

MINUTES

ELKHART COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

HELD ON THE 11TH DAY OF JULY 2013 AT 9:00 A.M.

MEETING ROOM – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING

4230 ELKHART ROAD, GOSHEN, INDIANA

1. The regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission was called to order by the Chairperson, Jeff Burbrink, with the following members present: Tony Campanello, Steve Edwards, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Doug Miller, Blake Doriot, Tom Stump, and Frank Lucchese. Staff members present were: Chris Godlewski, Plan Director; Brian Mabry, Planning Manager; Mark Kanney, Planner; Duane Burrow, Planner; Kathy Wilson, Administrative Manager; and James W. Kolbus, Attorney for the Board.

2. A motion was made and seconded (*R. Miller/D. Miller*) that the minutes of the regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission held on the 13th day of June 2013, be approved as submitted and the motion was carried unanimously.

3. A motion was made and seconded (*Warner/R. Miller*) that the legal advertisements, having been published on the 29th day of June 2013 in the Goshen News and the 30th day of June 2013 in the Elkhart Truth, be approved as read. The motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

4. A motion was made and seconded (*R. Miller/Lucchese*) that the Elkhart County Zoning Ordinance and Elkhart County Subdivision Control Ordinance be accepted as evidence for today's hearings. With a unanimous vote, the motion was carried.

5. The application for a zone map change from A-1 to M-1, for ***KLT Realty, Inc.***, on property located on the East side of SR 13, 555 ft. North of CR 20, in Middlebury Township, was presented at this time.

Duane Burrow presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #SR 13-130531-1*.

Kermit Troyer, KLT Realty, 58565 CR 35, Middlebury, is present on behalf of the petition. He stated that he has developed everything behind the property on the east side. He noted that two months ago the parcel to the north was rezoned. This property butts up against the property he did five years ago. He stated that there are two homes on the property. The old Nusbaum home is still there, as well as a mobile home belonging to the daughter. He intends to buy the property, whenever they are ready to sell. He believes the parcel with the home buildings on it may be for sale in the fall. The owner still owns the property to the south, and has indicated that she may possibly sell next spring or summer. The owner's parents have passed away and the current owner has family in Arizona, where she plans to move. Mr. Troyer's desire is to get it re-zoned. He stated that when he gets the other portion he will put pine trees up as a buffer. He went on to say that all of the property is going to be sold to one person when it's all said and done.

Linford Martin, 12401 CR 20, Middlebury, was present on behalf of this request. He said that the industrial park surrounds his property. He stated that five years ago, when KLT was developing the area, he and Mr. Troyer had some dialogue. His house is 37 feet from the property line. He said that Mr. Troyer said that with that close proximity he was sure it would be required that there be a double row of pine trees and probably a mound as well. At that time, Mr. Martin signed a petition with that expectation. He stated that they were both surprised when it came back with no requirement for a barrier there. Mr. Troyer did go ahead and put a row of pine trees along there and along the road. Along the road he put them at 15' centers, which will put them within touching distance to one another when they are completely grown. Mr. Martin asked that they be more densely planted, so Mr. Troyer planted trees on the east at 10' centers. Mr. Martin pointed out the area that is currently a hayfield and said he was okay with that. He said that he hopes when there is more development a double row of pine trees will be required which will give him a better barrier. He has a patio and double glass doors to the east looking right at the development. He stated that he appreciates the pine trees as they are growing. He noted that since the trees on the east end of the property are planted closer, there is 150' without any pine trees. He is requesting that pine trees encircle his property, thus creating more of a barrier. He would like that to happen as soon as the bean crop is over so that whenever the property is sold the trees are in process.

