

APPROVED 8/5/13

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

JULY 1, 2013, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Webster called the July 1, 2013 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and the public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Webster, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah, Ms. Urban, Mr. Waechtler

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Planning Director Tom Dabareiner; Village Planning Manager Charity Jones; Planner Damir Latinovic; Planner Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Mark Thoman, 1109 61st St.; John and Daphne Frederick, 916 40th Street; Peter and Marykay Jenkner, 912 40th Street; Judy Wohlt, 908 40th Street; Scott Wilson, 4030 Washington St.; Nigel Maughan and Megan Trenter, Washington St.; Luke Weber, 1011 Saylor St.; David Binkley, 2529 Indianapolis Ave.; Karen Samiek, 4613 Drendel Rd.; Mike Samiek, 4615 Drendel Rd.; Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Ave.; Kirk Bishop, Duncan Associates, 212 W. Kinzie St., Chicago; China Deluch, 4608 Cross St.

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 3, 2013 MINUTES

On page 1, a change was noted to correct the spelling of Mr. Waechtler's name. Also on Page 1, the following insertion (and clarification) was made in the motion to nominate Mr. Waechtler as chairman. It was revised to read as follows:

Mr. Matejczyk moved to nominate Mr. Waechtler as Chairman Pro tem. **Commissioner Waechtler withdrew his name before it was seconded inasmuch as he announced he was ailing with a bad left ear and his serving as chairman would be impaired.** No second followed. Motion failed.

THE MINUTES OF JUNE 3, 2013 WERE APPROVED, WITH NOTED CORRECTIONS, ON MOTION BY MR. MATEJCZYK, SECONDED BY MR. BEGGS.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. BEGGS, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATAH, MS. URBAN, MR. WAECHTLER, CHAIRMAN WEBSTER

NAY: NONE

ABSTAIN: MR. COZZO

APPROVED 8/5/13

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7-0-1

Chairman Webster reviewed the protocol for the meeting. A change in the agenda followed:

PC 20-13 A petition seeking a Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment to rezone the property from R-1, Single Family Residential to R-4, Single Family Residence. The property is located at the southwest corner of Cross Street and Indianapolis Avenue and is commonly known as 2525 Indianapolis Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 08-01-308-016). Luke Weber, Weber Custom Builders LLC., Petitioner; Weber Custom Builders LLC, Owner.

Chairman Webster swore in those individuals who would be speaking on the above petition.

Village Planner, Damir Latinovic, reviewed the subject property and its southwest corner lot location on the overhead. The land was currently zoned R-1 Single Family Residence and the petitioner was seeking a zoning map amendment to rezone the parcel to R-4 Single Family Residence in order to construct a single-family home in character with the surrounding homes. Mr. Latinovic stated the property consisted of portions of two lots of record and was force-annexed into the Village in 2012 with R-1 zoning (most restrictive zoning).

Referenced in staff's report (page 3) was a table detailing the minimum bulk standards for the R-4 zoning, noting the front setback for this proposal will be 25 feet rather than 40 feet and the height requirement will be 33 feet versus 35 feet. All other requirements will remain the same. A 40-ft. setback along Cross Street will remain since it is a private covenant setback created back in 1925.

Reviewing a zoning map on the overhead, Mr. Latinovic confirmed the proposal met the village's Comprehensive Plan. Proper notification and publishing of this proposal was completed and staff received general inquiry phone calls asking about the difference between R-1 and R-4 zoning.

The Standards for the Approval of the rezoning were referenced by Mr. Latinovic. He stated that there would be no negative effects to the surrounding property values and believed the proposal would enhance the value of the neighborhood. Staff recommended approval of the petition.

Commissioner questions/comments followed regarding the north setbacks on 2529 and 2533 Indianapolis Ave (between 20 and 23 feet, per staff); how many homes in the area were annexed into the Village in 2012 (parcels colored purple on the overhead map shown by staff); and the fact that the two existing homes adjacent to the west that were annexed into the village remain as R1 zoning and are classified as legal, non-conforming in the Village. Further clarification followed by Mr. Latinovic regarding the private covenant and how it overrode the Village's zoning requirement.

