Elkhart City Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order by Doug Mulvaney at 6:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT
Schaffer – in person
Stryker – in person
Stewart – in person
Davis – in person
Mulvaney – in person

MEMBERS ABSENT
none

REPRESENTING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Ryan Smith, Planner

LEGAL DEPARTMENT
None

RECORDING SECRETARY
Kathy Kalman

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Davis made motion to approve the agenda, second by Schaffer. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MARCH 12, 2020 MINUTES
Schaffer made motion to approve the March 12, 2020 minutes, second by Stewart. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF PROOFS OF PUBLICATION
Davis made motion to approve Proofs of Publication, second by Schaffer. Motion carried.

Mulvaney made a statement regarding this meeting with people attending via WebEx and Facebook so he will change up the normal procedures. Normally when there are comments for or against a petition, the comments are taken separately. For purposes of Facebook for the comments section, the comments for or against will be combined. Anyone attending the meeting via Facebook should type in their comments. If speaking live in the chambers, please sign your name on the sign in sheet.

OLD BUSINESS

This case is continued from the May 14th meeting.

20-UV-07 PETITIONER IS HOLY TEMPLE INC.
PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 1333 WEST LUSHER AVENUE

To vary from Section 5.2, Permitted Uses in the R-2 District, and Section 8.2, Permitted Uses in the R-5 District, to allow for an existing commercial building to be used as transitional housing (halfway house). Transitional housing (halfway houses) are not allowed by right in either the R-2 or R-5 District.

Mulvaney called the petitioner forward.

Derrick Matthews appearing via WebEx wants the board to approve their motion for transitional housing.

Mulvaney asks Matthews if he has any additional comments to present to the board.

Reverend Stewart said there were some recommendations at last month’s meeting to address some potential concerns the board may have in terms of public safety. He asks if Matthews was able to follow-up on the BZA request to talk with the Police Chief or have a meeting with the local police department to address some safety concerns that were brought up by the members of the board.

Matthews said there was a meeting held a week ago and they invited the community out to address their concerns. There were some supporters that came out. The Elkhart Police Chief came out and the IT person spoke about the security system and there were a few members of the community and pastors in attendance and Matthews explained how they will run the program and how structured it would be and how the safety of the community would be assured.

Mulvaney calls for any questions from the board. Seeing none, he opens the public meeting. If anyone is on Facebook, type in their comments and there will be a slight delay for or against and those will be read into the record. He calls for anyone in attendance to speak for or against this proposal.
Tonda Hines, 6th district city council, appreciates all the time and effort that Mr. Matthews and others on his team have put into this program. It is a well-needed program in the city. She has gotten a few calls about this petition. While the callers appreciated the opportunity to attend the meeting because that hadn’t happened prior to the board asking that to happen, but those same concerns that were raised before are still there. She and Councilman Dawson met with Mr. Matthews and they appreciate that time as well. But it still doesn’t seem the plan is very solid and things are being addressed as questions are being asked. There are concerns that the residents will be housed without supervision. When the question was asked, they were told they will get somebody. She thinks the stability of not knowing that the program is solid before it actually goes in there and not knowing all the unknowns is still unsettling for the neighbors in opposition. She asks that this not be rezoned for that and maybe look in a different area with the proper zoning.

Arvis Dawson, councilman at large, says as Tonda indicated, they met with Mr. Matthews and talked about the program he is proposing. Dawson initially asked for financials to see how the program was going to be able to sustain itself and he has yet to receive those. He says this is the second rezoning for that building and he feels this is unfair to the neighbors because if something doesn’t work and they rezone it and try to get something else to work that’s not fair to the neighbors who have made a significant investment in their homes and their retirements. After visiting the facility, it is pretty small for what they want to do and until councilwoman Hines really asked the question as to whether or not someone would be there for 24-hour supervision, they hadn’t thought about that and their answer was they would hire somebody part time to come in and do that. The person on-staff is there for clerical purposes and Dawson doesn’t know if they have training of any sorts with a re-entry program and that is a concern. The neighbors, they are still not happy with what is being proposed and they feel uneasy and uncomfortable about it. After meeting there, he and Hines have those same concerns and they are not prepared for what the possible questions could be. They are not prepared for the possible concerns and problems they might have. They may only have a clerical person there in the daytime and not anyone on professional staff that can deal with people going into re-entry. When they met there they were never given anything in writing, they would ask a question and their questions were answered. He asks if the board has seen any plans or just the petition. He admires their efforts and he thinks this is something needed in the community, but he feels this is not the neighborhood that needs it and the neighbors believe that as well. He respectfully asks that the board not approve this petition on behalf of himself and the neighbors to ensure their safety and that these taxpayers will receive the type of service they need from the BZA. They believe this is not the type of entity they want in that neighborhood and he supports that. He admires the cause but it is just not something that to him has been thought out or prepared for what could actually happen.

