

Village of Lemont
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of November 16, 2016

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 16, 2016 in the second floor Board Room of the Village Hall, 418 Main Street, Lemont, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Spinelli called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Kwasneski, Cunningham, McGleam, Sanderson, Zolecki, Spinelli

Absent: Maher

Village Planner Heather Valone, Village Deputy Village Administrator Jeff Stein and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present.

C. Approval of Minutes for the October 19, 2016 Meeting

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to approve the minutes from the October 19, 2016 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Spinelli greeted the audience. He then asked for everyone to stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 12-02 Timberline Knolls PUD and Annexation Agreement Amendments

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to open the public hearing for case 12-02. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

Staff Presentation

Mrs. Valone said Gabriel Agblevon acting on behalf of TK Behavioral Health, owner of the subject property, is requesting an amendment to both the Planned Unit Development (PUD) and the Annexation Agreement that control the subject property. The purpose of the requested amendments are to allow for the construction of three new buildings and a new entrance. Staff is recommending approval with conditions.

The applicant is requesting a number of variations from the UDO, however some of the variations do meet the requirements of the existing annexation agreement and the PUD on the property. The applicant is asking for additional parking. The maximum permitted by the UDO is 51 spaces and the applicant is proposing about 86. The applicant is proposing a very large parking lot for the three new buildings. This is due to the fact that some of the other parking areas are deficient on the site. Along Brown Drive there are a number of on-street parking spaces hinder the Fire Protection District's access. The Fire Protection District would prefer some of the parking on Brown Drive get moved to the proposed parking lot. Thus, staff is finding this deviation acceptable.

Mrs. Valone stated the next variation is the monument sign. She showed on the overhead where the monument signs were located. The applicant is proposing a new third sign for the new entrance. The sign would sit just off to the side just similar to the existing sign and would be similar shape and appearance of the existing sign. Staff is finding the deviation for the sign acceptable as this entrance would be for visitors and patients who don't normally come to the site and would need additional signage to finding it.

As stated before the applicant is proposing a very large parking lot. Village code requires exterior landscaping for that parking lot. The applicant is deficient with about 12 shrubs and grass to meet the UDO. Staff is finding this deviation unacceptable so grasses and shrubs should be put along the east side of the parking lot. The last area is tree preservation and the applicant is proposing that any tree within the actual project site be removed. The application is proposing a large amount of grading and the site does have a relatively unique topography. Staff is finding this deviation unacceptable. There are about four trees that are listed in the staff memo that are in good condition and are in areas that could possibly be saved.

The Comprehensive Plan indicates that this area as Employment Center. Thus,0 allowing a rather large existing employer in the Village to expand their facilities would be comparable to the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, there are no issues with surrounding land uses. The facility is already operating with minimal impacts on the surrounding area.

The applicant has provided a traffic study for the new entrance. There will be minimum impacts with the new entrance. It is mostly just shifting traffic for the site to the new entrance. Additionally, the applicant has indicated that the new buildings will be phased. The first building to be constructed will be the administrative building, then the buildings for the dormitories will be at a future dates as they become needed. Mrs. Valone said she will let the traffic consultant go into more detail in regards to the site line analysis and answer any questions for those items.

The applicant is constructing three new buildings. The buildings are almost identical to the 2013-2014 buildings. The annexation and PUD agreement requires that the buildings themselves be set back at least 50 feet from the property lines. The two new dormitory buildings are set back from the property line more than 150 feet. The administrative building is only set back about 51 feet. Staff and the Village Arborist are recommending that at the same grade as the edge of the building, evergreen trees are planted every 20 feet to fully screen the building from surrounding uses.

Mrs. Valone stated the Village Engineer generally approves of the plan. He has some questions on stormwater which can be worked out after if there are any conditions required by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Overall the development is well designed. It complies with most of the requirements of the UDO and the existing PUD and annexation agreement. Thus staff is recommending approval with the following conditions listed in staff's report on page 8 and 9.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission for staff.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if the 51 parking spaces required were for the entire facility.

Mrs. Valone said the 51 count will be required for the three new buildings which is the maximum per the UDO. They are proposing 86 so there is additional 35 spaces that they would like to put in this lot to make up for other lots being deficient.

Commissioner Zolecki asked with the other lots being deficient will this be enough to make up for this deficiency.

Mrs. Valone stated she will let the applicant speak in regards to this.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if the Logan Street access was the area where the Fire Department was having difficulty.

Mrs. Valone said when there is an emergency the Fire Department will usually access the site through the New Avenue entrance or through Timberline. The buildings that were expanded in 2013 and 2014, the drive is narrow and cars park along the street. So they are having issues turning and getting in there were patients are staying. The

Fire Department is content if they can get more of the cars that are parked on the street in non-designated spaces off the street so they can access those facilities.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if there was an egress on Brown Street.