Kermit Troyer responded that the new section will be for inventory only. He stated that he does not have a problem with putting the trees in. He suggested that at such time that the property develops as beyond a bean field is when the trees would be planted. Mr. Campanello asked if the Middlebury Comprehensive Plan requires planting of trees. Mr. Troyer responded that it does not, and went on to say that he is not opposed to making Mr. Martin happy.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Burbrink/R. Miller*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

Mr. Burbrink commented that the Board cannot require them to plant trees since this is a rezoning, but Mr. Kolbus advised they can require them to record a commitment. Mr. Campanello asked if they can require a commitment if there is building done there or just a commitment presently. Mr. Kolbus explained that the Board can stipulate that the petitioner install the tree buffer now, at the time construction is undertaken, or they could require no commitments. He explained that based on the new law that went into effect a year ago, they can do a conditional rezoning by placing commitments on it rather than going through the PUD process for one commitment if they want to take that route.

Mr. Campanello asked if they would be overstepping their bounds if Middlebury has their own Comprehensive Plan, but it was noted that this property is under the jurisdiction of Elkhart County.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

Motion: Action: Approve **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that this request for a zone map change from A-1 to M-1 be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis with the following commitment imposed:

1. A screening of evergreens spaced 10 ft. on centers to be installed along the south property line of the Real Estate prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 8).

Yes: Douglas Miller, Frank Lucchese, Jeff Burbrink, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Steven Edwards,

Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

6. The application for a zone map change from A-1 to R-4, for **Wayne L. & Barbera J. Schalliol (owner, lot 1); Almac, Inc. (owner, lot A); and Mike & Shelli Stutz (Angel Central Academy)** (developer) represented by Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, Inc., on property located on the East side of CR 15, 678 ft. South of CR 6, being lot 1 & lot A of Streeter's Subdivision, in Osolo Township, was presented at this time.

Duane Burrow presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #OCR 15-130603-1*. He clarified that there is a note of correction, pointing out that they do have DPUD M-1 on corner property. (SW)

Barry Pharis, Brads-Ko Engineering, 1009 S. 9th St., Goshen, is present on behalf of this petition. The owner and director of Angel Central Academy, Shelly Sultz, is present. Mr. Pharis explained that Ms. Sultz established the Angel Central Academy several years ago. Initially, it was a Christian preschool and daycare. Enrollment in the preschool is a requirement for use of the daycare. Ms. Sultz and her entire teaching staff are licensed professional teachers in Indiana. This academy was originally established in a church in Elkhart, but they outgrew their space. They leased space in a building that would accommodate their expansion needs. Unfortunately, the owner sold that building and the new owner has other plans. The academy was asked to vacate this site. As word spread that Angel Central Academy was being forced to move, many large gestures of support have occurred. A church located just north of Eastwood School is relocating and offered their building to Angel Central Academy for the cost of moving. Wayne and Barbera Schalliol learned of this and offered Lot 1 in this residential subdivision at a very reasonable price. Finally, Almac, Inc. – Al Ludwig and Rob Leatherman – own a 50 foot strip of land that goes back to the DPUD which they offered to donate so that the academy could have the entire parcel and be able to align their driveway with the driveway to Eastwood school, which would be the safest points of ingress/egress for both sides. He is asking for a rezoning to R-4 and will go before the BZA to request a Special Use in an R-4 zone. According to Mr. Pharis, the staff has worked very hard with him to establish a path that they could follow so that they could accommodate this and still enable Ms. Sultz to open the school at this site as early as possible this year. The Plan Commission Hearing for the rezoning is currently taking place and is scheduled for July 18th for the BZA hearing. With both approvals they would appear before the Commissioners, probably August 19th, or possibly August 5th.

Mr. Pharis stated that having seen the problems that developed with the rezoning of Mor/Ryde, Ms. Sultz approached the principal of Eastwood Elementary to explain what she wanted to do. Referencing Petitioner Exhibit #1, *[attached to file as Petitioner Exhibit #1]*, Mr. Pharis noted that on page one Elkhart Schools had indicated they would not oppose this proposed re-zoning, as evidenced by the signature of Douglas Hasler, Director of Support Services. On page two, Superintendent Rob Haworth indicated he would not be opposed to the academy. Finally, Kevin Beveridge, principal of Eastwood Elementary, noted that he is not opposed to rezoning either

