CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

***** MINUTES *****

REGULAR MEETING – MONDAY, August 23, 2021 – 7:00 PM

The Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals held a regular meeting on Monday, August 23, 2021, at 7:00 pm at the Orion Township Community Center, 1335 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

ZBA MEMBERS PRESENT (Board Member Location):
Dan Durham, Chairman
Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Mike Flood, BOT Rep to ZBA
Tony Cook, Vice-Chairman
Tony Kerby, Alternate

ZBA MEMBERS ABSENT:
Diane Dunaskiss, Board member

CONSULTANT PRESENT:
David Goodloe, Building Official

OTHERS PRESENT:
Gail Sherman
Mia Asta
Matt & Diane Dunaskiss
Robert Melichar
Jim Weiss
Todd Hamula
David Plautz
Michael Stroli
Gloria and Janne Sosa

1. OPEN MEETING
Chairman Durham called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

3. MINUTES

A. 8-9-2021, ZBA Regular Meeting Amended Minutes

Moved by Trustee Flood, seconded by Board member Walker, to approve the minutes with the following amendments: page 1, Agenda Review and Approval, replace “Chairman Walker” with “Board member Walker”; page 9, under Roll Call vote, replace “Brackon” with “Dunaskiss”; page 11, under Roll Call vote, replace “Brackon” with “Dunaskiss”.

Motion carried.

B. 7-29-2021, Joint Meeting Minutes

Moved by Trustee Flood, seconded by Board member Walker, to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion carried.

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Moved by Trustee Flood, seconded by Chairman Durham to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion carried.
5. **ZBA BUSINESS**

A. **AB-2021-47, Allied Signs/Firestone, 25 Indianwood, 09-02-177-020**

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 2 variances from Sign Ordinance #153, Section 7 Non-Residential Zoned Areas Wall Signs – Zoned GB

1. A variance to allow 1 additional wall sign to install a total of 2 wall signs totaling 145.66-sq. ft. Section 7 – Ground Signs in Non-Residential- Zoned GB
2. A 23-ft. road right-of-way setback variance from the required 30-ft. for a ground sign to be 7-ft. from the road right-of-way (Axford Road).

The petitioner is seeking 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned GB, Article 14, Section 14.04

1. A 23-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 30-ft. for a ground sign to be 7-ft. from the front property line (Axford Road).

Mr. Jim Fields, Allied Signs, introduced himself to the Board and explained the variance request. He commented that the property is in an area where several roads come together and the building is set 30 feet back from Axford Road. He explained the issues with locating the monument sign in a location allowed by the ordinance, it would be in the parking lot and it would not be visible. The amount of square footage conforms to the ordinance but it is the number of signs that is in violation.

Chairman Durham stated that this a big building on a small site and asked if people need the sign to tell what the building is.

Mr. Fields replied with the speed and the traffic on M-24, you will see the building sign before you see the monument sign. The monument sign is more for directional during egress; it will direct them into the parking lot. When you come down Indianwood, it is the same thing. You would see the building sign first and then the monument sign as you come into the intersection.

Chairman Durham stated that the same cars come up and down this road every day. They will see where the building is and will remember its location. He asked if they had done any traffic studies.

Mr. Fields replied no. He stated that with Firestone, they have their own national studies on roads and signage. He indicated that he does a lot of driving with his family and if he needs an oil change, he will look for a national brand like Firestone. He stated that 70% would be local traffic and another 30% would be people who are not familiar with the area.

Board member Walker asked Mr. Fields if he filled out the application for this request.

Mr. Fields replied yes.

Board member Walker stated that in the application it indicates that it is not self-created. He asked for an explanation.

Mr. Fields stated that to meet the setbacks, the building is set off of Axford at 30 feet and the parking lot is on the outside, to meet the 30 foot setback for the sign it puts it at the front of the building and would not be easily visible. The lot is a trapezoid and there are three roads there.