Mulvaney calls for anyone else wishing to speak in favor or against this proposal. He will keep this open for anyone online. Comments will be read into the record.

Mulvaney says if anyone is watching by video or WebEx, ask to join by audio or video.

Jerri Barnett spoke via WebEx and she is a property owner at 1303 West Lusher which is immediately adjacent to this property that is seeking another rezoning. She was at the meeting on Thursday and the vast majority of the residents that live and pay taxes in that area were opposed to having this facility in their neighborhood. They have a large elderly population and a lot of children in that neighborhood as well and they don’t want this facility in their neighborhood. Her family has been on Lusher since 1953 and they are the first family that lived there. She played in the fields there. To see how that neighborhood has been able to sustain itself over the years is wonderful and they don’t want this type of facility in their neighborhood. She went to the meeting hoping that she would have a written proposal of what was planned so she would be well informed as to why she objects but there was no documentation that she could read regarding security and the size of the facility which seems inadequate for the area. Everything was verbal, there was not a well thought out plan to present to the neighbor group. There is a large senior population in that area that pay taxes over the years and they have worked hard to keep that neighborhood where people want to live there and raise their families there. They do not want this facility coming into that area. Her position is for the board to vote no on this petition.

Mulvaney calls for anyone wishing to speak in favor or against. Seeing none, he asks Mr. Matthews for his comments.

Matthews says the first comment about safety and security is that they will have third shift there from 9:30 pm to 7:00 am. All participants will work first shift. After the third shift staff checks in at 9:30 and checks in the men by 10 and the first shift comes in at 7 and gets off at 2:30 when they have Elkhart police zoning and a camera system and Mathews will be with the participants. When it comes to property, his father has owned property at 1313 Concord Avenue for over 50 years. He also owns a house around the corner off of Fieldhouse and they feel that the property value would not go down. Also, with the support letters that will be read on their behalf, he feels that this program will be successful and it’s a good thing for the community.

Mulvaney calls for any further Facebook comments. Seeing none, he closes the public hearing and calls staff forward.

STAFF ANALYSIS
The petitioner is a church, Holy Temple Church in Christ, at 2205 Oakland Ave. The church owns an existing commercial building nearby at 1333 W. Lusher. The building is approximately 2,500 square feet and the parcel is approximately .7 acres with a 21-space parking lot. The building has previously been used as a bank and as a daycare center.

Holy Temple would like to use the building as an 8-bunk halfway house for men recently released from prison. Tenants would be screened and are anticipated to live in the facility for 9-18 months. Two staff members would be present for 8 hours a day, with the building under 24-hour camera surveillance. Tenants would be required to have first-shift jobs and would be responsible for maintaining the living space and conducting typical daily chores such as cooking and laundry. Staff has experience working in this capacity, and life skills classes such as personal finance and job search will be available. Some tenants may participate in programs at Oaklawn.

While the property is located in a residential neighborhood, it is a relatively low density neighborhood and the building and parking lot are located a distance from nearby residences. Care should be taken to buffer the property from those adjacent.
The petitioner is currently working with the Building and Fire Departments to ensure the formerly commercial building meets code as a residential facility. Both departments should approve of the building for its proposed use prior to occupancy.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
The Staff recommends approval of the use variance based on the following findings of fact:

1. Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community because there is a distance between this property and adjacent properties;
2. Use and value of the area adjacent will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner because all activities will remain on-site and the property will be buffered from adjacent properties;
3. The need for the variance does arise from some condition peculiar to the property;
4. The strict application of the terms of this Ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought because it limits the use of the property without board action;
5. The approval of this variance will be consistent with the comprehensive plan which calls for this area to be developed with low density residential uses.