Mrs. Valone stated that was gated and it will remain gated. The applicant has not made any requests to open that entrance.

Chairman Spinelli asked if that was in the current PUD that the gate will remain closed.

Mrs. Valone said the current PUD actually indicates that the Brown Street entrance could be opened at any point if the applicant requests it and if staff finds that it will be useful to their site.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was any intent from the applicant to open that entrance.

Mrs. Valone stated no.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if they were planning on preserving any trees.

Mrs. Valone said there are a number of trees inside the entire property and the applicant is only proposing to remove trees that are inside the proposed project site. She showed on the overhead where they were located and where the project site was located. There are however, four specific trees that are inside the project site that staff would like to see if they could save them. The majority of the trees are poor species or poor condition.

Commissioner McGleam asked if staff could elaborate on the hour restriction for the entrance.

Mrs. Valone stated staff is recommending this because there are residential surrounding the project. Additionally, this entrance is relatively close to a single-family home so by restricting the times it would prevent any incompatibilities with the neighboring uses.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any more questions for staff at this time. None responded. He then asked if the applicant wanted to come up and make a presentation.

Applicant Presentation

Gabriel Agblevon, ALPA Construction, stated he would have his traffic consultant and architect speak first.

Karl Krogstad, Landscape Architect and Arborist for the project, said he would like to explain a couple of things a little further. He showed on the overhead an area of trees that they are saving and putting in a pathway. The project site is defined to follow the limits of construction. He showed other areas on the east side and near the entrance where some trees will be saved. He has no problem adding the 12 shrubs along the side. They already are proposing an extensive amount of landscaping along the south buffer to provide some screening for the residents who live along there. They would prefer to do the planting at the top of the hill rather than near the building. There is a 13 foot drop from the south end to the building, so if they put it near the top it would be a greater benefit to the residents.

Mr. Krogstad showed on the overhead where the four trees were located that staff wanted them to try and preserve. He did look at that and because of the grade change, which is between three and seven feet, they could not potentially save those trees. They are willing to do some mitigation for those trees. He then showed on the overhead where the additional sign will go and they are meeting the setbacks. The sign will match the ones that already exist. He stated he is willing to answer any of their questions that they might have.

Chairman Spinelli said there is a cluster of three Douglas Firs on the south side of that entrance coming off of Timberline. He would like to see the tree that is closest to the right-of-way shifted to the east side of that cluster or shift the whole cluster. His concern is once it matures in height and size it may become an issue with sightlines.

Mr. Krogstad stated that is not a problem.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the fence was going to remain along that south property line.

Mr. Krogstad stated yes.

Chairman Spinelli asked how much of the fence is going to be removed.

Mr. Krogstad said just enough for the entrance.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the gate on Brown Street was going to remain closed.

Mr. Agblevon stated it will remain closed.

Commissioner McGleam asked what the height of the administrative building is to the ridge.

Mr. Agblevon said it is about 17 feet.

Chairman Spinelli said the architectural drawings that were submitted appear to be the ones that were used in the 2013 expansion. They need to be updated before going

to the Village Board to show the correct elevation. Also, the administrative building is either mirrored on the Site Plan or in the Architectural Drawings so it needs to be corrected to show the correct direction they are going to be building.

Michael Werthmann, KLOA, stated his firm had conducted the study for the proposed development and he wanted to go through the site distance. He showed on the overhead the access drive with a vehicle waiting to turn on Timberline. The access drive is located on the center of the curve to maximize the sight lines from north and south. It was shown with other vehicles on the road. The minimum amount of distance needed to pull out is 155 feet on a 20 mph road. There is a greater amount of sight line and what they showed was just the minimum. The entrance being at the center of the curve is probably better than what is at Evergreen now. It is in a 20 mph zone and it is a steep grade as you are coming up. This will reduce the speed of traffic coming up Timberline Road. He is available to answer any additional questions that the Commission might have.

Chairman Spinelli said since there is a steep slope there on Timberline, if they could update their stopping distance on SSD's on a grade. At 9% you would need 173 feet on a down slope and also the object height has to be 2 feet. He knows it will not change anything on the sight distance but he would like it corrected before going to the Village Board and corrected for the Village Engineer.

Commissioner Zolecki asked in regards to the deficiencies on parking, what would be the delta for the facility as a whole.

Mr. Agblevon stated right now it would be 123 parking spots.

Commissioner Zolecki asked what would be the maximum allowed by code for this type of facility.