Mr. Pharis notes that the R-4 zone is very limited. It can be used, if approved by the BZA, as a preschool and daycare center or it can be an office with an owner occupied residence. He believes that any "what if" questions have been answered. What if the school closes or what if Ms. Sultz sells the building? If that were to happen, the property could remain a school, or it could be an office space if someone is building a residence, or else it would go back to the Board for approval. There is not going to be any way that something that is not approved by the Board and the school

system would come back. This is Ms. Sultz's effort to finally have a permanent home for Angel Central Academy. Mr. Pharis noted that many little miracles have occurred over the last few months to get to this point. He pointed out there is a positive Staff Report, and he hopes that the Board will forward this to the County Commissioners with a favorable recommendation.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*R. Miller/Stump*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

Motion: Action: Approve **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Douglas Miller, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that this request for a zone map change from A-1 to R-4 be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 8).

Yes: Douglas Miller, Frank Lucchese, Jeff Burbrink, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Steven Edwards, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

7. The application for a zone map change from A-1 to a Detailed Planned Unit Development-A-1 to be known as **FARVER'S FARM DPUD**, for Larry Eugene & Judith Ann Farver represented by B. Doriot & Associates, on property located on the West side of CR 21, 2,300 ft. South of CR 40, in Elkhart Township, was presented at this time.

Brian Mabry presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #66231CR 21-130506-1*.

Terry Lang, in conjunction with B. Doriot & Associates appeared on behalf of this request. He stated that Mr. Farver lives in the home at the back. He would like to maintain the entrance, keeping it very private. The reinforced concrete drive meets all county designed standards. There is appropriate landscaping and lighting along that area, which he plans to maintain. The six new homes that can potentially be built on the property once approval is received, will maintain the stately, quiet, pristine approach that Mr. Farver desires to maintain. The drainage ditch that runs through the middle will be maintained in that fashion and any construction will be staged at least 100' away to protect that area. They will be doing individual on-site drainage for each home site, so there will be no draining into that ditch. They hope to make a quiet, gated community. Emergency vehicles will have access through the gated area which will be provided with the restrictive covenants that are being prepared. They would be recorded just before the plat itself would be done. The plan is to maintain the roadway as private, accepting responsibility for the snowplowing and features so it will not be a burden upon the county. Mr. Burbrink asked about maintaining potholes. Mr. Lang stated that all of those items will be addressed in the restrictive covenants. The covenants will also address architectural control of all the new homes that will be going up. Mr. Burbrink asked about the ability of school buses to travel down the road. Mr. Lang noted that the school bus would likely pick up at the County Road.

Jim Brown, 66154 CR 21, Goshen, is present. He questioned changing the property from agricultural to subdivision when there are farms on all four sides. Three of the four farms spread livestock manure. He noted that the nearest subdivision is in excess of one mile away, to the north. He felt it was premature to change it at this time unless the petitioner is going to subdivide and build on it right away. He pointed out that one of the nearby farms that has a well, which is 50-60' south of the fence. He said that he looked at the blueprints and they have a well/septic system across the fence from that well. He is concerned about the distance between the well and septic.

Mr. Lang addressed the concerns with regard to the well and septic locations. He explained that the schematic that has been submitted is a general layout showing that each of the lots are appropriately sized and the well and septic locations will accommodate the six additional homes. The schematic that was supplied is not necessarily where the well and septic will be located on site. That will be determined once there is a location for the home. The septic and well will have to comply with the Elkhart standards with the appropriate separation between other wells and septic systems, to make sure they all comply with appropriate separation. The fact that manure is spread in an agricultural area is something that each of the prospective buyers will know coming in. He stated that he lives ½ mile away from a farm that does the exact thing. It does not come as a surprise when living in an agricultural area. He does not see that as a major concern for people, where they would get to the point that they would be afraid to live in an agricultural area.

