



SCAPPOOSE *Oregon*

SCAPPOOSE PLANNING COMMISSION

Council Chambers at City Hall
33568 East Columbia Avenue

Thursday, March 23rd, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kulp called the Scappoose Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 pm

2.0 ROLL CALL

Planning Commission:

Carmen Kulp	Chair
Scott Jensen	Vice Chair
Bruce Shoemaker	Commissioner
Rita Bernhard	Commissioner
Tim Connell	Commissioner

Staff:

Laurie Oliver	City Planner
Chris Negelspach	City Engineer
Elizabeth Happala	Office Administrator III
Ben Tolles	AmeriCorps RARE Participant

Excused: Commissioner Blank

3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 March 9th, 2017 meeting

Commissioner Shoemaker moved and Commissioner Bernhardt seconded the motion to approve the March 9th, 2017 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Motion passed 6-0.

Chair Kulp, aye; Vice Chair Jensen, aye; Commissioner Shoemaker, aye; Commission Dahla, aye;

Commissioner Bernhard, aye, and Commissioner Connell, aye.

4.0 CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

5.1 DOCKET # SDR4-16/ PLA5-16

Lufkin Apartments LLC has requested approval of an application for Site Development Review (SDR4-16) and Property Line Adjustment (PLA5-16) for a proposed multi-family development consisting of three buildings; 1 building containing (4) studio units and the other two buildings each containing (8) two bedroom units (for a total of 20 units), and associated site amenities. The site is located at 33730 E. Columbia Ave., near the southwest corner of the E. Columbia Ave and NE West Lane Rd. intersection on property described as Columbia County Assessor Map # 3212-DB-00100 and 3212-DB-02900.

Chair Kulp read the docket and format, then asked if anyone wanted to declare any conflict of interest or if any party wanted to challenge any conflict. There was none.

City Planner Oliver went over the staff report.

Chair Kulp asked the Commissioners if they had any questions;

Vice Chair Jensen asked about the architectural character, it states on the plans that the false dormers are optional, or are those going to be included.

City Planner Oliver replied that it was listed in the narrative so we would hold them to it.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that E. Columbia Ave. is a collector street and wanted to know which collector street standard it would be improved to as it lists several types of collector streets; specifically wanting to find out if there would be on-street parking.

City Engineer stated that on page 7 of the approved minutes from the the Traffic Training; it shows 60' right of ways with parking for that type of street.

Vice Chair Jensen asked about the location of the surface water infiltration system.

City Engineer Negelspach replied that it shows an infiltration ditch on page 66 lower right hand corner of the page; it will be looked at again since it drains a public right of way. Adding that it would be classified as a UIC but it will not cause a huge impact as they have high infiltration rates so they could meet the treatment standard with mechanical infiltration or some other method and they won't need a lot of room to infiltrate.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if the two disabled parking spaces were above the required minimum.

City Planner Oliver stated it is what's required.

Chair Kulp ask if any commissioners had any questions for staff. As there were none she called up the applicant.

Applicant Joe Scharf approached the speaker's desk; and asked if anyone had any questions.

Commissioner Dalha asked if he came to a resolution with the Young's regarding the fence between the properties.

Applicant Joe Scharf asked Mr. Young to draft a letter so it was on record and stated he did talk to him also; currently there is a cyclone fence there and he will be working with him on getting a fence that would be best for him that would contain his small dogs.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if they plan to manage it after they build it; the applicant agreed.

Chair Kulp asked if this is the final plan they are looking at tonight; applicant agreed, but there might be a couple minor changes here or there but as far as the building is concerned it will be the same.

Chair Kulp asked if the commissioners had any further questions for the applicant;

Chair Kulp asked if there was an existing well or septic system on the property.

Applicant Joe Scharf replied that there is no septic but there is a well.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if he was going to abandon the well.

Applicant Joe Scharf replied that he originally wanted to keep it but was asked to abandon it.

Commissioner Bernhard thanked City Planner Oliver for the very thorough staff report as it answered many questions.