Board member Walker asked if the roads were there before the building was built.
Mr. Fields replied yes, but how would you know before the parking lots were placed. He added that clearly Firestone was not intended at this location when they parceled out the lot. He stated that Firestone is trying to apply their standard branding package to this location. Frequently, it is a square footage variance that they are asking for but this is not in this case. They are asking for the setback variance and the variance to allow two wall signs instead of just one.

Trustee Flood stated that in Ms. Harrison’s review letter, it is shown that they do meet the setback on Indianwood Road. They have three roads that they are dealing with.

Chairman Durham asked if there was public comment.

Mr. Michael Strohl introduced himself to the Board. He feels this is a self-created hardship based on the shape of the building. He is most concerned about the request for the additional sign. If the building was designed and built in a different manner, they would not need two signs. The roads were there prior to this developer being rejected for rezoning request. The two wall signs are in addition to one monument sign and they will have adequate visibility. When this developer made this plea, they indicated that most of their business is scheduled service. Additional signage is detrimental to the overall appearance of this commercial area and the nearby residential properties.

Mr. Todd Hamula, property owner representative, introduced himself to the Board. The wall signs are most critical and will be most seen. The hardship that exists for the monument sign is the right of way. The right of way that exists there is huge and is a giant tree lawn. The practical difficulty is that the lot is very unique and has a large depth of right of way. It is a unique lot. The ideal spot would be to put it in the right of way. The two wall signs on the corner of the building are most critical. The ground sign gets you into the site.

No further public comment was heard.

Chairman Durham asked if this was a corporate sign set up.

Mr. Fields replied that this is their standard for a corner lot. The monument sign is downgraded about 40% due to its location because they know that the two wall signs are the main points.

Chairman Durham commented that where the building is and with the number of cars going by it, this is the last place that you need motorist confusion.

Trustee Flood stated that one wall sign is going to be on the north side of the building where the bays are. The additional wall sign is on the east side of the building facing Lapeer Road and Axford.

Mr. Fields agreed.

Trustee Flood stated that the additional sign will not be facing the resident who spoke on Channel Street. The ground sign is at the corner which is on the northeast and will not affect the residents on the south side.

Mr. Fields stated that the sign meets the requirements of the ordinance regarding size.

Vice-chairman Cook asked which road the sign would face.

Mr. Fields replied that the monument sign is perpendicular to Indianwood at the point of egress.

Vice-chairman Cook commented that the sign is facing north. If there is already signage on the building and the monument sign is facing the same way, how does the monument sign provide more direction than the sign on the building itself.
Mr. Fields explained the visibility difference in the signs from a vehicle point of view. The monument is more of a directional sign placement. The channel letters direct your attention to the building and the monument sign guides the motorist into the parking area.

Vice-chairman Cook commented that most motorists are listening to directions on their phone anyway.

Mr. Fields stated that the applicant could add the vinyl that is allowable by code. He reiterated that the uniqueness of the lot creates the variance request.

Chairman Durham asked if they were trying to put too big of a building on too small of a piece of property.

Mr. Fields replied that he is not the developer, he is the sign guy. He is sure that they did a study for the community to determine how many bays were needed.

Board member Kerby stated that the total amount of wall signage proposed is significantly less than allowed for one wall sign.

Mr. Fields stated that when you look at the style, both signs have white lettering and not the red, white and blue that is part of the normal signage. The building owners wanted the building to stand out more than the sign. They are designing this building so it is not as loud.

Vice-chairman Cook stated that the self-created question is where he is stuck with the monument sign.

Mr. Fields stated that it is for the additional 7 feet. The monument sign is an allowable sign. The challenge is where the setback is off of Axford. There is not the depth in the parking lot.