Petitioner, Mr. Luke Weber, of Weber Custom Builders, 1011 Saylor Street, Downers Grove, stated he purchased the property a few months ago to construct the best possible home he could. Regarding the setback measurement, he stated that after several measurements the front setback of adjacent homes to the west is at 25 feet. He did speak with a number of neighbors which were concerned about drainage. He did clarify that if he does not get the rezoning approval, he would then construct a home pushed "way back on Indianapolis." However, he believed it would be beneficial to be closer to Indianapolis and in line with the neighbors' homes.

Chairman Webster opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Dave Binkley, 2529 Indianapolis Ave., supported the petition and was tired of the lot being used as a parking lot. His only issue was that drainage be addressed.

Ms. Karen Samiek, 4613 Drendel Road, discussed the smaller homes that were on some of the previous lots and she believed the high density homes built on Indianapolis were the cause of significant drainage issues, and the homes towered over the neighborhood. She discussed the drainage issues experienced on Cross Street and on her own block due to poor planning on the part of the village and park district. She believed the lot was too small for the project.

Ms. China Deluch, 4601 Cross St., also agreed that since the new homes have been built on Indianapolis her and her neighbors' homes have been flooded and the septic wells do not work. She did not oppose the home as long as it was built responsibly and the drainage issues were addressed.

Mr. Mark Samiek, 4615 Drendel Road, believed there were old drainage pipes existing in his area which were too small for what was needed and while the Village had previously sent officials to see the area, nothing had been done.

Hearing no further comments, public comment was closed by Chairman Webster.

Mr. Luke Weber responded that he had another house at 6240 Dunham that was under construction and restated that he is aware that drainage has been the Village's number one concern and it has taken steps to address such issues. He believed going forward with the new single family home would improve the issues, in his opinion.

Per a question regarding drainage, Mr. Latinovic explained that since the construction of the homes west of the property, DuPage County has adopted a new stormwater ordinance and that the ordinance is more stringent. He reminded commissioners that a building permit would not be issued until all plans and engineering requirements meet the requirements of the stormwater ordinance. He pointed out that when the three homes were built, DuPage County did not have a maximum lot coverage restriction -- citing the home at 2533 Indianapolis took up a significant portion of the lot -- which would not be permitted by the Village on the subject lot.

Mr. Beggs inquired as to how he could tell the effect of the run-off from a new building, wherein Mr. Latinovic explained that the petitioner had to provide an existing grading plan to reflect the water flows, along with a proposed grading plan, locating the swales, sump pump and gutter discharges etc. Mr. Cozzo confirmed with staff that a home could still be constructed even if the petition for rezoning was denied but that it would be set back further and a bit taller. Additional questions followed regarding clarification of whether the neighborhood had septic fields or a sanitary sewer system, whether a certain Village engineer was still with the Village, and whether this was the first request for the R-4 zoning in the area. Concern was raised by Mr. Waechtler that the proposed home was going to be constructed on a hill and that staff would have to pay attention to water drainage. Community Development Director Dabareiner interjected, explaining that no plans for the new home or the proposed grading plan were received yet and that swales were just one of many drainage options that were used to address drainage. Adding to that, he stated that some of these plans are reviewed by the Village consultant, specifically paying attention to calculations and ensuring that the plans adhere to the stormwater ordinance requirements.

APPROVED 8/5/13

Commissioner comments followed that the standards for rezoning were being met. Staff was asked whether the Village had known of any previous situations of water drainage involving septic fields and how was it handled, wherein Mr. Latinovic explained it was a common factor in this area where the sanitary sewer was not available to the residents but that the septic fields underground did not impact the management of the stormwater runoff. He emphasized that the runoff would be managed properly to meet the ordinance. Mr. Waechtler asked that in the future staff have a Village stormwater engineer on hand to address the issues being raised by the residents. In response, Mr. Latinovic indicated that the Village development engineer is always available by phone as is all other staff. Once the plans are received by staff, they could be reviewed by the public.