Mrs. Valone said the annexation agreement relieves them from some of the parking standards. With the annexation agreement there is no maximum and they could put as many as they like. According to the code though, even with this parking they would be deficient by 27 stalls.

Chairman Spinelli stated on the entrance one thing that does stand out to him is the proximity to the resident on Evergreen on the corner. He would request that they look at this and possibly move it to the north. He would like to see if curves could be softened up a bit. When they are evaluating it they could come back to staff with options and work with Village staff for that location along that curve.

Mr. Agblevon said they did look at that and he will have the Civil Engineer speak in regards to that.

Josh Terpstra, Haeger Engineering, stated that was one of their concerns initially as well. They did take a look at moving it to the north already. The grade on

Timberline is very steep and as you go north it gets lower and lower. Even if they move it just 20 to 30 feet it goes down to a grade of about 660 and for reference the buildings are at about 674. So there is a 13 foot grade distance. They are trying to avoid a very steep entrance drive. There is not a lot of room to make up that grade difference if they move it to the north.

Chairman Spinelli asked if he knew what the slope is on that entrance.

Mr. Terpstra said it is 8% on the curve radius and that is because Timberline drops so much. After you hit the right-of-way he thinks it is at 5%. If they move it to the north it is going to be substantially more than 5%.

Chairman Spinelli stated there is not only the proximity to the resident but also the proximity to the intersection of Evergreen. What might help is what staff indicated, which is restricting the hours of usage for the entrance. He would consider it more than just a private driveway. That is why he is suggesting to move it further north. If it can't be done and there is an engineering reason why then respond and let staff know. He wants to make sure that the Village Engineer knows that he is requesting this and you are looking into it.

Commissioner McGleam said the floor elevation is 674.70 and there is a 17 foot slab to ridge building height which should be 688. The elevation at the property line is 687 so you can see one foot of that ridge at the property line. He asked if the fence and evergreens will provide screening so there will be no way you can see that building.

Mr. Agblevon stated that is correct.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if the monument sign is going to be proposed on the north side of the entrance.

Mr. Agblevon said that is correct.

Commissioner McGleam asked what kind of means will be used to restrict that access to that entrance after 5 pm.

Mr. Agblevon stated he could put up a gate if the Commission wanted.

Chairman Spinelli said if their employees worked from 8 am to 5 pm then he would say the entrance could stay open till 6 pm just in case someone works late. He asked how the north entrance on Timberline was used.

Mr. Agblevon said it was used for employees and deliveries.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any reports of any issues with that entrance.

Mrs. Valone stated no.

Chairman Spinelli said if one of the Commissioners wanted to recommend a gate they can but he does not feel a gate is necessary.

Commissioner McGleam stated there are two different approaches. The passive approach would be signage and the more aggressive would be the gate.

Chairman Spinelli said it would be an issue for the Fire Department to gain access through there so it could be a public safety issue.

Commissioner Cunningham stated on the preliminary site plan overview, both the east and west entrances off of Timberline and the one that has been confirmed onto Brown, are both referencing Timberline accesses which is a little confusing. The one on the east side should have access to Brown and that will be the one that is gated.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if they could pull up the floor plan.

Mrs. Valone asked what were the visiting hours.

Mr. Agblevon said visiting hours are on the weekends from 2 pm to 5 pm and admissions can be as late as 6 pm in the evening.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if they could explain how many rooms there are and how many people are in a room.

Mr. Agblevon stated there are two residents to a room and there are 12 rooms.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was a basement on the building.

Mr. Agblevon said because of the grading it might be feasible to have a basement as well. The basement will be for storage.

Commissioner McGleam asked what the timing was for releasing construction on each of the residential buildings.

Mr. Agblevon stated it would depend on corporate office. The main thing is the administrative building.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they could point on the overhead where the rooms were at.

Mr. Agblevon showed eight rooms. He said code allows for three residents per room based on the square footage per room. The floor plan is just a schematic floor plan and even though he is representing the owner he is also an architect. So the floor plan that was done was just done for this phase now and a real plan will be generated using

the same footprint and they will arrange the rooms to either eight or twelve depending on what the owner wants. The maximum would be 24 beds.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if this was written in the PUD and what are they locking them into as of right now.

Mrs. Valone stated the PUD and Annexation Agreement currently limit the number of beds to 120 and that will be increased by 48 beds. Then they will be restricted to that number of beds.

Commissioner Cunningham asked once all phases are complete and it's fully staffed, do they have a number of increased employees that will be needed.

Mr. Agblevon said there should be an increase of three to five percent.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if they could pull up the floor plan to the administrative building. He asked an increase of three percent to what quantity of people.