Mr. Burbrink stated that he often places an agricultural statement on property and asks the property owners to sign the statement indicating that they are aware of issues they may encounter residing in an agricultural setting. He asked that a statement of that nature be included so that future property owners are aware. Mr. Lang agreed to do so.

Mr. Kolbus noted that there is language for that in the subdivision ordinance.

A motion was made and seconded (*R. Miller/D. Miller*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

Roger Miller asked how the subdivision, in its proposed location, complies with the draft zoning ordinance. Mr. Mabry said that as far as complying with the draft ordinance it's hard to determine because the zoning ordinance is in draft form. Additionally, the question of how subdivisions, residential use and agricultural zoning interact has not yet been decided. He said he is not able to give a concrete answer at this point.

Mr. Kolbus stated that currently, large residential lots are being proposed as a permitted use. This means that currently, this request would be consistent with where the proposed ordinance.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

Motion:, **Action:** Approve **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Douglas Miller, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that this request be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis provided the submitted Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions becomes part of the DPUD document, with the Agricultural Statement to be included in the Covenants and Restrictions.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 8).

Yes: Douglas Miller, Frank Lucchese, Jeff Burbrink, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Steven Edwards, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

8. The application for Secondary approval of a Detailed Planned Unit Development known as **FARVER'S FARM DPUD**, for Larry Eugene & Judith Ann Farver represented by B. Doriot & Associates, on property located on the West side of CR 21, 2,300 ft. South of CR 40, in Elkhart Township, zoned A-1, was presented at this time.

Brian Mabry presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #66231CR 21-130506-2*. He stated that the Plat cannot be approved until SWPPP is approved by Soil & Water. He noted that this will not appear to cause a delay for the project as a whole because this Plat can be before the Board on August 8, assuming SWPPP has been approved. Both of these items will still be able to go out before the Board of County Commissioners on August 19 for a final decision. Mr. Mabry recommended tabling it for the August 8 Plan Commission meeting, due to the

SWPPP approval not having taken place yet.

Terry Lang, B. Doriot & Associates, appeared on behalf of this request. He stated that the SWPPP has been submitted to Soil & Water and they are awaiting comments back from that. He said they understand that secondary cannot take place with regards to that, but he would like to have it come up at the next possible hearing. If it is not approved by that point in time then they will gladly table it, however, he would like to keep moving forward if possible.

Mr. Kolbus stated that the ordinance is pretty clear that it does not appear there will be a delay if the motion is tabled. They are not going to get anything until they get the rezoning finalized by the Commissioners.

Motion Action: Tabled **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Steven Edwards, that this request for Secondary approval be tabled until the August 8, 2013, Elkhart County Advisory Plan Commission meeting pending SWPPP approval.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

9. ***Kuert Kopf DPUD – Duane Burrow***

Mr. Burrow addressed the major minor change request. He noted that this involves Lot 3 of the Kuert Kopf DPUD. This request is in front of the Board because the site plan support drawing that was adopted by the Plan Commission and the County Commissioners did not show any off-site billboards. Brogan Outdoor Advertising removed the units with the intent to relocate them, as shown in the second to last page of the handout. The units are going to be taken from the existing location and relocated, combining the two units/signs into essentially one sign with two faces. The request is that this be considered a minor change to the site plan support drawing. If approved, a permit can be issued for relocation. Since the old signs have been taken down, it would be considered a new sign. Mr. Burrow said that they are trying to reduce the clutter by combining the two signs into one, although it was not shown on the site plans. He noted that he has a letter from Mr. Schrock, the owner of the property, stating that he agrees with the relocation. **Motion Action:** Approved **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Tony Campanello, that this request for a major/minor change for lot 3 of the Kuert Kopf DPUD be approved as presented.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

10. ***2014 Budget – Chris Godlewski***

Middlebury Comprehensive Plan was officially adopted by the County Commissioners on July 1st. This was a 2-1/2 year process, initiated by the Town of Middlebury. It encompasses the townships of York, Middlebury and the north 1 mile of Clinton Township. Their comprehensive plan extends into the County, which the County now recognizes for those portions as the Middlebury Comprehensive Plan. He explained that it is recorded and completed. He also noted that this meeting is Sandy Herrli's last meeting, as she will be retiring on July 26, 2013.