WITH RESPECT TO PC 20-13, MR. BEGGS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PETITION FOR REZONING FROM R-1 RESIDENTIAL TO R-4 RESIDENTIAL.

SECONDED BY MR. MATEJCZYK. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MS. RABATAH, MS. URBAN, MR. WAECHTLER, CHAIRMAN WEBSTER

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0

PC 25-13 A petition seeking a Final Plat of Subdivision approval to create two lots of record. The property is located on the East side of the terminus of Lindley Street approximately 600 feet north of 41st Street, commonly known as 4101 Lindley Street and 913 40th Street, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-05-112-003 and -033). Nigel Maughan and Megan Tranter, Petitioners and Owners.

Chairman Webster confirmed those individuals who were sworn in regarding the above petition.

Village Planner, Stan Popovich, located the property on the overhead, discussing that two existing single-family homes were on the lot, along with a shed and detached garage. Multiple non-conformities existed on the property (3 lots of record) which were pointed out by staff. Mr. Popovich confirmed that the proposed lot subdivision would eliminate the lot non-conformities. By creating two lots of record, he explained that there would be access to Lot 1 off of 40th Street and access to Lot 2 off of Lindley Street. The owners were intending to remove one of the two homes and construct a new home on Lot 1. The shed and garage would also be removed.

As to the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Popovich reviewed the goals of the plan in further detail, calling attention to the fact that if any remodeling were to take place, it would have to meet the requirements of Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and Stormwater Ordinance. He stated that nearby lot sizes were reviewed and that this proposal met the surrounding lot sizes of the area. Staff believed this proposal was consistent with the village's Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances. Details followed. More specifically, Mr. Popovich reported that with the rezoning, curbs and gutters were usually required with all new subdivisions; however, given the existing rural type streets, staff did not feel they were necessary to provide. A stormwater study was currently underway for this area and Mr. Popovich believed out of the study would come additional recommendations for the area, and therefore, did not want to bring a change to the area.

APPROVED 8/5/13

Per staff, the petitioner would be required to provide a fee-in-lieu of sidewalks since no sidewalks existed in the area. A fee-in-lieu for a new parkway tree along 40th Street would also be required.

Furthermore, Mr. Popovich added that the village was undertaking a stormwater study, based on the latest April storm, specifically reviewing the LPDA on the site and how to best remove water to a nearby wetland area. Continuing, proper notification and publication of this proposal was confirmed, with Mr. Popovich stating that he spoke with multiple residents in the area regarding the subdivision and drainage issues.

Regarding the Standards for Exception, Mr. Popovich believed all of the standards were satisfied and believed the 66-foot right-of-way and the lack of a curb and gutter would be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and its character. Therefore, he believed the two exceptions met the spirit of the Subdivision Ordinance and recommended approval of the proposal.

For the record, Mr. Popovich confirmed that the village had no intentions of connecting 40th Street and Lindley and that Public Works did look at the plans and there was no request for a “hammer head” (type of T-intersection) or additional right of way, nor did Public Works have concern about snow plowing both streets. Per questions, Mr. Popovich stated that Lot 2 would be approximately 13,574 square feet in size and would be a buildable lot. Questions/comments were raised on how the village determined its fee-in-lieu for sidewalks and the fact that Lot 1 was a buildable lot as it stood currently.

Petitioner, Mr. Nigel Maughan, 5337 Washington St., reported he purchased the property in May and the property sat vacant for six to seven years. He planned to renovate the home on Lindley Street and to construct a single family home on 40th Street. A demolition permit was being sought, along with architects being hired to design the new home and redesign the existing home. Mr. Maughan explained he split the lot because he wanted the larger lot and it had more value.

Chairman Webster opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Scott Wilson, 4030 Washington Street, supported having the house built but was concerned about stormwater issues affecting his property. He detailed the water flow in the area and stated he spoke to the Stormwater Commission which made some changes, but nothing was really resolved. He even suggested that the village purchase the lot just for the purpose of collecting water from the neighborhood. He stated he has attended meetings with neighbors with no progress occurring. When he purchased his home, he was told it did not flood and believed a vegetated area that was cleared out was part of the problem.

Ms. Judy Wohlt, 908 40th Street, agreed with the person prior to her but stated she wanted to be on record because she and her neighbors were having major water issues. Inadequate ditches or no ditches existed. She had no issues with the new home as long as water issues were addressed.

Ms. Marykay Jenkner, 912 40th Street, wanted to ensure that Lot 1 could not be subdivided again. She reiterated that there were water issues. She asked if she would be able to see the plans for the home and if she could provide input later.

Mr. John Frederick, 916 40th Street, stated that a neighbor at 904 40th Street lost a furnace and car to the floods and she was not present. Regarding the “hammer head,” he stated a snow plow landed

APPROVED 8/5/13

twice in a ditch. Also, he stated that the last flag lot near him was approved and after the vegetation on it was removed it started creating water issues in the area. He cautioned the commissioners approving this petition.

Mr. Pete Jenkner, 912 W. 40th Street, had no issue with the new home but wanted an answer to the flooding issue before the petition was approved.

Ms. Daphney Frederick, 916 40th Street, stated her block floods when it rains and while she wanted to trust the village, she has learned that the decisions made prior have not benefitted her neighbors. Her neighbors bought a home with a swale unbeknownst to them and she cautioned them not to do anything to it. She also stated that no one wanted to provide answers.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Webster closed public comment.

Mr. Nigel Maughan in response, stated he wanted some answers as well since the water drained across the property he owned and flowed toward Washington Street. He stated the basement of the home he owns on 40th Street is full of water.

Mrs. Rabatah asked Mr. Maughen what his plan was to resolve the water issue, wherein Mr. Maughen summarized that it was the village's responsibility to work out where the stormwater was placed on the property. Mr. Dabareiner spoke up and stated that at the point the village reviews a building plan is when the stormwater is reviewed to ensure there is no increased run-off at the property line. Mr. Quirk, addressing the residents also added that they needed to be heard at the stormwater level. Mr. Dabareiner agreed stating the subject area was currently being studied but that there was a right to build three houses currently and the proposal was a reduction to two homes and their impervious surfaces. As a group, Mr. Quirk believed there was an opportunity for the residents to participate in a cost-share program with the village to the address water issues. Mr. Waechtler reminded the residents that this was a first step in the review process and more chances would follow.

Asked what his experience was after a home had been constructed and its affect on the homes being already affected by water, Mr. Popovich stated he could not really comment except to say that when the proposal is approved, it will need to meet the village's Stormwater Management Ordinance. Additionally, he pointed out that the petitioner was in contact with Public Works Director Ms. Nan Newlon and Stormwater Administrator Karen Daulton-Lange and that staff was aware of the neighborhood issues. Mr. Popovich noted Ms. Newlon and Ms. Daulton-Lange were the right village staff that the residents should be talking to. Mr. Popovich believed the neighbors could approach the petitioner and his wife and also call the village's development engineer to review any plans.

Mr. Matejczyk also agreed with Mr. Waechtler's comment that a representative from the stormwater department should attend the meetings to answer residents' questions since it appeared to be a neighborhood issue, to which Mr. Popovich conveyed that the village was well aware of these issues and that the stormwater report was on the village's web site. However, he emphasized that tonight's discussion was the subdivision before the plan commissioners, a position echoed by Chairman Webster.