Board member Walker moved and Vice-chairman Cook supported, in the matter of case AB-2021-47, Allied Signs/Firestone, 25 Indianwood, 09-02-177-020 seeking 2 variances from Sign Ordinance #153, Section 7 Non-Residential Zoned Areas Wall Signs – Zoned GB consisting of a variance to allow 1 additional wall sign to install a total of 2 wall signs totaling 145.66-sq. ft. and Section 7 – Ground Signs in Non-Residential- Zoned GB for a variance for a 23-ft. road right-of-way setback variance from the required 30-ft. for a ground sign to be 7-ft. from the road right-of-way (Axford Road) and 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned GB, Article 14, Section 14.04 for a 23-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 30-ft. for a ground sign to be 7-ft. from the front property line (Axford Road) be denied because the petitioner did not demonstrate that the standards for variances have been met in this case. The petitioner does not have practical difficulty since it was all self-created. The property in question was not a tire store prior to this and it was too big a project for this corner. The developer moved forward and put this building in subsequent to all of the ordinances and the sign ordinances and setbacks were all in place when this occurred. There are not exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in this same district or zone: the petitioner knew about these items which are all self-created.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Cook, yes; Flood, no; Walker, yes; Kerby, no. Motion passed 3-2.

B. AB-2021-48, Gardner Signs Inc./NTBS, 4601 Liberty Dr., 09-34-300-016

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 2 variances from Sign Ordinance #153, Section 7 Non-Residential Zoned Areas Wall Signs – Zoned IP

1. A variance to allow 1 additional wall sign to for a total of 2 wall signs.
2. A 92.19-sq. ft. size variance above the allowed 200-sq. ft. for 2 wall signs totaling
Ms. Mia Asta, petitioner, introduced herself to the Board and summarized the variance request. She stated that it is a 54,000 square foot building and when you put the address in GPS, it doesn't take you there so signage is critical. There will not be a monument sign on the property. She stated that there are two businesses being run out of this one building and for identifications purposes, 2 wall signs are important. She showed a picture of the one wall sign that is already installed. She showed pictures representing the proposed location of the signage and the existing signage in the amount of 199 square feet. She stated that they are asking for proportionate signage for this size of building.

Board member Walker stated that he visited the site today and he didn't even know the building was there. He asked what goes on in the building now.

Ms. Asta replied that it is a production for medical marijuana. Everything is done inside of the building and is a state-of-the-art cannabis production facility.

Board member Walker commented that there is a large field to the west of the building that is being irrigated. The building is very large for the sign that is on it now.

Chairperson Durham asked if there were retail customers at the site.

Ms. Asta replied no.

Chairperson Durham stated that they would have pretty much the same people in and out of the site.

Ms. Asta replied that she doesn't know a lot of what goes on in the day to day processes. The business owner has said that they will have constant distribution in and out of the building and if there are different drivers, it would be an issue.

Chairperson Durham stated that if it was the same fleet of trucks and the same drivers, they will figure it out.

Board member Kerby stated that he is familiar with the industry and it is not always the same drivers in and out. The drivers have to be certified but it is a high turnover job.

Chairperson Durham asked if there was any public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Vice-chairman Cook commented on the fact that salesman find things. When things are new, there is a difficulty finding them but she mentioned in her application the fact that suppliers would find it difficult to find the building.

Ms. Asta stated that her answer should have been suppliers or delivery persons.

Vice-chairman Cook stated that in the application it asks if the situation was self-created and the answer was, the building was 54,000 square feet. He asked how this addresses the question on whether or not it is self-created.

Ms. Asta stated that it is not self-created by the ordinance itself. They have the one wall sign that meets the ordinance. They were able to make the building this large to meet the supply and demand of the industry and this was approved by building and zoning. The building is on a corner lot and this is not self-created. She stated that once you pull down Liberty Drive, it is difficult to find the building, especially since there are two names.
Vice-chairman Cook stated that she is underestimating the intelligence of the drivers and suppliers. He stated that since there are power lines in front, there will probably not be a building being built in front.

Ms. Asta stated that if someone is looking for Natrabis, there is no sign that says this. There is a sign that says Society C. Both names are registered with the property and they will have deliveries for both business names.

Chairman Durham asked Building Official Goodloe if there is going to be a second building placed in the subject area.

Building Official Goodloe stated that there is one going next door. It is going on the corner.

