

Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes April 18, 2011

Call to Order: Chairman Commissioner Steckling called the April 18, 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

Commissioners Absent:

Roger Lamont

Staff Present

Mike Trout, Supervisor
Greg Kazmierski, Ordinance Officer

Consultants Present

Brian Oppmann, Planner

Approval of Agenda:

Chairman Steckling suggested moving Old Business item #1 to the beginning, before New Business so that business owners that were present could have a chance to express their opinions first. Commissioners concurred.

Public Comment: None.

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

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

Public Hearing: None.

Old Business:

1. Sign ordinance-proposal and overview.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he stopped and talked to several business owners and urged them to come to the meeting because he thought their input was relevant.

Jim White, Al Deeby Chrysler-Jeep-Dodge, 8700 Dixie Highway stated that he was just made aware of the meeting on Saturday. He stated that the dealership wants to be able to operate on a level playing field with everyone else and also to get the word out to

everyone. He stated that there are several extra items for signage that the dealership needs to use like balloons, banners, etc. He wants to support the community, but also put some signage up advertising the service area, for example. Because of the signage that is allowed, they have not been able to put up what they want and to advise the customers where to go and what to do and he came to observe and hear what the Planning Commission had to say.

Chairperson Steckling stated that when he visited the dealership he spoke to Dave and Matt and they brought up the service sign.

Mr. White stated that currently they have vinyl letters on the glass of the service area entrance. He stated that he wants to use new signage from Chrysler; he wants it attached to the building which would look better.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the dealerships have unique signage needs including banners, painting in the windows for specials, Halloween and Christmas displays and parking vehicles in the greenbelt. He does not have a problem with them, but that needs to be addressed. He stated that it needs to be defined so that the business knows what the boundaries are. Deeby has a pylon sign at the entrance and flagpole signs. Randy Hosler has the same type of signs including sandwich boards advertising specials. These items are things that the Commission is trying to deal with.

Mr. White stated that the Commission should consider since there are just 3 dealerships is designating a certain number of vehicles and have the dealerships invest in a cement pad so that they are displayed uniformly. The number of pads should be based on the frontage; more frontage equals more pads. He stated that the Christmas and Halloween displays are an attempt to remain in the spirit of the season.

Greg Kazmierski, Ordinance Officer, stated one of the biggest problems is a wide variety and multiple signs placed very close to the roadway and vehicles parked in the greenbelt. He stated that there was a sale that used searchlights as well. He knows that sometimes the dealerships hire companies to conduct the sale for them.

Mr. White agreed that flashing lights are going to be distracting to drivers. He stated that he wants a display that is respectable. Chrysler has 16 new products coming out in the next 16 months and they want people to be able to see them.

Randy Hosler, 9603 Dixie Highway stated that he has been a car dealer in the area for 30 years and he is well versed on ordinances regarding signage. Most car dealerships believe they are too restrictive. He stated that it is a display type business and the Townships do not want them to be seen; they start off at odds from the beginning. He stated that some sign issues go back to what is required by the factory, some of which does not adhere to the Township ordinances. He stated that today the businesses are trying to do all they can do to stimulate business and traffic in their showrooms. He stated that the signs along the street were put up by a company that was hired for promoting the sale. When they found out what the problem was, they took half of them down. He stated that it was not a

weekend sale; it was a 4 day sale. He stated that sometimes they park cars on the right-of-way trying to generate business. He stated one of the issues that they have right now is service signage. With car sales down, they are looking at service to take care of some of their overhead expenses. He stated that GM wants them to put up signage that they prepare and that is tastefully done which is meant to hang off a light pole. They are not permanent. They place an oil change sign on the grass. He stated that these types of signs should not be an issue, but they are. There are so many operations under one roof that they do not have an ability to advertise all of the things that they do including service, parts and body shop. The signage controls are restrictive. He stated that he has 900 feet of frontage and he has one ground sign. He stated that he does not want a lot of clutter, but the Township needs to be more flexible.