APPROVED 8/5/13

WITH RESPECT TO PC 25-13, MR. MATEJCZYK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE MAUGHAN RESUBDIVISION PREPARED BY PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYING, INC, DATED MAY 29, 2013, EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO THE VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**
- 2. A \$500 FEE IN LIEU PAYMENT FOR ONE NEW PARKWAY TREES MUST BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE VILLAGE EXECUTING THE PLAT.**
- 3. A FEE IN LIEU PAYMENT FOR SIDEWALKS ALONG BOTH LINDLEY AND 40TH STREETS (\$11,832.00) MUST BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE VILLAGE EXECUTING THE PLAT.**

SECONDED BY MS. URBAN. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MATEJCZYK, MS. URBAN, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WAECHTLER, CHAIRMAN WEBSTER

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0

(The commission recessed at 8:45 p.m. and returned at 8:52 p.m.)

PC-18-13 (Continued from 06/03/2013) The purpose of the request is to consider updates to Chapter 20 (Subdivision Code) and Chapter 28 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Municipal Code; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Mr. Kirk Bishop, with Duncan Associates, 212 W. Kinzie, Chicago, IL, reviewed his PowerPoint presentation on Module 2 of the village's draft Zoning Ordinance update which focused on the residential, commercial, office and manufacturing/industrial zoning districts. He reminded the commissioners that the changes being proposed would not significantly change the village's existing regulations unless specifically noted.

Reviewing Article 2 he summarized that the proposed changes included the addition of two-unit attached houses (two units attached on two lots) as compared to a duplex (two units on one lot) in R-5 zoning districts. A question was asked if the village was protected against a situation where two families move into one address, wherein Mr. Bishop explained the village was protected by its definition of a household or family.

Another change included the standard for a minimum lot area requirement for non-residential uses in residential areas, such as churches, schools, civic institutions, etc. which were not included in the old ordinance. The next change included a single standard for different building types, i.e., the minimum lot area requirement per dwelling unit was now 1,000 sq. feet. Mr. Bishop cautioned commissioners that the new requirement could result in higher density units going into the R-6 area than the existing requirement. Examples followed. Another change included a five-foot side yard setback for the R-6 district and a maximum building height of 35 feet across the board. Mr. Bishop

reminded the commissioners that in the Concepts and Directions Report the village may want to establish a new public/civic/institutional zoning classification.

Mr. Bishop indicated that he and staff also discussed some ideas for the ordinance that had not been proposed and he wanted to share them with the commissioners to receive their input. Those changes included the possible consolidation of R-5 and R5A zoning districts, which staff was comfortable to change. The other idea for commissioners' consideration was the standard of minimum dwelling unit floor area, which was different from minimum lot area per dwelling unit requirements. Mr. Bishop suggested eliminating the latter requirement because 1) building codes and property values would not get a developer to those figures anyway; and 2) a nice quality home could be constructed smaller than those units. Examples followed. Asked if this proposal would have an effect on existing senior housing cared for by a non-profit organization, Mr. Bishop stated it would not.

Chairman Webster opened up the meeting to public comment:

Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, regarding the R-5 zoning, pointed out that what was occurring was separate lot platting with separate titles, but under the measurement requirements, there was a required setback. He asked for better clarification of that within the draft document.

Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Avenue, voiced concern on senior home sharing and asked how it fit into the ordinance, wherein staff explained it would fall under "group living." Also, Ms. Earl asked if schools would go under a separate district.

Moving to the Business and Employment Districts, Mr. Bishop stated he was proposing the elimination of the "existing maximum floor area limit" in the B-1 zoning and the elimination of the setback in the OR District where there exists a 100-foot front or street yard setback when a project abuts a residential area. The new standard would be 75 feet.

Mr. Bishop queried the commissioners whether there was a need to have separate M (manufacturing) districts. Mr. Dabareiner pointed out that the largest difference between M-1 and M-2 was vehicle sales and its service use list. He did not oppose the consolidation, nor did the commissioners.