Board member Kerby moved, and Vice-chairman Cook supported, in ZBA case #AB-2021-48, Gardner Signs Inc./NTBS, 4601 Liberty Dr., 09-34-300-016 for 2 variances from Sign Ordinance #153, Section 7 Non-Residential Zoned Areas Wall Signs – Zoned IP including a variance to allow 1 additional wall sign to for a total of 2 wall signs and a 92.19-sq. ft. size variance above the allowed 200-sq. ft. for 2 wall signs totaling 292.19-sq. ft. be denied because the petitioner did not demonstrate the following standards for the variance having been met in this case and the case set forth facts that show that in this case:

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, no; Cook, yes; Flood, no; Walker, yes; Kerby, yes. Motion passed 3-2.

C. AB-2021-49, Mathew Dunaskiss & Mike Riddle, Vacant Parcel South of 576 Cushing St., 09-03-278-026

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:
The petitioners are seeking to extend the expiration date for the approved AB-2019-23 ZBA case variances.

Mr. Mike Riddle introduced himself to the Board as representing the new owners of the subject lot. He stated that he came in front of the Board a couple of times and he provided history of his presentations. He summarized the variance request and indicated that the variance is exactly the same as what was approved previously. He asked for an extension of 12 months. The approval was originally granted in June 2019.

Chairman Durham summarized the variance request. He stated that the petitioner is asking that the Board go back to 2020.

Mr. Riddle stated that he has a document that says June 24, 2019 was the approval date. He stated that the new project was designed based on approvals that they had received in 2019.

Chairman Durham stated that he thought that if the Board were to move forward, they would start the clock at the expiration of the last granted variance and that would leave a gap. This Board has the authority to extend the permit. This is a new request for the Board.

Trustee Flood stated that in reviewing the Attorney’s opinion, the date that would make sense would be June 24, 2022.

Chairman Durham stated that they also had information that said they could start the new variance at the expiration date of the last one.

Board members and Building Official Goodloe discussed the Attorney’s opinion letter and the timing of the variance.
Mr. Riddle summarized the history of the variances on this property. He stated that because of COVID, the project was delayed and he stated that the owners would be fine if the Board members granted it for only 10 months.

Board member Kerby stated that the Board would be giving a 24 month extension on the variances.

Chairman Durham stated that he would question if anything has changed from last time.

Board member Walker stated that the applicant indicates that COVID is to blame, however, the Board has seen many cases and this is the first time that COVID is mentioned to be to blame for not following through on the variance.

Mr. Riddle stated that because of COVID, they closed on the lot and there was a quiet time between the seller and the new owner. The new owner has invested in the new plans and worked within the confines of the variances not knowing that they had expired. He stated that this is Lot 1 and Lot 2 is the next case on the agenda and was approved in 2020.

Chairman Durham asked Building Official Goodloe if he still has the variance material from 2019 and can it be worked off of.

Building Official Goodloe stated that they will review the minutes and make sure that the plans comply with what was approved.

Vice-chairman Cook asked about the new owners putting together a new plan for the property and isn’t this potentially different from what was approved.

Mr. Riddle stated that the setbacks are identical and the foundation is identical.

Chairman Durham asked for public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Trustee Flood stated that the developers know if they do not start on a development, they have to come before the Planning Commission to get site plan approval for an extension. This variance is 2 years old and without the extension of time, the variances go away and they have to start over. The problem is self-created because they were ignorant of the law.

Mr. Riddle stated that as far as residential projects go, they also apply for septic approval which is good for 24 months with a one-time extension ability for 24 months.

Board member Walker stated that what has happened with ignoring what was in place, now the Board is put in a position to re-approve something without seeing anything and they are taking the applicant’s word that the request will be the same.

Mr. Riddle stated that the new owner purchased it and had no idea and it was not intentional.

Board member Walker commented on the history of this variance being granted.

