

MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
August 26, 2015

COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Dutcher called the Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Anderson, Bray, Dutcher, Guest, Lamble, Lewis, Polluch

Absent: None

Chairman Dutcher opened the public hearing and explained the procedures for the hearing.

Public Hearing of Case ZBA15-07

Adam Poll, Planning and Development Director presented the zoning request as follows: Sunrise Mission, 622 W. Chisholm Street, is requesting a variance to the rear building setback in the Commercial Corridor District, the number of parking stalls required, the width of the parking stalls as well as the side yard setback of the parking area, to allow for the construction of a 60' x 34' activity center addition, 5'2" from the rear property line, 4'10" less than required, with 25 parking stalls provided, 46 fewer stalls than required, with 9 foot wide stalls, 1 foot less than required and a zero foot side yard parking setback, 5 feet less than required. Article 5.2, 3.13 f, 3.12 d (1), 3.12(2).

**Property Address: 622 W. Chisholm Street**

Notices were sent to all adjoining property owners within 300 feet of the subject property.

Four letters were received from surrounding property owners for this case asking to deny the variance.

To authorize a variance, the board shall find that all of the following conditions are met:

1. The need for the requested variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in the surrounding

area, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water, or topography and is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

2. Strict compliance with the regulations governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or would render conformity unnecessarily burdensome.
3. Whether granting the requested variance would do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether granting a lesser variance than requested would give substantial relief to the property owner and be more consistent with justice to other property owners;
4. The need for the requested variance is not the result of action of the property owner or previous property owners. It is not a self-created problem.
5. That the requested variance will not cause an adverse impact on the surrounding property, property values, or the use and enjoyment of the property in the neighborhood or zoning district and will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, or in any other respect impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the City of Alpena.

**CONDITIONS:** The Zoning Board of Appeals may impose such conditions or limitations in granting a variance as deemed necessary to protect the character of the area, as provided for in Section 9.9.

**FINDING OF FACT:** In granting or denying a variance, the board shall state in a written statement of findings of fact, which you can do verbally, the grounds upon which it justifies the granting of the variance.

In February, 2015, the Sunrise Mission asked for several variances to construct an activity center located behind the existing mission at 622 W. Chisholm Street. The request was denied as the Zoning Board of Appeals did not feel the request met the five variance standards for dimensional variances. The mission staff indicated they were not fully aware of the standards and would like the case to be heard again. They have noted in advance that they would agree to the following conditions:

- 1) The entire rear portion of the property from 622 W. Chisholm Street to 608 W. Chisholm Street would be fenced with a six foot tall privacy fence. They would tie their fence into existing privacy fencing where permission was granted. This would restrict access from the alley and only allow access to the mission through the front of the property.

- 2) The activity center would only be accessible to current residents of the mission and the Sunrise Mission Board with the exception of holiday meals, where access would be granted to former mission residents.
- 3) The activity center cannot be utilized for additional beds for the Sunrise Mission except for a City Manager declared emergency.

In addition, the Sunrise Mission has submitted a response to the recommendations that staff provided the Zoning Board of Appeals in February, 2015. This response deals with each of the five variance standards.

The facts of the case have not changed. Variances are still needed for the rear setback, parking requirements, parking stall width, and parking setback. The Sunrise Mission has clarified that the activity center use will have limited access, and has said that the classes offered would significantly assist their residents. The Sunrise Mission also states that busing residents to an off-site location would not be practical for a number of reasons including staffing issues, poor weather conditions, and poor off-site attendance.

If the training classes provided significantly assist the residents, and these benefits were not known when the special permit was last granted, these classes cannot be conducted without the benefit of the activity center, then these classes could be considered a uniqueness. The activity center would provide additional service to the target population that could not otherwise be provided. In addition, if the benefit was not known when the special permit was approved and the Sunrise Mission demonstrates that an off-site location will not work, then the request may not be self-created.

Issues still exist with the future use of the property. The Sunrise Mission has stated that most of their residents do not have cars and that the lack of parking will not be an issue. Other uses that may occupy the building after the mission, would have a much higher demand for parking, and that could negatively impact the area. Also, the house at 608 W. Chisholm Street is losing most of its rear and side yard, which is increasing its legal non-conforming status.

