

Volusia Growth Management Commission

MEETING MINUTES FOR  
REGULAR MEETING HELD  
Wednesday, November 28, 2007

City Commission Chambers  
Daytona Beach City Hall  
301 S. Ridgewood Avenue  
Daytona Beach, FL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Gerald Brandon , Chairman  
Robert Pascoe, Vice Chair  
Joan Spinney, Secretary  
Cheryl Harrison-Lee  
Danny Allen  
Steve Katz  
Rebecca Mendez  
Karen Hall  
John Heaphy  
Ed Blackman  
Sally MacKay  
James Kerr  
Donna Steinebach  
Billy Carter  
Sandra Walters  
Rachel Sieg  
Tony Cole  
Suzanne Steiner

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Sara Lee Morrissey (not present)  
Peter Brown (not present)

OTHERS PRESENT

Paul Chipok, GrayRobinson, P.A.  
Barry Wilcox, MSCW  
Merry Chris Smith, VGMC Coordinator

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Brandon called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

REPRESENTING

Ormond Beach  
Daytona Beach Shores  
South Daytona  
Daytona Beach  
DeBary  
DeLand  
Deltona  
Edgewater  
Holly Hill  
Lake Helen  
New Smyrna Beach  
Orange City  
Port Orange  
Pierson  
Volusia County  
Volusia County  
Volusia County  
Volusia County

REPRESENTING

Volusia Co. School Board  
SJRWMD

### ROLL CALL

Roll call was taken and it was determined there was a quorum present.

Chairman Brandon welcomed new member Cheryl Harrison-Lee representing the City of Daytona Beach.

Chairman Brandon called forward former VGMC member Ann Caner and presented her with a plaque in honor of her nearly 19 years serving as a member of the commission.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There being no changes to the draft minutes of the October 24, 2007 regular meeting, the minutes were accepted as written.

### PUBLIC HEARING

#### 1) VGMC Case No. 07-045, City of Port Orange, Request for Waiver of the 90-day Rule

Mike Disher, Planning and Development Manager with the City of Port Orange, stated that the City is requesting a waiver of the 90-day Rule in order to allow more time to work out issues with Volusia County. Barry Wilcox, MSCW, stated VGMC planning staff supports the request, and Paul Chipok, GrayRobinson, advised that legal staff concurs. There were no others present in the audience wishing to comment on the request.

Joan Spinney moved to approve the City of Port Orange's request for a waiver of the 90-day rule for VGMC Case No. 07-045; seconded by Steve Katz. Motion carried unanimously.

#### 2) Consideration of Request for Rehearing of VGMC Case Nos. 06-064A & 07-051A, City of Daytona Beach Shores Large Scale Amendment

Paul Chipok addressed the commission concerning two requests for rehearing; one from the City of Daytona Beach Shores, and the other from Lady Godiva 2. Mr. Chipok explained that the commission would only be considering the requests to rehear the amendments, not the technical merits. He further explained that if the commission decides to approve the requests for rehearing, it would be re-advertised and scheduled for full public hearing at a later date.

Commissioner Pascoe disclosed that he had discussions with the following individuals at the City of Daytona Beach Shores relating to the October 24, 2007 hearing: City Manager Mike Booker on October 25, 2007; Mayor Greg Northrup on October 29, 2007; and discussions with Jim McCroskey on October 30th, and November 27, 2007.

Chairman Brandon disclosed that he received a call from Attorney Ty Harris relating to the hearing held on October 24, 2007.

Commissioner Katz disclosed that he had received a call from Attorney Ty Harris today as well.

Commissioner Steinebach disclosed that she had a conversation with Jim McCroskey, Assistant City Manager for Daytona Beach Shores, as well as Glenn Storch who represents the City, relating to the events of the October 24, 2007 hearing.

Commissioner Harrison-Lee disclosed that she had a conversation with Jim McCroskey trying to understand what the request was before the commission tonight.

Commissioner Walters stated she did not have any conversations, however, disclosed that she sent an email to Mike McDaniel at DCA who responded, and sent an email to certain County Council members who have not responded.