Chair Kulp stated that since there are no other questions she was closing the hearing at 7:23pm and opened it up for Commissioner Discussions.

Vice Chair Jensen stated he is glad to see it.

Commissioner Bernhard agreed as we need the housing.

Chair Kulp stated it was a great application.

Vice Chair Jensen motioned to approve Site Development Review (SDR4-16) and Property Line Adjustment (PLA5-16) with conditions as presented and Commissioner Bernhard second the motion. **Motion passed 6-0.**

Chair Kulp, aye; Vice Chair Jensen, aye; Commissioner Shoemaker, aye; Commission Dahla, aye; Commissioner Bernhard, aye, and Commissioner Connell, aye.

5.2 WORK SESSION

Review proposed sign and parking code amendments.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles started the discussion by going over the recommended sign code changes after discussions from the last sign code work session and editing the Troutdale sign code to make it more applicable to Scappoose.

City Planner Oliver asked AmeriCorps RARE Participant about page 109 related to bench signs if the idea of it being 20' from an established transit stop was from the St. Helens code or something he added.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles replied that it was something he added, as bus stops are normally where he sees bench signs, and it would be strange to have bench signs in a park. Adding that he did get the 15 square feet from the St. Helens code.

Commissioner Dahla asked how the changes would affect the current bench signage in the city.

City Planner Oliver stated that everything existing would be grandfathered in; she only recalls a few benches but they are within the commercial zones.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if the existing bench signs are on private property or in the public right of way. Adding that some are within the sidewalk.

City Planner Oliver replied that when they are constructed they still have to meet the required sidewalk widths but would look into that further.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if they were on private property then what would the setbacks be, so that someone sitting on them doesn't have their knees blocking the sidewalk.

City Planner Oliver stated they would look into that.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles went over his recommended changes to temporary signs on page 111, item B #2; stating one temporary sign per street frontage and not placed more than 60 days before the event.

City Planner Oliver asked if our current sign code allowed for two temporary signs or was that from Troutdale, they allowed two lawn signs.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles replied that there was a discrepancy between lawn signs and temporary signs so he just eliminated lawn signs in favor of temporary signs. Adding that they could add it to two or three for political signs where you would support two different candidates.

Commissioner Shoemaker recalls that the discussion; it was unrealistic to only allow for one.

Chair Kulp agreed that they should be allowed more than one.

Vice Chair Jensen proposes leaving the total as 12 square feet on page 111 item B.1, which would allow for more than

one sign as long as the total of all would be no more than 12 square feet.

City Planner Oliver replied that is per sign face not a total, so if we allow 2 signs that would be 2- 12 square foot sign faces.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked Vice Chair Jensen for clarification on his recommendation of 12 total square feet for all signs.

Vice Chair Jensen agreed, then they aren't counting the number of signs but the total square footage.

City Planner Oliver added that it might be hard to police as they would be out there measuring all the signs.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that it would only be complaint driven.

City Planner Oliver & Chair Kulp agreed.

Vice Chair Jensen added that this would convey the spirit that we aren't limiting their candidate choices.

Chair Kulp and Commissioner Shoemaker agreed.

Commissioner Bernard asked if there was a rule from the State regarding political signs.

City Planner Oliver replied that she was not aware of any.

Commissioner Shoemaker added that he too thought there was a ruling from the State about when it needed to be taken down.

City Planner Oliver added that the Troutdale code states that it could go up 90 days before the event, but that seems long so we switched it to 60 days.

Vice Chair Jensen stated he would like to see 30-45 days prior.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles added that is only 2 months.

Vice Chair Jensen stated they have the May elections and the November elections so potentially someone could have signs out 4 months a year.

Chair Kulp doesn't think it will have that big of an impact.

Commissioner Bernhard added that if they put out their signs really early eventually people just don't notice them anymore as they become accustomed to seeing them.

City Planner Oliver stated they would review the county codes too.