**CONDITIONS**
If the Board chooses to approve the requested special exception, staff recommends that the following conditions be placed upon the approval:

1. The petitioner must obtain clearance from the Building and Fire Departments to use the building as a residential halfway house.
2. A six-foot privacy fence shall be installed along the southern and eastern property edges as permitted by ordinance to buffer the property from adjacent residences.

Smith says the staff report was read in full last month and has not changed so he will forgo re-reading it. He will get into the comments that were received and since this was re-advertised and re-sent public notices which gave people the opportunity to respond he will only read the new comments.

Smith says there were 32 letters sent, four received in favor with comments and he notes those are the four letters Mr. Mathews mentioned previously and five received not in favor of which one has comments.

In favor comments:

1) **RE: Project SCOPE, Transitional Housing**

The Center for Community Justice's Transitional & Recovery Coaching (TRC) program whole-heartedly supports the efforts of Project SCOPE to provide stable housing to those in our community who are in desperate need of stability in their lives. As an individual who has worked with justice-involved men and women for over 15 years, I have become aware of the immense importance stable housing plays in the journeys of those who are in transition and/or recovery. Please, read the following statement from a report published by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice:

"Housing serves a basic human need and further the American value of redemption, affording the justice-involved a home that gives them the footing they need to find jobs, connect with family, complete community supervision, build a supportive social network, receive necessary services and pursue education." (2017)

Evidence-based practice reveals that when a community provides stable, supportive housing for those most in need, that community becomes a safer place to live for everyone. Therefore, I encourage you to support Project SCOPE and this much needed endeavor, not just to increase the stability of a few individuals — even though that would be reason enough — but to ultimately increase the stability of our community.

Respectfully submitted
Do d E. French, OWDS, APRC dfrench@ccjelkhart.org

2) **Unity Church of God in Christ**
W. Wolf Ave. Elkhart, IN. 46516
Admin. Asst., Supt. William C. Hackworth Sr., Pastor

To whom it may concern;

I am submitting this letter in reference to a Men's Transitional Living Facility to be located on Lasher Ave.

I personally believe that given the right resources and guidance that these men can be worked back into society and become productive.

This facility to my knowledge will set in force rules and regulations to be in regards to the residents, I'm also informed that a staff will be formed to provide around the clock presence with the residents,

I'm asking those concerned and involved would consider the vision of this location to be a help to men of lower case crimes be given the opportunity to be worked back into society through this facility.

Sincerely,
3) Dear Board Members:

On the afternoon of Tuesday, June 9, 2020, I had the opportunity to meet with Derrick Mathews of SCOPE, located at 1333 West Lusher Avenue, in regard to a proposed transitional housing project.

During our meeting, Mr. Matthews showed me around the building, both inside and out, as he described his vision, including layout, structure and security of the transitional housing project. While not related to law enforcement, we also discussed other details, such as the allowable number of occupants for a residence of that size, and how many restrooms and shower facilities are required for a residence of that size.

We than went on to discuss some of the great things I have seen resulting from a project like this. It should come as no surprise to hear that one of the failures of the criminal justice system is lack of housing and programing for individuals being released from incarceration. Just last week I heard of two individuals who were released from incarceration and dropped on the streets of Elkhart with no place to stay and no means of income. It is my belief that transitional housing and relevant programs are a must for those being released from incarceration if we, as society, expect those being released to be productive members of society.

Not all, but many being released from incarceration are left with only the items they have on their person when released: no home, no belongings, no job, and often, no dignity. SCOPE Transitional Housing will provide some of these individuals with a place to stay, rather than on our streets or at homeless centers. It will also provide job skills and training, allowing them the opportunity to support themselves as well as acquire belongings and a support network helping them to rebuild their dignity.

The final part of our conversation was how the Elkhart Police Department could be part of their programing. Mr. Matthews is committed to involving the police department in their programing so that residents understand police practices and policies, and so that police officers better understand the concerns and needs of the community we serve.

