

Minutes
Cascade Charter Township
Planning Commission
Monday November 8, 2021
7:00 P.M.
2870 Jacksmith Ave SE

ARTICLE 1. Chairman Rissi called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.
Members Present: Noordhoek, Moxley, Deering, Noordyke, Rissi, Rapin, Korstange, and Meurlin
Members Absent: None
Others Present: Interim Planning Director Brian Hilbrands and those listed on the sign-in sheet

ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance

ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to approve the current Agenda. Supported by Member Deering. Motion carried 8 to 0.

ARTICLE 4. Disclose any Conflicts of Interest

Chair Rissi disclosed that he owns land in Lowell as it pertains to article 12, the Lowell Charter Township Draft Master Plan.

ARTICLE 5. Approve the Minutes of the September 13, 2021 Meeting.

Member Deering brought up the 'Other Business' section of the September 13th meeting that included a commendation for previous Community Development Director Steve Peterson, saying that the minutes show both Member Meurlin and Member Korstange saying they would abstain from voting on the motion but their votes are still counted in the minutes.

Member Meurlin and Chair Rissi confirmed that this was what happened at the meeting and Member Meurlin clarified that he and Member Korstange had said they would abstain if they were to be the only dissenting votes but, since other members of the Planning Commission agreed with them, they didn't see the need to abstain. It was requested that the September 13, 2021 minutes be corrected to clarify this.

Member Moxley brought up Article 9, Old Business, line 7 that says, "Member Meurlin asked it lot 6 still belonged to the developers," and requested 'it' be corrected to 'if'.

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to approve the Minutes of September 13, 2021 with the aforementioned changes. Supported by Member Korstange. Motion carried 8 to 0.

ARTICLE 6. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to non-agenda items.

There was no one who wished to speak to non-agenda items.

ARTICLE 7. Case #21-3632/Gole Dental Properties

Property Address: 3636 Kraft Ave

Requested Action: The applicant is requesting preliminary plan approval to amend the existing PUD to permit a dental office.

Interim Planning Director Hilbrands presented the case. The site was rezoned to PUD in 1989 in order to allow the existing home on the property to be used as an office space. The language will have to be amended in order to allow for the dental office as a permitted use. He said that the case was brought in front of the Planning Commission for a Basic Plan Review at the April 19, 2021 meeting and the applicant has now provided the required information to proceed to the preliminary plan review. The developer is proposing use of the existing building for the dental office and slightly expanding the parking lot to accommodate 12 parking spaces. The township engineer has reviewed and approved the plans contingent on their application for permits such as SESC and a water connection from the city before beginning construction. The plans have been reviewed and approved by the Fire Department. They will also need to submit a stormwater maintenance agreement to the township and will be installing a new septic system on the south of the building that has already been approved by the Kent County Health Department. Kent County Road Commission has approved changes to the curb-cuts. A landscaping plan has been submitted that includes new plantings along the west property line, on Kraft Ave. The application includes a \$2,000 landscape bond prior to obtaining a building permit. A photometric plan was submitted that day. If the Planning Commission gives preliminary plan approval, a PUD amendment will be written and brought back to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to the Township Board.

Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plan with the condition that the applicant comply with the Township Engineer's letter dated November 2, 2021 and all necessary permits are obtained before construction begins, a stormwater maintenance agreement is recorded, and a landscape bond of \$2,000 is submitted.

Member Moxley asked if there were two curb-cuts coming out onto the road and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that it had previously been a circular drive, but the Road Commission preferred it with only one outlet, with the other cut ending at the property line.

Member Meurlin asked if there was a significant drop-off into a creek of some sort. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that there is one to the East and a little bit to the south around where the proposed dumpster enclosure is to be located. Member Meurlin asked what their stormwater requirements will be and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that it would follow the current stormwater ordinances. Member Meurlin asked if all of the stormwater was going to be allowed to flow into the creek and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that there would be a leaching basin

in the parking lot, capturing much of the water, while the rest flowed into the creek. Member Meurlin asked if the parking lot will be contoured so that the stormwater flows into the basin and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands confirmed that this would be the case.