Vice-chairman Cook moved, and Board member Kerby supported, in the matter of case AB-2021-49, Mathew Dunaskiss & Mike Riddle, Vacant Parcel South of 576 Cushing St., 09-03-278-026 that the petitioner’s request to extend the expiration date for the approved AB-2019-23 ZBA case be denied because the petitioner did not demonstrate the following standards for this request have been met in this case in that they set forth facts which show that in this case:

1. The petitioner does not show practical difficulty due to the fact that the original petitioner was not aware of the one year time frame.
2. The following are not exceptional or extraordinary circumstances applicable to the property involved in that they generally do not apply to other properties in the same district or zone in that in when most variances are issued, the property owners take action to move forward in the one year time frame that is set.

3. The variance is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by others in the same zone or vicinity.

4. The granting of the variance or modification will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to the improvement in such zone or district in which the property is located due to the fact that by the Board granting an extension on this case, the detrimental part is that it begins to cloud future decisions that the Zoning Board may make in reference to extensions whereas this is a full 24 months after the original variances were granted.

5. Based on the following findings of fact, this variance would not impair an adequate supply of light or not unusually increase congestion on the public streets since the driveways have not been set up. This variance would not increase danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, and the Board has received a report from the Fire Department. This variance is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values. But in respect to rules that have been established, by granting this, it puts the Zoning Board in a position where they have not seen any of the current plans and it also does not prevent the current owners in coming forth and submitting plan to receive variances if they choose to.

Mr. Riddle stated that he would like to withdraw this case from this meeting.

Chairman Durham stated that they should have spoken up earlier; there is a motion and support on the floor. They will have the option to do that for the next case if they choose to.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Kerby, yes; Cook, yes; Flood, no; Walker, yes. Motion passed 4-1.

Vice-chairman Cook asked if the new family would have an ability to come before the Board.

Chairman Durham indicated yes; they would have to submit a new application in accordance with ordinance procedures.

D. AB-2021-50, Mike Riddle, Vacant Parcel 2 Parcels South of 576 Cushing St., 09-03-278-027

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:
The petitioners are seeking to extend the expiration date for the approved AB-2020-08 ZBA case variances.

Mr. Riddle stated that they would like to withdraw this case.

Ms. Diane Dunaskiss asked what the date for this parcel is.


Ms. Diane Dunaskiss asked if this puts it in the same category as the last parcel.

Chairman Durham replied in his opinion, yes. He asked if there was a date they would like to come back.

Trustee Flood asked if they are asking for withdraw or postpone.
Mr. Riddle stated that if the option on lot 1 is to start all over again, he is not sure what postponing would do as opposed to withdrawing.

Building Official Goodloe asked if they had soil erosion permits on this lot.

Mr. Riddle stated that they had soil erosion permits on all of them.

Chairman Durham replied that lot 1 is a new application. If they are postponing this case to a date certain, they are saying that they want to come back, reorganize and come to a meeting in the future.

Mr. Riddle confirmed that they would like to postpone to October 11, 2021.

Trustee Flood moved, and Chairman Durham supported, in case AB-2021-50, Mike Riddle, Vacant Parcel 2 Parcels South of 576 Cushing St., 09-03-278-027 at the request of the petitioner to postpone this request until October 11, 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Kerby, yes; Cook, no; Flood, yes; Walker, yes. Motion passed 4-1.

E. AB-2021-51, Gloria Sosa, 461 Heights, 09-11-307-015

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:
The petitioner is seeking 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-3, Article VI, Section 6.04, Zoned R-3

1. A 5- ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to build a house 5-ft. from the side property line (east).

2. A 7.34% lot coverage variance above the allowed 25% for a total lot coverage of 32.34% (parcel section south of Heights Road).

Ms. Gloria Sosa introduced herself to the Board and summarized the variance request and the history of this request. She provided a summary of the materials provided to the Board members. She stated that there was a concern from the neighbors regarding water runoff and said that the builder can speak to that. She provided photographs of the recent rainfall on the property showing there was no runoff on her property.

Chairman Durham stated that this property has a substandard lot width. He stated that the historical information on the surrounding properties are difficult to evaluate because they do not know what ordinance was in place, who was the Building Official, etc.

