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CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Calling to order the Zoning Board of Appeals regularly scheduled meeting February 10, 2015. Would you like to lead this, please, Member Ibe. Everybody please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Ms. Pawlowski, can you call roll, please.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Present.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi is absent excused.

Member Mosteiko?

MR. MOSTEIKO: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Here. Okay. Just a reminder. This is a public hearing and the formal
rules of conduct are in the back if you'd like a copy. And ask that if anybody has any cell phones or pagers to please silence them or turn them off at this time.

Okay. Under the approval of the agenda, do we have any additions?

MS. PAWLOWSKI: No.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Anybody else?

Nothing. Okay. All in favor of approval of the agenda say aye.

(All members stated aye.)

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Any opposed? Seeing none, we have an agenda.

Onto the minutes. Approval of December 9th, 2014 minutes?

MS. KRIEGER: No changes.


Okay. All in favor of the approval of December 9th, 2014 minutes say aye.

(All members stated aye.)

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Any opposed? Seeing none, minutes are approved.

Approval of the January 13th, 2015 minutes?

MS. KRIEGER: No changes.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. All in favor of approval of January 13th, 2015 minutes say aye.
(All members stated aye.)

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Any opposed? Seeing none, okay.

Any public remarks? Does anybody have anything that they wish to address the board other than any cases that are being heard this evening? Okay. Seeing none.

Under the first case, PZ14-0056 West Oaks 1, 43741 West Oaks Drive. Please come forward to be sworn in by the secretary, and state and spell your name for the recorder, please.

MS. GRONACHAN: Good evening. Are you an attorney?

MR. FOSSE: No. I'm an architect.

MS. GRONACHAN: Would you state your name for the secretary, please.

MR. FOSSE: Charles Fosse, F-O-S-S-E.

MS. GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right hand to be sworn in.

CHARLES FOSSE,

was thereupon called as a witness herein, and after having first been duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

MR. FOSSE: I do.
MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you.

MR. FOSSEE: My name is Charles Fosse. I'm with the architectural firm Wah Yee Associates. We're the architects for the project.

Also with me tonight is civil engineer, Dave Hunter, and David Darling, representative of Ramco-Gershenson.

And we're here tonight to ask you for three variances to allow us to expand and update West Oaks, West Oaks 1 Shopping Center.

It involves a revision to the existing tenant, Gander Mountain, relocation of existing tenant, David's Bridal, and the introduction of a new national high-end fashion tenant that whose name we can't disclose at this time.

And these variances were made necessary to accommodate, basically, to accommodate these relocations, and a small expansion to the center to accommodate the new major store.

And we feel that there is really no impact, no negative impact to the community caused by the variances that we're requesting. And the reason for the request, other than the expansion, is that this particular site really has three front yards. So we're, you know, dealing with that and the setback
requirements that come with that kind of a situation.

So that necessitates the loading, which
architecturally is really in the rear of the building,
but technically falls on the side yard. And then to
accommodate that loading dock, and the expansion to
accommodate the new tenant, we're requesting a
reduction in the 100 foot variance on the side, what's
technically the front yard to the north, and the side
yard to the west. I believe that's correct.

And so based on that, we're here to answer
any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody in the audience have any questions or comments
they'd like to address the board? Okay. Seeing none,
anything from the city?

MR. WALSH: No comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Any
correspondence?

MS. GRONACHAN: There are 22 letters mailed,
one returned, no approvals, no objections.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Open up to the
board for discussion. Yes?

MS. KRIEGER: Question. Do you know which
tenant is going to go where? Because the bridal
boutique they asked to be -- they're on the end. They
had two signs we approved on the side, so would they still be on the end?

MR. FOSSE: They're going to be basically where they are now. They're going to move slightly to the south. The new tenant will be on the north on the end. So then it'll be David's Bridal, and then the existing Gander Mountain. But the Gander will be reduced in size slightly.

MS. KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Anybody else?

MR. MOSTEIKO: Yes. My question is as far as the loading area. Is there currently a loading area in that general area for the other stores?

MR. FOSSE: Further down, the Gander Mountain has a similar loading dock space that projects in a similar distance from the property line actually.

MR. MOSTEIKO: Okay. My main concern is as far as semis, large trucks trying to get into the loading area. And it seems like it might be a little bit of a confined space, and maybe the entrance like just actually the gate accessibilities of the loading area, big semis having to back themselves in to load things, how would that work?

MR. FOSSE: Yeah. Basically, they'll come in from the drive to the north and circulate around to
the south, and back in, and then continue in that
counter clockwise, which is the same direction as the
existing loading dock is required.

MR. MOSTEIKO: Okay. I can exactly picture
what you're explaining, so that works with me.

MR. FOSSE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Anybody else?

MS. GRONACHAN: I just want to clarify,
they're asking for -- you started it off saying that
you were requesting three variances, but we've got a
request for one. So I just want to state for the
record that there is only one variance, and that's for
the side yard setback of 100 feet, the reduction of
that; is that correct? Maybe that question should be
for the building department.

MR. WALSH: There's two variances. One for
the front yard, and one for the side yard.

MS. GRONACHAN: Okay. And so the loading
dock is not requesting any kind of variance?

MR. WALSH: No. And those are the
dimensional setbacks for front and side yard, and then
a Section 2507 to add the loading zone.

MS. GRONACHAN: Okay. All right. Thank you
for the clarification.

MR. WALSH: Yes.
MS. GRONACHAN: I have no further questions.

MR. FOSSE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Any questions?

MR. IBE: Not really.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: No. Do I hear a motion?

MR. MOSTEIKO: Yeah. In case number PZ14-0056, West Oaks 1, I propose that we pass the motion to grant the variances as requested. There are unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water, topography or similar conditions, and the need for the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficulty because of the reasons stated are there.

The need is not self-created because the building was already in place.

The strict compliance with regulations, governing area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimensional requirements will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome as stated earlier in the testimony.

The requested variance is the minimum variance necessary to do substantial justice to the
applicant as well as to other property owners in the
district as explained by prior testimony.

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

MS. GRONACHAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Motion seconded. Any
further discussion? Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski, can
you call roll, please.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Mosteiko?

MR. MOSTEIKO: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. FOSSE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: All right. Thanks.

On the case number PZ14-0063, Providence
Hospital Campus and Kidney Centers of Michigan. 47601
Grand River Ave. Please step up and state and spell your name for the recorder.

MR. JONNA: Sure. Good evening. My name is Gary Steven Jonna, J-O-N-N-A. My address is 39525 West Thirteen Mile Road, Novi, Michigan. I'm president of Whitehall Realty Interests, and this evening representing the proposed Kidney Centers of Michigan.

With me this evening is Mark Yagerlener, who is the regional director of real estate for Ascension Health, which is the parent of St. John Providence Health System.

MS. GRONACHAN: I'm sorry. Are you both giving testimony tonight?

MR. JONNA: Mark is here to answer any questions.

MS. GRONACHAN: Would you both like to be sworn in then?

MR. JONNA: Oh, sure.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Can you state and spell your name for the recorder as well, sir.

MR. YAGERLENER: Sure. I'd be glad to. My name is Mark Yagerlener, Y-A-G-E-R-L-E-N-E-R.

MS. GRONACHAN: And would you raise your right hand, please.

GARY JONNA and MARK YAGERLENER,
were thereupon called as witnesses herein, and after having first been duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, were examined and testified as follows:

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you.
MS. KRIEGER: In this case, before we start.
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Yes.
MS. KRIEGER: I work for Providence Hospital, so I should be considered to recuse myself?
MS. SAARELA: I think that you could in this case, yes.
MS. KRIEGER: Okay. See you in a little bit.

(Member Krieger excused at 7:11 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. You may proceed.
MR. JONNA: Thank you. We have a rather extensive packet before you this evening, so I'll just cover a few salient points.

First, there was previously variances granted for three projects that were developed along the Providence Park Ring Road, that the being orthopedic center, the large MOB, and then also the Staybridge Hotel back in 2006.

So as the packet indicates, Providence Parkway was built to public standards, and meets all
the engineering and requirements of the City of Novi
for public streets and dedication, although it's been
held private.

And the roadway is also governed by a
recorded declaration that runs with the land that
ensures the perpetual access to Providence Parkway.

What we're asking for this evening is
there's additional developments planned. The Kidney
Centers of Michigan has received preliminary site plan
approval from the City of Novi. As you might expect,
all of the parcels that are undeveloped at the St. John
Providence Campus rely on Providence Parkway for
access.

There are also driveways along Beck and so
on, but some of the interior undeveloped parcels solely
rely on Providence Parkway for access. So, you know,
the only way to develop these sites is to access
Providence Parkway, and that therein lies our factual
difficulty.

So more than happy to answer any questions
you may have. We work very closely with staff in
trying to give you as much detail in the package as
possible, and delighted to answer any questions you
might have.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody in the audience have any questions or comments pertaining to this case? Okay. Seeing none. Anything from the city?

MR. WALSH: Not at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Can you read the correspondence, please.

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes. There were 46 letters mailed. Four returned. One objection. The objection is from Dr. S., and I'll spell that for the record, P-I-N-N-A-M-A-R-A-J-U, M.D., 26850 Providence Parkway in Novi. Affects patient's traffic coming to the hospital and medical office building. And I just marked it as an objection. No other correspondence.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Thank you. Open up to the board for discussion. Do you have a map with you, by chance, of the road that you're trying to actually add?

MR. JONNA: I think it's -- can they put it on the screen?

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Yeah. If you have a copy up there so you can kind of go over it with us.

MR. JONNA: Well, I'm saying isn't it part of the package, the roadway? There's a colored drawing.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Yeah, but there's people
at home and in the audience that want to see it as well.

MR. JONNA: Oh, I'm sorry. Do you have a copy we can put on the screen?

MS. SAARELA: I have this one.

MR. JONNA: Yes, sorry.

MS. SAARELA: Do you want this, too?

MR. JONNA: There's a colored one.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: It's kind of hard to see.

MS. SAARELA: You can add this other one, too.

MR. JONNA: Thank you. Can I have one moment, please? Can I grab a drawing?

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Yes, you may.

MS. SAARELA: This came to my computer, and I didn't want to print it in color. Here it is.

MR. WALSH: There's the file.

MR. JONNA: I'm sorry I didn't print it. I should have. Thank you. There's the configuration, and then you can see the parcels that are coded in orange are the subject of the petition this evening. Those are parcels, I said before, that are -- rely on access onto Providence Parkway.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Where's the development going to be, just those two that are in orange you're
MR. JONNA: No. The only one that's developing, I think, if I point right here, that's the current project, Kidney Centers of Michigan Total Renal Care, two acres. That's what has, again, received preliminary site plan approval. The balance of the parcels in orange, after discussions with the city attorney and staff administration, they suggested that a more a global approach to the variance, and so we wouldn't have to keep coming back on a repeated basis for really the same matter.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you. Do any of the board members have any questions?

MR. IBE: Just a quick comment. I've had a chance to look at the applicant's request, and it appears obviously that it really wasn't a no brainer. There's no way to access this place without that arrangement. With all due respect to the party who objected, I don't know what else you could possibly do here. There is a significant practical difficulty. If you ask me, that is just a mild one.

Looking at this map, it tells a story pretty much what you can see very clear. I will be in support, of course, of this, and I will await to see what my fellow members think about this.
MR. JONNA: Thank you.

MR. IBE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you. Anybody else?

MR. MOSTEIKO: I don't see any issue with it, and I also was trying to kind of visualize what the person that said that they would disapprove on the correspondence. And I really don't see any other way to get around it. And I think that the variance should be probably approved here, so I'll be in support of it.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you. Any comments? None?

MS. GRONACHAN: I've got none.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Not even one?

MS. GRONACHAN: Except that I can really support this. This is, I will just say, from a long time resident of this area, and seeing that this development has come a long way. And congratulations to the entire complex. To add any additional roads, or the other solution would be to buy additional property, and then to get into the back end of these properties, which is not realistic.

MR. JONNA: That's correct.

MS. GRONACHAN: And I'm stating that just for people that don't know or come back and say, well, why did they do that.
MS. GRONACHAN: The Ring Road is definitely complete in with that complex, and it just ties it all in, and it makes perfect sense. And I think it's all in spirit of the ordinance. So I'm in full support as well.

MR. JONNA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you. Do I hear a motion?

MS. GRONACHAN: It's Rickie.

MR. IBE: Yeah, I better take the motion, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you.

MR. IBE: Thank you very much. In case Number PZ14-0063, Providence Hospital Campus and Kidney Centers of Michigan. I move that we grant the applicant's request as requested for the following reasons.

One, the applicant have demonstrated a practical difficulty does exist to warrant an approval of the request.

There are unique circumstances of the physical condition of the property such as the narrowness, and the shape, and similar physical conditions. Specifically, if you look at the landscape
of the entire campus itself, there's just no other way for this to do justice to this applicant other than grant the variance. There's just no other way.

And second, the need is not self-created. In order to grant a variance of this nature, you have to determine whether or not something is self-created, meaning that the parties have other alternatives, but chose this particular one. This is something that the applicant could not have foreseen. It is something that was there based on the unique nature of the parcel itself. Therefore, the need is not self-created.

In strict compliance with regulations governing the area, setback, frontage, height, density or the dimensional requirements will unreasonably prevent this applicant from using the property for the purpose permitted, and will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome to this applicant, which technically the ordinance is designed to do.

Four, the requested variance is the minimum variance that is necessary to do substantial justice to the applicant, as well as other property owners in the district.

And five, the requested variance will not cause an adverse impact on surrounding property,
property values, or the use and enjoyment of the
property in the neighborhood, or the zoning district.

And let me also add that there was one
objection that was made through the correspondence that
was read into the record. It appears as if the --
while the complainant may have a valid, what I mean to
be a valid reason that they made an objection, looking
at the totality of what has been presented before us
here, there is just no way that this applicant will be
able to accomplish what the applicant sets to do
without this variance.

Therefore, based on the application
submitted, the exhibits that were submitted along with
the application, the comments made by the board
members, I move that we grant the applicant's request.

MS. GRONACHAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Motion to second. Any
further discussion? Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski, can
you call the roll, please.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Mosteiko?

MR. MOSTEIKO: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes four to zero.
MR. JONNA: May I make a brief comment.
First, thank you for your support as we continue to
endeavor to build a world class health campus in Novi.
There'll be future projects, and by virtue of your
support we can continue towards our goal. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you.
MS. GRONACHAN: Good luck.
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Do you mind grabbing
Linda Krieger.
(Member Krieger now present 7:24 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. On to case number
PZ14-0064, 24844 Mallard Trail. Please come forward
and raise your right hand, and be sworn in. And state
and spell your name for the recorder, please.
MR. HUMPHREY: Good evening. My name is
Jason Humphrey, J-A-S-O-N H-U-M-P-H-R-E-Y. I'm with
Kyle Builders. We've been hired on by Mr. and
Mrs. Logan Mays here to build a deck project in the
back of their house.
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Do you guys plan on
speaking as well?
MR. MAYS: Only if you have questions.
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Why don't you just be sworn in as well.

MR. MAYS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Come to the podium and state and spell your name for the recorder, and then be sworn in as well.


MS. SHAVER: Jill Shaver, S-H-A-V-E-R.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Go ahead and raise your right hand, please.

JASON HUMPHREY, LOGAN MAYS, JILL SHAVER, were thereupon called as witnesses herein, and after having first been duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, were examined and testified as follows:

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you.

MR. HUMPHREY: Again, we've been hired on to build a deck project in the back of their house. The deck meets the variance codes, along with the stairs. The homeowners are looking to also get -- install a roof project over the deck project to provide shade from the sun. We don't see any hardships with any of the homeowners. It's a corner lot, so there is one homeowner directly adjacent, but just the street on the other side.
Again, there are retractable awnings around that provide shade. They're looking for more of a permanent structure. We don't see any negative impact, but it would add actual value to their current home, and the adjacent properties.

If there are any other questions, I'd like to answer those for you.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you. Anybody in the audience have any questions or comments? Seeing none. Anything from city?

MR. WALSH: No comment.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. Any correspondence?

MS. GRONACHAN: There were 28 letters mailed. Eight returned. No objections. No approvals.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Okay. I open up to the board for discussion.

MR. IBE: Just checking.

MR. HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. IBE: Is this in a subdivision where you have a homeowner's association?

MR. HUMPHREY: Yes. And actually I was going to mention it if it came up. We did get approval from the homeowner's association as well.

MR. IBE: Oh, you did?
MR. HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. IBE: Okay.

MR. HUMPHREY: I believe we submitted that a couple weeks back. I'm not sure if it's in your packet. It was submitted.

MR. IBE: Okay. Very well. The architecture looks pretty good. I mean, it's actually an improvement.

MR. MAYS: Yes.

MR. IBE: And your neighborhood, do you have a neighbor in the back of this property? There's no one in the rear, right?

MS. SHAVER: No.

MR. IBE: Okay. So really, yeah, I think that looking at the design, as well as the value that it adds to the property, that alone I think is enough to sway me to be in support of it.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Anybody else?

MS. KRIEGER: I agree.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you.

MR. MOSTEIKO: The plans look great, and I'll be in support of your project.

MR. MAYS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Yes.

MS. GRONACHAN: Mr. Chair, good evening.
Beautiful, exciting, right?

MR. MAYS: Yes.

MS. GRONACHAN: This is new construction, correct?

MR. MAYS: Yes.

MS. GRONACHAN: You're not living there yet?

MR. MAYS: No, we are.

MS. GRONACHAN: You are living there. So the house is all done, and you moved in, and so the other neighbors do know what you're doing, and you haven't had any rumblings?

MR. MAYS: Correct.

MS. GRONACHAN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure. I'm in support.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Thank you. Do I hear a motion?

MR. MOSTEIKO: In case number PZ14-0064 at 24844 Mallard Trail, I move that we grant the variance as requested. The variance should be granted because a practical difficulty exists currently due to the following:

There's unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property such as the narrowness, or shape, or topography, or similar physical conditions, and the need for the variance is not due to the
applicant's personal or economic difficulty.

The need is not self-created because of the size of the parcel.

The strict compliance with the regulations governing area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimensional requirements will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for the permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome.

The requested variance is the minimum variance necessary to do substantial justice to the applicant, as well as other property owners in the district, because denying this would prevent them from enjoying the deck.

The requested variance will not cause an adverse impact on surrounding property, property values, or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood or zoning district and will, in fact, increase the value of their home. So for all these reasons, I propose a motion to pass the variance as requested.

MS. KRIEGER: Second.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: There's a motion to second. Any further discussion?
Okay. Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call roll, please.

MS. PAWLOWSKI:  Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Mosteiko?

MR. MOSTEIKO: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Congratulations.

MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you very much.

MS. GRONACHAN: Let us know for the first hot dog roast.

MR. MAYS: Hurry up and tell the weather to hurry. Thank you.

MR. IBE: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Onto other matters. Anything?

MR. MOSTEIKO: I will have to resign from the ZBA after the March meeting. I'll be moving to Chicago for a promotion.
CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Congratulations.

MR. MOSTEIKO: I'm excited and a little bit disappointed. I just you know, got my feet underneath me here.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Bigger and better things.

MR. MOSTEIKO: Exactly.

MS. GRONACHAN: Well, good luck to you.

We're sorry to see you go.

MR. MOSTEIKO: Thanks.

MS. GRONACHAN: And three meetings does not constitute a going away party.

MR. MOSTEIKO: Well, I never got welcome party either.

MS. GRONACHAN: I didn't even get a coming back party.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: We'll see what we can do.

MS. GRONACHAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Is there a motion to adjourn?

MS. GRONACHAN: So moved.

MR. IBE: Second.

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Motion to second. All in favor say aye.

(All members stated aye.)

CHAIRMAN FERRELL: Any opposed? Seeing