

**PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES
5500 SCHOFIELD AVENUE
WESTON, WI 54476
MONDAY, APRIL 26, 2010 – 5:30 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Village President, Fred Schuster called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. Members present were DPW Keith Donner, Mark Maloney, Mary Hancock, Mike Stenstrom, John Evans, and Dave Diesen. Mary Hancock was excused. Ex Officio member Dan Froelich and Tina Kollmansberger were present. Village Trustees Loren White and Karen Schmutzler were present. Village Administrator, Dean Zuleger, Community Development Director, Jennifer Higgins, Building Inspector, Scott Tatro, and Recording Secretary, Valerie Parker were present. There were 20 audience members present.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – 5:30 P.M.

A. APPLICATION #REZN-4-10-1130 – REQUEST TO REZONE FROM RR (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) TO RR (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) WITH OME (OVERLAY MINING EXTRACTION) THE PROPERTY KNOWN AS 3810 CAMP PHILLIPS ROAD WITH THE INTENT TO REMOVE SAND AND AGGREGATE FROM APPROXIMATELY 41 OF THE 104 ACRES AND CONSTRUCT A 9.8 ACRE POND ON THE SITE THROUGH A 3-PHASE PROCESS CONCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2015. (EAU CLAIRE RIVER, LLC)

1. OPEN HEARING AND SOLICIT PUBLIC COMMENT

Gary Guerndt, 8201 Zinser Street, and Dan Higginbotham P4225 Pine View Road, Birnamwood, were present in support.

Higginbotham described the location of this property, stated this is the Dehnel Property. He stated there are about 28 acres there that are above the floodplain. He said the land is almost flat until you hit the ridge, which is about 20-30 feet down to the floodplain. He stated there is about 2 acres of land on the northwest portion on this lot that is buildable. He stated that they are planning for a 9.8-acre pond and with 9 residential lots in this development. Their intent is to make more of a gradual slope down to the river. There are two gas/ANR pipelines that run through the property. They wanted to lower those lines to grade the property from east to west, but the cost would be too excessive. Initial materials removed from phase 1 will be stockpiled and aggregate from phase 1 will be hauled off site. Fill from the phase 2 (pond) site will be placed on the phase 1 site. Phase 3 will be to contour the steep slope and prepare for house sites. He stated that they will be staying more than 500 feet from the Eau Claire River, thus staying away from the DNR Chapter 340 permit requirements. They have been working with County on the non-metallic mine permit.

Guerndt stated that they are anticipating about 500,000 yards being hauled off site and going directly to County Materials, who want the aggregate for making concrete. He stated there will be about 100,000 yards removed every year. The only issue Guerndt is anticipating is the road closure that will occur when the County reconstructs Camp Phillips Road into a 4-lane highway. He stated there will be a berm built up in front of entire property. He stated it would be similar to that of Greenwood Hills entrance.

Diesen confirmed that they are in the floodplain, but are still over 500 feet from the wetland. Higginbotham stated that Army Corps. does not get involved in floodplain issues, only wetland issues. Guerndt stated that Keith Patrick, WIDNR, did walk the property with him. He pointed out that Justin Cavey, Marathon County, is present. Guerndt stated that years ago this was a sand and gravel pit.

Higginbotham informed Diesen that the depth of the water will be about 15 feet. Diesen question the pond filling back in over time with materials. Higginbotham gave an example of his pond at his home property. Guerndt stated that they are just trying to make buildable lots and with the feasibility, this seemed to be the most economical way.

Evans questioned the number of dump trucks that will be coming in and out of that site if there will be 100,000 removed from this site for the next 5 years. After some calculations were made, it was discussed that based on dump trucks carrying 8-yards each, this could amount to about ±50 dump trucks each work day. Zuleger commented that there are about 13,000-15,000 vehicles per day that

travel on Camp Phillips Road. Maloney questioned if this could possibly be done in 1 year, versus 5 years. Even though it would be an extreme amount of truck traffic, it would cause less aggravations to the area to be hit hard one year with the truck traffic, versus spreading out over 5 years. It was explained that the haul route would most likely be Camp Phillips Road to Schofield Avenue, then to County Materials. Maloney, Stenstrom, and Diesen were concerned about all these dump trucks going past the elementary school.

