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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission for November 16, 2016.

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Lynch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, if we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call for a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion and a second. All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: None opposed. We have an agenda.

Presentations?

MS. MCBETH: None this evening.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Audience participation.

We have two public hearings on tonight's agenda. If there is anybody else in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time, other than those two, please step forward.
Seeing no one, we will close the first audience participation.

Any correspondence?

MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Committee reports, City Planner Reports? Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good evening. I just wanted to report some activity that took place at the November 14 City Council meeting.

Two of the text amendments that the Planning Commission had recently considered were approved for a first reading.

Those related to the Town Center text amendments, related to the study that was completed in 2014, and the other clean-up items that the Planning Commission recently reviewed. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, appreciate that.

Come now to our public hearings.

First are matters for
consideration, I should say. Item number one is American Interiors JSP16-55. It's the consideration at the request of American Interiors for the approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, land bank parking and storm water management plan.

The subject property is located in Section 4 in the City of Novi, north of West Road and east of Hudson Drive. The applicant is proposing to construct a 21,437 square foot single story office and warehouse building, consisting of office and warehouse space and associated site improvements. The applicant is proposing a land bank up to 17 spaces of the required 66 parking spaces.

Sri.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Thank you. The subject property is located in Section 4 at the northeast corner of West Road and Hudson Drive in the existing Beck North corridor park. It is zoned I1, light industrial, surrounding by same on all sides, with a
non-conforming residential use property zoned I2, general industrial on south.

The future land use map indicates industrial research and development and technology for this property and surrounding properties.

The properties to the east and southeast are identified as parks.

There are no regulated woodlands or wetlands on the property. The applicant is proposing a 21,000 square feet one-story building to accommodate their new location for American Interiors office.

The proposed building includes about 12,400 square feet of office space, 1,660 square feet of mezzanine space and 7,387 square feet of warehouse space. They are moving their current facility from Wixom to Novi.

The proposed facility will currently host 21 employees with a future anticipated growth for up to 30 employees. The site access will be provided by a single
drive onto Hudson Drive and an eight foot wide concrete path is proposed along West Road frontage.

The site plan as proposed would require 66 parking spaces. With the initial submittal, the applicant proposed 43 spaces and to land bank 23 spaces to be built when the business expands or if a need is identified.

Per our zoning ordinance, only 25 percent of required parking, which is up to 17 spaces, can be land banked.

In order to comply with the requirement, the applicant has submitted an alternate plan via email which is on your screens and also was provided in your packet.

Staff believes that the plan complies with the ordinance but will need to be reviewed in detail at the time of final site plan submittal.

Approval of land banking of parking lot construction shall be granted based on Planning Commission's findings as
listed in Section 5.2.13.E which are included in the motion sheet. Planning recommends approval.

Storm water is proposed to be collected by a single storm sewer collection system and detained in an existing off-site basin for the overall office park. Engineering recommends approval with additional details at the time of final plan submittal.

The site plan is in general conformance with the zoning ordinance except a few deviations are identified in the landscape review letter. Planning Commission waivers are required for not meeting the minimum requirements for parking lot perimeter landscaping and for relocation of building foundation. Landscape recommends approval.

Based on the proposed office use, in addition to the warehouse use, traffic requires a traffic impact assessment for the proposed site plan. Given that the
subject property is part of the Beck North office park, staff suggests that the applicant at the time of final site plan submittal submit either a traffic impact assessment statement or any other prior studies prepared for the Beck North Corporate Park or other additional information, if determined, as a suitable replacement for the traffic impact assessment, for review and approval by the city traffic consultant. Traffic recommends approval.

The proposed elevations exceed the minimum required percentage for flat metal panels, wood siding and exposed concrete, which would require a Section 9 facade waiver.

Our facade consultant supports the waiver as the proposed alteration will significantly improve the overall appearance of the building and is consistent with the intent and purpose of the facade ordinance.

The applicant has provided
colored building elevations and perspectives and material sample board to further explain the design. Facade recommends approval, so does fire.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve the preliminary site plan and storm water management plan. The applicant, Rick Essig, from American Interiors is here tonight with architect Stan Cole and Charlotte Glaab from Neumann Smith and the engineer Bob Emerine from Siber Kiest to answer any questions you have.

