

Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes March 21, 2011

Call to Order: Chairman Commissioner Steckling called the March 21, 2011 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present:

Ruth Ann Hines
Bill Leddy
John Steckling
Beverly Shaver
Dean Baker
Neil Willson
Roger Lamont

Commissioners Absent:

None

Staff Present

Mike Trout, Supervisor
Laura Moreau, Clerk
Greg Kazmierski, Ordinance Officer

Consultants Present

Brian Oppmann, Planner

Approval of Agenda: Approved as presented.

Public Comment: None.

Consent Agenda: Minutes of the February 21, 2011 meeting.

Commissioner Shaver moved to approve the minutes of the February 21, 2011 meeting as presented. Support by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Baker, Willson, Lamont. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing: None.

New Business:

1. Site Plan flowchart and narrative overview.

Commissioner Steckling stated that the idea was to streamline some of our procedures for applicants.

Supervisor Trout stated that the site plan approval document in the Commissioner's packet was derived from going through the Ordinance book and clarifying the steps. He

stated that this will allow applicants to know what is involved in the entire process. In addition, the Supervisor's office put together a flow chart that visually depicts process. Supervisor Trout noted the chart is convoluted and complicated and we are trying to give applicants an opportunity to understand the process. The site plan application approval document follows the flow chart. This information is still open for correction or tweaking. He stated that it describes all of the entities that are involved and he added an informal review step at the beginning of the process. The applicant can come and talk to him and he can help them to understand the process. He can look at their project and guide them through the process to make it easier. He explained that the next step is the preliminary review which would involve Carlisle and the Supervisor looking at their concept plan. Every applicant starts with a concept, but the preliminary concept review is only required under certain conditions. If these conditions do not exist, the applicant has the option of going right to final site plan. He explained that they will be able to give the applicant enough feedback so when they come to the first round with the Planning Commission and they will have a plan with substance to it. The Clerk is involved in doing the noticing, and distribution to the engineer, the planner and the Planning Commission for formal technical review. If the site plan requires a special land use, the Township Board is involved at both approving the special land use and approving the final site plan. He stated that for special land use approval, the Planning Commission will say the concept makes sense and with their recommendation, it will go to the Township Board. Once they are through this process, they go into final site plan review. The site plan approval document also describes what to do if the plan is not approved. He stated that if it does not require the Township Board's approval, the Planning Commission can approve the final site plan with recommendations and changes that were recommended. He encouraged comments or questions. He could also provide copies of the site plan flow chart if requested by the Commissioners. All of this information is in the ordinance; we have just put it into a form that is usable.

Commissioner Hines questioned if the intent was to give the document to someone in the informal review.

Supervisor Trout explained that along with this we are looking at both the concept plan, final plan and special land use applications and what information is being given at each step of the process. This would insure that the applications are as easy as possible to understand. He stated that this handout gives the developer a chance to see what they are in for.

Commissioner Shaver asked about the preliminary review; how formal or informal are the plans that they have to submit.

Supervisor Trout explained that he would think the planner would spend an hour reviewing the concept to make sure it makes sense. He stated that a small letter format would be adequate.

Commissioner Shaver asked about #3, does the applicant have to have all of these conditions to proceed to concept plan review.

Supervisor Trout answered that they have to undergo concept plan review if only one of these conditions exist.

Commissioner Shaver indicated that this is not clear.

Supervisor Trout stated that we can clarify this point.

Commission Willson asked if this was an interpretation of existing ordinance, or does it shorten the process.

Supervisor Trout stated that this is the same ordinance process. It is just for our benefit to understand what all of the steps are.

Commissioner Hines asked about the relationship between the preliminary review and the informal review.

Supervisor Trout stated that the preliminary review is already present. He stated that it is really not clear how detailed this needs to be. We have not had an opportunity to test this because we have not had any site plans. The informal review is something that he has added. This is an informal meeting between the applicant and the Supervisor so that he can go through their idea with them and see what the next steps are. He stated that starting with the preliminary review and down, this is all information that is required.

Commissioner Hines stated that the informal review is available for the applicant, it is not a requirement.

Supervisor Trout stated that he would suggest that all applicants have it. He stated that the drawings that are submitted on a concept plan level vary greatly. He stated that before the applicant accrues a lot of expense, he wants to make sure that they understand what they are going to need.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the concept is something that the commission has struggled with in the past. This has been addressed before; this could probably be addressed in the forms and the engineering requirements. The ordinance requirements are set, but the forms could dictate what you would need to provide. His thought was to get away from so much detail at the concept level and try to streamline this a little bit. He asked if we have changed the forms that the applicant fills out.

Supervisor Trout stated that at the concept review you are only required to meet the applicable section of the ordinance. At final site plan review, there are a lot more conditions. He believes the applications do distinguish between what is required, as well as the checklist that goes along with them. He stated that it is much more limited. He stated that the drawings are similar; frequently on larger developments the engineered drawing is already done. They are not discouraging someone against going through the concept step if they want, but there is a cost associated with that. It should be enough at

the concept plan review step to allow the planning commission to determine that the plan makes sense and then the applicant can be guided through the formal steps.

Commissioner Baker stated that the steps that are itemized in our ordinance for concept review are seventeen or eighteen different criteria. He stated that some are general, but others require information about the storm water maintenance and drainage layouts. He stated that this is detailed for the concept plan. He stated that he believes this is a good starting point.

Commissioner Lamont stated that there are a lot of things asked for at concept that put a lot of burden on an applicant. He stated that if it was not going to work, the applicant has already assumed financial burden. He stated that the applicant that has to go through both concept and final. He recalled that on previous site plans submitted, the applicant would come with a concept and the commission would want to see more that was required by concept plan. It is important to define what the commission wants to see at concept; then everyone would know what to prepare for. Commissioner Baker's example of the storm water system is a perfect example to something that they would not need to see at concept, but would need to see in detail at the final.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the problem is the ordinance states that we want all of this information and need it. He stated that they need to look through those sections to determine what they can take out.

Commissioner Baker stated that there is an advantage for the applicant in getting as much information in the informal preliminary session; it gives a list for applicants of things that they need to be considering. The people who purchased the property on Andersonville Road that the Township has since taken ownership of, would have benefitted greatly from discussions about the limitations of the property. The high water table, the dramatic contours of this site and the volume of residences; all this information could have been addressed. He stated that when they are trying to aid the developers, it is important to push all of this information far in the front of this process so they don't invest \$10,000.00 to come to the Planning Commission and then they are told that this is not working.

Supervisor Trout stated that there may be a statement in the ordinance prior to where these items are listed that allows for determining how these factors may impact the ability of the commission to review this concept plan. He stated maybe some language that gives the township flexibility on these points, as to the extent that it impacts the planning commission to make a decision on the concept.

Chairperson Steckling stated that they may determine that the applicant has to provide all of the information and then they can work out a lot of the problems ahead of time. It would make it easier for them to make a decision. However, the planning commission may say they do not like the plan, and the applicant has spent all of the money on something that is not going to work. On the other hand, they may come in and get the okay from the planning commission, but in further steps, they may find that it is not going to work; the concept is good, but mechanically it won't work. He stated that he

would like the applicant to know that at the concept level you don't have to provide all of this information, but you are going to have to prove it if the plan is accepted. The applicant can then decide if they want to spend the money ahead of time. He stated that there has been controversy on when to do an environmental study; before or after. This is the same issue and he would rather let the applicant make this decision. There are no guarantees; the planning commission may approve the plan but ultimately the applicant needs to bring it to fruition in the final process. This is the applicant's problem. He stated that this may take some looking at the ordinance; if this information is required, they have to follow it.

Commissioner Baker stated that one of the things that they may want to do is create more structure as to what the informal review contains so that we know to the best of the township's ability that we are educating the developer on these critical concepts. They will go in with as much knowledge as possible about the expense.

Supervisor Trout suggested that next month they could look at the applications and the provisions of the ordinance that apply.

Commissioner Leddy stated they should look at the checklist that lists all of the required information.

2. CIP narrative.

Supervisor Trout stated that this is based on the spreadsheet format of the CIP that has already been provided. This narrative has been updated and reorganized. It is simple and was originally developed by Carlisle Wortman. It has not changed drastically, so we have been able to update it each year. It is important to update our progress and if we have a grant application, we could attach this document letting them know what has been done in the past and the commitments that have been made and that we are ready to make. He stated that it covers everything we have done, or thought about doing.

