever more that shall be. But this makes more sense. He adds that he doesn't see this as a draw when you have large pieces of land in the Township that is starting to be developed. This is better for the community.

Commissioner Chubb states that he agrees. He is withing spitting distance of this development and he is struggling with this becoming Industrial for the reasons that Commissioner Joseph mentioned. He states that he is not putting forward a motion right now because he is not excited by the plan.

Chair Lanam questions if there is something that can be revised or done that could increase the value and possibly help with the noise that is going to come from the Mill. He adds that he is over a mile from there and at times he can hear the noise.

Commissioner Chubb states that he is going to argue the point about the noise just for a second and adds that at one time he lived close to the railroad tracks and went a train went by, he could not here his television. He adds that he chose to live there. Chubb states that if the developer feels that he can sell \$300,000.00 houses with noise in their back yard, then power to them. Otherwise, those are going to sit as nice green lots opening to open space.

Spencer states that they are trying to make this more of a cost-effective neighborhood for people that work in South Lyon. If we were going to put in \$300, \$400, \$500,000.00 houses next to a Tube Mill, no one would buy that.

Spencer states that Schroder was intending on putting triple pane glass windows in the rear of these house and more insulation in the walls to help with the noise from the Tube Mill. There is a reason that it was developed the way it is, to keep cost down for the people with lower income can afford to own a home in South Lyon. So, they can work and live in the same area.

Commissioner Finnegan questions if the goal is low-income housing? It sounds like that is what you are trying to sell us on.

Spencer states that the houses are very nice but less expensive to build. They had lesser expensive houses from the last presentation, but the Commissioners said that they looked too cheap. The developer then went a little nicer on the houses, made the lots a little bit bigger and went with less density. She states that this is their third time in front of the Commissioners, each time they have come back adding additional cost to the developer based on what the Commissioners wanted. They need a decision tonight so that they can move forward.

Commissioner Finnegan questions if the triple pane and thicker walls are all standard in every home. Spencer states that she would assume that this would be

standard on every home as this is a benefit to the sale. Schroder agrees and states that they would put that down. He states that they would make the triple pane standard to the homes that back up to the South and add the additional thickness to the walls.

Deputy Pieper asks Schroder for a clarification for the minutes and asks if it is all the homes or just the homes that back to the Tube Mill that will have the triple pane windows and the thicker walls. Schroder advises that it is for all the homes that back to the Tube Mill, which in this case would be all the homes to the South.

Commissioner Chubb confirms with McIntyre that the Tube Mill extends all the way to Dixboro, so in reality who knows that they are going to be in 50 years or if they decide to sell this parcel on Dixboro and all these people by right could have another tube mill in their back yard. Schroder adds, we are going to have happy residents, happy downtown residents. Chubb states, not if there is an industrial building being built in their backyard.

Commissioner Finnegan states that it would be to his expectations if they were all built consistently with thicker windows and thicker walls not just select properties. Schroder states, if that is important to you, he would agree to that. He goes on to say, he wants happy homeowners. He goes on to confirm that this would be all the walls (not the basement) 2 x 6 and packed the walls with insulation, more insulation to the ceilings which helps for sound deadening. He adds that he has also provided triple pane windows in some of his homes in the past and that will also add for sound deadening. Schroder states that he knows that a lot of the complaints in the City is the noise from the Tube Mill and that Tube Mill has been in the City probably before the city became a City, and a lot of the folks in the city came from the Tube Mill. So to help further insulate these homes, he again states that he would be happy to do so to make the homeowners happy, and to make the Commission happy.

Commissioner Joseph states that Mr. Schroder is still not stating to using 2 x 6 walls for all your exterior walls. Mr. Schroder states that he is saying that, and again states that he would be using 2 x 6 walls in all the homes, packed full of insulation and sound deadening triple pane windows to make things quieter for the homeowners. He does add that in the summer some of these will have their air conditioning on and in the winter their heat and it will be quiet and cozy.

Chair Lanam asks if anyone has anything further to ask.