Chair Rissi asked why the property wouldn't be hooked up to city sewer and was instead installing a septic tank. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands shared that the sewer doesn't extend directly to the property. Chair Rissi asked how many feet away does the sewer line have to be from the property to connect and why they would rather have a septic tank. Member Noordyke said that there are buildings further down Kraft Ave that have sewer but Interim Planning Director Hilbrands clarified that it is an extremely long lateral that extends to the further properties, but not a sewer main in itself. Member Noordyke requested Interim Planning Director Hilbrands do further research into the sewer situation and Chair Rissi said that they will also ask the applicant for more information.

Chair Rissi asked how the value of landscaping performance bonds are calculated when requiring applicants to purchase one. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that it is based on the price of the proposed trees and shrubs. Chair Rissi asked how often the base price of the trees and shrubs are updated and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that they have not change since he arrived and he will look into it. Chair Rissi said that it may be time to reevaluate those prices as he believes the market price is significantly higher now than it was when the base standards were set.

Member Meurlin asked if the dental waste leaving the property is safe to flow into the septic system or sewer. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that the health department had approved the plan but he was not knowledgeable in that field and the applicant may be able to provide better information.

Philip Gole, the applicant who lives in Oliver Woods, addressed the dental waste question. He said that the holding or amalgamation tanks were discussed with the Health Department and that way any dental/medical waste would go into the amalgamating separator which will be a holding tank in the basement that is professionally drained by a third party. He stated that he talked to the health department about this and the recent industry standard is to have a holding tank that all of the dental/medical waste goes into.

Philip Gole said that he looked into using the city sewer system originally and it was his preference to be on city sewer but that wasn't possible and deferred to the project engineer to speak on this.

Chair Rissi asked if the practice was being relocated to this location from another building and the applicant shared that he and his brother have a second-generation dental practice in Hastings and he is looking to add a second practice at this location as he lives in Cascade Township.

Member Noordyke asked if, to the applicant's knowledge, there wasn't an option to connect to the city sewer. The applicant said that was correct and that they had also looked into an additional option of boring under to get to the sewer. He spoke with the Road Commission and they didn't want to tear up the road, especially with the easement allowing an extensive amount of fiber optic cables to run underground in that area, up towards the airport.

Motion was made by Member Moxley to go to public hearing. Supported by Member Rapin.

There was no one who wished to speak.

Member Meurlin motioned to close public hearing. Supported by Member Rapin.

Member Meurlin asked where the building would be on the site in relation to the site map.

Motion was made by Member Meurlin to approve the PUD preliminary plans with the conditions listed by staff. He also recommended these conditions be included in the ordinance so they can be kept track of. Supported by Member Korstange. Motion carried 8 to 0.

ARTICLE 8. Case #21-3677/Elliott

Property Address: 6870 48th St

Requested Action: The applicant is requesting approval of a Special Use Permit for an accessory building over 832 sq ft.

Interim Planning Director Hilbrands presented the case. He said that the property is located on 48th St, just east of Thornapple River Dr. The building will be 48' x 32' for a total of 1,536 sq ft with a height of 12.5 feet as measured to the midpoint of the roof. It requires a minimum of a 10-foot setback to the side property line and a 25-foot to the rear property line. It also must be at least 10 feet from any other building. The 3-acre property is permitted to have one accessory building with an attached or detached garage. There is not currently an attached garage, so the building would be considered a detached garage. Storage is the intended building use and the size of the building is normal for the zoning district. It will have a metal roof and metal siding which is typical for the agricultural areas of the township. The lot and home size are a little smaller than typical but this property is unique in that it is surrounded by agricultural vacant land.

Staff recommend approval of the Special Use Permit with the conditions that the building be in compliance with all applicable zoning ordinance regulations, including the building not be used for living space or to run a business and any outdoor lighting meets regulations.

Member Moxley asked if the site plan was showing that the proposed building be at least 25 feet from the property line in the south east corner as it didn't look like it was and Member Meurlin asked if there was a creek on the property that runs into the

Thornapple River. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said yes to both accounts and that there is a creek to the south of the property that runs through the golf course and into the Thornapple River.