Chairperson Steckling asked if the planning commission gets involved in the approval process.

Supervisor Trout stated that it is not even a requirement that our township develop a CIP. It is only required if the township has a public works project. He stated that the township has done it because they feel it is important for the Planning Commission, Township Board and the residents to understand that this is the direction and this is what we plan on investing in the future. He stated that any feedback that can be provided is appreciated.

Commissioner Lamont stated that there are many projects that have been started and that continue to move forward and the list goes on. There are a lot of projects that are in process such as the tornado sirens, which people take for granted until all of a sudden they are needed. These types of projects probably do not get enough publicity. Also the completion of the light at Dixie and Davisburg will mean a lot to this township. There are

a lot of things on the list that have happened already and it is important to have these things documented.

Supervisor Trout stated that there is also a bridge project that is happening that is not on the list, the bridge improvements in Rotary Park. He stated that even the little things are important.

Chairperson Steckling stated that it is a good plan and a good idea. He stated that a lot of things get done that we just don't know about.

3. Sign ordinance-proposal and overview.

Chairperson Steckling asked if the survey had gone out to the businesses.

Supervisor Trout stated that it has not gone out; but we can send it out. He stated that they have put a lot of time into this sign proposal and he didn't know if the commission wanted to go through it section by section. He has made revisions and we should put it out to try and include the types of things that we have been talking about for several months now, including temporary signs and the various ways that we should address our ground signs, especially on Dixie Highway. He stated that these are two important areas. There are options given in the proposal. He stated that the sign proposal is distributed for discussion and comments and further refinement.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he is still very interested in getting the business community involved. He stated that their input is valuable and he would like to get it at this stage or as soon as possible.

Supervisor Trout stated that the car dealerships had been invited to this meeting by Greg Kazmierski, Ordinance Officer. He stated that he will mail out the surveys to all businesses.

Commissioner Leddy stated that they might want to limit the size of flags so they do not have huge 50 foot flags.

Mr. Oppmann stated that you have to be very careful in how you regulate flags. The only thing that you can regulate is a business flag; you can't limit American flags or Michigan flags or other government flags. You might be able to regulate the number of flags that you could put on a property, but you cannot limit size or flagpole height.

Commissioner Leddy stated that "business flags" were included in the sign proposal.

Mr. Oppmann stated that business flags should be put in a miscellaneous not permitted section.

Commissioner Leddy stated in paragraph #5, second page, this does not seem to be a finished sentence. In #25, B; he stated that the formula for the area of a circle is incorrect. He stated in the next paragraph concerning square footage requirement, the last sentence

is unclear. He stated that we should be able to be clearer in the language. He stated that he had some suggestions on the electrical signs. He stated that they possibly could put language that if the sign shines into residential windows, it shall be shielded, or turned off after business hours so that it is not disturbing people that live in subdivisions close by. He stated that he did not find the language for directional signs for garage sales and real estate open houses. They are temporary signs and their use has been allowed and it should be continued. He stated that there should be a reasonable time limit. He stated that he didn't see anything that referred to signs such as those for the Renaissance Festival. He stated that there are provisions for public events, but this would be a private business.

Supervisor Trout stated that this had been brought up by Commissioner Willson also. He stated that this is a unique situation, but he would like to hear suggestions.

Commissioner Leddy stated that it is a situation that if you allow it in one case, you have to allow it for all.

Supervisor Trout stated one of the issues with this sign is the duration; this event can be 6 weeks or more.

Commissioner Leddy agreed and stated that it was like 4-H which is a community event, but this is a private business.

Chairperson Steckling also stated that most of the Renaissance Festival signs are off site.

Commissioner Leddy stated that they don't fit the ordinance this way; it needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Baker stated that he noticed the same sentence that Commissioner Leddy had pointed out, where the prorated was mentioned under item, #25, D. He stated in the section, "signs permitted in all districts without a permit"; two of the items were ones that they had talked about, the heritage festival and the church services that are taking place at Davisburg Elementary. He stated that he was trying to find these two items in the language of the proposal presented. He stated he wondered if they should be part of the "signs permitted in all districts without a permit", or if they are incapable of being dealt with there. He stated in the last item under E, "signs with no commercial message intended to display civic events"; these signs are permitted for 4 consecutive days and must be removed at the end of this time. He stated that this would probably permit the church service. He stated that it does not seem to limit the number of occurrences. He stated that it could be done over and over again. He stated that the church could probably fit here. He stated that this could not cover the Heritage festival since their signs were staying out for a longer duration of time. He stated in the changeable electronic variable message sign section, item #7 under A.2., "no off premise CEVMS shall be permitted." He stated he interprets this to mean that there will not be a billboard.

Supervisor Trout concurred; this would not be a billboard.

Commissioner Baker stated that these changeable signs would only be in place, on property and they would be advertising the business or activity that is taking place on that property. He stated item #3, under the same section; it states that the display is given as 60 seconds. He stated he tried to envision driving down Dixie Highway at 50 mph and if the sign is to be displayed for a minimum of 60 seconds, it would only be able to be seen for one advertisement. He stated if this was the intent, he understands. However, he stated from the business owner's perspective, he would think they would want to have this cycling more often so they can take advantage of the investment in this product. He stated that in the same section, under #5, CEVMS shall contain default that will freeze the sign in one position if malfunctioning occurs. He states it would make more sense to freeze it in a dark screen mode because it would be easy to see that it is broken if it was dark. In item #6, the sign shall not display with such intensity or brilliance to cause glare or otherwise impair vision of the driver. In the following item, the limits of illumination are given during daytime and nighttime hours. He stated that requirements are set and then in another section we are saying if it is too brilliant, we are not going to permit this to happen. He stated that there should be something between these two items that says, if 2500 nits during the nighttime units is too brilliant, maybe we should change it to read 2000 nits.

Mr. Oppmann stated that LED message signs are not given in nits. He stated that these are handled in lumens, or lux, or luminance and the maximum luminance that you probably want on a sign during nighttime is .05 foot candles. A nit is candle per square meter so the math would be done to figure out how this equates. He states that 7000 NITS seems extremely bright. He stated that lumens or lux is what you need to use for industry standards. He stated that an electronic sign needs to be bright during the day and then dark at night. He stated that you need to require a light sensor that would adjust it automatically. He stated that he has never seen nits before.

Commissioner Leddy asked Mr. Oppmann to provide the industry guidelines so that we could put it into the ordinance.

Mr. Oppmann stated yes.

Commissioner Leddy stated that in section #12, b; it does say that if it is causing a problem, the township has the option to change it.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he wonders what would determine when it causes intensity to your eyes, or not. He stated that it is different for different people. He questioned how the township is going to determine this.

Commissioner Leddy stated that it why they need to look it up to find out the industry limits.

Commissioner Lamont stated that the amounts need to be converted to industry standards, lumens or luminance.

Commissioner Baker looked at the other temporary signs section, #10, C, item #7. “permits for portable temporary signs”. These are signs that will appear in commercial, office, or industrial areas. He stated that these signs are allowed for 14 days, no more than 4 times per year only during normal business. He stated he is still trying to find a spot for the Heritage Festival sign. In section D, requirements for permitted temporary signs for civic and charitable non-profit activities and here it is determined that they must be displayed for 7 days, and removed 48 hours after.

Jennifer Tucker stated that the Heritage Festival signs were up for 4 weeks.

Commissioner Baker stated that this language seems to be applicable for the Heritage Festival, it looks like they would be limited to 7 days, and perhaps this time limit could be increased.

Supervisor Trout stated that these time frames are up for discussion and revision.

Jennifer Tucker stated that there were 3 signs, Dixie/Davisburg, Rotary Park and in front of Springfield Oaks.

Commissioner Baker stated that they also have the Oakland County Fair signs. He asked if this was a civic, charitable or non-profit sign. He stated that 4 weeks of duration might cover these too.

Supervisor Trout asked if 28 days would work, or if this was not enough time.

Jennifer Tucker stated that 4 weeks would be optimum, but they would comply with the guidelines.

Supervisor Trout stated that after 4-6 weeks, it is not really seen anymore.

Commissioner Baker reiterated that these were only for civic, charitable and non-profit signs. He stated even for a blood drive, the Red Cross does not put out a sign 4 weeks ahead of time. He stated that something beyond 7 days is warranted.

Commissioner Willson asked about the minimum heights and sizes. He wondered if both charts are not saying the same thing. He stated that the top chart is allowing signage based on speed limits, and the bottom one locks it into the zoning district. He stated that the sizes offered by both tables are generally about the same. He stated that if you pick the top one, you are locked into it for as long as the speed limits are the same. He stated if the speed limits change, we don't have control over this. He stated that if an outside entity comes in and changes the speed limit, it will change the sign allowances.

Commissioners concurred that these signs would be grandfathered.

Commissioner Willson stated that if the bottom chart is picked, perhaps we have more control.

Commissioner Baker stated that rezoning can potentially occur as well. This would modify the signage requirements too. He stated that all of these are permitted signs. He stated that if a sign is placed by a permitting process and there is a speed limit change, it probably would be grandfathered in. He stated that any new signs coming in would be governed by the sign ordinance that exists today.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this exists no matter what. They should not be overly concerned about this.

Commissioner Willson stated on the next to the last page, there is language describing how we can limit the number of non-conforming signs in the Township. He stated the section under B it implies that if it exists today and it is non-conforming, it is the township's responsibility to take care of these signs. He stated that if there are any changes that they are planning to make under this, then the business has to come in to apply for the permit and this is the time that the township has to compare what they are proposing with the ordinance. He stated that if it is non-conforming and there is no permit then the existing sign can stay up.

Supervisor Trout stated that no structural changes would be allowed without a permit. He asked Mr. Oppmann if it was possible to bring all businesses into conformity.

Mr. Oppmann stated yes, there can be an amortization program which would give them so many years to comply. He stated that if you have a business that is no longer in business with a non-conforming sign, you can write provision that within 180 days of the use on the property being vacated, it will force conformity. Someone else buying the property and putting a business in there would be required to bring it into conformance. He stated that a lot of communities have this stipulation.

Commissioner Willson stated that this language was not strong enough. He stated that this would give the township the opportunity to remove some of these signs.

Commissioner Leddy stated that some signs are in violation of the current code.

Commissioner Lamont stated that in the section on temporary signs, #10, D, 1, he would support that being changed to 28 days to handle the Heritage Festival. He also stated that the Renaissance Festival may fit under #10, D, 3c, which allows an annual permit for a temporary sign. He stated that this could be worded to make the Renaissance Festival signs fit. He stated that they need to build the provision in there that it could be off premise. He stated that they may want to call it a special event. He stated under #7, CEVMS, he wondered if they want to add the zoning districts in which they are permitted. He stated that he believes they are allowed in PUDs. He stated that he has a few concerns about the 500 feet limitation. There are a lot of unique parcels in the township that are zoned PUD or commercial that do not have a lot of depth, but that could use a CEVMS sign. He questioned if there was 500 feet in depth from Randy Hosler's property to the closest residential property line. He stated he would not see a

problem with an electronic sign in front of Randy Hosler. He stated that 500 feet is too much. He also agrees with Commission Baker that 60 seconds is too long. He stated that the sign flip should be based on the speed limit. He stated that statements on brightness, #6 and #7, are redundant and could be worded better. Also, in #11, under section #7, there are no CEVMS signs shall be located within 1000 feet of another on the same side of the roadway. He stated that with unique parcels, this may be too far.

Commissioner Leddy asked if a school wants to use an electronic sign, do we have an allowance for that because it may be in a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Oppmann stated that you cannot control what a school does. He also stated that the Township is also exempt from the sign ordinance. He stated that this does not include 4-H. He stated that the township itself does not need to follow their own rules. They are exempt from their own ordinance.

Chairperson Steckling stated that on changeable copy signs, it states that if you change it more than one time in a day, it then became an animated sign. And under signs permitted under this ordinance, it says animated signs. He stated that this is an unnecessary exclusion. He stated under portable signs, under #17, definitions, transported means including wheels. He stated that he has trucks and these means that he could use them for temporary signs. Also, Bordines has a semi-truck which would also be permitted.

Commissioner Leddy stated that these vehicles have to be usable and licensed.

Mr. Oppmann stated that in other communities, these are not allowed.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the sections on computing the surface area are confusing and superfluous. He questioned the 3-D areas that are not included. He stated that the whole thing needed to be reworked. He stated that under the section for roof signs, it states that they are prohibited. He stated he thought that the township entered into a consent judgment with the party store at Davisburg Road and Dixie Highway allowing the roof sign. He stated if someone can do it, everyone can do it. He stated that the right-of-way is another issue, the right of way changes depending upon your location on Dixie Highway. He stated that he would rather see a standard; with standards like, #1, it cannot infringe upon traffic or safety, and #2 the business knows that if they have to remove it because the county or someone else says they have to move it, we cannot govern another agency. He stated that he would like right-of-way standards.

Supervisor Trout stated that they looked at that in the ground signs section, #4. He stated that they were trying to make it consistent along the right-of way. He stated that they wanted to measure from the center line, this would make it a uniform distance then every sign would be consistent. He stated that they looked at the right-of-way on Andersonville, Davisburg and Dixie and the distances from the center line seemed to be the consistent answer.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he didn't see anything about a combination of building and ground signs to contribute to overall square footage. He stated that this should be an option. He would like to see the maximum. He stated that the square footage in #6, A needs clarification. He stated that the computation of height section, the last section states, "in cases where the normal grade cannot be reasonably determined, sign height would be computed on the assumption that the elevation of the normal grade at the base of the sign is equal to the elevation of the nearest point of the crown of a public street or a grade of land at the principle entrance of the principal structure on the zoning lot or whichever is lower." He stated that according to this, on his property, his sign would have to be buried. He stated that it does not make sense. He stated that he agrees with Commissioner Lamont on the 500 feet clearance from residential neighborhoods. He stated that #9 under electronic signs, which stated "it may be located on either side of the road way; however each sign must be visible from only one direction of travel." He stated that this does not make sense. He stated under #11, he also does not agree. He stated that if he puts an electronic sign up, then New Horizons cannot put an electronic sign up.

Greg Kazmierski, Ordinance Officer, stated that people are driving with many distractions. He stated that now with electronic signs, their attention is being taken away from the road to read the changeable sign.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this is no different than trying to find a location that is not well marked; this is a more severe distraction. He stated that the other option is to ban the electronic signs totally. He stated that permitted real estate signs are only listed at 6 square feet and this is too small for commercial property. He stated that under permitted real estate, #2 and #3, it uses the word director; it should say township.

Supervisor Trout stated that he will take the Commissions comments and bring it back next month. He stated that if they have a preference over the speed limit table or zoning district table for sizes, let him know.

Commissioner Baker asked if there can be page numbers added for the next version.

Old Business:

- 1. None.**

Other Business:

- 1. Priority Task List.**

Chairperson Steckling commented briefly on each item for follow through and clarification.

Supervisor Trout stated that he has found a lot of material on the Mediplex issue that Trustee Vallad brought up last month.

Commissioners concurred that there are no new additions for the Priority Task List.

Commissioner Willson directed the Commissioners to an article regarding pathways in the Planning publication regarding road right of way and approval. He stated that he has pointed this article out to Supervisor Trout to be forwarded to the township attorney.

Clerk Moreau asked the Commission to review the item, a church being an allowable use in an office district. She stated that it was thought that this was an oversight; she asked the Planning Commission to look at this issue. This would require an ordinance amendment to make it an acceptable use.

Commissioners and Supervisor Trout agreed that this could be brought to the Commission as an agenda item.

Public Comment:

Mike Donnellon, Oakland County Chief of Park Facilities and Development and Community Education, invited the Commission to come to Rotary Park on May 7th to assist with the removal of the bridge. They are being assisted by the Davisburg Rotary Club as well as the Knights of Columbus. He stated that there will be parking behind the attorney's office at Eaton Road and Davisburg Road. He asked for volunteers to come with saws, pry bars, sledgehammers, picks, etc. to assist in this effort. He stated that they are looking at getting the replacement bridge as early as May 21st. He explained that the fundraising opportunity is a buy-a-board program for a \$50.00 donation.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Leddy made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 pm. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson, Baker, Lamont. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Erin Mattice, Recording Secretary