Commissioner Kopkowski – No

Commissioner Chubb – No

Commissioner Joseph states that the applicant has submitted some house designs that are better than what was originally presented. He states to Spencer that it scares him when you say low income homes.

Spencer states with a Conditional Re-Zoning, the approval is tied to a specific plan and it would have to be those houses or like (similar) houses.

McIntyre states that it must be these houses (elevations). They may not be changed. Spencer confirms and states that if they had to change them they would have to come back and start from square one again.

Chair Lanam clarifies that it wouldn't have to be square one, but they would have to come back with their revisions and get an approval.

Chair Lanam goes on to the remaining Commissioners.

Commissioner Mosier – No

Commissioner Finnegan – No

Chair asks if anyone is ready to make a motion.

Mr. Schroder states that he has done everything that they have asked for. He states that he has reduced the lots, he has very pretty/nice homes which have to be saleable. He goes on to say, he has been building homes in the area for about 40 years and has built over 350 homes and developed over 500 residential lots in the South Lyon area. He believes these are very nice homes with attractive floor plans and believes this will be a very nice addition to the South Lyon Community. He states he would like a win/win situation and asks the Commission if there is anything else that they can think of that would help to make a positive recommendation.

City Attorney Hamemeh states that the Commission can't really ask for anything.

Chair Lanam adds that because a Conditional was brought to them, they can only vote on what was brought.

The discussion continues about the value of the homes and Schroder states that we are possibly looking at mid to upper \$200,000's and with options, people may

end up bumping it up a bit higher. Schroder goes on to discuss the tax base and compares it to the Township. It's a fact that if people are comparing homes in the city to the Township, they could get a much higher home and still have the same payment. They are all about the payment. He wants the homes to be more obtainable, and again, if they work in South Lyon, it would nice for them to also live in the city. These are not large custom homes, but they are nice attractive homes.

Schroder states that this has been sitting for over 20 years, not one bite and it is nothing but blight at this time.

Commissioner Finnegan questions if there is any ruling on diversity regarding the elevations and avoiding the same exact houses being built side by side. Spencer states that she believes that is in the ordinance stating that every two house has to be different colors or different elevations. McIntyre states that it is not in our ordinance, but it is something that has been put in almost all of our PUD's, we call it the anti-monotony rule. Schroder states that this is definitely something that he would agree to.

Hamameh goes on to explain the options at this point as it doesn't sound like we are going to get very far. She states that a motion was made to deny and that motion failed. A person that voted on the winning side of the failure (opposite the motion) can make a motion to re-consider. If they want to re-consider that denial. Another option is an alternate motion, which would be to approve. But unless minds have changed, that motion would also fail. However, there was quite a bit of discussion, so minds may have changed. If the motion fails, they can bring it back because there was no action taken by the Planning Commission. The only question is that if the motion fails can the applicant go to the City Council with no recommendation? McIntyre states that she does not know the answer to that, as she has never been in that situation.

Spencer states that it has been 4 years since this came before the Planning Commission last time. Last time it was a unanimous denial, it sat for 4 years and they made it very clear that they did not want Multiple-family here. Multiple family has since been approved at the corner. This is less dense than a multiple is and we are requesting something different than what was turned down last time. She goes on to say that just because the Commission may recommend this for approval, it still has to go before City Council. Spencer goes on to say that she just wants to remind the Commission that this was zoned industrial because a

petitioner came in and requested it to be re-zoned. This was not zoned because the city saw the need for additional industrial. Spencer asks, how many more decades do we want to let this property to sit vacant waiting for someone to come in and state that they want to develop this industrial, 15 minutes from the expressway, driving through the middle of this downtown.

Commissioner Kopkowski asks the City Attorney if it is possible to just vote on the re-zoning and not accept the plans that we were given. So, can we re-zone it conditionally and go back to square one and really let the Commission think about what type of house we want to see on that property.