Chair Rissi asked if there was currently a building there. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said yes, but it was a very small shed. Chair Rissi said that using rudimentary measurements, it doesn't appear to have the required setback to the property line. Member Rissi recommended extra diligence on the part of the applicant to confirm that the building meets the setback and recommended the owner have the property officially surveyed.

Member Noordhoek asked if the applicant was having a professional survey done and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that he was unsure but that the applicant has found the metal stakes that mark out the property line.

The applicant, Jeff Elliott of 6870 48th St, came up to answer questions from the Planning Commission. Member Noordhoek asked if there was a surveyor going to come in and put down stakes for the south side of the building. Elliot said that he had not intended to as he had found the two stakes at the side of the property in question but he will if that is what the commission is requiring of him.

Member Noordyke asked if the commission could require the applicant to build at least 25ft from the property line, following current policy, but not require the applicant to get a survey done as he is in an unusual position of having no neighbors and living in an agricultural district. Member Meurlin said that the applicant will be building it at his own consequence. He asked how the township measured a survey line when the lines are not vertical. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that they measure out to the closest spot on the line.

Motion by Member Moxley to move to public hearing. Supported by Member Rapin.

There was no one who wished to speak.

Motion by Member Moxley to close public hearing. Supported by Member Deering.

Motion by Member Deering to approve the application with the following requirements: the building is not used for living space or a business and the lighting meets township regulations. Supported by Member Rapin.

Motion carried 8 to 0.

ARTICLE 9. Case #21-3669/John Rabideau/Cascade Roadhouse

Property Address: 6817 Cascade Rd

Requested Action: The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan review for a new 480 sq ft covered structure.

Interim Planning Director Hilbrands presented the case. He said that the applicant is looking to construct a covered structure/canopy at the Cascade Roadhouse restaurant.

It will be made of transparent panels placed on a steel-framed structure. The addition complies with all B1 zoning regulation, but it is within the front yard setback area. The applicant received a variance for the front yard setback from the Zoning Board of Appeals at their October 12, 2021 meeting. The township engineer has reviewed and approved the plans and required the applicant to submit a stormwater maintenance agreement to the township. The plan has been reviewed by the Fire Department and they have approved the canopy but require the applicant to ensure that the enclosure meets fire code. If there is any outdoor lighting being added, it will need to comply with township regulations.

Staff recommend Site Plan Approval with the conditions that the applicant comply with the Township Engineer letter dated October 26, 2021, all necessary permits are obtained before construction begins, the stormwater maintenance agreement is recorded, and any exterior lighting comply with Township regulations.

Neither the applicant nor anyone on behalf of the applicant attended the meeting to answer questions.

Member Korstange asked if the plan for this enclosure was to be a three season or four-season structure. She said that she's seen them put plastic on the other side of the building to make that area usable during the winter months and wondered if that would occur in this part of the structure as well. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that the fact that it has a roof would cause it to be considered a permanent structure so it would not need additional approvals to add walls. Member Rapin said that wouldn't stop them from adding curtains to make it enclosed in the winter months and Member Deering asked if the commission can request they appear and explain their intentions. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that you can request that the applicant attend to answer questions.

Multiple members felt that there were unanswered questions and would prefer the case is tabled until the applicant either came to the meeting to answer their questions, the applicant sent in their responses, or they sent in someone on their behalf to answer the questions.

Motion by Member Korstange to table the case pending the applicant provides information as to which months the structure is intended to be used and the purpose of the canopy. Supported by Member Moxley.

Motion carried 8 to 0.

ARTICLE 10. Election of Officer - Secretary

Chair Rissi said that he and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands received communication from Member Katsma on September 27, 2021. Katsma had intended to attend the October meeting which was cancelled on September 27th and he would resign after that meeting but since it was cancelled, he notified Chair Rissi and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands. His reason for resignation was a change in his work schedule and responsibilities. Chair Rissi notified Supervisor Lesperance about the opening on the

commission. The commission is now in need of a secretary to fill out the remainder of Katsma's term, through to the end of the year. Member Deering volunteered to hold the position.

Motion by Member Noordyke to appoint Member Deering as Secretary for the remainder of Katsma's term. Supported by Member Moxley.