Mr. Godlewski noted that there were copies of budgets in their packets. He stated that there were not many changes. The County Commissioners and the County Council put in a 3% pay increase for all County employees, as reflected in the budget. He explained that the 2012 figures are the actual money spent. The 2013 figures show what is budgeted for, but not actually spent yet. He stated that the figure could be 5% lower, which would be typical. He noted that the 2014 budget is proposed, but not approved yet. Regarding capital items, he indicated that there was a request this year for laptop and projector, which have been purchased. Next year they will request the replacement of a scanner and copier in the office, as well as a laminator. This will cost

approximately \$12,000 total. Replacement vehicles will be requested the following two years, 2015 and 2016. Mr. Godlewski stated that there are five budgets including Plan Commission – 132. Roger Miller asked about the reduction in budget for line item 4129, Office & Clerical. Mr. Godlewski responded that revenue was transferred into the Code Enforcement Budget – 131, because a large percent of the clerical help out front is dealing with complaints from the code budget. Therefore, any additional part-time help gets paid out of the Code budget. It will be reflected in the next budget. He stated that it can be followed up next month at the next meeting if there are questions or any recommended changes. Roger Miller asked about the number of vehicles within the department. Mr. Godlewski responded that there are nine, with one spare vehicle due to the retirement of Roy Nichols, who was not replaced. He believes this helps the longevity of vehicles because it allows for rotation of vehicles when needed. Roger Miller asked if vehicle expenses were in the Code Enforcement budget. Mr. Godlewski noted that they are shared between Code Enforcement and Planning. Roger Miller questioned the \$750 amount in line item 4210. Mr. Godlewski explained that it is for one vehicle, a Honda, that does not get driven as much as the inspector's vehicles.

Mr. Godlewski pointed out another change to the budget under Legal Services, item 4301. He noted there is a huge increase, which is misleading. He explained that Mr. Kolbus' pay that comes out of that budget is to serve at the meeting. The remainder of that budget pays Craig Buche to do Redevelopment Commission work. That money is reimbursed from the TIF account. He said this is not a tax on the General Fund. The \$65,000 that Craig Buche is paid is paid through the TIF Funds. He was paid that amount in 2012, this year, and is proposed for next year. There is a lag in catching up with budgeting for it. Out of that account, only about \$7400 comes out of the General Fund. Jim Kolbus gets paid out of Code Enforcement.

Regarding Craig Buche and the Redevelopment Commission, there is a reimbursement agreement. It gets paid out of the General Fund and gets reimbursed from the TIF Fund to the General Fund. It's cyclical so there's really no taxing on the General Fund. Roger Miller asked if the income coming from TIF Fund is indicated as income. Mr. Godlewski stated that it is not income. He explained that there are TIF balances, and one of the line items as an expense is legal fees and that gets paid usually by him to the County General towards the end of the year. The County Auditor understands they are being paid out of the General Fund but they know the reimbursement tends to offset this. Roger Miller noted that the 2014 estimated revenue budget, form 33, reflects \$100,000 to be received from TIF. Mr. Godlewski explained that with revenue, when estimating, it is probably never close because it's hard to know what will be received every year in any account in any fund until close to the end of the year. He stated that revenue is higher this year than it has been last year. It almost doubled what it was in 2011. For purposes, the Auditor just needs a general estimation. He explained that the number is pretty much carried through every year.

Roger Miller pointed out that the budget reflects \$0 revenue from July 1 to December 31, with an estimated increase to \$100,000 for 2014. Mr. Godlewski stated that he is uncertain why the paperwork reflects those numbers and will get back to them with an answer. He said there is nothing new and no new income. Tom Stump stated that he was curious as to why the estimated amount for this year was \$0 and next year's estimate is \$100,000. Mr. Kolbus explained that it could be that the funds come in the Spring, since the budget shows July-December for 2013 versus January-December 2013.

Mr. Kolbus asked if the Board wanted to see any additional information or if they wanted to pass for approval.

Motion Action: Approved **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Doug Miller, that the budget be approved as presented -- with clarification on TIF income.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Warner asked if there was an annual review set to review fees so that they stay current. He stated that in the past they had to make a huge change because they hadn't been done for so long. Chris Godlewski responded that they do not have a review set. He said that fees have always been talked about, with questions about whether they are appropriate, too high, or too low. However, he doesn't recall a discussion concerning an annual review but believes it is a good idea to have a review. Mr. Warner recommends reviewing the fees at least every two years, if not annually. Mr. Godlewski explained that some building department fees had to be changed because there was a new type of inspection required by the State for the energy code. A small fee was added for that change. He stated that there have been no adjustments, with nothing pushing to make it higher or lower. He asked for a proposed time to review those fees. Mr. Warner said that it could be approved at the January meeting when voting for offices takes place, asking that the fees be brought before them with staff recommendation in December. This would allow them time to look at it before voting on it in January. Mr. Kolbus noted that the fees have to relate to the actual costs incurred.

Tom Stump stated that within the last two years, the Building Department went through a review of some fees, along with Elkhart and Goshen in an attempt to have comparable fees. Mr. Stump asked if that might be a good approach to take again, in an attempt to keep similar fees. Mr. Kolbus recommended incorporating that information into a presentation, to see where Elkhart County compares in the chart.

**B. Doriot joined meeting*

11. **Zoning Ordinance Update—Module 2**

Concerning the Zoning Ordinance Update, Mr. Godlewski stated that he had little to add to the discussion this month. He noted that they went through the reviews the past two months with the Power Point in May, and touching on the high points of the Executive Summary in June. He stated that the Policy Committee will wind up the review of Module 2 by the end of next month. It is likely that during September through November, the Policy Committee, Technical Committee, and the Planning Commission will review the combined part Module 1 and 2, Articles 1-5, which would be half of the zoning ordinance. He indicated that he would like to review it again and see it in its final draft form. At that point he would provide a red line draft so it would be possible to see what changes were made from all the discussion, rather than waiting for the very end and then reviewing it all at once. He thought things had been going well so far. Jeff Burbrink commented that he has been sitting in the background watching it happen and they seem to be going through it box by box, with all the zoning categories and uses. He feels that at this point it's pretty detailed and believes that almost everything has been addressed and discussed. He noted that they are putting a lot of thought into it. Mr. Kolbus feels that it has been a very open discussion.

Roger Miller asked if the process is getting streamlined. He was hoping that it would get set up so that there might not quite as many negative thoughts about it. Mr. Burbrink stated that as they are going through the uses, more uses are being permitted, either by right or if they meet

certain conditions. From that standpoint things are being streamlined. He believes there should be less matters coming through the BZA if this is approved. Issues the BZA face all the time are being fixed and issues seen by routinely by the Plan Commission are being fixed with the hopes that these repeating issues won't appear before the board regularly. Chris Godlewski stated that current situations are being addressed and they are attempting to work those in to the draft. A lot more uses are being permitted versus going the route of variance or PUD. The other key thing is it should read better with not as many technical or big compound words. Mr. Warner asked if the majority of the group that started have stayed with the process. Mr. Godlewski said that there is a mixture of 10-11 individuals from the group of 15 individuals who regularly attend the meetings.

Mr. Campanello noted that money savings by doing it in-house, with no consultants. Chris Godlewski agreed but said that one of the effects of doing it in house is it probably takes a bit longer. Mr. Godlewski believes there still may be a point where they want to spend \$10,000 on a consultant to do the graphics for it, like the diagrams and maybe some dimensional tables. Those are the things that are very technical or that he feels would benefit from their expertise.

12. A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Roger Miller and seconded by Tony Campanello. With a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Herrli, Recording Secretary

Teresa McLain, Co-Transcriptionist

Jeff Burbrink, Chairman