Hamameh states that the Conditional Re-zoning actually goes along with the site plan. If you just re-zone it, they can build whatever they want there. So another words, it has to be tied to a site plan. Kopkowski confirms that if we re-zone it, we are tied to that plan. Hamameh states that the Commission can explain to the applicant why they don't like it and then the applicant can decide if they want to table it and re-consider what options they want to offer. This can't be turned in to a negotiation, but she states that she is sure that the applicant would like to hear what the Commission likes and what the Commission does not like so that they can make an informed decision moving forward.

Schroder states that we have done that twice in a row and this is now the third meeting and we tried to get and did get the Commissions feedback so that we could come back with something very favorable.

McIntyre states that she wanted to again remind the Commission the uses that are permitted in this district. We are talking about industrial. This does not have to be a large manufacturing facility. Some of the uses: greenhouses, commercial kennels, trade or industrial schools. Some of the uses for a special land use: auto engine and body repair, under coating shop. It does not have to be a very large industrial complex or building and when you evaluate this, you have to ascertain whether the site is not appropriate for any of the uses and can't be used for any of these.

Spencer states that she is fairly certain that in the last 18 years of trying to sell this, they did not say we are only excepting it for these five uses. They have been trying to sell this for the last 2 decades now and they have not received one single call. How many decades do you want to sit on a piece of property hoping that someone will come in to develop it?

Commissioner Finnegan states that he is not a home builder, but in his observation, Charleston Park that is across the street has taken ages to move through and add more homes and sell out. How do we know that we are not going to be looking at a bunch of empty parcels? Schroder states that this is a very good point. But those are higher price homes and the home buyer can go down the street to the township and get the lower tax base. These homes that we are building are very obtainable homes, lower price but still very attractive homes and that's why I am investing a lot of time and money into this development to make it successful.

Hamameh states that if Planning Commission does nothing at this point with a failed motion, the applicant can go on to City Council. So if no one wants to make an alternate motion, or make a motion to reconsider the motion that failed, then there really isn't anything further to do and the applicant can then make the decision to bring this back to the Planning Commission for a recommendation in a future date or the applicant can just go straight to City Council.

Chair Lanam verifies that if it goes that way, will it still come back to the Planning Commission for a final. Hamameh states that it does.

Motion to approve the proposed development brought before the Commission under the conditionally re-zoning of the 34.32 – acres, file #20-01

Motion by Joseph, Second by Chubb

Commissioner Mosier – No

Commissioner Kopkowski – No

Commissioner Chubb – Yes

Commissioner Finnegan – Yes

Commissioner Joseph – Yes

Chair Lanam – Yes

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: 4

Nays: 2

Motion Passes

**Motion amended to approve the Open Space Preservation Development
Conditional Re-zoning of the 34.32 - acres and the accompanying Site Plan parts
1 and 2 – File #20-01**

Motion by Joseph, Second by Chubb

Commissioner Mosier – No

Commissioner Kopkowski – No

Commissioner Chubb – Yes

Commissioner Finnegan – Yes

Commissioner Joseph – Yes

Chair Lanam – Yes

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: 4

Nays: 2

Motion Passes

New Business: None

Consultant Report –

McIntyre (sharing her screen) states that at the last meeting the Commission discussed training opportunities. She provided some information on potential workshops.

Hamameh states that she has offered a number of presentations and has a power point presentation that she can forward on to the Commission. It is the most commonly used motions and how to use them.

Chair Lanam asks about the windows at the RCA building. McIntyre states that she had a conversation with the Building Official and they have not been presented with anything else, we don't have any reason to believe that they are going with anything else other than what was originally presented.

McIntyre states that the BP has completed their stonework. It appears that they are finished.

Commissioner Mosier questions the work being done on Draft Street. McIntyre confirms that they have pulled permits for interior work. Lanam questions if they

need to come to Planning. McIntyre states that they are not changing the use of something that is not allowed in the downtown. That would be the only reason that they would have to come before Planning, or if they exceed the threshold for parking or if they are doing façade work. Lanam confirms with McIntyre that it is medical office, but she is unsure of what the second portion will be.

Staff Report – None

Adjournment:

Motion to Adjourn – 8:52 p.m.

Motion by Kopkowski, Second by Mosier

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted,

Judy L. Pieper – Deputy Clerk