As our community continues to grow and become more diversified we must find ways to better ourselves and those around us. SCOPE Transitional Housing, as presented to me, will help our community grow, become self-supported, better educated and more unified.

Respectfully,

Chris Snyder
Chief of Police

4) To whom it may concern:

My name is Keith Fox and I am an assistant chaplain at the Elkhart County Jail. I also serve as treasurer for the chaplaincy board.

I have personally worked with several inmates both while they were incarcerated and after their release. I attend River Oaks Community Church and we have a jail ministry team that has assisted inmates with housing and other essential needs when they are released.

I recently became acquainted with Project SCOPE and am impressed with the program and the leadership Derrick Matthews is providing.

I am currently working with a former inmate who is struggling to find clean, affordable housing that is focused on helping him re-enter society.

As a jail chaplaincy board we have wrestled with the housing challenges for former inmates and have actually purchased some houses designated for inmates once they get released.

So for all the aforementioned reasons I whole heartily support and encourage you to allow the zoning necessary for the house to open.

Thank you

Respectfully Submitted.

Keith Fox

Not in favor comments:

Again I say that our neighborhood has been a family structure area for years and I am opposed to the idea of a transitional type of housing being considered for this area, if transitional housing by right is not allowed in the R-2 or R-5 district why even consider allowing it to happen.

Mulvaney calls for any questions for staff.

Schaffer asks in which zoning district would this be allowed.

Smith says it is not explicitly allowed in any zoning district. There are special exceptions for group homes and assisted living that tend to be in residential districts. They felt this was a little bit different proposal so they took it in as a variance.
Schaffer says no matter what this property was zoned, it would be a use variance based on your interpretation of the ordinance.

Smith says yes.

Schaffer apologizes for putting Smith on the spot because there is no one from the legal department in attendance. Some variances will have a review time on them that it comes back to the board in 24 or 36 months for review so can the BZA make a condition.

Smith says yes, that can be added as a condition.

Mulvaney says that could be a condition of approval.

Smith says the board can add that.

Mulvaney calls for any further questions for staff. Seeing none, he calls for a motion with a refresher course on making a motion. Every vote to either affirm or deny has to be a vote in the affirmative. In other words, if this is a vote to approve, it is all aye. If there is a vote to deny, they have to take a vote first in the affirmative and if that is denied then a second vote to deny it and that is an affirmative vote.

Mulvaney calls for a motion.

Stewart calls for point of order. He reads his prepared statement addressed to his fellow board members and members of city government in attendance and to his fellow citizens of Elkhart. In this particular variance, the board has to balance the needs of the few vs. the needs of the many. To speak of the potential risk that a few men at a time may pose to our community of which he is personally a resident, as they try to put their lives back together in a structured, secured and safe environment and the possible loss of a few thousand dollars of property value vs. the gain of rehabilitated men who are working, paying taxes to the city, rebuilding broken relationships with children and family and given a chance to live productive lives is what shared community responsibility is all about. The city has to share equally in the burden of re-entry to community as other cities of comparable size in our county are already demonstrating. The potential value that this program offers for us to uphold the promise of our justice system which gives men and women the right to try and re-enter society after paying their debt to that society is as democratic as the right to vote. Denying this program when there is need for such a thing in our community is just unjust on many levels. For that reason, he wants to strongly urge the board to consider the potential that this program has to be a benefit to our community. Thank you.

Mulvaney thanks Stewart and calls for a motion.

Schaffer made motion to approve 20-UV-07 and adopt the staff conditions and adopt an additional condition that the board would review this as a staff item 24 months from June 11, 2020, second by Stewart.

Schaffer – Yes
Stryker – Yes
Stewart – Yes
Davis – No
Mulvaney – Yes

Motion carried four to one.

NEW BUSINESS:

20-BZA-14 PETITIONER IS JULIA STECH
PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 2846 OLD US 20
An amendment to variance 19-BZA-42, which granted a variance from the Yard Requirements, Section 19.6, in the M-I, Limited Manufacturing District of eighteen (18) feet where twenty-five (25) feet is required in the front yard, for an existing building. The actual setback is fourteen (14) feet, a variance of eleven (11) feet from the requirement and a change of four (4) feet from 19-BZA-42.