Commissioner Connell asked about the person that does the extreme by putting out 12 – 1 square foot signs.

Vice Chair Jensen replied that those signs would have to be custom made since normal is about 18"x24". Adding he wants something simple that would give property owners a choice.

City Planner Oliver added that the bottom of page 110-112; it is specifically looking at signs within the residential zone then goes into commercial and industrial. Adding that it repeats again at the bottom of page 112, asking if the commissioners want to remove the one temporary sign rule and just use the total square footage calculation instead.

Chair Kulp added that a businesses use for a temporary sign is different from the residential uses, so they might not have 3 or 4 different signs out.

City Planner Oliver replied that they could limit to one temporary sign per street frontage; then take a look at the maximum sign area allowed per D. 1.

Commissioner Dahla asked how it would affect window signs for business; like McDonalds that has huge glossy signs in all their windows.

City Planner Oliver looked up the definition of a wall signs versus window sign.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that he thought those weren't regulated as they are on the inside.

Commissioner Bernhard stated that it seems to be more difficult to regulate signs inside a building versus outside.

City Planner Oliver replied that window signs are addressed on page 109 item F; under sign permit exemptions, provided they are not flashing or blinking.

Chair Kulp asked about the 60 day limit on temporary signs adding that they could make an exemption with the businesses.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that they could put their sign up 60 days prior to the sale and keep it up during the sale but then after the sale it must come down within 14 days.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles added that temporary signs within the commercial area are limited to 32 square feet whereas it's only 12 square feet in residential.

City Planner Oliver asked about the banner sign at 96 square feet (on page 112 D.1).

Vice Chair Jensen said 96 square feet seems good for a collector street if they are stringing it up across the street.

Commissioner Connell asked if they could put in an exception based on the time they need it up.

City Planner Oliver replied that would be hard to track as the only time it comes to her attention is if someone complains.

Chair Kulp likes the 48 square foot limit.

Commissioner Shoemaker agrees with Vice Chair.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that 15 sounds fine for the residential cap; then 48 square feet for a commercial banner.

City Planner Oliver asked if they still wanted to limit it to one temporary sign per commercial frontage.

Vice Chair Jensen replied that they could do the same as they did for residential, as they are more likely to use just one large sign than multiple.

City Planner Oliver stated it would be a good idea to limit them to one sign.

Chair Kulp agreed unless they were able to put one sign on each corner.

City Planner Oliver replied they would be allowed one sign per street frontage so corner lots could have two signs.

Vice Chair Jensen added that he would be concerned if businesses wanted to put up multiple political signs.

Chair Kulp asked if they could add an exception to political signs.

City Planner Oliver replied no.

Applicant Joe Scharf added that he would be putting up commercial temporary signs on sandwich boards.

City Planner Oliver replied that those are addressed separately. Then asked commissioners for clarification to the Commercial/Industrial regulations; moving it to 45 days and 7.

Chair Kulp replied that it should be 60 & 14.

City Engineer Negelspach asked if the Dairy Queen digital sign would be allowed in the new code and the high school reader board sign.

City Planner Oliver replied that it would specify how quickly the message could change. Adding that someone would have to watch it to make sure the message slowed down, maybe they just need to adjust it to slow it down.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked everyone if they could get to that later since we're skipping around, going back to where they were on page 113.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if they could go back to page 107 E. Lighting; if they need to specify anything related to LED or light sources meeting the same type of requirements.

City Planner Oliver stated that it was pulled straight from the Troutdale code so they could look into their code more to see if it specifies a difference.

Vice Chair Jensen stated he did read about illumination of signs that should not interfere with the public right of way.

City Engineer Negelspach stated for example the Frake's building has 2- 8' strips of fluorescent lights that aim at the street to attract attention to their sign; so it appears more like part of the sign; it's technically allowed in this code since it's not in the definitions but it needs to be addressed.

City Planner Oliver suggested everyone read E. 2, on page 107 as it addresses lighting and how signs are illuminated; stating that they could add roadway to the list or that it needs to be directed away from the public right of way.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that they could add in the definition that any flashing light would be considered a sign.