As usual, staff is on standby for any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you very much, Sri.

Does the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time?

MR. ESSIG: I am Rick Essig from American Interiors. Thank you for the opportunity to present tonight.

As Sri mentioned, we have our architect and site engineer on staff. We are
a commercial office furniture dealership. As Sri mentioned, we have 21 associates currently. Very seldom are all on staff, because we have salespeople, we have project managers and we have designers. So on most days, be quite honest, probably ten or 11 people in the office and the rest are out in the field, or come for an hour, then leave for the rest of the day or come in the afternoon.

We are currently residing in Wixom off of Wixom Road. We have been there for about 16 years now, and we are excited to be a part of the Novi community.

Neumann Smith has done a phenomenal job in terms of the renderings that they have done, and we simply want to this building to be, not only a statement piece for what we do, but blend into the community and really be a place that Novi, the community can be proud of and representative in the architectural field that we have done.
Our business is the interior, so we want to make a statement obviously on the inside, but the exterior also is very important to us, because it's the whole -- the whole mesh that we are doing.

So, as Sri mentioned, we have office, and we do have warehouse space, where we store customer products, panels, chairs, that type of thing. So very low impact.

So I have been a part of American Interiors for 20 years. This is our first time in doing this, we are ready to get going. We are excited and obviously ready to make the investment with Novi.

Any questions of me or my staff? Obviously Neumann Smith can answer architectural questions. That's not my forte.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have several questions. Thank you, sir.

With that we will turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Who would like to start.
11/16/2016

MR. GIACOPETTI: Through the Chair, I have a question for the applicant. You have 21 associates you said on-site?

MR. ESSIG: Yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: At any given time how many customers do you have coming and going?

MR. ESSIG: Coming and going, some days we don't have any. Other days, coming and going, we will have six or seven. So on a weekly base, total, ten, 12.

MR. GIACOPETTI: If you could, I mean, the way the ordinance is written, is that you can only land bank 25. If you could land bank more, how many would you land bank?

MR. ESSIG: 35, 36. Typically when we have presentations and a lot of the...
customers come in, they typically carpool. 
For example, if we have -- one of my 
customers, Denso, for example, they might 
bring two of their facility people and they 
will typically carpool. I mean, normally if 
they have four or five people, we might have 
two cars. 

So very seldom if we have -- 
in our groups, very seldom is it bigger than 
a group of four people. I mean, on rare 
occasions, maybe twice a year, we will bring 
a customer in, they might have ten people, 
but that's on rare occasions. 

Normally, it's an individual 
or no more than four individuals. 

MR. GIACOPETTI: That would be -- 
the 35 to 36 would be the ideal size for you?

MR. ESSIG: 35, 36, 40, correct. 

MR. GIACOPETTI: Okay. I have 

another question, but it's for our landscape 
architect. 

Rick, if you don't mind, in 
the facade review, there was a recommendation
that there would be some more trees, fencing.

There was a recommendation in the letter about adding some more trees. I didn't know if you had seen that and if that was consistent with your general recommendation landscape recommendations.

MR. MEADER: I didn't see his review. Let me take a look at it really quick.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Was it in facade or landscape?

MR. GIACOPETTI: It was in the facade recommendation or review.

MR. MEADER: Basically, without having read it, I think they have enough trees. There is a few requirements, they need to change their calculation, all cuts in. They don't have quite the right calculation, but basically I think they have enough trees.

MR. GIACOPETTI: On the second page, on the top, it says additional evergreen plantings are recommended to
conceal the trucks, loading dock.

MR. MEADER: This is talking about on the east side. There is not really anything over there to screen. I wanted them to actually put more perimeter trees on there, perimeter, parking trees which are not evergreen, just to shade out that as much as possible, that big paved area, but evergreens would be fine. There is not really anything to the east to worry about in terms of someone seeing it. So I wasn't worried about as much about the screening. But the evergreens could be nice. It would block the view more, but I think that you really are not going to be able to see much from the road, anyway, based on how much is between the road and the loading area, which is pretty much behind the building anyway.

So I mean, if you want to go, that's fine, but that's not generally what we use for perimeter trees.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I am now clear more on your recommendation. That was my
question. I support it. Well thought out.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Just a couple quick questions for the architect, I guess. I don't see any rooftop equipment in the elevations.

So my question would be, I think, is that where they have the delivery door, but the truck coming into the bay. All right. There is no intakes shown on the wall, fresh air intakes or anything. So I am assuming they're getting their fresh air from up off the roof someplace, and so that we don't have to worry about truck diesel or anything like that?

MS. GLAAB: No. Exactly. We do have rooftop units, but they are recessed well. So you can't see them from the street level. You see it on the elevations, on the screen there.

If we look at the bottom
elevation, on that left roof, there is a little dip where it goes down, that is where that well is. All the rooftop units are even further below that, so we can't see them.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Nice.

The only other question that I have is that the elevation in the upper right-hand corner that shows the truck into the building. If you look at the concrete floor that that truck is backing up to, looks like it's about 18 inches higher than the backing of that truck, the loading, was there a reason for that difference in elevation?

MS. GLAAB: I'm not sure I am understanding the question.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Right in the corner here, as you come up right there, if you look at the back end of the truck, there is about 18 inches that it wouldn't match. So I am wondering is the truck lower for a reason.

MS. GLAAB: I think the truck is just shown more graphically, but the dock
level is well within the building, so if
that -- they have smaller trucks, bigger
tucks, the dock level will help to bring it
down to the elevation.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: And the last
question is, they're going to be using hi-los
inside?

MS.GLAAB: Yes.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So is there a
battery charging bank for the hi-los or are
they battery operated --

MS.GLAAB: I believe so.

Rick -- yes, that is correct. I am not
aware -- I don't know exactly what type of
hi-lo they're using. I know there will only
be one, and yes, it's battery operated.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Okay. I was
just -- if you got a battery rack to charge,
ventilation is required for that, a
separation of some kind.

Those are my questions. I
just thought I would see what's going on.
Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Just a few comments.

Looking at the review, I mean, the building looks really nice. I think it looks really good. We are glad you're moving from so close, we will still take you. Definitely take you.

In looking at the review from the staff and the letters on the -- any kind of -- I will say either compromises or waivers seem to make sense, no doubt, given the site, and what we are looking at, so I am going to support this.

I assume we have all looked at the motion sheet, is everyone comfortable in the amendments.

I would like to make a motion. In the matter of American Interiors, JSP16-55, motion to approve the preliminary site plan with land bank parking and a Section 9 waiver based on and subject to items A through H set forth in the motion
sheet, and because the conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters, being addressed on the final site plan and this motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the zoning ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Zuchlewski. Any other comments? Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MR. GIACOPETTI: Motion passes four to zero.

MR. GRECO: I'd like to make another motion. In the matter of American Interior JSP16-55, motion to approve the storm water management plan based on and subject to the following.

The findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan.

And this motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicant provisions of the ordinance.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Giacopetti, any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member

Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member

Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

MR. GRECO: Welcome.

MR. ESSIG: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the agenda is the Goddard School JSP16-50.

It's a consideration at the request of Hobbs and Black on behalf of Derick and Bobbie Doe for approval of a preliminary site plan, storm water management plan.

The subject property is located in Section 17 of the City of Novi,
north of Grand River Avenue and east of Wixom Road.

The applicant is proposing to construct a single-story day-care building consisting of 9,689 square feet, outdoor recreation area, which includes two play structures, two canopies and associated site improvements.

Kirsten, good evening.

MS. MELLEM: So we have the Goddard School here. The applicant is proposing to construct a single-story day-care consisting of a 9,689 square foot building, outdoor recreation area, and play structure and associated site improvements. The project is 2.10 acres located on the north side of Grand River Avenue and east of Wixom Road in Section 16, to the north is the City of Wixom and existing commercial uses, to the west is PNC Bank, offices and Grand Diner. To the east is vacant land and to the south are existing industry uses.

The zoning map shows the
subject property is currently zoned B3, general business. To the north is the City of Wixom, zoned also B3, general business. To the east and west are also B3, general business. And to the south is I1, light industrial and I2, general industrial.

The future land use map indicates community commercial for the subject property and properties to the east and west as well as to the north in Wixom. And to the south is intended to be office research development and technology.

The natural features map, there are no wetlands or woodlands. The site plan shows the applicant is proposing a day-care facility for approximately 150 children. The building is about 9,600 square feet with two playground areas and a detention pond.

There are several ZBA variances that the applicant is seeking. The applicant is proposing 16,959 square feet of outdoor recreation space, where 22,500 is
required, which results in a deficiency of
the 5,544 square feet, which is supported by
staff due to the site constraints and
adequate outdoor recreation areas being
provided.

The applicant is also
proposing two canopy structures, one is
usually only allowed due to the site size,
but we are supporting this deviation due to
the need to protect children from the sun.

The applicant is not
proposing any loading spaces, which is
supported by staff since all children are
escorted to the building and all deliveries
will be scheduled around pickup and drop-off
times.

The fourth one is the
applicant is proposing the dumpster in the
secondary front yard. This site has two
frontages, one on Grand River and one on
Twelve Mile, so it doesn't have a rear yard,
which means that there is no place to put the
dumpster based on our ordinance. So the
location that they propose is adequate and preferred by staff.

So the applicant is also proposing a painted guardrail on the southwest and west sides of the property. So the southwest of the building and to the west side, proposing this painted black guardrail, kind of bubbled here in red, to protect the outdoor recreation areas. Staff doesn't believe this is esthetically pleasing and appropriate for the proposed location.

There are some shrubs that are being proposed to kind of block it between the parking lot and the guardrails so it's not easily visible, but it's not proposing shrubs along the whole guardrail.

The additional reviews from engineering and traffic recommend approval of the same side, opposite side driveway waiver for both entrances on Grand River Avenue and Twelve Mile Road.

Staff does support this waiver, however, would like to point out that
the applicant should still consider combining their driveway with the future owner of the property to the east, in order -- so there is only one curb cut on Grand River. Grand River is highly traveled, and it would make less curb cuts and less traffic issues if there is only one curb cut on that road.

The landscape review letters recommend approval of several waivers as well on the greenbelt trees, street trees, parking lot perimeter trees and building foundation plantings, which are supported by staff.

The facade review letter recommends approval and a Section 9 facade waiver for overage of asphalt shingles.

The applicant, Mr. and Mrs. Doe and representatives from Hobbs and Black and the engineer are also here to answer any questions you may have about this proposed project. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Kirsten.

Does the applicant wish to
address the Planning Commission at this time?

MR. DOE: Thank you all. Thank you, Kirsten, for the introduction to the project. Thank you Planning Commission, Mr. Chairman.

I'll introduce myself. My name is Derick Doe. This is my wife, Bobbie Doe. We are representing the Goddard School project and we're thrilled to be developing and looking to get established and join the Novi community.

We have had a great working experience with the Novi Planning Department throughout the process. It's been a good learning experience for all of us I think, and we kind of -- we have had some very good dialogue throughout the project duration.

I think as a result of that, we actually have a better product that we can showcase. We are very excited about the location. We are very excited about joining Novi. We have got a beautiful building that we are looking to showcase, and we are
excited to get started here soon.

On a personal note, I just wanted to talk about briefly Bobbie and I both, we have got a child that attends a nearby Goddard School, and it's been a great experience for us. The development for the little guy has been just -- it's a joy to see. He's changed our lives.

The Goddard School product has just -- we can't say enough about it. That's really what led us down this path. So we are thrilled about the opportunity to actually locate the business here in Novi. And we just want to take this opportunity to actually make available the Goddard School product to other families similar to what we have experienced.

So with that said, I want to open it up, answer any questions you have about the project.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

Thank you very much. Turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.
Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Kirsten, I have a question for you.

There was discussion about a guardrail in the front as you turn in and face the building, the cars coming in. I didn't look for a detail until now. Is that guardrail -- is that like a highway guardrail, medium guardrail or is it -- I mean, or would bollards be better there?

MS. MELLEM: So, I don't know what the Planning Commission would prefer. If it's screened, I think it would be okay, but it's not screened along the whole west side.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So it's probably galvanized?

MS. MELLEM: Exactly. They're going to paint it black to kind of match with the fence. But it is, I believe, a standard highway guardrail.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: The next question I had, you had a comment about
combining the driveways, so that driveway
could share with the property to the east.

If that was going to happen,
first off, would we need an agreement or
tenants or landlord, you know, to share that
property. Obviously there would be people
going back and forth across two properties.

So would there have to be
some kind of an agreement between property
owners to share that?

MS. MELLEM: Yeah, so someone
came in earlier this week that was looking to
purchase that, and so -- that discussion was
amenable to it, but combining those to
driveways together, it would be a shared
access agreement they would have to come to.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: My other
question, and my concern then would be
whoever that other property owner is, and
whatever that facility is going to be there,
you know, or the curb cut as it is today,
you've got in and out turn right, turn left,
then you have got a straight in.
So would there be people coming -- obviously people then coming and sharing that curb cut from the adjacent property, what would happen -- what kind of congestion would we experience so close because it looks like, you're making a quick right in or quick right out, which is fine.

The quick turn out east could be a problem waiting for traffic to clear, and then so would there be a possible congestion point right at this first one or two parking spaces to the east? Or would this whole curb cut shift over so that the property shared in the curb cut shared in the middle of both properties?

MS. MELLEM: Right, that's what the idea would be to shift it over. They get additional parking spaces if they want to, or if could be green space. The issue with the property to the east is that there is no other space for a curb cut, and I don't think -- we don't believe Oakland County Road Commission would allow them a curb cut there
because it's too close, create more conflict, I believe, by having those so close together. So this is a compromise I guess for both of those properties to be able to have that.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Likely, if that becomes a bottleneck, then the people really, instead of going out onto Grand River would probably use Twelve Mile to exit the property?

MS. MELLEM: Right. That driveway is already much larger than we usually see for a curb cut. It has the three lanes. I think their intent was so that there wouldn't be any traffic for people trying to turn left onto Grand River versus turning right.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I believe the applicant indicated that it's not a drop-off in front of the school, the parents actually park and walk the kids into the school building. There is no staffing up front?

MR. DOE: That's correct. Yes, they park and bring the children in. There
is not a drop-off option.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: That's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

Just from looking at it, I think it fits the property well. Typically when we see this many Zoning Board of Appeal kind of requests, kind of get a little bit nervous. I think this property is pretty much warranted, based upon the size and the shape of it. So I have no issues with this particular applicant or proposal.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Just a brief comment. I don't have any issues either. I mean, some of the, again, compromises and waivers and things that you're going to have to do going forward from here again, I think they make practical sense with the way the site is, with the property to the west, or rather to the east being vacant, you know, doesn't make any sense for us to send them out to get a
sharing agreement. We have sent applicants out before, and usually without there being at least an idea on what's going on next door, there is really no way for anyone to agree.

All right. I would like to make a motion, in the matter of the Goddard School, JSP16-50, motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the items listed in A through L in the motion sheet, which includes the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and conditions and the items listed in those letters, being addressed on the final site plan.

And this motion has been made or is being made because the plan is in otherwise compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco and second by Member Zuchlewski.

Any other comments? Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Motion passes four to zero.

MR. GRECO: Like to make another motion in the matter of the Goddard School, JSP16-50, motion to approve the storm water management plan, based on and subject to the finding of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review
letters, and the conditions and items listed
in those letters being addressed on the final
site plan.

This motion is being made
because the plan is otherwise in compliance
with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and
all other applicable provisions of the
ordinance.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Member Greco, second by Member Giacopetti.

Any other comments? Sri, please.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member
Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member
Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Motion passes
four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You're all set.

MR. DOE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the agenda is matters for discussion. Any of those? Supplemental issues?

Last chance for audience participation. No one in the audience who wants to. Jeremy doesn't want to pipe up and say anything.

Look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.)
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