Mulvaney calls the petitioner forward.

Stephanie Floyd of Progressive Engineering represents the petitioner. There was an error in the original petition application in the amount of footage from the road to the building, so she is here to correct that so their reference will reflect the right measurements.

Mulvaney asks if this is to approve the addition that they approved in a variance before. He comments that a nice job has been done on the building.

Floyd says yes.

Mulvaney calls for questions from the board. Seeing none, he calls for anyone wishing to speak in favor or against this petition. If anyone is on Facebook type your comments and if you are on WebEx, you can speak or type your comments. Seeing none, closes public meeting and calls staff forward.

STAFF ANALYSIS
On October 10, 2019, the BZA approved variance number 19-BZA-42, which in part sanctioned a nonconforming front setback on an existing building. However, there was an error in the application; the setback that was requested and granted was eighteen (18) feet. A surveyor subsequently confirmed that the setback was actually fourteen (14) feet. Since part of the plan for this property is to build a substantial addition to this nonconforming building,
the actual setback needs to be approved before permits for the addition can be issued. The petitioner is therefore requesting an amendment to 19-BZA-42 to approve a fourteen (14) foot existing setback. Staff’s position is again to recommend approval.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The Staff recommends approval of the developmental variance based on the following findings of fact:

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals or general welfare of the community because the existing setbacks poses no threat to public health, safety, morals, or the general welfare of the community and the addition will be required to meet all applicable building and code regulations;
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner because the setbacks of the structure from the property lines are not changing;
3. Granting the variance would be consistent with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance because approval of the variance would allow for a reasonable addition to the structure and would not increase non-conformity;
4. Special conditions and circumstances do exist which include the existence of this structure prior to the adoption of current developmental standards;
5. The strict application of the terms of this Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property because it will prevent any modifications to the footprint of the building;
6. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from an action or inaction by the applicant;
7. This property does not lie within a designated flood area.

Smith states there were 20 letters mailed, one returned in favor with no comment, and one returned not in favor with no comment.

Mulvaney calls for further questions for staff. Seeing none, he calls for a motion.

Schaffer made motion to approve 20-BZA-14, second by Strycker.

Schaffer – Yes
Strycker – Yes
Stewart – Yes
Davis – Yes
Mulvaney – Yes

Motion carried.

**20-BZA-15 PETITIONER IS JOE LIDY**

**PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 1201 RICHMOND STREET**

Per Section 13.4, the required setback for a principal building from the front property line is 30 feet; petitioner seeks a setback of zero feet from property line, a variance of 30 feet;

Per Section 13.4, the required setback for a principal building from the rear property line is 20 feet; petitioner seeks a setback of 10 feet from property line, a variance of 10 feet;

Per Section 13.4, the required setback for a principal building from the side property line is 10 feet; petitioner seeks a setback of zero feet from property line, a variance of 10 feet;

Per Section 13.4, the maximum lot coverage for structures is 50 percent; petitioner seeks a lot coverage of 53 percent, a variance of 3 percent;

Per Section 26.7.D Schedule of Off-Street Parking Space Requirements; petitioner is seeking exemption from parking requirements.

These variances are requested in anticipation of a subdivision being filed by the petitioner.

Mulvaney calls petitioner forward.

Stephanie Floyd from Progressive Engineering gives the history of the building’s use and the business known as Wheelchair Help. The owner had plans to rent or sell part of the building, and that is when the city discovered multiple issues that need to be corrected. The petitioner is in communication with the city and an engineer to try and fix a lot of these issues which means bringing it into compliance with many variances so he can continue to rehab the building; he does not want to demolish the site or get rid of the building. He thinks it is part of the community and he wants to restore as much as possible. He plans on keeping part of the facility for himself to store the wheelchairs for his business as he has run out of space at his other building. He would like to have the extra storage and he still plans on selling half of the site or renting it for a retail space such as a heating and cooling business.

Schaffer explains that the variances they are asking for are not necessarily an issue but the splitting of the building is and they have a while to go before the city staff is comfortable with that.

Floyd says that is correct. The owner is working with a structural engineer and she has had multiple conversations on where they feel things should move. The last she heard is the engineer and Mr. Lidy are working on the structural issues that the city has proposed to him.
Mulvaney remarks on the two conditions by the staff in terms of making the building safe and habitable and meeting all applicable zoning, building and code enforcement regulations and to get a revocable permit to allow parking to occur in the right of way.

Floyd assures the board that the petitioner does know the conditions and is agreeable.

Mulvaney calls for any further questions from the board. Seeing none, he calls for anyone wishing to speak in favor or against the petition. Seeing none, he closes public comment and calls staff forward.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**
The petitioner owns an existing, legal nonconforming lot and wishes to subdivide the lot to create three parcels. The existing lot is nonconforming in terms of its setbacks along the front, north, and rear property lines. In 1995, the petitioner received a revocable permit for an encroachment 5.5' into the right-of-way at a length of 46' and a height of 15' to consist of stairs, landing, ramp and canopy on the 500 block of Congress St. on the north side of the complex. The petitioner also received a variance in 1995 to reduce the required parking by 30, reduce the required front yard and corner side yard setbacks by 25' on Richmond and Congress Streets, and to vary the 50-feet corner visibility triangle setback by 8'.

The proposed subdivision would split the building in two, creating a warehouse and a service office amenable to a repair or other service industry on two properties, thus enabling the sale of the two parcels separately.

Access from Congress Street to Lots 1 and 3 will be maintained by easements across Lot 2. Lots 2 and 3 also front on right-of-way parking on Richmond. Lot 3 also has four parking spaces accessible via Richmond Street. Currently there are ten off-street spaces for the entire property, with approximately 13 front right-of-way spaces and additional on-street parking on Congress. While there is currently adequate parking due in large part to the public parking on Richmond, there is no guarantee that the parking there will remain in perpetuity, as right-of-way configurations may change over time.

Additionally, the building in its current condition has been deemed unsafe by the City’s Building and Code Enforcement Department. The applicant has stated his intent to restore the building; however, as of the writing of this report no plans have been received on how to do so. Additionally, the building does not have the interior divisions that would be required to split it between multiple properties. Staff recommends approval of the variances, with the condition that the building be approved as safe and divisible before either the variance or the subdivision may take effect.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
The Staff recommends approval of the developmental variance based on the following findings of fact:

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals or general welfare of the community because the request does not entail any physical changes to the building;
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner because the building is not being expanded;
3. Granting the variance would be consistent with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance because nonconforming structures are required to come into compliance only when a significant investment is made;
4. Special conditions and circumstances do exist which are peculiar to the land involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the same district because it was developed prior to the current setback requirements;
5. The strict application of the terms of this Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property because it places constraints upon development;
6. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from an action or inaction by the applicant because the structure was pre-existing;
7. This property does not lie within a designated flood area.

**CONDITIONS**
If the Board chooses to approve the requested variance, staff recommends that the following conditions be placed upon the approval:

1. The buildings on-site must be deemed safe and habitable, and able to be divided along the proposed lot lines, by the City of Elkhart Building and Code Enforcement Department, before the variance or subdivision will take effect. Failure to do so within two (2) years of variance approval will render the variance null and void.
2. The petitioner must obtain from the Board of Works a revocable permit to allow for parking for the use situated on this property to continue to occur in the right-of-way.

Smith states there were 28 letters mailed, two returned in favor with no comments, three returned not in favor, two with comments.

The first comment was not in favor because of inconsistent parking practices. The second comment was not in favor because of the building's consistent state of disrepair and neglect.

Mulvaney calls for any further questions for staff. Seeing none, he calls for a motion.

Davis made motion to approve 20-BZA-15 and include the staff conditions, second by Stewart.

Schaffer – No
Stryker – No
Stewart – Yes
Davis – Yes
Mulvaney – Yes

Motion carried three to two.
STAFF ITEMS
None.

ADJOURNMENT
Davis made motion to adjourn, second by Schaffer. Motion carried.

_____________________________  ________________________________
Doug Mulvany, Chair             Ron Davis, Vice Chair