Mitch King, 5607 E. Jelinek Avenue, was present in opposition. He explained that he owns Mitch King Sand and Gravel, out in the Town of Reid. He purchased his piece of property in the Town of Reid 4 years ago and it was a major investment for him to make. He feels this would be in competition for his business to survive. He feels mining here (Camp Phillips Road) would be really detrimental to his business. He tries to sell sand all over the area, however, a majority of the sand does come up into the Weston, Schofield, Wausau areas; and he can't compete when it goes way up on the north side of town. King stated that if there is going to be a big store going up here in the next 5 years, County Materials will still be bidding against him for that sand, and that sand will be coming off of this proposed development. King wonders if the development can be done without the mining. He suggested that Guernsdorf be required to keep all the excavated materials on site, instead of opening a new store that sells sand. He stated that there is a lot of sand around in this area and that we do not need more stores that sell sand. He is against this due to the competition. He also brought up the Village not allowing properties to rezone to commercial up by the E. Everest Avenue area, and feels we should treat this development in a similar way. Maloney clarified that we turned those down because they were outside the TIF District.

Scott Turner, 3601 Camp Phillips was present in opposition. He stated that he lives directly across the street from this proposed development. He feels it is too open ended and feels 50-60 trucks each day in this area would be way too much, for 5 years. If you take the grade from where the houses are to the bottom of the pit and another 15 feet lower, they will be hitting groundwater. A 9-acre lake with 5 lots may work. He feels we should have something firm and in writing here. He feels this is too vague. Schuster questioned if the pond will be in the ground water – Higginbotham stated about 10 feet into the groundwater. The land will be about 5 feet above the river.

Mike McCarthy, Executive Director for the Boy Scouts, 3511 Camp Phillips Road. He is concerned on the length of time – 5 years is a lot. He feels it would detract from their privacy.

A resident in the audience spoke about how he once lived in Kronenwetter where the developer put in some ponds, and there were 15 – 20 homes that had water in their basements. He said he had 5 sump pumps running at one time in. He is concerned about future homes having basement flooding issues.

Zuleger clarified that when we go for the finding of fact that we have to look into 7 specific points, which do not include competition. He said Plan Commission's responsibility is to take a look at the land use and not regulate commerce.

2. CLOSE HEARING

Schuster closed the hearing at 6:05 p.m.

3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON APPLICATION #REZN-4-10-1130

Maloney stated although he can understand doing this development, he has a major problem with this going on (dump trucks hauling) for 5 years. He feels they are not taking the neighbor's concerns into consideration. Maloney feels they could do this quicker, that the only reason they want to make this a 5-year project is to save money.

Evans feels with the number of trucks that would be coming in, and the fact that they do not have a clear plan on building on the lots, he feels this is more of a gravel pit operation, than a planned development. He does not feel that a gravel pit operation should be in a residential area.

Stenstrom questioned how this area compares to the Comprehensive Plan. Higgins stated that this area is not designated as anything right now. Zuleger stated historically, we have left that area alone

because we understood the intent and that this more of a conservation area. We understood Mr. Greenheck's intent on what they thought that area should be, so we left it alone with respect to future development, because it generally has been held a greenspace for a while. Diesen had no further comments.

Donner stated that with respect to the level of proposed truck traffic, he does not believe that the level of the truck traffic had been addressed, and feels this would also be a question for Marathon County, on whether or not there would be some concern about wear and tear on the road (as far as possibly obtaining a bond or some type of security with Guerdnt). There is an application making provision for restoration on the site where we could request a bond or letter of credit. Donner clarified that though depending on how the Village rules on this issue, Marathon County still would have some say in the restoration. Within the application there is an indication that the estimated restoration cost would be \$80,700.00. Donner stated from his earlier discussion with Cavey, Cavey felt this was an adequate amount on a proposal like this. Donner described how the backside of this property is "pock-marked" with some previous excavation and that even the timber area has been cut to a point that this area does not look as attractive as it may have at one point in time. His proposal is to be able to restore it to a better aesthetic is certainly going to take some time. Donner stated that with the amount of material that is proposed to come off of this property, to suggest they remove the material in 1 year (versus the planned 5 years), he feels that would be a lot. He stated that we are not sure what this property is going to become, we do not have an ultimate plan for this or designation on our comprehensive plan for this.