City Engineer Negelspach adding that if they just classify that type of a light as a sign then it would have to meet this requirement.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that it would be easy to add that any flashing light must comply with the sign code.

City Engineer Negelspach added that a bright spot light aimed at an intersection that technically doesn't fall into this code should be addressed or defined in this code also.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles added that he would do some research on that and come back with something that sounds reasonable.

Commissioner Shoemaker asked if this is something that might already be addressed in the traffic code.

Vice Chair Jensen agreed and wondered if is already addressed in a traffic safety code but does agree that we need to

identify it in our sign code if it flashes.

City Planner Oliver stated that item E. 3 does prohibit strobe lights or similar devices (page 107).

Vice Chair Jensen called out reader boards on page 111, and is all for striking reader boards from residential areas.

City Planner Oliver added that there are churches in residential areas with reader boards.

Chair Kulp is wondering if we could exclude non-profits or state no private residents.

Vice Chair Jensen stated we could go by taxing status so if they are tax exempt as a church, although it would be cumbersome to confirm.

Commissioner Dahla asked about the hair salon in the residential home on SW JP West and 1st, they have a reader board.

City Planner Oliver stated that she believes that section of 1st Street is in a commercial zone.

City Engineer Negelspach asked about the definition of a reader board vs the high school sign.

City Planner Oliver replied that the high school sign is considered a digital sign.

Chair Kulp wonders if the wording might need to be looked at again and City Planner Oliver agreed.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if churches have a business license.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated the the signage is addressed in the home business code.

Vice Chair Jensen wondered if we should add an exception for reader boards in residential areas, with the exception of a city business license.

City Planner Oliver agreed that the home occupation permit does limit signage in a residential area; if Type 1 - no signs are allowed, but if it's a Type II, then it's limited.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that the code already does that so we could just add an exception for churches and schools.

(Multiple short discussions about churches & schools)

City Planner Oliver stated they would look into it more and bring it back to everyone later.

Commissioner Dahla asked about churches that would want to update their reader board sign to an LED sign. Vice Chair Jensen replied that would be an electronic sign.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles stated that those are not allowed.

City Planner Oliver agreed, those are not allowed but they could have a free standing sign.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles stated he would look into other codes and bring it back. He then brought everyone's attention to page 113; projecting signs. Stating that the Troutdale sign only allows for 4 square feet.

City Planner Oliver added that this type of sign would be perpendicular to the building projecting out, reading E. 4; "One projecting sign allowed per site". The word "site" will need to be further defined.

Lufkin Applicant, Joe Scharf, whom is a local developer and builder, also had comments about the language of code although inaudible. City Planner Oliver did like the points he brought up.

Vice Chair Jensen asked about a building owner that might have multiple tenants.

(Multiple short conversations at the same time.)

Vice Chair Jensen asked about limiting their sign style. Adding that one building could have 5 businesses but they would have the same silhouette.

City Planner Oliver replied that many businesses like to have their own unique look and style.

Vice Chair Jensen added that the business could put whatever they want on the sign and we just regulate the silhouette so there would be some uniformity to the building. Stating the the City of Cannon Beach does that.

City Planner Oliver stated they could have it read "Per Unit" or "Per Store Front" instead of "per site".

Vice Chair Jensen stated that sometimes one business might take 2 store fronts.

City Planner Oliver stated we could say "per business" instead of "per store front".

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked if we are allowed to regulate the shape of a sign.

City Planner Oliver replied they are just looking into regulating the outside shape of the sign.

Vice Chair Jensen added that he was just proposing that the silhouettes be the same.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked if one store front had a fancy/expensive board, would all the the other store fronts be required to mimic the fancy one.

Vice Chair Jensen replied that if anything is existing now it would be grandfathered so any new sign would have to conform to the current code and the building owner would have some input.

City Engineer Negelspach stated it would be hard to regulate as many signs are already trademarked.