Mr. Agblevon stated there is about 200 employees there a day. It should only increase six to ten more people.

Commissioner Sanderson said he is looking at the floor plan with all the offices and desks that is there for all current employees.

Mr. Agblevon stated the desks are for patients who come in with their family members. The increment of employees will be around ten. Most of the patients that come in will come in with family members and they have to go through the insurance process. They did create ample room so they could sit and wait. All those rooms will not be filled all of the time.

Mrs. Valone said there are multiple offices that do intake all over the facility. So they wanted to concentrate all of these employees, which are existing, into this building. That way intake is not bouncing the patient all over the site. There is a higher number of administrative people than their actual facility staff.

Commissioner Sanderson asked when looking at all those chairs on the floor, he wants to make sure that five years from now, the traffic study has accounted for any increases. He asked did the traffic study not only include employees but patients and family coming in during those peak hours.

Mr. Werthmann stated they counted all the traffic coming in and out currently based on 120 beds. They did increase that number based on the increase of beds. So they increased the existing traffic coming into the facility by 35 to 39 percent. The administrative staff is only going up 10% and they increased it by 39% based on the

increase in beds. It will not all be coming in off of Timberline. The traffic will be distributed between Timberline and Brown.

Mrs. Valone said staff had them amend the traffic study to indicate that this new entrance will only be used for patients and visitors. They would be restricting that traffic. There would be the increase of 10% of people in general that might utilize the entrance but it will cut down on the traffic and it was incorporated into the traffic study.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if there is an increase of 39% of 200 that would be an increase of about 80 additional people. He asked if the traffic study took that into consideration.

Mr. Werthmann stated they counted the physical cars coming in each day. Not all the employees come in at the same time. He cannot tell you how many employees came in but rather the number of physical cars that came in and out and they increased that number by 39%.

Commissioner Sanderson asked for how many days did they count this and was it done on different days.

Mr. Werthmann said it was done on one typical day of the week. They usually count two to three hours in the morning and then two to three hours in the evening. From that they figure out the peak hour of the roadway system in the morning and evening. Based on those numbers they increased it by 39%, in addition they increased the background traffic on the other streets by three to five percent for other growth. Everything is operating really well on these streets. The traffic study was done on Tuesday, July 26th.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked when was the peak hour.

Mr. Werthmann stated the peak hour was from 7 to 8 am and then 4:45 to 5 pm.

Commissioner Sanderson said visiting hours are on the weekends so the study did not pick up any visitors.

Mr. Agblevon stated there is less administrative staff there on the weekends though.

Commissioner Sanderson said he would assume most of the neighbors are going to be concerned about the traffic. He would have expected another day or two done for the study. This facility operates differently on the weekends then it does during the week. Given the size of the project it would have made sense to him to have an extra day for the study.

Mr. Werthmann stated most of your typical studies are only based on one day. They did not look at a Saturday because most of the streets have less traffic on the

weekends. There is sufficient capacity even if there was a minor increase. They felt they were very conservative with the 39% increase. He could understand the Saturday, but the administrative staff is much less on the weekend.

Chairman Spinelli asked if tenants are permitted to have vehicles.

Mr. Werthmann said no. They do have a number of doctors that come in and out but that is really on the weekdays.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was any more questions for the applicant at this time. None responded. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted speak in regards to this public hearing.

Public Comment

Nancy Jackson stated her concern is the amount of traffic on Brown Street. They are dealing with the curve in the road when you come off that street onto New Avenue. She asked if that access was going to open all the time. She asked if Brown was going to change besides adding these additional employees.

Chairman Spinelli said there is another location that will be intended for patients and visitors. He would assume that staff would come off of Timberline because it is a closer route to the building rather than coming off of New Avenue.

Ms. Jackson asked if there was a gate on Brown.

Chairman Spinelli stated there was.

Mrs. Valone showed on the overhead where the gate was located.

Chairman Spinelli said the gate is closed currently and the intent is that it will remain closed. They do not use it at all for access to Logan.

Mark Huegelman, 14 Evergreen Place, stated he overlooks the property. He asked if the entrance was going to be by the existing double gates.

Chairman Spinelli said the proposed entrance will be south of those double gates.

Mr. Huegelman asked if there was ever going to be an expansion cap on the facility.

Chairman Spinelli stated right now because it is a PUD they are requesting additional 48 beds. If it gets approved the cap will extend to 48 beds. If they want to exceed that then they will have to go through this process all over again. At some point based on the topography of their property it will not be financially beneficial to add a building because it will be too difficult to build it. Again, if they want more than they will have to come back through this process.

Mr. Huegelman said the people speed up and down Timberline and the police need to monitor that.