Commissioner Steiner asked Mr. Chipok which members of the commission would be allowed to vote on the rehearing requests. Mr. Chipok responded that all members present at the meeting tonight would be voting. Ms. Steiner stated she felt those members who were not present at the prior hearing would not have all of the information. Mr. Chipok responded that under Florida case law and Florida Statutes, if members of an appointed or elected board are present at a meeting, they are not allowed to abstain from the actions before the board unless there is a statutory conflict of interest. Ms. Steiner asked if VGMC procedures address rehearsals. Mr. Chipok stated this is not specifically addressed, however, their research concluded that bodies such as the VGMC have the ability to hold a rehearing on a prior action. Mr. Chipok added that the requests for rehearing were timely made and this matter is being appropriately considered by the commission this evening.

Commissioner Allen asked if we follow Roberts Rules of Order. Mr. Chipok stated that legal has researched that as well and based on their findings, the VGMC has not adopted Roberts Rules of Order in any formal documentation that he is aware of.

Commissioner Walters raised a question concerning Section 90-40 regarding the appeal process and stated it appears we are applying a different standard in this case than the standards applied to others in the past, such as RKH Investments. Mr. Chipok responded that we are not applying a different standard, but rather they are taking advantage of an alternative means. Mr. Chipok added that they are not appealing the decision at this time, they are asking the commission to reconsider.

Commissioner Sieg asked on what grounds would the commission base the rehearing. Mr. Chipok responded that Florida law provides that there is a fundamental right to request a rehearing, however, it is within the discretion of the commission whether or not they wish to grant it. Mr. Chipok added that based on Florida law, if the commission grants the rehearing, they should cite a reason for doing so, however, if denied, no explanation is necessary.

Mr. Chipok stated there are basically four criteria for considering the rehearing: 1) That there were errors on the face of the record; 2) That errors occurred during the hearing; 3) Surprise; and 4) Newly discovered evidence, including evidence which was not fully washed out.

Commissioner Katz asked when the rehearing would occur if it was granted. Mr. Chipok responded that it would be a public hearing and requires appropriate notification and advertising. When asked about the potential for a hearing at the December 19, 2007 meeting, Mr. Chipok stated that we are past the 20 working day rule date for the December hearing and suggested with the holidays it be scheduled for the January meeting or at a special meeting. He added that our rules do not prohibit documentation from being submitted up to and including the date of a public hearing, however, if any of the parties wished to provide supplemental documentation, it would behoove them to provide it in a timely fashion so that the members can receive it in advance of the hearing.

Commissioner Walters commented that she did not feel it was fair for either side, adding that those members who were not present at the original hearing will not have the benefit of the same experience of what those members present heard as evidence. Mr. Chipok stated that the purpose of a rehearing is not to hear the same arguments over, but rather to consider new and different materials and arguments that were not previously made. He added that there is a fine line with that since you have to go back to the original arguments and expand upon them.

Mark Watts, Cobb & Cole, 351 E New York Avenue, Suite 200, DeLand, representing the property owner, Lady Godiva 2 LLC, addressed the commission. Mr. Watts stated this is the first time a rehearing request has come before the commission. He also stated to his knowledge, this is the first time a case with a JPA had come before the commission, which is one of the reasons he believes this deserves reconsideration.

Mr. Watts explained that some of the documentation that the commission looked at during the October 24, 2007 hearing, including staff comments, related to the 2006 application. Mr. Watts stated that these documents were superseded by a policy statement made by the elected officials for the City and County. He added that the commission should be focusing on the 2007 application.

Mr. Watts also stated that there were documents presented at the hearing relating to the 2006 application that were not previously distributed, which puts the parties involved at a disadvantage since they did not have the opportunity to review these documents which are not part of the current application.

Mr. Watts stated the presence of the JPA shows that the parties have agreed that consistency exists between the comprehensive plans, and the amendment does not present conflict between the jurisdictions. He further added that VGMC rules state in that case, you get a rebuttable presumption. Mr. Watts stated that this aspect needs to be readdressed at a rehearing to discuss what type of evidence and at what level needs to be submitted in order to overturn that point. With this being the first case before the commission where there was a JPA present, Mr. Watts stated that the standards for rebuttable presumption must be very clearly defined since JPA's are a principle tool for the cities and county for implementing smart growth initiatives and resolution of conflict which will result in future applications before the commission.

Mr. Watts stated that their view on the JPA is that the commission had a policy statement from each of the jurisdictions involved, an agreement that was entered into by the jurisdictions following negotiations and consideration at public hearings. He stated those are policy positions taken by those governments, a legislative action setting policy. Because of that, Mr. Watts stated that legislative actions in the state of Florida are given high deference and he believes that the rule relating to rebuttable presumption and how to overcome that needs to be high deference.

In summary, Mr. Watts stated if you follow the standards of the JPA, there is no conflict between the jurisdictions. When there is no conflict, he stated the policy decisions which have been made must be given deference. Mr. Watts requested the commission grant the rehearing and emphasized the importance of the commission's decision and need to define the standards of rebuttable presumption.

Commissioner Katz stated that one of the issues at the original hearing was a question of whether or not the City of Port Orange had adequate water supply and he requested that be addressed. Additionally, he requested that standards for rebuttable presumption be prepared in writing for a rehearing if granted. Mr. Watts agreed that getting coming into a rehearing knowing what the ground rules are is important. With respect to the Port Orange matter, Mr. Watts stated that Mr. Parker's letter was from September, 2006, which addressed the original application. Additionally, he stated Mr. Parker's letter stated they were not supportive of multi-family development, however, under the JPA the proposed development is townhomes which are considered single-family under both the city and county rules.

Glenn Storch, Storch Morris & Harris, representing the City of Daytona Beach Shores addressed the commission. Mr. Storch stated he was brought in by the city to assist in negotiating a JPA. He stated he listened to what the various parties were saying, including residents, county staff, the applicant and the city, at which time the application was placed in abeyance in order to allow time to review everything and negotiate a JPA. With respect to Ken Parker's letter, he stated it was related to the original 2006 application, and that he contacted Mr. Parker who specifically stated the City of Port Orange did not have any objections to the JPA because the city and county were well on their way to resolving the issues Port Orange had. Mr. Storch stated evidence relating to this matter will be presented if the rehearing is granted.

Mr. Storch emphasized that the primary purpose of the VGMC is to encourage cooperation and consistency. In this case, the concept of the JPA demonstrates the city and county worked together to arrive at an agreement and shows they are consistent. He added that no one anticipated that there would be any problem with the VGMC with the JPA in place, and there was absolute surprise. He also stated that there were at least three public hearings on the JPA, that he had spoke with members of the Wilbur Association and adjoining members and he knows that Art Giles did the same thing. Mr. Storch stated there were errors on the record, adding that there was clearly confusion between the 2006 and 2007 applications and the documents which were presented. He also stated that there is newly discovered evidence that would be helpful to the commission.

Mr. Storch stated since the VGMC's role is to create cooperation and consistency, a thorough airing of the issues is in order, rather than to create conflict or potential litigation and he requested the commission grant the rehearing.

Commissioner Sieg stated she did not have a problem with a rehearing, however, she stated she was not confused between the 2006 and 2007 applications as it was the JPA and the evidence presented by the residents that she looked at. Ms. Sieg further stated that it is not only the county and city that have to work together, but the neighbors as well. Mr. Storch agreed that is important for consensus building and the JPA went through the public hearing process.

Jamie Seaman from the Volusia County Attorney's office addressed the commission. With respect to the residents being granted party status, Ms. Seaman stated it is the County's position that the resolution is incorrect as to the law. She further stated it would have been impossible for the city and county to enter into an interlocal agreement with the residents as they were not granted party status until the VGMC hearing, regardless of the fact that Chapter 163 of the Florida Statutes does not permit it. To the extent that VGMC granted them party status, it could have been possible to enter into a settlement agreement, but not a JPA. She also stated that the record from the earlier hearing clearly implied that only the County Manager and City Manager were involved in the JPA, and that staff was not involved. Ms. Seaman stated that the County Attorney's office become involved in January 2007, there were seven versions of the JPA, it went to Montye Beamer in the County's Growth & Resource Management Department several times who made changes and she was also present at the public hearing when the JPA was adopted.

Ms. Seaman also stated there was confusion on the record as to whether or not the county held a public hearing. Ms. Seaman confirmed the county did hold a public hearing, Myra Gercken appeared at the public hearing and Tommy Partin sent in a letter. She stated the public hearing lasted approximately 45 minutes, the public was notified and heard, and the County Council chose to adopt the JPA. Ms. Seaman stated the County Council was comfortable with the 35 foot height limitation, adding that is what is currently allowed under the county's land use, as well as in Wilbur by the Sea. The County also put into place the setbacks for the low impact urban land use category as another density control. Ms. Seaman stated this is information that Terry James, who is new to the county, would not have had at the prior hearing. Additionally, she stated there was surprise with documents which were handed to him at the hearing. Ms. Seaman stated the county will have the answers to the questions if given the opportunity for a rehearing.

There being no one else present wishing to speak in favor of the request for rehearing, Chairman Brandon asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in opposition.

Dennis Bayer, representing the citizens, addressed the commission. Mr. Bayer advised the commission that the citizens were not involved in the JPA process and the issues that are important to them were not addressed in the JPA. Mr. Bayer stated he does not believe there was confusion over whether it was the 2006 or 2007 application. He also stated that he disagrees with Ms. Seaman's analysis that for the citizens to be a part of the JPA they would have had to

been previously granted party status. Mr. Bayer stated that VGMC rules do not say that you have to be an actual party, in party status, to the JPA if you are a substantially affected party. He also stated their legal position is that those members who were not present at the original hearing cannot make a determination if there was confusion or surprise, since they were not present to hear what the original issues were. Mr. Bayer stated that there was considerable discussion by VGMC legal counsel Tom Cloud and the members at the original hearing and doesn't see how there can be an argument of confusion. He added he doesn't believe newly discovered evidence exists.

Mr. Bayer stated that all of the issues were thoroughly discussed at the original hearing and feels the city is looking for another bite at the apple. He added that to grant a rehearing would discourage the public from participating in these issues.

Sue Burns, 4250 S. Atlantic Avenue, Wilbur by the Sea, spoke in opposition. Ms. Burns stated based on her understanding from County Council members, they were not in favor of the project but wanted to do their best to limit the project. She also stated that townhomes are considered multi-family. Ms. Burns stated this is about a neighborhood, a land use, and not about future JPA's.

Mr. Storch stated they were shocked when they learned the VGMC had issues with the JPA. The reason, he stated, was that many of documents presented at the hearing were not a part of the staff report which recommended approval, and not provided to the jurisdictions prior to the hearing. He stated the rehearing is to give the opportunity to respond to those items and provide the commission with as much knowledge as possible to make a determination.

Commissioner Walters asked Mr. Storch if there's a rehearing and evidence is presented that night that he hasn't seen before, will he ask for another rehearing. Mr. Storch responded no. He added the rehearing is to address the problems with the evidence from the original hearing. Mr. Storch stated that the commission is entitled to hearing all of the evidence and doesn't understand why anyone would not want to have all of the knowledge. He stated the additional information may address the issues of the commission and residents, adding that he would like to see the matter resolved to everyone's satisfaction. Mr. Storch stated Art Giles was adamantly opposed to this project originally, however, he put pressure on both the city and the county to work out the issues, which resulted in the JPA.

Commissioner Sieg asked if it was possible for the parties to talk to the neighbors, amend the JPA and bring it back to the rehearing. Mr. Chipok responded that it would not be impossible, however, it is not within the jurisdiction of the VGMC as the JPA is between the county and the city.

Commissioner Harrison-Lee raised a question relating to the 20-day rule. Mr. Chipok explained that the 20 working day rule was established as an internal working tool to define a timeframe so that staff could prepare a staff report based on documentation received and provide it to the commission members in advance of the hearing. Mr. Chipok added that our rules do not prohibit documentation from being submitted up to and including the hearing. Ms. Harrison-Lee asked if

documentation presented at a hearing has been analyzed by staff. Mr. Chipok stated not typically, however, in some cases yes.

Mark Watts stated they are not requesting the commission to rewrite the rules or do something different. He also stated the commission has the right to reopen a case, pursuant to 90-37(i) of the VGMC rules. Mr. Watts clarified that under the county's land development code, townhomes are considered single-family.

Jamie Seaman clarified that Mr. Giles, the district representative that includes Daytona Beach Shores, was adamantly opposed to the project in September, 2006. In November, 2006 discussions began at the County Council level to look at a JPA. In January, 2007, she stated it was assigned to the County Attorney's office to start working on the JPA. At that time, Ms. Seaman stated Mr. Giles was intimately involved, he met with the city on five occasions, he spoke with the citizens and stayed in contact with Tommy Partin throughout. She added that Mr. Giles made the motion to approve the JPA which carried with a vote of 6-0, one member of the council was not present. Ms. Seaman stated that, yes, there was surprise based on the VGMC's 21 year history of denying only one case at public hearing, and that they generally approve with conditions.

Michael Clancy, 3812 Amelia Drive, addressed the commission in opposition of the rehearing, stating he did not believe there was any surprise relating to the prior hearing.

Commissioner Hall asked if the city could resubmit a new application. Mr. Chipok responded there is a 12-month waiting period to resubmit an application on the same property with the same request.

Mr. Chipok suggested that if a motion is to be made in favor of a rehearing, the motion should come from a member who voted in favor of the denial at the last hearing, which follows Roberts Rules of Order.

Steve Katz made a motion to grant the request for rehearing; seconded by Danny Allen. Mr. Katz added that his motion is based on the fact that it has been pointed out that there were errors in the original hearing and he wants to be sure the commission did not have errors in the deliberations.

Commissioner Walters asked what errors occurred. Commissioner Allen stated he understood that when you are sitting on a board such as this, as a member you cannot bring evidence and testify. Mr. Chipok responded his opinion is that the members are essentially in a judge position and should not be in an advocate role on the commission. Mr. Allen stated that would be his reason to support the rehearing. Mr. Chipok added that due process requires an opportunity to be heard by a fair and impartial board and members should be considering the evidence presented, not coming in advocating a particular position or presenting evidence.

Commissioner Walters asked if VGMC legal counsel Tom Cloud who was present at the original meeting knowingly or mistakenly allowed errors to occur. Mr. Chipok responded that

sometimes better decision can be made with more information. Commissioner Sieg commented that she does not see this as errors as far as how the attorneys ran the meeting, however, errors in how it was presented to the commission.

Commissioner Walters stated she disagrees with the statement that VGMC's purpose is to make consistency, she believes VGMC was created to determine consistency. She also stated the JPA was presented as the panacea to the objections, however, she feels it is a hollow agreement that was negotiated by the County Manager who is not a planner and has no land use experience. Ms. Walters added that the only fault of Terry James was his honesty. She also stated that Michael Woods who is an experienced land use attorney was present and had every opportunity to rebut. Ms. Walters stated in listening to the audio of the earlier hearing, she heard objections to wetlands, traffic, evacuation routes, that Port Orange put nothing in writing, that it was not consistent with the Wilbur by the Sea local plan, the single-family character of the neighborhood, commercial is not prohibited by the JPA and size of the water mains. Ms. Walters quoted from page 14 of the minutes from the October 24, 2007 hearing.

Commissioner Steiner commented that she was not confused at the original hearing. She stated that the JPA does not cover the details, particularly with respect to traffic. Ms. Steiner also stated she was concerned that the residents were not allowed to participate in the JPA discussions, and to show up at a County Council meeting and speak for three minutes is hardly involvement.

Mr. Katz stated if the rehearing is granted, he would like clarity on the standards of rebuttable presumption on the JPA, and also if all of the parties were involved in the JPA, particularly the City of Port Orange. Additionally, he stated he would like to hear specifically what the errors were at the rehearing.

Motion carried with a 13-5 vote; Commissioners Hall, MacKay, Steiner, Cole & Walters dissented.

Steve Katz made a motion to schedule the rehearing for the regular January meeting of the VGMC; seconded by Rachel Sieg. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Brandon announced a break at 8:28 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

#### REMARKS OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

None

#### REPORTS OF OFFICERS

None

#### REPORTS FROM CONSULTANTS

Barry Wilcox provided the commission with a pending case update, reporting that many of the public school facilities amendments have been submitted and certified. He also reported that the two older New Smyrna Beach cases, #05-055 & #06-050, may come before the commission in January. Additionally, he stated that staff recently met with the Town of Pierson concerning their amendment application, Case #06-051, which went well and he anticipates it will be letter certified once the necessary documentation is exchanged between Pierson and the county.

Mr. Wilcox suggested the commission look at putting in some form of time constraints relating to RAI's when they review their procedures.

Commissioner Katz asked that the name of the applicant to the jurisdiction be added to the pending case log.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Robert Pascoe, POP Committee Chair, reported the POP Committee met prior to the regular meeting and all members were present. Mr. Pascoe stated the committee evaluated the VGMC Coordinator's performance and all rated her above average. He stated that Rebecca Mendez made a motion to approve a 5% increase for the coordinator, retroactive to September 2007; motion was seconded by Tony Cole.

Rebecca Mendez added that the committee discussed the possibility of holiday pay for the coordinator. Mr. Pascoe stated they would discuss this at their next meeting and requested that a POP committee meeting be scheduled one hour prior to the next regular meeting.

The motion to approve a 5% increase carried unanimously by the full commission.

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Presentation of VGMC Rules Redraft:

Mr. Chipok stated one of the most important part of the rules change is defining the process. He recommended that the commission start by looking first at the consistency certification rules which are adopted by county ordinance, followed by the rules of procedure to ensure they are consistent with the certification rules, and finally update any forms in order to comply with the changes.

Mr. Chipok referred the members to a draft prepared for the VGMC review process (Exhibit A to these minutes) and suggested the commission arrive at a consensus on the process in order to maintain structure through the review process. Mr. Chipok recommended working the review through the POP Committee, adding that this is a big undertaking and in a smaller group we can have discourse on what the issues are and how they play off of one another. Mr. Chipok continued to discuss the proposed review process.

Commissioner Katz asked if any of the rules changes being considered can be applied while the review process is underway. Mr. Chipok responded that we need to continue to utilize current procedure until the process is finalized since our rules are governed by county ordinance.

Chairman Brandon requested that when the process gets to item II.A. of the review process, he would like the POP committee to establish a timetable for each of the phases.

Commissioner Steinebach suggested that the commission consider moving item III.C. up to item I.C so the commission can have as much input as possible in the beginning, and also establish timeframes for response in order to move the process along.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the POP should start reviewing based on the issues prepared by staff and comments received from DeBary and Ormond Beach. Or, send a letter to all of the jurisdictions requesting their comments within a certain timeframe and POP would review once those are received. Commissioner Spinney noted that Issue #4 in the staff prepared amendments is to correct a typographical error and felt that the commission should simply take action to correct that.

The commission discussed what has already been sent out to the various jurisdictions and agencies. Several members commented in favor of sending a letter to the jurisdictions requesting input, and also to issue a press release to solicit input from the general public.

There was a general consensus that a letter would be sent to the local governments and a press release issued, requesting input by December 31, 2007. Additionally, it was a consensus that VGMC members should submit comments by December 31<sup>st</sup> as well. The POP committee will then meet once all comments are received.

Commissioner Spinney made a motion to accept the typographical correction outlined in Issue #4 of staff's suggestions and to include this with any other proposed changes that are adopted; seconded by Donna Steinebach. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Mendez raised a question concerning application submittal requirements and suggested the commission look at expanding on those, including a completeness review.

Commissioner Allen asked if the members are covered by liability insurance. Chairman Brandon responded affirmatively.

Additional discussion ensued concerning the VGMC application submittal requirements and various standards. In response to questions concerning traffic standards, Commissioner Harrison-Lee reported that the MPO and technical committee had adopted the Traffic Impact Analysis. She further stated that MPO passed a resolution that requires all jurisdictions to adopt it in order to submit future funding requests to the MPO.

Commissioner Katz stated he would like to see a clear statement on what the commission does not look at. Commissioner Mendez suggested a training session to discuss comp plan

amendments vs. zoning vs. site-plan issues, in order to filter out those definitions. Mr. Chipok stated that some of what is being discussed may be more education related, as opposed to rules changes. Commissioner Katz asked that a guidance memo be prepared and submitted to POP to show what can be considered in the commission's determinations.

Commissioner Walters requested the VGMC Coordinator email the application submittal requirements to all members.

NEW BUSINESS

None

REPORTS AND REQUESTS OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Commissioner Blackman extended an invitation for all members and staff to attend the Lake Helen Home Tour this upcoming weekend.

REPORTS AND REQUEST OF COMMISSION CHAIR

None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

---

Attest:

---

Chairman