Commissioner Dahla added that would be hard to tell businesses to change their logo.

City Planner Oliver added that we could look into this one further too.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated we need to bring this back for further discussion.

City Engineer Negelspach added that 4 square feet is not a big sign and is more of a decorative sign that many wouldn't notice from the road.

City Planner Oliver added that it is more of a pedestrian scale sign.

Commissioner Connell added that it's like the signs on NW 23rd in Portland.

Chair Kulp stated that for certain areas of town it would be acceptable, but not on the highway.

Commissioner Connell asked if the code needs to say something about perpendicular signs.

Vice Chair Jensen replied that on page 105 it already has a definition of projecting signs.

City Planner Oliver added that they are generally at right angles to the building.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked if all were perpendicular.

City Planner Oliver replied that some could be flat.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked if any commissioners had further comments about Projecting Signs. As there were none, they moved onto Roof Signs, packet page 114.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that he thought they already agreed they did not want to allow any roof signs; in which all Commissioners agreed.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles stated that he was looking around and found a statement, G.1, page 114; that would allow for roof signs when no other sign options are available. Adding that it might be hard for a business to move somewhere that would not allow for any other sign other than a roof top sign.

Chair Kulp asked AmeriCorps RARE Participant if he could provide an example of one.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that he could not think of any situation where there would not be another sign option besides a roof sign.

Vice Chair Jensen does like the idea of leaving this statement in the code as a possibility.

Commissioner Shoemaker suggested instead of doing that they could just say that they would have to file for an exception for anything outside of the code.

Vice Chair Jensen replied that criteria would need to be written for granting the exception or it would need to come to Planning Commission for approval.

Chair Kulp added that she was not in favor of that. Vice Chair Jensen agreed.

Commissioner Dahla asked if someone had a blue tarp on their roof due to a leak; could that be a roof sign.

Vice Chair Jensen stated it might only be communicating that they need a roofer.

City Planner Oliver confirmed that the roof top section has been struck.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles stated that was all the corrections for now, unless anyone has any comments on electronic signs.

Vice Chair Jensen replied that he did have one comment; page 116 item B; definition of "one per premises".

City Planner Oliver replied that she thinks they are saying "per business".

Vice Chair Jensen agreed that is probably what they mean, but we should define it; suggesting one per street frontage then leave it up to the commercial property owner to make that call.

City Planner Oliver used the example of Dairy Queen with the many businesses on one lot; especially if the other businesses want one too.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that it would be the commercial property owner's decision; as they are a distraction.

City Engineer Negelspace asked if it restricted location in the code.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles replied/read page 116; "Electronic display signs shall be allowed only in commercial and industrial zones."

City Engineer Negelspach added that means it could be anywhere on the site not associated with the building or next to a traffic signal or cross walk; like the electronic sign the school has.

City Planner Oliver asked if it should say along the frontage.

City Engineer Negelspach added that the old code did not allow it.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if there was a specification on how close an entrance could be to an intersection.

City Planner Oliver agreed.

Vice Chair Jensen asked what if we use that distance to specify where the electronic sign couldn't go.

City Planner Oliver replied the Dairy Queen sign would still meet that criteria.

City Engineer Negelspach added that it is still distracting as you approach the intersection your site level is above the pedestrians and crosswalk.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked if they could add a height requirement.

City Engineer Negelspach stated the old code had language about distracting drivers.

City Planner Oliver stated they could look at that further.

Vice Chair Jensen page 116 C; the high school sign is a single color and they scroll more than once every 2 minutes; and asked if they wanted to differentiate between monochrome or not.

City Engineer Negelspach replied that it's more static; once you read the high school sign you're done, but the Dairy Queen sign flashes very quickly and displays something different very quickly.

Vice Chair Jensen added that this would limit it to 10 seconds if under 4 square feet and the signal could change every 2 minutes.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked could we force them to stop doing that as soon as they change the message on the sign.