The city's and Sunrise Mission's responses to the five criteria are as follows:

1. The need for the requested variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in the surrounding area, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water, or topography and is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

City's response:

The activity center does not appear necessary for the continued operation of the mission; and the activity center could be created off-site in a manner that meets the existing requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Sunrise Mission's response:

The activity center has been researched by our board for six years (this is not a recent development). Its purpose is to relieve overcrowding on holidays, our ability to enhance services, provide more room for holiday meals, MSU extension service classes such as nutrition and budgeting and a children/parents play area for the cold winter months, as well as board meetings and in-house 12 step meetings. We do not believe the activity center would be beneficial off-site due to the logistics of getting people there and back when with an on-site addition, no one would have to go outdoors. We believe we are the experts on the needs of the mission and the people we serve; and this arrangement best suits our needs at this time.

2. Strict compliance with the regulations governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or would render conformity unnecessarily burdensome.

City's response:

The applicants have operated the mission at its current capacity since 2008. Although the proposed activity center would appear to increase service provided to the existing residences, it would not appear to be necessary for continued operations.

Sunrise Mission's response:

The new activity center may not appear to be necessary to someone not affiliated with the mission; however, our Board, guests, and employees will all tell you just how crowded the holidays are, and how much need there is for a children's play area in the winter months. This area would also accommodate our annual August Motorcycle Ride Fundraiser, and educational classes are a large part of our motivation.

3. Whether granting the requested variance would do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether granting a lesser variance than requested would give substantial relief to the property owner and be more consistent with justice to other property owners.

City's response:

Surrounding property owners could be negatively affected by the proposed variance request. The proposed activity center would increase the non-conformity of an existing residence at 608 W. Chisholm Street, a property that although is owned by the mission,

but not part of the mission's operations; and because of the amount of parking required by the activity center and residence at 608 W. Chisholm Street far exceeds the parking amount that is able to be provided.

Sunrise Mission's response:

We would like to point out that at no time in the past has parking been an issue, either for the city or in a practical sense here. We almost never have more than four or five cars at a time due to the extreme poverty of most of our guests. The proposed plan has many more parking spaces than we have ever had need for. The city mailed 71 notices as required to surrounding property owners – only a very small percentage had negative comments. Also, some negative comments were from persons outside the mailing area. As Adam Poll mentioned in his report, some parking issues were of an "incidental" nature, like someone dropping someone off and using the party store parking lot momentarily. We try our best to be a good neighbor.

4. The need for the requested variance is not the result of action of the property owner or previous property owners (self-created).

City's response:

The need for the variance would appear to be self-created. The mission has been operating at its current capacity since 2008 without an activity center. Adding an activity center would cause there to be a shortage of required parking. The activity center could be located off-site and meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements.

Sunrise Mission's response:

Times change, entities change and so do their needs. The need for a new activity center was not "self-created" but brought about by changing circumstances (i.e. crowding) and has been talked about at the Board level for all of six years. Part of being good stewards of our resources and the poor who come to our door is from time to time reassessing our needs in regards to service. We are the experts on the needs of Sunrise Mission, these are our plans for the future.

We considered beforehand an "off-site" location for the activity center. There are too many positives to housing here to consider it off-site. Namely, we own the property, we believe we have the room, and it just does not make sense to locate elsewhere and transport women and kids to another location when we could just go out back here and stay out of the Michigan winter weather. Class attendance is much better when held in-house at the mission. We believe our choice here is best by far.

5. That the requested variance will not cause an adverse impact on the surrounding property, property values, or the use and enjoyment of the property in the neighborhood

or zoning district and will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, or in any other respect impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the City of Alpena.

City's response:

The amount of parking required by the activity center and residence at 608 W. Chisholm Street far exceeds the parking amount that is able to be provided.

Sunrise Mission's response:

Parking: We have had 33 beds since 1998 – there was never a complaint before now. We have a “special use” permit from the city and for good reason. Sunrise Mission is unlike any other property in the city. Due to the extreme poverty of our guests, it is highly unlikely we will ever exceed the parking allotment for the new building. I (John Ritter) have been here 16 years and have never seen more than five cars maximum at any time by our guests. The new plan has a designated traffic flow (one way) which will facilitate smooth traffic flow at all times. The West and South sides of the parking area will be fenced so as to limit access to this area. The activity center will not be open to the general public, only current guests and former guests.

Member Lamble asked Adam Poll, what is different in terms of this proposal from when it was previously made when we had a hearing on it in February, 2015?

Adam said the actual building footprint is the same and nothing has changed regarding the variances that are required. They still need the same variances. The differences are the mission did not feel they had adequate knowledge of the five criteria. Also they sent supplemental information about programs that they believe are necessary and reasons as to why an on-site location would work.

Member Lamble asked in terms of this board's function, is this in the form of like a motion for reconsideration or is this a new request.

Adam said technically this is a new request. Ultimately speaking it is the same request, but how they treat it, it is a new request and it has additional information.

Member Lamble asked is there a limitation in terms of the city code or charter. If this board takes action tonight, what's to prevent the same request coming back to next month's meeting?

Adam said there are no limitations for Zoning Board of Appeals. They are allowed to come back if they change it or have significant additional information.

Dennis Bray said to Adam that he is in an awkward position because he is the person that designed this plan, but he said he could address issues regarding this plan. Technically there have been no changes to this design from the beginning. However, there has been discussion as to what could be changed based on the outcome of meetings. There are a couple of items here on variances on setbacks that they can alter without disrupting anything that stays the same.

Adam Poll asked Member Bray if he was going to be voting tonight on this issue. Member Bray said no he will not.

Adam Poll asked that Member Bray will be abstaining from this case for reasons that he worked on this in the past. Dennis Bray said yes, because he is the professional that did the design. For clarification, Adam Poll asked Member Bray that he is speaking not as a board member on this case, but as a R. S. Scott Associate. Mr. Bray said yes.

Chairman Dutcher said what they are here to vote on is what is presented.

Dennis Bray said he can clarify the design requirements and what they were actually doing with this plan. He said the plans are identical. They have not gone to the expense to have R.S. Scott Associate to re-modify the plan. He said there are plans to alter some of the site work. He said there are still going to be variances, but there will be less variances needed.

Member Lamble said what happens if the Sunrise Mission decides to convey to somebody else the mission property (referring to 608 W Chisholm), how do they tie all this together without deed restrictions to prevent that potential disposition of the center along with its activity center?

Member Lewis said the same thing came up at the Planning Commission. He said basically once they put that parking lot on there, there is no dividing it. In reality, the property at 608 W Chisholm Street is going to become part of the mission.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

John Ritter, Director of the Sunrise Mission addressed the board. His address is 14145 E. Grand Lake Road, Presque Isle, Michigan. The big reason at the first meeting is they did not have any answers to the questions, because they never saw the questions until the meeting was over. They did not know what anybody was talking about. He said that was a huge disadvantage to them. This time they had the questions and they answered them. On the site plan, he said he can explain about the parking and the setbacks. Mr. Ritter said Sunrise Mission has been at this site since 1995. They acquired the two properties next door to suit their needs. One house is for income and the other house is used for overflow for family rooms. They wanted to add this activity center for better service for their guests. This activity center is not an expansion for bed space. This is an improvement to their property. The old garage in back needs to be torn down and it will all be paved back there, and new fencing in the back to keep people from coming in from the alley. He feels with the new plan, it is much more parking than they are ever going to use for their needs. Most of the people that come to them are poor and/or destitute and most

of them do not have cars. He feels it is not a parking problem. He said with the new setup, they are going to have traffic flow with signage indicating which way to enter and which way to exit to help keep things in order. He said their setback off the alley for the fence would be five feet.

Last year they averaged 28 people a night. It is a dorm setting for the most part. The people are there out of necessity. If the mission was not there, these people would be on the street. It is an activity center, and once this is up and going you are not even going to know that is there by any additional traffic. It is not going to be open to the public, except alumni or holidays. Mr. Ritter says it is a definite improvement over what they have back there now. He does not see any valid reason why they should not be granted these variances.

Their holidays are crowded. Right now they have a dining room and a living room and they have to move all the furniture and put it in the hallway. They borrow tables and chairs and set all that up. The meeting room, which has carpet, is used for food service and they don't like using that. It has worked in the past, but they are kind of elbow-to-elbow. There is a smaller kitchen where everything gets prepared in. That is why the board has been looking at this for six years and one of the reasons the holidays are really crowded for them.

Robian Durdik of 3120 Hodgins Road, Lachine, Michigan addressed the board. She has served on the board at Sunrise Mission for the last four years. She said their meeting room is actually someone's bedroom. She said their table is crammed in there. She said they are so in need of more space for board meetings. We would like to see and use that activity center, because we need the room. It would be such an advantage to the board and to the people that we serve, that we would be able to offer these additional services.

Paula Welling of 9250 Schultz Road, Herron, Michigan addressed the board. She has been on the board for six years at Sunrise Mission. She is retired from Alcona Health Center. She was a practitioner there. Many various situations bring these guests into the mission. They rotate people. These are not the same people living there. These people are there from any length of time typically from one month to three months. There are new people coming and going throughout this time. The mission is able to give them skills and give them information they need so they can leave the mission with a better chance of success.

Gail Burg is representing Greg and Gail Burg at 630 W. Chisholm Street and 628 W. Chisholm Street (Cracker Barrel Party Store and Burgies). Gail Burg addressed the board. The variances the mission have asked for have not changed. We do not have an issue with the center; we also would like to see. Our problem is it is on the wrong piece of property. It was not built for this purpose. The parking is not there. The parking is out of control now and will only get worse. What they have contested is that our parking issue at the Cracker Barrel and Burgies is not important, it is just a little bit of an issue. For us it is a big issue. The police and the ambulance park at Burgies, and everybody else coming to visit the mission, or to drop items off, park at Burgies or at the Cracker Barrel. We have two businesses to run. There is no real entrance to a parking lot there at the mission. What they want to do now is put a fence around the property, which I don't think makes the parking issue any better for us. They said they have outgrown their

space. This is what we agree with. It would behoove all involved if the mission were to find a more appropriate location (perhaps where everything is located all under one roof rather than three separate structures which might encompass an activity center within its walls). On holidays, our businesses are very busy. Not only are they taking our parking spaces, nobody can come in to park at our businesses. All the variances they are asking for, it is obvious it is not appropriate for this situation. Trying to cram more into a space that is already inadequate is not in anyone's best interest! The Burg's also submitted a letter saying they are vehemently opposed to the requested variance.

Angelia Skiba of 635 River Street, Alpena, Michigan addressed the board. I am respectfully requesting you deny the variance that is being requested at 622, 616 & 608 W. Chisholm Street. It is not in the best interest of the City of Alpena to expand the existing Sunrise Mission. The variance to the rear building setback would disrupt traffic flow on a heavily traveled alleyway. I travel that alleyway often to see who is at the mission and how many cars are there. I have a picture I took on August 12, John said generally never more than five cars. I have five cars just one day, that particular day. Many days there are many cars coming and going. That was just a random day driving through. I drive through there all the time. This is a safety issue for the cars coming and going, and the traffic that would increase there where the traffic flow would change. It could cause serious traffic accidents. There are all services nearby and no variance is needed. Please deny any and all variance requests. Angela said the people on the board, none of them live near the mission, nor see what goes on, on a daily basis; however, I do. I find that interesting that they are not watching the day-to-day comings and goings. When they increased the amount of beds that has increased the amount of traffic. I feel it would be a detriment to the City of Alpena if this variance is allowed.

Dave Meyer of 1115 Merchant Street, Alpena, Michigan addressed the board. He is a retired teacher and principal of Emmanuel Lutheran School. He became a member of the board in 2006. He said in 2011 there were 284 guests that received case management services. Of this total, permanent housing was found for 39 of these guests. In housing with family or friends was found for 102. The mission is all about reducing homelessness. We are a rescue mission, which means we have a safe place for the homeless and providing services to them. We could also be a lot more comfortable and maybe have a place that is a lot easier for the teacher to accommodate them in the additional space that we are proposing.

Carl Chrzan of 152 Long Rapids Road, Alpena, Michigan addressed the board. His interest is he owns an apartment house at 117 S. Seventh Avenue which is adjacent to the property. His question has always been, what percent of homeless people are from Alpena. He has had the good fortune of working for the Department of Human Services for over 25 years. During that period of time, he has interviewed many people that come from the mission. Many times his main question to them after the interview is, how did you arrive in Alpena? Their main comment is, we heard you have a great homeless shelter. It comes from all territories, southern states, out west, along with southern part of Michigan. It also is part of an early release program from prison. He talked to many of those individuals that came here and they had no idea where Alpena was. Mr. Chrzan says with his interest in the area it does not meet the zoning

requirements. He is not in favor of any changes at this time. Mr. Chrzan also submitted a letter to the board saying they are not in favor of any change of zoning expansion of the Sunrise Mission Center.

Mr. Ritter addressed the board again for a couple of rebuttal things he would like to say just for clarification purposes. He respects the Burg's and their business. We try to be respectful. The Burg's have plenty of signage, but people are in a hurry and park there. We used to get more calls from them. We have not had a lot of calls. The last call John had they said there were two cars from out-of-state in back of their store and we think they are your guests and they might be stolen. John said he did not know whose cars they were, but the cars were not from anyone staying at the mission. We do respond to their complaints when they call us or if they come over. Mr. Ritter says as far as the back alley, it is already paved. The whole thing is blacktop. There is not a lot of traffic in the alley unless once in a while someone is pulling into our place or maybe it is staff. The garbage truck comes in every other week. It is not a high traffic area. With the proper signage with arrows showing this way in, this way out for the mission, showing this is our parking and head back there.

Part of what Mr. Ritter said he heard is fear mongering and all he had to do is yell felon or they are out-of-state. Mr. Ritter said they do get people from out-of-state. Almost 80 percent of the people are from Alpena County and the four counties they service, which are Alpena, Alcona, Presque Isle, and Montmorency. They do get some people from the Gaylord area, because their shelter closed. Those people are out on the street. Their social services directed them to us. Sometimes there are felons at the mission. They are under house rules, they have to be in by 10:00 p.m., and we know where they are. There are alarms on the doors. These people are not running around at night doing anything. If they are a problem for us, we can call probation, and they are in trouble.

We are only asking for some variances. To us it is progress for Alpena. If we can help people and have more space and more educational opportunities for people that come to us that need those services, and they are in a better position when they leave than when they came in that is the whole thing of the mission. I apologize there are some inconveniences. Such as the mission, it is a homeless shelter. He said some of the nicest people he has met has come through the mission. There are a lot of people that are just down on their luck and they have been burned out, they have been divorced, kicked out by their spouse or significant other, lost their job, or lost their health, and sometimes there are addiction problems. They do not come to us except out of need. Yes, John says, we do have a good shelter and Alpena needs a shelter. Mr. Ritter says the only time we will be ready to sell is when there is no demand for our services, and he does not see that happening.

Member Guest asked Mr. Ritter about the fence. The fence that they propose to go along the alley property line would essentially close access off from the alley to their parking facility. Member Guest asked Mr. Ritter if that is correct. Mr. Ritter said yes it would be closed on three sides.

Adam Poll also said he is asking them they go the additional two sides so there cannot be pedestrian access from the alley.

John Lappan of 112 N. Eighth Avenue, Alpena, Michigan addressed the board. He said he wants to go on record that these proposed variances should be turned down. Nothing has changed since the last meeting. Mr. Lappan said a lot of people in the community are concerned. Mr. Lappan said the mission found homes for people. Are these people working in the community, do they have jobs in the community, are they taxpayers of the community, or did we set them up with assistance. Those are some of the questions I would like to have answered. Case management they talk about. What type of case management are they talking about? What of the educational background of the people who do have this case management? If people are coming from the prison system, what is the intake? He thinks that is important to know. The fear mongering is a serious thing for many people in the community. The mission is a viable place, but expanding it to this nature that you are requesting, seems to me that you are just running out of space.

Adam Poll told the board the mission is not asking to add any beds. They are trying to expand the services to the people that are there. He told the board to focus on the land use, the impact of the proposed activity center, and not necessarily the existing mission and that of the activity center.

Member Lamble said we are expanding the use of the facility in terms of allowing these different functions that are taking place at this activity center that may be an addition to what is currently being done. Is it not proper for this board, when we look at this, to determine future uses of this particular property, particularly when it is in our commercial zone? Adam Poll told the board that is what they can looking at. Poll mentioned that the Mission has mentioned they have no intention of moving in the near future.

Mr. Ritter says this is also in their newsletter. Anybody that has questions about the mission is invited and see how things work, if you have questions about case management, you want to see how the facility is laid out, a tour, or if you want to meet some actual homeless people, that is fine. We do not have a problem with that. There is nothing at the mission we are trying to hide or sweep under the rug. It is a Christian center for people who have nowhere else to go. Anybody is invited to come in, and John said he will answer any questions that you have.

Chris Corwin of Quid Pro Quo Properties located at 615 W. Chisholm Street sent a letter to the board stating, to request the variance requested by the Sunrise Mission be denied. My business is located directly across the street from the proposed pole barn. I imagine if there are not enough parking places as required by code, that the users of the activity center will be parking in my parking lot and in the parking lots of my business neighbors. An activity center is not needed.

Chairman Dutcher said we have debated this subject long enough. Since no one else wished to speak on this case, either for or against, Chairman Dutcher closed the public comment portion of the meeting at 6:10 p.m. to deliberate for case ZBA15-07.

DISCUSSION BY BOARD MEMBERS:

Member Guest said he would like to point out there are some positives in what they are doing. He said he does like the fact there is fencing restricting access to the alleyway, and bringing in all the clients in from the front, in his mind, makes things more orderly and visually more appealing. Also the paving and the stripping of the parking lot to him has a potential of relieving some of the parking issues in most cases. The additional facility at times may add to the burden of people coming into the mission and parking, but many cases it would be relieving it because it is actually providing additional spaces for these people to go to when they visit the mission. There still are the issues Mr. Lamble pointed out that what if this facility is sold and the parking issues may become even more pronounced, as if a different type of business occupies that facility. So there is a negative there. We would still have a struggle of satisfying the five criteria, in his mind, so there are strong positives and strong negatives he thinks need to be considered in the case.

Member Anderson said the Sunrise Mission is a highway to heaven, but the criteria has not been presented, there is no density to the argumentation that would support a yes, because it is an impingement on the ordinance. It is criteria, criteria, criteria and it has nothing to do with the good the mission does or the mission does not do. It is the ordinance and that is the criteria. If you cannot meet all the criteria, it does not get met.

Member Polluch said there are strong arguments on both sides. If this property decides to get sold, then what. He agrees with Member Anderson that the mission does not meet the criteria.

Member Lewis said he is a member on the Planning Commission and he heard the same case basically there. One point that he pointed out there is that you are asking for five variances and you came back with the same plan. Member Lewis said he would have liked to have seen some changes to this plan, maybe make your addition smaller so you need less parking, the side setbacks you would not need those. Coming back with the same plan was not good in his opinion.

Member Lamble made a motion to deny the request for a variance on this case, based on the fact it does not meet the current five criteria, and it did not meet the five criteria back in February either.

Anderson seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion on this variance from the board members.

ROLL:

Ayes: Anderson, Dutcher, Lamble, Lewis, Polluch

Nays: Guest

Abstain: Bray

The variance to construct a 60' x 34' activity center addition 5'2" from the rear property line, with 25 parking stalls provided, with nine foot wide parking stalls, and a zero foot side yard parking setback has been denied.

OLD BUSINESS:

There was not any old business.

NEW BUSINESS:

The minutes of the July 29, 2015 meeting were approved as printed.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no other business, Chairman Dutcher adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

---

Alan Guest, Secretary

---

Norman Dutcher, Chairman