Karen Knack stated she lives on New Avenue. She asked where the new driveway was going to be.

Chairman Spinelli said it will be coming in off of Timberline. They showed on the overhead where it will be located.

Ms. Knack asked if the new buildings were going to be located north of the entrance.

Chairman Spinelli stated yes.

Ms. Knack said sometimes there will be cars parked on Timberline and within the gateway there might be two or three cars if something special is going on.

Chairman Spinelli stated Timberline is public roadway and it is wide enough that you can park on it. They are adding additional parking so that should help reduce on street parking within the facility. If there is overflow parking at the north entrance of Timberline, then this might help elevate it.

Ms. Knack asked if anything was mentioned about drainage.

Chairman Spinelli said this site will have its own detention facility up near the buildings.

Ms. Knack stated there was a detention area on the southeast side of the property and back in the mid 90's that had broken and they had to put a new one in. Timberline drive does not drain to a storm sewer on New Avenue so she is concerned about drainage. Right before the current entrance on Timberline there is drainage that goes into a pond to the west. She said she is concerned about the drainage.

Chairman Spinelli said all of the development that is going to be done for this request will have its own stormwater detention basin near the development. It will be a wet bottom detention basin. So it temporary stores the excess water and then slowly releases it. They are governed by the Village's rules and MWRD.

Ms. Knack asked where that water was released.

Chairman Spinelli stated based upon the drawings it is on their property further down the hill.

Mr. Terpstra said currently detention is already provided for the site and it goes down the hill to the series of lakes on the north side. Currently water flows to the north and to the west a little bit.

Ms. Knack asked if any water was going to the pond across Timberline, west of the subject site.

Chairman Spinelli stated this facility is not directing any water from this site to that location. The runoff from this site that they are developing will be contained and kept on sight.

Mr. Terpstra said he cannot speak about the runoff that happens on Timberline Drive.

Mr. Huegelman asked what the timeline was for approval.

Chairman Spinelli stated they will make a recommendation tonight then it will go to the Village Board for final decision. Staff will provide that date before they leave.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any additional comments or questions for the applicant. None responded. He then asked if the applicant wanted to make any closing statements. Applicant declined. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kwasneski to close the public hearing for Case 12-02. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Plan Commission Discussion

Commissioner McGleam asked if they are adding anything to the staff recommendations.

Chairman Spinelli said some of his comments made at the beginning don't necessarily need to be made as part of the motion. The developer had indicated on record that they will move the evergreens, update the sight distance exhibit, update the architectural drawing, and attempt to relocate the entrance to the north.

Mr. Stein stated as long as they testified to do it then it does not necessarily need to be in the motion.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked if they should add that signage needs to be posted about driveway closing by a certain time.

Chairman Spinelli said that could be added and he thinks the applicant did not have an issue with that also.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant had requested to put the evergreen trees every 20 feet along the top of the hill rather than along the south side of the building. So they need to strike that portion of it.

Commissioner McGleam said the other change would be to staff's recommendation number six for preserving trees with tag numbers 289, 290, 292, and 306. The applicant had stated it was not feasible due to grading changes.

Mrs. Valone stated how they handled it in the past, is if staff recommended that certain trees be saved and the applicant had put on the tree preservation that these trees are going to be removed, then notes have to be put that they will mitigate based on the UDO codes. It can be changed if they like, otherwise staff will handle it.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions or comments. None responded. He then called for a recommendation.

Plan Commission Recommendation

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval of Case 12-02, Timberline Knolls PUD and Annexation Agreement Amendments, based on staff's recommendations listed on page 8 and 9 of staff's report, with the following changes:

1. Signage must be placed along new entranceway restricting access from 7 am to 6 pm.
2. On condition four of staff's recommendations strike the portion that says "along the south side of the proposed administrative building". It should read, "The landscape plan should be updated to include evergreen trees every 20 feet along the top of the hill for the purpose of providing a buffer from the surrounding residences and the proposed building."

A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: McGleam, Zolecki, Kwasneski, Sanderson, Cunningham, Spinelli

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 12-02 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

IV. ACTION ITEMS

None

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

A. Update from Village Board

Mrs. Valone said the application from last month for 4th Street will go before the Committee of the Whole on November 21st. The applicant did revise his plans to remove some of the errors and added the parkway trees. However, he is still making the same request for the size of the lots and the interior side yards.

The UDO amendments did get passed so the native planting guidelines are in effect.

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Chairman Spinelli asked if staff was continuing to work on getting the public hearing signs taken down.

Mrs. Valone stated yes they were.

Discussion continued in regards to how this might be done.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sanderson to adjourn the meeting. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper