

The Regular Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Waller at 7:30 p.m. on July 13, 2004, in the Council Chambers of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Gary Chamberlain
Lawrence Littman
Robert Schultz
Thomas Strat
Mark J. Vleck
David T. Waller

Absent:

Lynn Drake-Batts
Fazal Khan
Wayne Wright

Also Present:

Mark F. Miller, Planning Director
Allan Motzny, Assistant City Attorney
Howard Wu, Student Representative
Kathy Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

Resolution # PC-2004-07-072

Moved by: Chamberlain
Seconded by: Schultz

RESOLVED, That Members Drake-Batts, Khan and Wright be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Yes: All present (6)
No: None
Absent: Drake-Batts, Khan, Wright

MOTION CARRIED

2. MINUTES

Resolution # PC-2004-07-073

Moved by: Chamberlain
Seconded by: Schultz

RESOLVED, To approve the June 22, 2004 Special/Study Meeting minutes as published.

Yes: Chamberlain, Schultz, Strat, Waller
No: None
Abstain: Littman, Vleck
Absent: Drake-Batts, Khan, Wright

MOTION CARRIED

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no one present who wished to speak.

SITE CONDOMINIUM SITE PLANS

4. SITE PLAN REVIEW – Proposed Presidential Place Site Condominium, 5 units/lots proposed, West side of John R, North of Square Lake, Section 2 – R-1D

Mr. Miller presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the proposed Presidential Place Site Condominium. Mr. Miller reported that it is the recommendation of the Planning Department to approve the preliminary site condominium plan as submitted, subject to three conditions: (1) construction of a 5-foot wide concrete sidewalk, designed and constructed to City standards, within the 5-foot wide sidewalk easement; (2) that the petitioner obtain an MDEQ Wetlands Permit or Jurisdictional Wetland Determination Document stating authoritative status prior to Final Approval; and (3) that the petitioner create a general common area to replace the recreation easement that provides access to the pond and gazebo.

Mr. Schultz questioned the limited space remaining with respect to the 25-foot front setback and the required 5-foot sidewalk, and asked if the building could be pushed back to eliminate the possibility of parked cars on the sidewalk.

Mr. Miller replied that the 25-foot setback is the City's current standard.

Mr. Chamberlain expressed concern with the designated trees on the preliminary tree preservation plan. He said he would not vote favorably on the site plan unless the trees were removed from the tree preservation plan.

Mr. Miller said the preliminary tree plan is in essence only a tree inventory, and it is at the discretion of the Commission to remove the trees from the tree preservation plan at this time. Mr. Miller noted the petitioner would be required to remove the trees from the plan prior to getting final site plan approval.

Mr. Chamberlain expressed concern that a potential dam could be created with the fill dirt that would be necessary for the proposed development, and said this is a good example that final grading plans should be required for site plan approval.

Mr. Miller replied that the petitioner's engineer would address this concern.

Mr. Strat questioned why the recommendations of the City's Environmental Specialist have not been incorporated in the site plan; i.e., bio retention in the center aisle. He said the plan shows no creativity with respect to the retention pond.

Chair Waller questioned the location of the required 8-foot sidewalk.

Mr. Miller clarified that the 8-foot sidewalk is along John R and the 5-foot sidewalk is within the interior roads.

Chair Waller shared information with respect to new ideas on storm water detention. He proposed that the petitioner contact the Planning Department with respect to incorporating the new ideas in the development of the project's storm water detention.

There was a brief discussion on the site plan designation of "detention" and the Engineering Department's recommendation of a "retention" pond. Mr. Miller said he would check the original Engineering Department review and confirm the correct designation.

Bill Mosher of Apex Engineering, 47745 Van Dyke, Shelby Township, was present on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Mosher confirmed that the site plan shows the sidewalk easement on the outside of the 40-foot private road easement. Mr. Mosher said a wetlands permit would be obtained, and noted that a previous MDEQ letter of no authority had expired. Mr. Mosher said the plan would be revised to include a general common area instead of the recreational component. To address the setback concerns, Mr. Mosher said it would be possible to impose a 30-foot setback on Lots 1 and 2, but not on Lots 3, 4, and 5. Mr. Mosher said the designated trees would be removed from the tree preservation plan. He also addressed the grading issues and stated he would work with the Engineering Department to insure that the detention is sufficient. Further, Mr. Mosher said he would work on a creative concept for the proposed detention pond.

Mr. Miller reported that the Engineering Department's review specifically states "retention", not "detention". The Engineering Department's review states there is a lack of drainage capacity on John R and notes there are no planned improvements until the year 2008 or later.

Discussion followed with respect to maintaining the pond as a retention pond, once improvements are completed on John R.

Mr. Mosher said he would like to keep the pond dry and the building envelopes as large as possible, and noted there is a detention facility at the fire station. Mr. Mosher said he would work with the Engineering Department on a complete evaluation of the storm water detention.

Mr. Strat asked if the petitioner would come back to the Planning Commission for resubmission of site plan approval should the preliminary engineering requirements change.

Mr. Mosher answered in the affirmative. He stated that a condition of the Condominium Act is to review some forms of drainage and lot configurations. Mr. Mosher said that should the Engineering Department not waive the requirement for a retention facility, there would be changes in the layout and it would be necessary to re-evaluate the plan.

Chair Waller asked if it is reasonable to have the City review the fire station retention pond at the same time.

Mr. Miller replied that a request could be made to the Engineering Department.

Discussion continued on the grades.

Mr. Mosher said he would do whatever is necessary to get the project going; i.e., bio swales, catch basin, etc.

Chair Waller opened the floor for public comment.

Leonid Shashlo of 6336 Atkins Drive, Troy, was present. Mr. Shashlo voiced his objections to the proposed development. He said Unit #5 of the proposed development is too close to his property. Mr. Shashlo expressed concern for the young children playing near two roads and the potential to destroy the existing environment and wildlife.

Jerry Slywka of 6322 Atkins Drive, Troy, was present. Mr. Slywka has been a Troy resident for 25 years. Mr. Slywka bought the property in 1969 and sold the property to Mr. Haddad approximately six or seven years ago. Mr. Slywka said Mr. Haddad promised to build two nice houses on the property for his sons. Mr. Slywka protested strongly to the proposed development because of potential danger to the existing environment, nature and wildlife. Mr. Slywka voiced concerns that the sump pumps would be connected to the pond. He asked that the 17-foot pond not be touched because it provides clean water for his children and grandchildren to swim in. Mr. Slywka questioned the logic of the City that it placed such strong restrictions on the quality of water when he created the pond, but has no interest in the water quality with the proposed development. Mr. Slywka said the proposed development would affect his life and the lives of his neighbors, children and grandchildren. Further, Mr. Slywka questioned the size of the lots in relation to the size of the homes, and encouraged the City to impose soil and boring tests on the property.

Chair Waller explained that the petitioner is proposing to create a pond for aesthetic pleasure and the pond would not be used for water sports or anything similar. Chair Waller confirmed that a wetlands report would be provided. He also stated that a

natural features ordinance proposed several years ago was not passed because the majority of residents were in opposition to it.

Mr. Vleck clarified that (1) there is no rezoning request on the subject parcel; (2) the proposed development is on the petitioner's property and not on anybody else's property; (3) the Planning Commission does not have the authority to deviate from the requirements set forth by the City; and (4) the petitioner has met all of the City codes and requirements.

Kinette Bayliss, owner of 2.5 acres of property located to the south of the proposed development, Sidwell No. 88-20-02-427-007, was present. Ms. Bayliss is very concerned about the development of the property. She said it was her understanding that the property would remain as two residential lots after it was sold. She questioned how the property could go from two residential lots to five lots without the property getting rezoned. Ms. Bayliss said her concerns are similar to the concerns expressed by Mr. Slywka; i.e., sump pump run-off into the pond and the clean water in the pond for recreational purposes. She said that she and Mr. Slywka developed the pond to be what it is and it is very important to them that the pond water remains the same. She asked for an explanation why the City would go from all wetlands to constructing condominiums.

Mr. Miller provided a brief explanation of the R-1D zoning district and its requirements and provisions for development.

Ms. Bayliss asked if there was a capacity requirement for the use of the pond.

Chair Waller announced that the floor at tonight's meeting is the wrong forum to discuss the pond. He said that any concern about the quality of the pond and whether or not the sump pumps from Lots 4 and 5 might be directed toward the pond is something that should be negotiated with the property owner. Chair Waller said that concerns should be brought to the attention of the City Council. He explained that the decision made tonight by the Planning Commission is only a recommendation to the City Council for its review and approval. Chair Waller stated that Mr. Haddad owns part of the pond and Ms. Bayliss can only wish that the future property owners would have her passion for its quality. Chair Waller assisted Ms. Bayliss in locating the retention pond on the proposed site plan in relation to her property.

Mr. Chamberlain said his sump pump drains into the storm system, and he presumes that is how sump pumps are in operation today.

Mr. Miller agreed. Mr. Miller further advised the Planning Commission to strike the notation on the site plan that relates to the discharge of the sump pumps to Lots 4 and 5. He stated that the information is extraneous at this time.

Priscilla King of 6310 Atkins, Troy, was present. Ms. King said the Planning Commission informed her the property could not be developed because it was

wetlands. Ms. King strongly objected to the proposed development, and stated that her husband spent years trying to improve the property.

The floor was closed.

Resolution # PC-2004-07-074

Moved by: Vleck
Seconded by: Littman

RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission recommends to City Council, that the Preliminary Site Plan (Section 34.30.00 Unplatted One-Family Residential Development), as requested for Presidential Place Site Condominium, including 5 units, located on the west side of John R Road and north of Square Lake Road, Section 2, within the R-1D zoning district be granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. Construction of a 5-foot wide concrete sidewalk, designed and constructed to City standards, within the 5-foot wide sidewalk easement.
2. The petitioner obtain an MDEQ Wetlands Permit or Jurisdictional Wetland Determination Document stating authoritative status, prior to Final Approval.
3. The petitioner create a general common area to replace the recreation easement that provides access to the pond and gazebo.
4. That all existing illegal trees on the property will be removed.
5. That the note on the drawing that states "sump pump discharge directly to pond for Units 4 and 5 will be removed.
6. That the design recommendations provide that the petitioner will duly note all drainage concern for neighboring properties and plan for adequate drainage.

Discussion on the motion.

Mr. Littman requested that the motion be amended to reflect the site plan designation of a "retention" pond, as recommended by the Engineering Department.

Mr. Miller explained the difference between a detention pond and a retention pond. He said detention pond water is detained and slowly released so there is not a quick flash of water that would overburden the storm water drainage system. Retention pond water is retained and in essence is a wet pond. Mr. Miller noted that not all storm water drainage systems are City owned; that the County owns some of the systems.

Mr. Vleck recommended the site maintain a detention pond because the fire station has an existing detention pond and a retention pond with its standing water would create a risk factor for West Nile Virus.

Vote on the motion on the floor, as moved and seconded.

Yes: Chamberlain, Littman, Schultz, Vleck, Waller
No: Strat
Absent: Drake-Batts, Khan, Wright

MOTION CARRIED/DENIED

Mr. Strat stated his reasons for not voting in favor of the motion. He feels (1) the final engineering has not been provided to determine exactly the size of the detention pond or retention pond; (2) the wetlands report might affect the final layout of the design of the site and the plan might have to return to the Planning Commission for a second approval; (3) the plan does not protect the value of the adjacent property owners; and (4) there is a lack of innovative design and bio retention, as indicated by the City's Environmental Specialist review comments.

Members Chamberlain and Strat encouraged the residents to voice their objections to the City Council.

Mr. Miller said the item most likely would be on the City Council agenda at their 2nd meeting in August or their 1st meeting in September. Mr. Miller confirmed that abutting property owners would be notified.

[Student Representative Howard Wu joined the meeting]

5. SITE PLAN REVIEW – Proposed Timbercrest Estates Site Condominium, 11 units/lots proposed, South side of Wattles, West of Fernleigh, Section 24 – R-1C

Mr. Miller presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the proposed Timbercrest Estates Site Condominium. Mr. Miller noted that the Planning Department recognizes the potential for future development on parcels to the south and west, and the Planning Department has worked with the petitioner to create a layout that would include a stub street to the south property line that would allow for the extension of further development. Mr. Miller reported that it is the recommendation of the Planning Department to approve the preliminary site condominium plan as submitted.

Mr. Chamberlain said the Planning Commission should be advised on the potential development of surrounding properties in relation to proposed projects. Mr. Chamberlain noted there is a potential curb cut on Wattles Road should the property to the west of the proposed development be developed, and it is very important to the Commission how that property to the west might be developed.

Mr. Miller said his research showed the property to the west as an old outlot that runs one-half mile to the south and the majority of the property is owned by the

State of Michigan. Mr. Miller reported that the City has a long history of asking petitioners to provide information on potential development of surrounding properties, but there is no requirement. He noted there is a requirement in the Subdivision Ordinance to provide information on potential development of large tracts of unplatted land. Mr. Miller apologized for the Planning Department's error in not providing information on the potential development of the 160-foot wide property to the west. Mr. Miller said the matter was discussed with the petitioner, and indicated the petitioner may be able to address it further. He said the Planning Department could prepare alternate layouts for the surrounding area for a future study meeting, should the Commission desire. Mr. Miller said the City should provide a means for future development in the rear portions that front Fernleigh.

Mr. Chamberlain pointed out that the Planning Department should have on file how this particular piece of property could be developed before the item is forwarded to the City Council for review and approval.

Discussion continued on the potential development of the property to the west with respect to different design layouts, emergency access, additional access points, and a boulevard entrance.

Nader Wehbe of Beckman Wehbe Corp., 25775 W. Ten Mile Road, Southfield, and Ben Gill of Chesterfield Building, 31125 Westwood, Farmington Hills, were present.

Mr. Wehbe commented on the access situation and alternate layouts. He said he worked closely with the Planning Department, and it is the preference of the Planning Department to provide the stub road because it would create many possibilities to extend the road for future development.

Mr. Gill stated that negotiations with the owner to purchase the property to the west were unsuccessful.

Chair Waller opened the floor for public comment.

Claude Vidal of 2506 E. Wattles Road, Troy, was present. Mr. Vidal is the owner of the property to the west and has lived there for 52 years. He said that is the reason he asked such an exorbitant purchase price. Mr. Vidal said he does not appreciate the Commission dissecting his property and telling him how it should be developed. Mr. Vidal said there is a retention pond on the DNR strip, and asked if he would really have to look out his front window at the proposed project's retention pond that would be located directly next door and in the front of his house. Mr. Vidal stated that he had a speech prepared but implied he was too emotional to present it.

Stephen Munteer of 3845 Fernleigh Drive, Troy, was present. Mr. Munteer said his home is at the southeast corner of the proposed development. Mr. Munteer expressed concerns with the potential traffic and safety issues that would result from the proposed development. He said currently it is almost impossible to exit onto Wattles Road, in either direction, during morning traffic. He expressed concerns with

the potential widening of Wattles Road, and noted that the proposed development is at the narrowest part of the Wattles Road. Mr. Mounteer said he would like to see lower density on the development or improvement to the traffic flow from the property.

Pat O'Donnell of 3951 Fernleigh, Troy, was present. Ms. O'Donnell expressed her objection to the proposed development because it appears to be too high of a density for the space available, and she believes it would take away from the atmosphere of the neighborhood. Ms. O'Donnell also asked for information on the widening of Wattles Road to five lanes.

Mr. Miller replied that the ultimate right of way for Wattles Road is 120 feet wide, which would accommodate a five-lane road. Mr. Miller informed Ms. O'Donnell to contact the Engineering Department for the improvement schedule for Wattles Road.

Max Akins of 2545 E. Wattles Road, Troy, was present. Mr. Akins said he does not want to look at a retention pond across from his house, which is where the proposed retention pond would be located. He asked how the City would widen Wattles Road at that particular point and expressed concerns with the remaining frontage of his home.

A short discussion followed on the future widening of Wattles Road.