Vice-chairman Cook commented that Ms. Sosa took the Board comments from the last meeting and made considerable improvements.

Trustee Flood stated that the Board already approved the nonconformity of the lot width. The last application asked for four variances and she is now asking for two. The lot coverage has also gone down. He stated that he appreciates the applicant working with her neighbors.

Chairman Durham asked for public comment.

Mr. Dave Plautz, Crest Homes, introduced himself as the builder for this lot. He stated that the lot presents challenges including the steepness of the lot. They are working with Kieft Engineering and the engineer designed the water flow which is a concern. The site plan shows the water flow on the lot and the road and they have to follow this plan which eliminates the chance for water to flow on someone else’s lot. He stated that they will maintain the ordinance height of 30 feet.

Trustee Flood asked if they were removing the existing garage.
Mr. Plautz answered yes.

Vice-chairman Cook asked what the plan is for delivery of building materials on such a narrow lot.

Mr. Plautz stated that they build with a crane and use partial deliveries.

Ms. Gail Sherman, 2561 Judah Road, stated that she is the previous owner of the subject property. She stated that at the last meeting they spoke about the water on the subject lot. She provided a summary of her history with the subject lot. She stated that throughout her experience on the lot, water shedding was never a problem but was on 451 Heights Road to the east of 461 Heights Road, water shedding was an issue. She stated that regarding the 5 foot setback variance, there shouldn’t be a problem because the house will sit 50 feet from the neighboring house.

Mr. Jim Weiss, 451 Heights Road, pointed out that the location of their house should have no relevance on the variance but he supports what the Board decides. He looks forward to a house being built there because it will improve the neighborhood.

Ms. Sosa commented that she is thankful that the neighbors came to support her project and it shows the great community that she will be a part of.

Trustee Flood pointed out that the Fire Marshall has no concerns.

Trustee Flood moved, and Board member Walker supported, in case AB-2021-51, Gloria Sosa, 461 Heights, 09-11-307-015 to approve 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-3, Article VI, Section 6.04, Zoned R-3 including a 5- ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to build a house 5-ft. from the side property line (east) and a 7.34% lot coverage variance above the allowed 25% for a total lot coverage of 32.34% (parcel section south of Heights Road) because the petitioner did demonstrate that the following standards for variances have been met in this case and they set forth facts that in this case:

1. The petitioner does show the following practical difficulties including the unique lot being only 40 feet in width considered a nonconformity which the Board already approved and on the condition of this approval the existing garage will be demolished.

2. The following are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in this same district or zone: this being a narrow 40 foot lot, it had a previous home on it that burned down. The petitioner has come before the Board again and reduced the request of other variances including eliminating the west side variance and the also reduced the amount of lot coverage.

3. The variance is also necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by others in the same zone or vicinity based on the following findings of fact: this is a buildable lot and the owner is not trying to overbuild on this lot.

4. The granting of the variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to the improvement in such zone or district in which the property is located based on the following: the petitioner has worked with the neighbors and there is no objection at this time to the variances requested.

5. Based on the following findings of fact, the granting this variance would not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property, it would not unusually increase congestion on the public streets. There is also not going to be an increase of fire, or endanger of the public safety shown by Fire Marshal Jeff Williams has determined that he has no concerns on this matter. The variance request is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area and will in fact increase the property values by building a modern building on
this property. The granting of this variance will not impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Charter Township of Orion.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Kerby, yes; Cook, yes; Flood, yes; Walker, yes. Motion passed 5-0.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
   None

7. **COMMUNICATIONS**
   A. 7-29-2021, Joint Meeting Minutes

8. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**
   None

9. **MEMBERS’ COMMENTS**
   Board members commented on the expired cases on the agenda tonight.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**
    Moved by Trustee Flood, seconded by Board member Kerby to adjourn the meeting at 8:41 pm

    Respectfully submitted,

    Erin A. Mattice
    Recording Secretary