Mr. Thoman returned and suggested that the commission consider including Low Intensity Office Research Medical in Section 3 - Uses, since it was one of the new items that was specifically included in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated the use was to be used as a buffer zone between high densities and residential areas. Clarification followed regarding the land needed (10 acres) if the village were to rezone property to Office Research. Staff offered to follow up on the Low Intensity Office Research Medical use but Mr. Dabareiner pointed out that in the B-3 district there existed a retail category and a low intensity office potential use. Dialog then followed by Mr. Dabareiner that this issue could be addressed as it arose. The Use table was further explained with questions following as to why the Natural Resource Preservation category was separate from the Parks and Recreation use; why there was a difference between public and private schools (Mr. Bishop suggested to eliminate the distinction moving forward); and the reasoning behind Eating and Drinking Establishments. Other comments/concerns raised included fueling stations and not making electric vehicles charging stations as a special use; restricting equipment/material storage to outdoor use only; and whether a special use in the M district may be appropriate. Dialog

continued with Mr. Bishop pointing out that under Financial Services, pawn shops and cash for gold shops were being prohibited as a new use. If that were the case, Ms. Urban suggested tightening up the retail sales definition then. She asked if the Title Max loans were also included in that restriction.

Further conversation was raised by Mr. Bishop that the Use table may have to be further refined and discussed in a separate meeting because it was a matter of what made sense to the village. To Chairman Webster's question on where an excavation business may go, dialog followed that it may be under Manufacturing where such businesses are less obtrusive, or, it could be a special use in B-2, permitted in B-3 and M-1.

Mr. Thoman returned and thanked the commissioners for excluding salvaging and junk yards.

Planning Manager, Charity Jones, questioned whether the medical marijuana trend should be discussed now or later to which Mr. Bishop was aware of this matter.

Reviewing Article 14, Mr. Bishop explained that this article focused on how to take proper measurements with a few general exceptions to establish rules. Examples followed. With regard to the types of trellises, he would review the matter further. Mr. Beggs asked that Mr. Bishop elaborate on the requirements of floor area since he questioned what occurred when a home had a chimney on the exterior. Mr. Bishop explained that it would have never been counted as floor area in the first place. Details followed on how the calculation would take place and the fact that the village was trying to find consistency, as used by other municipalities.

Turning to the Setbacks Encroachment table, specifically the trellis line, Mr. Bishop asked the commissioners if the one foot difference between the R-4 and all other remaining residential districts was necessary. Chairman Webster recalled that this restriction was possibly due to the small homes on smaller lots in the grid areas of town and may have had something to do with the tear-downs. Mr. Bishop would further research. A question was raised by Mr. Quirk regarding the rationale between the one foot setbacks for driveways in a side yard and would it be allowed if a driveway had to be replaced, wherein Mr. Dabareiner stated the restriction had to do more with neighbor-to-neighbor problems. Ms. Jones stated that the requirement was fairly standard throughout other communities. Mr. Dabareiner then explained how such issues would be addressed.

Lastly, Mr. Bishop reported that a new provision entitled Contextual Setbacks addressed many issues that had been raised over the years (bottom of Page 14-4). This provision addressed front yard setbacks and made a home consistent with the front setbacks of the neighbors on either side of the property by averaging the setback figures. The provision allowed a property owner to move his property forward to match an established pattern but not move it further back. This would also include the addition of porches.

Mr. Beggs asked what topics would be upcoming in order to give businesses a heads-up on the topic of signage. Mr. Bishop stated he did not know just yet but added that minor changes were occurring with signage.

APPROVED 8/5/13

Returning to the trellis conversation, Ms. Jones commented that there were many arbors, pergolas and trellises on the street side of homes within the village and she would question having a restriction on the street side since fences were allowed.

WITH RESPECT TO PC 18-13, MR. WAECHTLER MOVED TO CONTINUE THE HEARING. SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. WAECHTLER, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATA, MS. URBAN, CHAIRMAN WEBSTER.

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:52 P.M. ON MOTION BY CHAIRMAN WEBSTER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Celeste K. Weilandt

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)