Mr. Wehbe responded to the concerns expressed on the retention pond. He said the proposed retention basin is 3 feet high with a 1:6 slope, unfenced and well landscaped. Mr. Wehbe said the retention pond would look like a depression on the ground, and would fill up with water only during rain events. Mr. Wehbe confirmed the detention pond would be conveyed to the City for maintenance purposes.

Chair Waller announced that any drainage concerns should be brought to the attention of the Planning Department or Engineering Department.

Mr. Strat asked if the petitioner proposed to do the landscaping as indicated on the plan, approximately 4 feet deep.

Mr. Wehbe answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Vleck directed comments to the resident who owns the property to the west. He said the reason the Commission would like to be advised of future development is that should the property be sold, the Commission must take into consideration what may happen in the future, and that the Commission tries to design as best it can for future development. The Commission's concern in looking at the property to west is whether or not the street layout would accommodate possible future developments.

Mr. Littman requested an explanation on the location of the retention basin.

Mr. Wehbe responded that the property is considered fairly level, and the retention basin is best positioned at the outlet in the corner of the property. He said also that its location near a public road is best for overflow purposes. Mr. Wehbe said that

everything on site would stay on sight, inclusive of landscaping and trees, and the run-off water would be collected in the underground storm system.

Mr. Schultz apologized to the property owner to the west if there was a misunderstanding. He said the Commission is not indicating that his property must be developed. Mr. Schultz explained that it is in the best, long-term interest of the property owner that he/she is not left with an undevelopable piece of property.

Mr. Strat asked if the Planning Department received any specific comments on the proposed development from the Environmental Specialist.

Mr. Miller replied that the only comment from the Environmental Specialist is that there are no wetlands or flood plain issues.

Chair Waller asked that the motion reflect the comments of the petitioner that the trees along the property line would be saved, and that should rear yard drain routing result in tree loss, the petitioner would come back before the Planning Commission.

The floor was closed.

Resolution # PC-2004-07-075

Moved by: Chamberlain

Seconded by: Schultz

RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission recommends to City Council, that the Preliminary Site Plan (Section 34.30.00 Unplatted One-Family Residential Development), as requested for Timbercrest Estates Site Condominium, including 11 units, located south of Wattles Road and west of Fernleigh Road, Section 24, within the R-1C zoning district be granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. That an adjacent property plat layout for the properties to the south and to the west be on file at the Planning Department before the item goes to City Council.
2. That the drainage of this property to the properties to the east that are developed is engineered such that there are no water flows that create standing water in the properties to the east.
3. The tree survey lists a number of trees that are not the kind of trees the City of Troy wants, and those trees that do meet the requirement of being a good tree, on the property lines specifically, that every effort be made to do the underground utility work without cutting roots and maybe the recommendation would be not to do any rear yard underground utility work, but make it all down Timbercrest.
4. If there are trees to be destroyed, the item needs to come back to see how best the City and the petitioner can get together and save as many trees as possible.

Yes: All present (6)
No: None
Absent: Drake-Batts, Khan, Wright

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Schultz proposed that the motion be amended to reflect that the petitioner is required to bring back the site plan for approval should there be any significant change to the site plan.

Mr. Chamberlain asked for a legal opinion on the proposed amendment to the motion.

Mr. Motzny said the Commission could put the language in the motion but, in his opinion, City Council is not required to honor the request because the motion is only a recommendation to City Council.

ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS

6. PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (ZOTA 202) – Outdoor Storage of Commercial and Recreational Vehicles in M-1 Light Industrial District

Mr. Miller presented a summary of ZOTA 202 and the most recent revisions.

Chair Waller referred to a letter received from Shurguard stating that it recognizes the need and is very much in favor of the proposed zoning ordinance text amendment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

No one was present to speak.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Resolution # PC-2004-07-076

Moved by: Schultz
Seconded by: Littman

RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that Article 28.30.02, Article 40.21.83 and Article 04.20.128 of the Zoning Ordinance, be amended as printed on the Updated Version of the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment (ZOTA 202), dated 02/16/04.