City Engineer Negelspach suggested that he could ask them.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles stated that he would look at the old code about distracting drivers.

City Planner Oliver added to review the maximum sign area allowance.

Vice Chair Jensen also suggested that they look at the ODOT sign regulations.

City Engineer Negelspach added that if the standard was to allow those flashing signs then as a driver you are used to it but when there is only one sign that is flashing then drivers become attracted to it.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles asked if anyone else had any comments or suggestions.

City Engineer Negelspach suggested that they also talk to the Building Official Don Salle to see how you define the roof

line as it applies to wall signs; page 112.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles replied it was already defined.

City Planner Oliver added that some of the enforcement listed in the very back will need to be brought back as she will need to discuss this further with our police chief, as the city's municipal code gives him certain powers different from hers.

Chair Kulp brought us to the next topic; Parking Discussions on packet page 120.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles stated that it's just the sentence at the bottom of page; "for every 10 required parking spaces, one additional space labeled VISITOR must be included". Adding that this change was discussed last time for multifamily only.

Vice Chair Jensen stated he liked it as he is concerned about all the on street parking; he is concerned about the 4th and Columbia Ave. building that is trying to use on street parking.

Lufkin Applicant Joe Scharf stated from the audience that it seems most areas were trying to get away from more asphalt/parking.

Vice Chair Jensen agreed, but only for areas that have effective mass transit; we do not.

Lufkin Application Joe Scharf spoke from the audience, but it was inaudible.

Chair Kulp added that when they have the joint work session with city council they could bring this issue up in conjunction with the changes proposed to the zoning.

City Planner Oliver agreed.

Commissioners thanked Lufkin Applicant Joe Scharf for his suggestions.

City Engineer Chris Negelspach stated there is an intent to increase the amount of units per building.

Vice Chair Jensen added that is why we are doing the housing needs assessment.

City Planner Oliver stated that there will be changes, more than likely, to the A-1 zoning on how the density is calculated.

City Engineer Negelspach added that the concept of having more units per buildings allows more space since separate buildings eat up the available ground.

City Planner Oliver stated that they will not limit it to how many units per building and welcomed Lufkin Applicant Joe Scharf to those conversations.

Chair Kulp stated that they would table a few of those sign codes to come back for further discussions.

6.0 COMMUNICATIONS

6.1 Calendar Check

City Planner Oliver went over the upcoming calendar.

6.2 Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Connell stated that he will be out of town for the next two meetings.

Vice Chair Jensen told AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles that he did a great job editing the codes.

AmeriCorps RARE Participant Ben Tolles stated that it was fun.

City Planner Oliver stated he is a future planner in the making.

Vice Chair Jensen agreed and thanked Lufkin Applicant Joe Scharf for this comments.

6.3 Staff Comments

City Planner Oliver stated that they are moving along on the east airport subdivision application; it's very involved.

City Engineer Negelspach added their original application was light on engineering details; so the applicant will tune that up and bring it back.

City Planner Oliver stated that the OMIC annexation application is moving forward, they are doing their TPR analysis now and looking to bring in 52 acres initially, which is north of the gravel pit. Stating that the pre-application meeting was a few months ago so Planning Commission should see that in a couple months.

City Engineer Negelspach stated that they are moving forward as they have a lease with a tenant.

City Planner Oliver stated that Mike Meyers, Oregon Institute of Technology, has his office there.

City Engineer Negelspach stated that they will be building a road and permitting some site development improvements with the county with the intent that they will have to make subsequent improvements once they come into the city, along with the timing of their grant funding.

Vice Chair Jensen asked about the complaint or the appeal.

City Planner Oliver replied that the airport annexation was appealed to LUBA; they issued a stay on that to have more time, with a potential to work through the issues and settle out of court. Adding that they have not seen the appeal but it would be confined to the issues raised at Planning Commission and City Council.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kulp adjourned the meeting at 8:40pm.



Chair Carmen Kulp

Attest:



Elizabeth Happala, Office Administrator III