Schuster stated that he agrees with Evans and feels this seems to be more of a business to sell sand a gravel and then to later, dig a pond and put up some high-end housing. He pointed out, with the current economic times, all of the high-end houses that have been for sale for several years that are now getting sold for a lot less. Schuster stated that he would like to see a nice development out there, but he feels the housing is currently not what this proposal is all about (that he feels it appears to be more of the selling of the gravel than anything).

Froelich stated that he is concerned about the level of truck traffic (noise and pollution) traveling past the elementary school. He is also concerned about the Boy Scout area and YMCA. He feels the noise pollution will greatly affect his neighborhood (and himself). It would eventually be good, but not in the next 5 years. He is concerned about the length of time this will take. Kollmansberger agreed with Froelich.

Higginbotham stated that the YMCA Camp sold this property to Dehnel in 1996. Guerdnt stated that as far as timeframe, there is a buffer that would be all the way around the property and away from the neighbors. The bermed buffer will be in front, and going in right away. It was stated that the regrading of the banks can not be done in too short of time. Guerdnt stated that Joe Jordan has proposed to buy the property from him when he is done with it.

****M/S/P Evans/Maloney: to reject the Application #REZN-4-10-1130 – Request to rezone from RR (Rural Residential) to RR (Rural Residential) with OME (Overlay Mining Extraction) the property known as 3810 Camp Phillips Road with the intent to remove sand and aggregate from approximately 41 of the 104 acres and construct a 9.8 acre pond on the site through a 3-phase process concluding December 31, 2015. (Eau Claire River, LLC), based on the concerns brought up by Plan Commission. Q: Zuleger stated and read the Code 94.104 and 94.105 and explained the points. He feels we should go through 7 Finding of Facts in this discussion area.***

- 1. Higgins stated that since we do not have this type of use (i.e. quarry) designated and our Comprehensive Plan gives us the leeway on things like this (properties zoned AG and RR). Zuleger stated that this actually is consistent because it is in a holding district, and that Plan Commission can use their judgment on how to use.***
- 2. The underlying zoning district is RR and will remain that. The future lots that they are creating are based on that RR designation, they have not requested that it change to R1. Evans feels, with the current characteristics of the surrounding area, that a gravel pit would change the use of the land, so it is not consistent.***

3. *Schuster stated that proposed future housing is consistent, but the gravel pit is not. Donner questioned if something will have to be here – could it be a scaled back version. Evans clarified that we are working with the plans as presented tonight.*
4. *The result of the development would be consistent with the conservation of the property values throughout the jurisdiction, but the initial 5-year operation is not consistent.*
5. *Is not consistent with responsible growth and development because of the timeframe. Diesen pointed out as well as the wear and tear of Camp Phillips Road and the safety issues in front of the school. Evans stated having Everest Metro, Marathon County, and School involved in future discussions.*
6. *Stenstrom stated that this is not in compliance with the intent and purpose of Chapter 94.104 and 94.105 because the key issue is keeping the streets free and safe.*
7. *It was stated that this proposal is not in the public interest, and will solely benefit the applicant (at least in the short term).*

Based on the finding of fact, with respect to Application #REZN-4-10-1130, the finding of fact concludes that this is an unfavorable recommendation to the Village Board. Motion to reject passes.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. **REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF BUILDING SITE AND OPERATIONAL PLANS FOR JW PERRY, INC./HOMETOWN BLOOMING GARDENS GREENHOUSE, 2107 SCHOFIELD AVENUE (BRZEZINSKI)**

Higgins handed out the paperwork for this. Basically in the past couple of years, they have set up their greenhouse on Kraut's (Clarence Kersemeier) vacant land (where there was a gas station located, but since torn down) next to Family Video. With everything that was brought before Plan Commission last month on whether to allow temporary structures when they are not with the principal use, which Plan Commission at the April 12th meeting said no and for staff to start enforcing the code on that. JW Perry requested a seller's permit through our Clerk's office. The initial request was turned down because they could not find a principal structure to work out of. She stated that JW Perry was able to find a site available, next to Nicole's on Schofield Avenue which is zoned B3. She stated that a green house is a permitted use by right in the B3 zoning district. The current use of the permanent structure on the property is currently vacant, but they will utilize that building for their operation. They will be leasing the site from Ken Brzezinski. Higgins pointed out that JW Perry did provide a site plan. Any permitted use or accessory use is still subject to approval by Plan Commission, by review of the building site and operational plan. She stated that there will be an actual green house structure placed on the property. It is a temporary business and leasing until July 1, 2010. They meet setbacks and all other zoning requirements. Staff recommends approval.

****M/S/P Maloney/Evans to approve the request for approval of Building Site and Operational Plans for JW Perry, Inc/Hometown Blooming Gardens Greenhouse, 2107 Schofield Avenue (Brzezinski). Q: Diesen questioned if that parking lot will get paved. Zuleger stated that it was grand-fathered in. He stated that the business owner of Nicole's has been diligent in working with Brzezinski to get parking lot paved in the future. Zuleger stated that if they changed the use of the site from retail they would then need to pave the lot. Stenstrom questioned the temporary structure. Higgins stated this is a commercial grade greenhouse and they will be operating out of the greenhouse and the permanent building (store). Motion carried.***

B. **REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF BUILDING SITE AND OPERATIONAL PLANS FOR ADDITION OF AN ACCESSORY STRUCTURE FOR BETTY'S LUNCH, LLC, 3406 SCHOFIELD AVENUE (ROTH/BETTY'S LUNCH LLC)**

Zuleger introduced Marjorie Roth, 606 County Road J, Hatley, and Allen Hellrood, 5310 Gordon Street, who were present, which Zuleger clarified that Hellrood was the person operating the produce stand at Betty's Lunch (formerly known as Mom's Café), which Plan Commission denied at the last Plan Commission meeting. Since then, and through a lot of discussion and public debate, it has been determined that Roth has purchased the business from Red's, who was basically providing the supply and the infrastructure of the product for that stand. Roth had informed staff of this last week, so staff decided to quickly get her request on this agenda to be brought before Plan Commission. Zuleger pointed out that the code does allow for accessory buildings if they have an incidental purpose to the

primary business. Zuleger pointed out the site plan (that Hellrood submitted to him at the meeting) that shows where the restaurant is, where the garage and living facilities are that run off of Gordon Street. It shows the property lines of the Louis Carter property (3316 Schofield Avenue) to the west. Zuleger stated that we have a letter from Carter basically stating he does not have a problem with the structure being next to his property line with the proper setback of 12 feet. We addressed the parking lot issue (on number of parking spaces available) and it appears she has approximately 40 parking spots there, which he feels should be more than adequate to service both a breakfast and lunch business (primary business) at this time. Zuleger pointed out the flowers shown on this site plan across the front of the property, which will be used to dress up the property. Zuleger stated the temporary structure is set back approximately 70-feet from the street. Zuleger stated that Roth would like to be considered with this site plan for an accessory permanent building to be run in conjunction with her restaurant business.

[Clerk's Note: Point of clarification – This property is zoned B-3. Per the B-3 zoning district regulations (Sec. 94.187 (b)), *“Permitted Uses. Any use permitted by right or by conditional use in the B-1 or B-2 Districts shall be permitted in the B-3 District...”* Per the B-2 zoning district regulations (Sec. 94.186 (b)), *“Permitted Uses. Any use permitted in the B-1 District, shall be permitted in the B-2 District; and, in addition the following uses shall be permitted subject to the approval by the Planning Commission of building, site and operational plans (see Article V of this Chapter)...”* Produce Markets is a permitted use in the B-2 zoning district, but subject to the approval by the Planning Commission of building, site and operational plans (see Article V of this Chapter).]

Higgins discussed the zoning code and stated that in her interpretation of the B-3 zoning district (Sec. 94.187), it must be a permanent building. We do not allow tarp sheds, which is basically what this proposed structure is. She can not determine if this is a permitted use by right, as we do allow produce markets in the B-3 zoning district, but there has to be some type of a building that meets setbacks and everything called for in the building, site and operational plan section of the zoning code (Article V). Basically, everything that we would take a site plan through, this building would have to be, if it was allowed. She then read Section 94.123 of the zoning code which reads *“Permitted accessory uses are uses incidental, customary to and commonly associated with a permitted principal use, and therefore permitted on the same basis as the principal use. Accessory uses shall not be permitted prior to principal uses.”*

It was pointed out that the difference with this structure on Roth's property between now and last week is that she now owns the temporary structure.

Roth stated she does not understand why she is here tonight, she just wants to set up this stand and sell produce, and she did not think it would be such a big deal. Roth stated that she previously spoke with Higgins asking what the guidelines are, and Higgins provided Roth with those. Roth stated that her interpretation of the regulations is that the permanent structure is something that is there for 9 months, that she did not see in those regulations where it defines what kind of building it has to be, just that it is something that will be there for 9 months.

Schuster clarified with Higgins that this structure does not meet what is required. Higgins stated that we do not even allow these types of structures put up in our residential areas. This is a temporary structure, but they want to leave it up permanently. Higgins explained to Stenstrom that if a business wants a structure like this to be put up for party or special event, they can obtain a special event permit from her to have it up for 10 days maximum per code. Stenstrom clarified that in the RR and AG districts where produce stands are permitted, they read that it must be the sale principally of products produced by that farm (per Sec.94.175 (c)(6) and Sec. 94.176 (c)(6)). Schuster questioned to Roth how this is incidental to her restaurant business. She pointed out that she serves and sells food and if this has produce for sale, that she could use that produce in her restaurant. Schuster confirmed with her that she does not grow that produce herself.

Diesen questioned if they had a structure (small wooden buildings with shingle roofing on them) such as those that are being sold across the street from Arrow Sports Bar, if that would be okay. Tatro stated they are under 150 square feet. Higgins stated even if a permitted or accessory use, that anything that is done outside, such as people wanting to put up storage buildings, even in B-3 district, still need to

come before Plan Commission for approval. Maloney questioned the difference on JW Perry's greenhouse on his site versus having that same structure at the Betty's Lunch site. Higgins stated that the B-3 district allows greenhouses and nurseries. [Clerks Note: Point of Clarification – the greenhouse structure that JW Perry is planning to erect will be incidental to the permanent store structure that is on that site]

Schuster pointed out that per this site plan, submitted tonight by Hellrood, it suggests that there are 40 parking spaces. Schuster commented that from what he has personally noticed on Roth's property is that the parking there is very confusing. He stated that initial cars pull right up to the building (on the west side), and other traffic has to leave them enough room to get out. The parking lot is not defined at all, if there are 40 parking spaces, for adequate flow of traffic through her parking lot. He questioned how she will correct that. Roth pointed out that she is not the person who came up with 40 available parking spaces in her parking lot, that Hellrood wrote that there are 40 parking spaces on the site plan. Roth stated that her biggest question (along with questions from neighbors she has spoken to) is how is this a negative impact on the community? She stated that everyone she talks to have told her that they feel this is a productive asset to the community. She pointed out that this particular stand is clean and orderly, is not hurting anyone, and is far enough back from the road, it is not a vision problem. Evans pointed out that the Village already has a Farmer's Market area available for people to use. Roth feels these issues should be taken on an individual basis. Higgins pointed out to Roth that if we allowed one person to do this, that we would have to let everyone do this. Maloney gave an example of how residents of the Village use to have cars for sale all over on the side of the streets, then finally the Village created an ordinance with regulations on selling vehicles and now it is not a problem. He stated that if we allow this stand as proposed, we will have these types of stands all over the Village. Maloney stated that these produce-type stands that you may see around the communities at this time of year are not local produce. He stated that in the fall, there will be local produce, but not this time of year. Maloney pointed out that Red's does not even have his own local produce. Maloney stated that Red currently buys his produce from the produce business that Maloney works for, which Maloney stated that the produce from the business he works for comes from all over the place, such as Mexico, Canada, etc. Maloney stated the first local produce that you see will be corn. He said right now any corn being sold is coming from Florida.

Zuleger questioned if the issue with this structure is the tarp. Schuster clarified it is the entire structure that they have issues with. He stated one big wind storm and it will be destroyed. Stenstrom explained how we have made other businesses conform to our standards, and he gave the example of the future KFC building. Zuleger gave the example of newly built and remodeled Kwik Trip buildings. Stenstrom pointed out that this temporary structure in no way meets the standards. Maloney stated that this is why the Weston Farmer's Market was created, to give a place to these types of stands (on a daily not permanent basis). Roth pointed out that the Weston Farmer's Market is full, and there is a waiting list to get in there.

Schuster questioned Hellrood what the property taxes on this structure are (Zuleger clarified that question by asking what the building is worth). Hellrood stated that you can buy this type of structure for \$200.00. He said this one is about a year old now, so it is probably only worth a dollar. Hellrood then admitted that this structure is "a piece of crap, no doubt about it".

Hellrood brought up his discussion with Zuleger last year, when he was set up at the Asian Food Store (3306 Schofield Avenue), when Zuleger then approached Hellrood and suggested to Hellrood make a more permanent building. Hellrood stated that he agreed with Zuleger then. Zuleger asked Hellrood if Hellrood would agree with him that last year Zuleger made the mistake of letting Hellrood have that structure there. Zuleger stated that he and Hellrood were also talking about that Hellrood was looking at building a permanent structure there, where they could serve the Hmong community that wanted to sell fruits and vegetables, etc. Hellrood stated that yes, that was the intent at that time (because he had a water store there 15 years ago, and he has been selling on and off at that block for 15 years) was to get that area started. Hellrood explained that Mr. Vang told him then that he (Mr. Vang) had many relatives and they all want to put up these stands on his property. Hellrood stated that Mr. Vang can't do that, without alienating all his clan members, because how could he choose who to put in there. So Mr. Vang told Hellrood that since Hellrood is his friend, that Hellrood could have his stand in front of Mr.

Vang's property, and Mr. Vang then could tell his relatives that Hellrood pays Mr. Vang to be there, and Mr. Vang could keep the peace with his clan. Zuleger then reiterated to Hellrood that the intent was put a permanent structure there. Hellrood agreed, but clarified that his intent with a permanent structure there was to see how it would work there.

Schuster stated that he feels this does not meet any of the codes that we would require of anybody else. If we allow this stand, we can't control anything. This is contrary to our zoning.

Diesen clarified if Hellrood got one of those permanent storage shed, that would work for his business, if that would be okay. Zuleger pointed out that with the buildings for sale across the road from Arrow Sports Bar, that there is actually one with a porch on the front of the building. Higgins stated that yes a structure such as those across the street from Arrow Sports Bar would be acceptable, once they get the approval from Plan Commission by meeting the code regulations. Tatro clarified to Schuster that an accessory structure would not have to be built on a foundation. Higgins stated that they would want to address the parking and the setbacks, etc., and staff could work with them on that. Schuster questioned Roth if she is willing to work with staff on that basis. Schuster clarified to Roth and Hellrood that from discussions tonight, it is clear that Plan Commission is not going to allow this stand there.

Roth questioned what would be required to take care of parking issues. Higgins stated that she would need to define parking spots by painting lines. Roth was concerned at the idea that she will have to hire someone to come in and paint individual parking spots in her parking lot. Zuleger explained to Roth that this is what we require of everyone going through this process. He said they need to show that there will be enough parking spots to accommodate the breakfast crowd and if there will be a drive lane that will be enough to get people from the parking spots past the produce market and out to the road. He stated that if they have to add some parking spots, will it be some space in the back, and feels that that could be an issue with what Dave Roth does back there in the summer months.

Stenstrom stated that they need to work with staff. Roth stated that she is thinking to have somebody come in and paint lines to draw out parking spots, first of all will cost a fortune and secondly, she has yet to see parking lots (at other businesses) where people abide by the parking spaces anyway. Evans stated that we are not going to be able to solve the parking issue tonight, but that is not the main issue tonight.

Schuster told Roth that the Village is not against her, but that the problem always is the next guy that comes along, and we try to say no to them. They question how come so and so can do that. Schuster stated that we need to remain consistent so that we can have the rules and regulations.

****M/S/P Stenstrom/Maloney: to deny the request for approval of building site and operational plans for addition of an accessory structure for Betty's Lunch, LLC, 3406 Schofield Avenue (Roth/Betty's Lunch LLC). Q: Zuleger confirmed with the Plan Commission that they are disapproving this request based on the temporary nature of the structure, that they are not disapproving this request based on the nature of the business. Motion to deny passes.***

IV. FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

A. Next meeting all members that were present here tonight will be here.

VIII. ADJOURN

****M/S/P Maloney/Stenstrom: to adjourn at 7:05 p.m.***

Respectfully submitted,



Valerie R. Parker
Recording Secretary