Motion carried 8 to 0.

ARTICLE 11. Old Business

Update from Roundhill Subcommittee:

Chair Rissi provided updates from the Roundhill subcommittee. He shared that they have met seven or eight times as a committee with a combination of township staff, two members of the public, and once with a brief visit from Supervisor Lesperance. They typically meet at the Wisner Center with one or two meetings at the township office. At the September meeting Chair Rissi wrote some notes to share with the full Planning Commission. Since the October meeting was cancelled, he was not able to present them and he needed to reacquaint himself with the notes he had taken. He started to do this prior to the meeting but ended up speaking with Member Meurlin who had begun a lengthy memo to provide the committee; the memo has yet to be finished and polished. He said they would have the memo ready for the next week's meeting but he would now share the main points he had pulled from his September subcommittee notes.

One of the meetings of the subcommittee included prior-Planning Director, Steve Peterson and Township Manager Ben Swayze. This was the only meeting they were able to hold that included Peterson as he resigned before more additional meetings were held. They also held a meeting with Manager Swayze in September where he provided them with the township process manual. A few members of the committee also have met with Interim Planning Director Hilbrands about various topics.

Items of concern include: deviations from the site plan that were approved by staff, current staff's inability to find the originally approved site plan, questionable signatures on the stormwater maintenance agreement (due to dates on the notarization not matching dates that staff were employed), performance bonds that were not collected or created at the time of filing (partially due to lack of software to track where applications are in the pipeline, especially when projects drag out), plan application and when building permits are filed, among other things. Chair Rissi said that he understands how things can get missed when the project is stretched over multiple years and there are many moving pieces.

Member Meurlin disagreed on the point of understanding where things may have been missed and believes that some of the action or inaction was intentional. He said that lawyers had been hammering out every section of this agreement and for some of these things to be forgotten is too much of a coincidence. It is hard for him to believe that things were forgotten and/or never filed and that no one had a checklist to keep track of

projects. Chair Rissi said that these are the same documents that had conflicting dates and signatures and were fundamentally different plans than what was approved by the Planning Commission.

Another large problem has been the retaining wall that sits right on the property line without any sort of buffer, especially when there is a drop off after it. There were also questions with the wall height and if a railing is required by state building code. The commission has learned more about how the state building code works and how it can be used, in conjunction with township requirements, to keep residents safe.

Chair Rissi also brought up timing of key infrastructure points that need to be completed. One of their main takeaways from the subcommittee's meeting with Peterson was that the planning commission should set a deadline as to when key infrastructure items (such as roads, walls, etc.) in relation to when other parts of the project are completed. Since the commission hadn't imposed any of these deadlines, that made it so that the wall could be put off so long it could potentially even be the last part of the project completed. Member Deering asked if the recommendation to add these deadlines should have come from staff as the Planning Commission members aren't necessarily knowledgeable about these specific circumstances. Chair Rissi said that was correct and that staff has recommended this sometimes in the past but the commission often relies on the applicant and developer to make sure all steps of the process are completed along a reasonable timeline.

Member Meurlin asked if the 700ft of wall that was originally proposed was part of the soil and sediment plan or stopped storm water from running down the hill. Since it is not specified as a facility as part of the soil and sediment controls, it is in a cloudy area where the Planning Commission needs to be extra careful when there are even minor changes being made by the Planning Director. He also said that the commission may need to revisit what are considered 'minor' changes that the Planning Director can make without first consulting the Planning Commission. Peterson changed the plan from a traditional plan to a site condo and he changed the property lines, as well as other things along the line. The project began in 2015 and the first complaint came from a neighbor about being washed out, since the developer clear cut all of the trees from the front of the lot without providing any protection for the neighbors, pushing the lot to the far corner so that each lot could have as much area as possible. The neighbor, who is a civil engineer, provided evidence that the washout was due to this development and the board ignored him for over a year and questioned his motives, both at the Township Board and Planning Commission level. The first violation noted by Kent County occurred almost immediately after the clear cut and each month they issued a notice of violation or an inspection report. The state also issued an inspection report at water was flowing through a bayou and into the Thornapple River. He stated that the Planning Commission didn't do anything while all of this was happening and should have intervened.

Chair Rissi said that they also noted that lots eight and nine were assigned the wrong addresses for six to eight months before it was corrected. Member Meurlin disagreed

saying that the Road Commission assigns the addresses and took a plat of the property. A document of Peterson's listed lots eight and nine of having the same address and lot nine having a half a million-dollar house on it that was mostly complete, but in reality, there isn't anything on lot nine. Lot eight showed up as vacant on Peterson's document while in reality the two lots were switched, leading the contractors to put liens on vacant property.

Brian Wilson of the Cascade Township Building department issued stop work orders on construction that were recommended by the Kent County Road Commission due to stormwater and sediment erosion that were the first issued within the last 16 years. Member Meurlin clarified that the stop work order was issued on behalf of Wayne Harrall of the Kent County Road Commission, but came out under the letterhead of the Cascade Building Department because the township has the leverage and the Road Commission maintains the soil erosion so they could go at the problem from two sides. Member Meurlin said that Peterson also called the developer and told him that he was going to stop everything but this was in the midst of houses going up and Peterson said he wanted to be as accommodating as possible for developers based on what stage of the development process they are in, as long as the neighbors or others aren't adversely affected.

Member Meurlin said that one of the neighbors to this project was adversely affected by 23 loads of sediment having to be removed from his lawn in addition to trees that were falling down the hill. Member Deering commented that she believed that this topic had come to the Planning Commission in the year before she joined the commission. She remembers that a \$150,000 performance bond came before the commission and the township but the staff never asked the applicant for it. Chair Rissi asked Interim Planning Director Hilbrands if he could confirm that, which he could not. He said he would have to check as the bank had called about another bond for that project that had to be renewed, and he wasn't sure which of the performance bonds it was in relation to as there were three or four for this project. Member Meurlin shared that there was an ordinance adopted in March of 2016 that required a performance bond of \$50,000 for stormwater issues as well as a \$10,000 bond for landscaping. He said those bonds were forgotten. The applicant put in an application to build a deck at one of the units and the planning commission used this as an opportunity to corner all of the problems they were aware of, mainly that the performance bonds weren't ever collected, in their amendment to allow the deck. Once the deck was approved, the developer promptly forgot about the 25ft setback and moved to putting in a pool.

Chair Rissi said that, with Peterson and previous Assistant Manager Stephanie Fast leaving, a lot of first-hand knowledge about the project has been lost and the only people who would have firsthand knowledge are Manager Swayze, Building Official Brian Wilson, and (to a lesser degree) Interim Planning Director Hilbrands. They will work together to create rules and standards that keep situations like the Roundhill project from occurring in the future. Some of the ones currently being pursued are: PUD approvals require basic infrastructure first, per Peterson, and also include a

definition of 'basic infrastructure' and the expected project timelines. The Planning Commission will date site plans with their and the Township Board's date of approval and note any changes to the site plan. Define minor changes that can happen by staff and require they be reported back to the Planning Commission as well as the line between major changes and minor changes. When staff approve a minor change, the Planning Commission wants to be apprised of it so that they know how to respond when a resident has questions. Member Korstange clarified that the only 'minor changes' the Planning Commission needs to be apprised of are ones related to cases that the Planning Commission has reviewed and/or issued decisions on. Member Meurlin stated that the definition of 'minor change' is in section 21.04 of the zoning ordinance and comes back into PUD properties under section 16.12 of the zoning ordinance. Chair Rissi shared that the committee recommends the use of a tracking software to make sure all steps to approval are followed as they believe that is how some of the master deeds and performance bonds have been missed. They also believe a project manager that occasionally visits sites to make sure things look correct and respectable. The current system of relying on residents to follow through with requirements allows these types of things to be missed.

Member Meurlin stated that the major revelation he and Member Moxley have made while researching the Roundhill project is that there is a lack of staff oversight in process, both during construction and after, as well as ignoring the neighbors, Kent County's, and the state's complaints. Chair Rissi said he believed that's where the project manager position comes into play as the township has not done well handling complaints; this would allow staff to take complaints of residents and follow up on them. Member Meurlin said that the Cascade Building Department has good software that functions well but the department has a unique position in the township where they are expected to go into the property and only address what they are there to inspect, ignoring any other violations they may see, setting aside that they're a Cascade employee. He said this was because their policy is to only focus on what they're there for and not get into local politics. He thinks the group should be helping out in the oversight process as they are Cascade employees. Chair Rissi said that he believes that was how the deck was discovered in the Roundhill project when they went and reported to the Planning Department; this is how they believe the department should be working. Member Meurlin said that most Michigan municipalities don't have the money to have someone in an inspection roll to keep track of things. Chair Rissi said that if the township had an ordinance enforcement officer, this may be something they could do part of the time. Member Meurlin said that these currently fall under the honor system with the developer and it would only require common sense rather than a surveyor coming to the property and measuring everything like staff have stated in the past. He sees this as a failure of white space management.

Member Noordyke asked if the building department reports to the planning department or to the manager. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that they report to the manager. Member Noordyke asked if this was typical of other Michigan townships and Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said he didn't have the knowledge to speak to that.

Member Noordyke asked that he look into that as the current reporting model didn't make sense. Member Meurlin said that this model doesn't make sense unless the department is also working for other townships and, in Cascade, it's considered a revenue generator and a semi-independent business. Chair Rissi said that this is a conversation for another time and that this was outside of tonight's purview. Chair Rissi said that he hopes to have a lengthy memo that compiles all of the Roundhill concerns sent out by the next planning commission meeting. Member Moxley requested it be sent to them a couple days before the meeting so they have time to go through it. Chair Rissi said that was the goal, it just wasn't prepared for this meeting.

Member Meurlin shared that he believes too many projects are put onto Manager Swayze and the responsibility needs to be spread out. Chair Rissi said that he agrees but that is due to current understaffing and the number of employees that are no longer with the township and need to be replaced, including someone to manage projects. Chair Rissi said that they were getting more into Township Board decisions rather than ones they have influence over. Member Meurlin said that he intends to raise that at the next township board meeting and Member Noordyke suggested the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Township Board. Member Noordhoek, who is a Township Board member, said that he is pushing to have an outside company come in and do a study to look into the staffing structure and give the township guidance as to how they should restructure before they begin hiring new staff. Chair Rissi said that if that's going to happen, it needs to be done expeditiously as the community's quality of service is already beginning to suffer due to lack of staff. Member Meurlin said that the township has been suffering from a lack of service for a long time and the lack of staff may not be the problem. Member Noordhoek commended Interim Planning Director Hilbrands on seamlessly doing both his own job and the Community Development Director position.

Member Korstange said that everyone seems to be moving toward a better foundation. Member Rapin asked if the Community Development Director position had been posted yet and consensus was that it had not. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands shared that he has it in writing that he is the current Interim Planning Director.

ARTICLE 12. Any Other Business

Draft 2022 Meeting Schedule: Interim Planning Director Hilbrands brought the first draft for the 2022 meeting schedule and shared that the intention was to continue holding meetings the first and third Monday of the month with a few exceptions due to Holidays.

Member Merlin said that caused an awkward problem where the Planning Commission meets on Monday and then the Township Board meets that Wednesday and doesn't have enough time to review the situation. Chair Rissi saw meetings that ended up the same week as beneficial because it got whatever was referred to the board taken care of in an expedient time span. Chair Rissi asked Interim Planning Director Hilbrands if he had heard any complaints about the meeting schedule and he said he had not. Member

Meurlin expressed that he had a problem with the meeting dates because he wanted to meet on the off weeks of the Township Board. Interim Planning Director Hilbrands said that they already do meet on the off weeks of the Township Board, and that would only be changed due to holidays or elections. This was acceptable to all members and the schedule will be brought back once election dates have been confirmed.

Lowell Charter Township Draft Master Plan: Chair Rissi said that the draft of the Lowell Charter Township Master Plan is on their website and recommended the members read through it for any comments and to send those to Interim Planning Director Hilbrands.

ARTICLE 13. Adjournment

**Motion was made by Member Rapin to adjourn. Supported by Member Deering.
Motion carried 8 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Diedre Deering, Secretary