Commissioner Steckling stated that this discussion began as one regarding temporary signage and has gotten to the point where they are now. He stated that they have looked at signage for the buildings based on the area and the highway speeds. They have also proposed that signs could be closer to the road based on the centerline. They have opened up the consideration for electronic signs. He stated that they have also tried to change the yearly permitting basis for temporary signs. It is not expected that they will resolve it tonight, but some of the sections can be worked on.

Commissioner Shaver stated that there is a need for a sign ordinance to keep the balance between good signage and overkill. She stated that they should take into consideration what is required by the factories and franchises. She stated that the greenbelts are put in to keep the road clean and keep a certain appearance. She stated that she doesn't like taking advantage of the greenbelt area for advertising.

Commissioner Hines stated that on page 7, it states that a sign can be 65 feet from the centerline; she asked if this will put signs in the greenbelt areas.

Commissioner Steckling stated that you could. The right-of-way along Dixie Highway is different along the road.

Commissioner Hines asked if the 60 feet or 65 feet was too far.

Commissioner Steckling answered yes, in a number of instances. This would be too far off the roadway and will not be able to be seen. He stated that a sign is prohibited from being in the road right-of-way and he has a problem with that unless we are prohibited from other jurisdictions. He stated that it should be allowed, but if the Road Commission or a utility comes along to widen the road, it is the business's responsibility to move the sign and realign it.

Commissioner Baker stated that it was his impression that it was not possible to place a ground sign in the right-of-way because the Road Commission controlled this area.

Mr. Oppmann stated that is correct.

Chairperson Steckling stated the utility poles are put in the road-right-of-way.

Commissioner Baker stated they have the approval of the Road Commission.

Chairperson Steckling stated his point is that a sign or a utility pole are the same obstacle.

Commissioner Baker stated that one serves the public and one serves the property owner.

Mr. Oppmann stated there are examples in other communities of restrictions in the types of trees that can be planted in the right-of-way. He stated you need to go through permitting with the Road Commission to get medians landscaped the way you want to. The Road Commission tends to not be very flexible with their right-of-way. He stated it would be challenging to allow someone to put a sign in the right-of-way when really the Township has no jurisdiction over it. He stated you could build into the ordinance that they would have to obtain an approval letter from the Road Commission, but he is not sure this would ever happen.

Chairperson Steckling concurred.

Commissioner Baker stated that the commission is attempting to address the uniqueness of the speed limits and taking these into account to recognize the difference between Dixie Highway and another 2 lane road. This is a worthy discussion. He would like to honor the Road Commission's jurisdiction over the right-of-way; he likes the idea of creating some uniformity along Dixie Highway, like measuring from the center line. The idea of having signage maximums according to frontage he believes is worthy. He stated they are beginning the process and creating a more liberal document that creates more opportunity for the business owner. This would be creating a common approach and would create an ordinance that would be able to be enforced. He stated they are heading in the right direction.

Chairperson Steckling stated there are size criteria for building and ground signs. He would like to see the size have some correlation to frontage. He stated that some structures are on multiple lots. He would like to allow the business to allocate the total signage any way they want; they could divide it up between ground and building signs. He stated that the businesses are spending money on temporary signage like banners because it works and he would like to allow them to continue to do it. How can it be worked in so it is tasteful and they are happy with it? He stated that the temporary banners, temporary required dealer-type signs and window signage are signs that they should look at. He stated that right now, banners are not permitted and window signage is allowed at 25%. These signs should be regulated as temporary signage.

Commissioner Leddy stated one of the problems is defining tastefully done. If a business wanted to design their signage, maybe this should be brought to a committee or someone else in the Township who could recommend it go in front of the Planning Commission. He reiterated that the definition of tasteful is not clear.

Chairperson Steckling stated that in the current ordinance, any sign change requires a permit and they need to go through the procedure.

Commissioner Leddy stated that he is against the sandwich board type signs but thinks that if the car dealership has several different businesses located at the same building, he should be able to put signage on each. He also likes the idea of having a specific number of pads in front to show the new cars.

Chairperson Steckling asked about the banners.

Commissioner Leddy stated that we need to go to the temporary sign ordinance on banners and have restrictions on them according to the number of times per year. There must be restrictions to eliminate hand-painted banners.

Commissioner Willson stated that technology is changing rapidly. He is familiar with car dealerships and understands the difficulties that they face. There are several operations located within the business and each is very important to the overall profit of the business. They should be able to show all of these different facets to the consumer. He asked Randy Hosler and Jim Wilson if they have numerous businesses to advertize for, have the dealerships considered using the illuminated signs.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the Township does not allow them yet. He hopes that if we allow them, they would replace banners and other temporary signage.

Commissioner Willson concurred. He knows they are expensive and wondered if they were a viable option.

Mr. White stated that they would help.

Mr. Hosler stated that some of the signage is required by the factory. He thinks the electronic signs are great and would be useful.

Commissioner Willson stated that the dealership agreements he recalls determines the amount of signage you need to put in place is based on the size of your dealership, the larger the building, the more signage they are asked to carry. The dealerships have individual issues that the Commission needs to pay attention to.

Commissioner Leddy asked if the dealership can ask you to do something that is against local code.

Commissioner Willson stated no.

Chairperson Steckling asked the representatives about the frequency of banners.

Mr. White stated that there are quarterly promotions or with the seasons.

Chairperson Steckling asked the car dealership representatives to submit some idea of usage so their needs could be incorporated into the ordinance. It would be helpful to know how many times per year a permit is needed. He wanted to see the usage for banners and temporary signage.

Commissioner Baker asked if the potential existed to create some type of guidelines which would be based on frontage, speed limit of the road, etc., the business would be given a determined amount of temporary signage.

Chairperson Steckling stated that yes, the size of the signs are important.

Commissioner Baker stated that the volume of signs as well as the size would be important information to have. He would like to learn more about not only the number of signs, but the size of the signs. So perhaps, each business is given a certain amount of total signage to use within guidelines.

Commissioner Hines stated that she liked the bank account version of a total amount of signage available.

Commissioner Leddy stated that the reason behind temporary signs was to allow the ordinance officer to be aware of who had signs up and insuring that they were allowable.

Mike Trout, Supervisor, stated that the Township Board did approve the Special Event and Seasonal Sales amendment at the April meeting and he thinks this will address some of the temporary sign issues that the businesses face. The car sales and temporary sales would fall under that. He stated they are looking for size of temporary signs that will be allowed on the permit application.

Chairperson Steckling stated that on the first page, the definition of banner takes many different forms. The flagpole versions should be included. He asked the car dealerships to provide feedback on the use of banners. In the definition of what is excluded, the roof signs are excluded. He asked about the consent judgment which allowed a roof sign at Davisburg Road and Dixie. He stated that this is something that needs to be resolved; if we are going to allow one, we have to allow others. He also had a question about D.4 animated signs containing flashing, running light or twinkle signs and signs containing intermittent or moving lights." He would add, "signs containing." Under #6, it says, "signs affixed to utility poles, trees, rocks, shrubs or natural features." It says, "signs on a rock denoting a site of historical significance or a person being honored may be allowed." He stated that it did not have to be just "on a rock." Under permanent signs, #8, add "they are subject to right-of-way exceptions below." Under E.3., add "locally required signs on private property." Under Ground Signs, general requirements, #1, "within all residential zoning districts only one ground sign shall be permitted per zoning lot." He questioned the Kroger shopping center having more than one lot there. He stated that perhaps they should allow for more than one sign in this example and perhaps others in the future.

Commissioner Shaver suggested the word "tract" instead of "lot."

Chairperson Steckling stated he did not know. He suggested adopting Commissioner Baker's suggestion of using a combination of frontage, speed limit and size and it can be allocated within these perimeters.

Mr. Oppmann stated that many communities that have parcels with multiple frontages would allow a ground sign on each frontage; it does not seem that the sign ordinance example allows for this. He states that it allows for only one sign.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this is the same for residential districts, only one entryway sign is allowed. He does not believe it needs to be restricted this much. On page #7, he questions the 60 or 65 feet. He suggested allowing it in the right-of-way subject to the County giving their consent. He stated that they need uniformity along the road. It would be easier to identify businesses. He would remove the prohibition and make it a qualified prohibition for buildings in the right-of-way. On the height and size, he would like to get some input from the businesses, especially the 3 business owners in the audience. He would not discriminate C-2 with having higher requirements. He would make them all about the same. He would try to integrate the square footage so between the ground signs and building signs, guidelines could be set. He stated comparing Deeby, Hosler and Bordines sign compared to the size of their sites, they are pretty small in comparison. As an electronic sign, they would be fine. It would be better served on the building or in the windows. Under changeable, electronic message signs, the first items talks about proximity to residential areas. He stated that this needs further clarification. He stated that the idea is that you don't want the light shining in room windows; however, it needs to be tightened up. On page 11, #11, it says "no CEVMS" shall be located within 1000 feet of another on the same side of the roadway." This would not work well because of the closeness of different businesses. He is ambivalent about window signs, car dealerships and party stores use them. The amount is given at 25% on the ground floor for window signage, if they have a liquor license, they can use 50%. He stated that the auto dealers could use 25% of the area. Under permitted real estate, he does not think 6 square feet advertising a building for rent is big enough for some commercial areas. He proposed making this bigger. He stated he did not know the extent of the Township's limits on political signs. He stated that he has political signs in the right-of-way in front of his business, but business signs are not permitted in the right-of-way.

Supervisor Trout stated political signs are not permitted in the right-of-way and they have revised the ordinance to remove unenforceable provisions.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the problem with political signs is that they end up in the right-of-way anyway. It is up to the Road Commission to enforce this. They frequently don't enforce it unless it is causing a traffic issue. If they do take it down, they are accused of not supporting a candidate and supporting others and this causes problems. He stated that they should get input from the Township attorney about this. This issue evolves every year. The Township attorney should provide an update as to what we can do and what we can't do regarding political signs.

Chairperson Steckling stated that at his business location, almost everything in the front lot is located in the right-of-way including the trees approved for his site plan. He stated that he agrees with Supervisor Trout, the use of electronic signs will eliminate the use of temporary signs and the clutter.

Commissioner Hines questioned if they had any idea how the Township Board viewed electronic signs.

Supervisor Trout stated that they approved the electronic sign at Dixie Highway and Davisburg Road.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he would like feedback from the two dealerships.

Commissioner Hines asked the dealerships to provide feedback specifically about the items discussed.

Commissioners concurred that they should get feedback from the business owners.

Wanda Bothermel, Old House Inn, asked the Commission if they were going to make the business owners change the signage that is already on the property.

Chairperson Steckling stated that it would become nonconforming.

Wanda Bothermel stated that this sign change and/or movement would cost money.

Chairperson Steckling stated that if the use is changed, or if the sign is destroyed, it then has to be brought into conformity.

Wanda Bothermel stated that she bought a car from a local car dealership and the only way that she knew it was there was by seeing it parked by the road. She stated that the Commission should permit them to park cars by the road so that they can be seen by customers.

New Business:

1. Site Plan applications and ordinance requirements-discussion

Chairperson Steckling stated that the application mirrors what is required for the ordinance. In prior years, a lot of data was collected from the applicant at the preliminary step. He stated that in moving forward, perhaps they don't need as much data in the beginning. It could be brought to the Commission in concept form and they could determine whether or not it should go to the next step or the process where much more data and information would be required. He stated much of the information contained on the application might be information that they did not need at the preliminary step. He suggested keeping general information, but physical feature and natural features are not required. The written explanation is required by the ordinance. He stated that the natural

features would be found by visiting the site. He suggested that the grading plan with contours is not necessary, but is very expensive to provide and then the Planning Commission might not even approve the plan at this step. He stated that the other side of this is that if the applicant does not provide this information and gets the Planning Commission's initial approval, he needs to be prepared to meet the qualifications of the ordinance.

Commissioner Leddy stated that the applicant should be given the checklist.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the information still needs to be gathered at the final site plan review and they need to understand that they need to provide it eventually. He stated that they have a requirement in the ordinance that if the land falls in a specific area, you need to do an environmental survey. He stated that it would be hard to discern whether the applicant should do it before or after the initial approval. He stated that they could spend the money to do all of the site plan work, but they should not have to.

Commissioner Baker stated that the checklist for preliminary and final is the same. He suggested that this document could be used while sitting with the developer discussing the plan. He stated that some of the items are just information and gathering data. He stated that some of it involves topographic work which requires having an engineer work with the plan. He stated that it seems like this list can be used as the developer works through his plan

Mr. Oppmann stated that the ordinance has the items required for concept. He stated that this checklist is designed for Mike to sit down with the developer and go through the checklist and if it is completed, then as a plan, it is acceptable to go to the Commission. If there are deficiencies, then he can go back to the developer and let them know what is missing and needed. He stated that a copy should be given to the developer with a letter stating what is missing. As long as the checklist has all items that are required in the ordinance, you are fine.

Commissioner Hines asked if soil borings were part of the concept plan.

Chairperson Steckling pointed out that all of the pertinent portions of the ordinance were in the Commissioner's packet. He stated that the wording describing the concept plan as general. He stated that this was one of Mr. Carlisle's recommendations that they streamline the concept portion of the site plan review. It has to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Oppmann stated that in #3 shown in the ordinance, the information required is the final site plan. The concept plan consists of the building, the parking layout, entrances, but that is it. The final step involves landscaping, lighting, etc. The concept basically proves that the use meets the ordinance on that site. Soil borings usually never happen at the preliminary stage.

Chairperson Steckling stated he would make much of the information optional, but include the engineered drawing.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he does not think that it has to be sealed, but it has to be prepared. On the preliminary checklist it is hard to check these items off. They are subjective standards based on the ordinance. These are hard to ascertain at the preliminary stage.

Chairperson Steckling stated that letters from the Road Commission and Health Department used to be required at concept.

Commissioner Baker stated that if the objective is to educate the applicant as best they can before they invest a lot of money, then they should not have to even submit a concept plan.

Chairperson Steckling reiterated that the concept plan is required in some instances, over 2 acres, etc.

Commissioner Baker stated that he thought they were trying to develop a methodology in which the Supervisor, and others with his discretion, work with the applicant. This is not the focus. The focus is to create a concept plan requiring modest items that they would bring to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the concept plan is required for Special Land Use, structures greater than 25,000 square feet and developments larger than 2 acres. This would be a developer that would meet with Mike and Randy Ford and they will already have a preliminary plan prepared. There might be a meeting or two before this where Mike meets with the applicant and hears their ideas. There will be a lot of discussion before the preliminary plan is even drawn up.

Commissioner Baker stated that once this work takes place for these significant projects, we would ask the applicant to bring a subset of items to the Planning Commission. He stated that he does not understand how this is beneficial to the applicant. If they are qualified developers who have done this many times who are used to what is necessary, if the revised ordinance language lessens the requirements, how are we saving them anything?

Chairperson Steckling stated we are not revising the ordinance. In the past, they would have to include a lot of detailed work from various authorities. We are not going to require they do this. He stated that the Planning Commission does not approve the concept, they just give comments and the developer uses these when doing the final. We are letting them know that we do not need all of the details at concept. If they want to provide all details, they can, but it is not required. The last section of the ordinance gives the details of the concept and is fairly vague. After they go to the Planning Commission and hear their comments, then they have to get serious with the engineering work required for final. It is an attempt to streamline.

Commissioner Baker stated that it was not evident that it would be successful in streamlining.

Mr. Oppmann stated that some developers will do a full-blown site plan at concept. If the items are there, they can comment on them. It would reduce issues if they know early. The point of a checklist is to insure that they have the minimum requirements to get the plan to the Commission.

Commissioner Willson stated that one of the items to think about is time. He stated that Commissioner Lamont said at another meeting that in the past, a developer would come to a Planning Commission and would be asked for more information than the individual brought with them. The developer would bring in what he thought was required, but the Commission would continually ask for more. This time issue sets up a roadblock and adds to the frustration which hopefully we can resolve. Will the applicant come in understanding enough?

Commissioner Shaver stated that there should be a minimum amount of information that is required to pass the preliminary point, but the checklist will show them everything.

Commissioner Willson asked if it was necessary to divide the preliminary site checklist into a mandatory section and an optional section.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he would get rid of some of the information listed as required on the Preliminary Checklist for Concept and make sure it adheres to the ordinance. If a developer brings more, they can look at it. He stated with Brian's guidance, they can make sure that it adheres to the ordinance at the concept level. The subjective questions are ones that the Commission should be answering.

Commissioner Willson stated that it is hard to test because there hasn't been any site plans.

Chairperson Steckling stated that they are trying to lighten up the initial stage. It is important to rechannel our focus which was the suggestion of Dick Carlisle.

Commissioner Leddy stated that they need their own checklist.

Commissioner Willson stated that this will shorten and streamline the process.

Commissioner Hines stated that there will be no surprises because they have the final checklist and know what will be required of them eventually.

Chairperson Steckling stated that at a prior meeting, they had asked for help from the administrative staff for motions so they have all the essential information for the ordinance. They have to make sure that technically they are following the law. There are

certain requirements required in the motion language. He stated that he liked Commissioner Leddy suggestion that the Commission have a checklist.

Mr. Oppmann stated the written explanation and analysis portion of the checklist is essentially how it adheres to the criteria in the ordinance 18.07.

Chairperson Steckling stated this portion could be developed as the Commissioner's checklist for concept plans and not make the applicant complete this section. These decisions are for the Commission. His suggestion is on the preliminary checklist was the leave the general information and to make the physical features and natural features sections optional. He would use the written explanation portion as the Commission's checklist. At this point, the Township would have met with the developers once or twice and they should provide a drawing showing the generalized layout of the development because this is required in the ordinance. The applicant would be required to provide all of the necessary information for final site plan after they get the initial comments from the Planning Commission.

Supervisor Trout stated that his office would work on creating a new preliminary application taking the Commissions comments into consideration.

2. Article XI-O-S- Office Service-discussion regarding adding churches as an allowable use

Commissioner Baker asked if OS was the only zoning district that did not have churches listed as a principal permitted use.

Commissioners concurred that it is allowed in C1 and everything allowed in C1 is an allowable use in C2.

Commissioner Leddy stated that they would still have to meet certain conditions.

Chairperson Steckling stated that you could make an approved use but attach certain conditions to the approval process or you can make it a special use.

Commissioner Hines stated that perhaps it should be a special use because it could be large and there are factors to consider.

Commissioner Baker stated that churches were a use permitted to special conditions in residential. He stated that the OS should follow in a similar fashion.

Mr. Oppmann stated that you do not have to attach any site specific standards. He stated if it was a special land use, it would have to go through the approval process.

Commissioner Willson stated that if it was allowed, it would be possible to have a large member church in a store front. How is it possible to avoid this?

Commissioner Leddy stated that the parking requirements would restrict this type of use.

Commissioner Willson asked if they had to write specific restrictions in the ordinance or could they list it as a special land use and if so, what are the special conditions.

Mr. Oppmann clarified that the Commission might want to be careful using the word church because they are covered by certain federal laws. He dealt with this in Holly Township with a church that went in a strip mall. The federal law says that you cannot discriminate against churches. They grouped churches in with other assemblies, which is a large gathering of people. He stated that in Holly, they went through every zoning and decided if it was permitted, or a special land use and then they had to change the definition. He stated that Greg Need, the Township attorney, could probably provide language so that the Township is operating in accordance with the federal law. He stated that he had some information at the office that would provide Mike Trout with additional information. He stated that the special land use gives the neighbors some checks and balances; the problem comes in when you impose special restrictions on some special land uses and not on others.

Commissioners agreed to get additional information from Greg Need and Brian Oppmann before any decision is made.

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List.

Supervisor Trout stated that there going to be two new ordinance amendments for consideration by the Planning Commission next month; these are soliciting and vicious animals. These were just brought to the Township Board in April.

Commissioner Willson asked what the plans were for the lumberyard.

Supervisor Trout stated that he had a meeting scheduled with Dick Carlisle and Brian Oppmann to go over the plan. The property was recently surveyed.

Commissioner Hines asked if the Township Attorney was providing information on Mediplex.

Supervisor Trout stated that this has been forwarded to the Attorney, but we do not have a timeline yet.

Public Comment: None.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 pm. Supported by Commissioner Shaver. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson, Baker. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont. Motion Carried.

Erin Mattice, Recording Secretary