Yes: All present (6)
 No: None
 Absent: Drake-Batts, Khan, Wright

MOTION CARRIED

7. PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (ZOTA 200) – Article 34.70.00 One Family Cluster Option

Mr. Miller presented a summary of ZOTA 200. Mr. Miller reviewed clarifications and/or corrections to the following sections of the proposed zoning ordinance text amendment: 34.70.02 (B)(1), 34.70.05 (A) and 34.70.06 (D).

A thorough discussion followed on the size of trees to be planted. After a straw vote, the tree size determined was 3 to 3.5 dbh.

A discussion followed on the wording of Section 34.70.02 (B)(1). It was determined that the paragraph should read: "...significant individual trees, significant individual trees ten inches in diameter or larger...".

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

No one was present to speak.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Resolution # PC-2004-07-077

Moved by: Chamberlain
 Seconded by: Littman

RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that Article 34.70.00, Article 10.20.09 and Articles 04.20.120 through 04.20.122 of the Zoning Ordinance, be amended as printed on the Updated Version, dated 06/29/04, and the changes noted by the Planning Director on the paragraphs 34.70.02 (B)(1), 34.70.05 (A) and 34.70.06 (D).

Yes: All present (6)
 No: None
 Absent: Drake-Batts, Khan, Wright

MOTION CARRIED

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present who wished to speak.

GOOD OF THE ORDER

Mr. Miller announced that the Planning Department is in receipt of a letter from the Oakland Mall stating that due to the new acquisition and change of ownership of the Lord & Taylor department store, Lord & Taylor is no longer moving forward with its plan to put a store at Oakland Mall.

Mr. Schultz referenced an informational item on last night's City Council agenda. A 3,300 square foot home is being built on Alpine with a 6,000 square foot attached garage, and the construction is taking place totally within the City's ordinances. Mr. Schultz suggested that the Planning Commission should consider moving forward with changing ordinances as they pertain to accessory structures or garages that outweigh the house.

Mr. Miller reported that the matter will be a City Council regular item to seek direction on (1) what can happen from an existing standpoint and define an enforcement on Alpine; and (2) whether City Council would like the Planning Commission and City Management to address compatibility of those structures and attached garages, and whether size should be limited on attached garages.

Mr. Schultz distributed information with respect to green sustainable development. He also stated his appreciation for the tour of the Sanctuary Lakes Golf Course. He said the tour was very informative and the facility is one that the citizens of Troy can be justifiably proud.

Mr. Littman welcomed Mr. Wu to the Commission, and encouraged his input on Planning Commission matters.

Mr. Strat asked the status of the zoning ordinance text amendment with respect to site plan approval and the requirement to submit landscape plans.

Mr. Miller reported the proposed ZOTA is scheduled for a Public Hearing in August, and would be forwarded to the City Council for review and approval in September. Mr. Miller said the amendment, if adopted by City Council, would become effective 10 days after its approval. Mr. Miller said a determination would have to be made for site plan applications that are in the process of site plan review and the effective date of the amendment.

Mr. Strat asked if the Planning Commission could directly receive the review comments of the various departmental site plan reviews.

Mr. Miller said the departmental comments are incorporated verbatim in the Planning Department reports. He would prefer not to make additional copies of the departmental reviews when review comments are easily incorporated into the reports. Mr. Miller said a complete review would be provided to the Planning Commission should there be substantial comments.

Mr. Miller confirmed that the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) is meeting tomorrow morning. He said a presentation is being given by the City Manager with respect to the vision of the DDA on items that the Planning Commission has been involved.

Mr. Chamberlain said that tonight's meeting is the first meeting being recorded on DVD.

Resolution # PC-2004-07-078

Moved by: Chamberlain

Seconded by: Vleck

RESOLVED, That all Planning Commission meetings be recorded on DVD and a copy of the DVD be stored at the Planning Department for future reference.

Yes: All present (6)

No: None

Absent: Drake-Batts, Khan, Wright

MOTION CARRIED

Chair Waller asked the City Attorney to prepare a document explaining the origins and the rule of law of the City of Troy development standards; how it came to be, how it is viewed, how it is approved, and how it is utilized.

ADJOURN

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David T. Waller, Chair

Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary