PRE-MEETING:

The board members in attendance were: Jason Lanoha, Sean Kelley, Brian Mahlendorf, Kristine Moore and Dustin Friedman. Planning Department staff in attendance were: Cliff Todd (Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator), Debbie Hightower (Recording Secretary) and Jennifer Taylor (City Attorney). Ms. Taylor briefly advised the board about Case 19-083. Jay Noddle and Eric Noll were in attendance for Case 19-083. The board reviewed the remaining cases.

Certification of Publication: Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator certifies publication of this agenda in the Daily Record, the official newspaper of the City of Omaha on Monday, July 29, 2019 (Use Waivers) and Thursday, August 1, 2019.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Jason Lanoha - Chair  
Sean Kelley – Acting Chair  
Brian Mahlendorf  
Kristine Moore  
Dustin Friedman (Alternate)

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:  
Jeremy Aspen – Vice Chair  
Matthew Kortright (Alternate)

STAFF PRESENT:  
Mike Carter, Current Planning Manager  
Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator  
Jake Placzek, City Planner  
Jennifer Taylor, City Attorney  
Debbie Hightower, Recording Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Lanoha introduced the board members, City staff and explained the procedures for hearing the cases.

Mr. Lanoha requested a moment of silence in memory of Mr. Sebastian “Subby” Anzaldo who spent several years as a member of the board and in service to the City of Omaha in various capacities.
NEW CASES:

1. Case No. 19-079
   Raymond Plumb
   c/o Schlick Construction
   503 South 36th Street
   Omaha, NE 68105
   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-715 - Variance to the minimum street yard landscaping percentage from 50% to 34% to allow for construction of a new 10 unit townhome development.
   LOCATION: 618-636 North 46th Street
   ZONE: R7

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Raymond Plumb appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new, 10-unit townhome development and was unable to meet the required 50% street yard landscaping requirement. He noted that the request resulted from a design preference and the Planning Department found no hardship or difficulty to support the request. He further noted that the request was for new construction on an undeveloped site and that it should be designed in a manner that would allow the project to be built according to regulations. The Planning Department recommended denial of the request.

Mr. Plumb stated that the lots had not been developed for several decades. He indicated that investors had passed over redeveloping the lots because of the difficulties involved that included drastic grade changes (40' difference within a distance of 150'). He stated that investors had concluded that luxury townhomes needed to be built on the site in order to absorb the excess building costs. He stated that the market value of the homes would be $470,000 for the 2-bedroom and $540,000 for the 3-bedroom. He mentioned some adjustments that had been made to bring the landscaping as close to 50% as possible. He explained that making the backyards even smaller would be detrimental to the project.

Ms. Kelley noted that there was a hardship due to the topography and irregular shape of the lot.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

AYES: Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
2. Case No. 19-080
   Damond Stokes
   224 10th Avenue
   Council Bluffs, IA 51503
   
   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-126 - Variance to the rear yard setback from 35' to 31'4" to allow for an addition to an existing garage.

   LOCATION: 615 Fairacres Road
   ZONE: R1

   PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

   At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, John Rebrovic (615 Fairacres Road) appeared before the board.

   Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant wanted to construct a 4’ addition to an existing non-conforming garage and was unable to meet the required 35’ rear yard setback. He noted that the request resulted from a design preference and no hardship or difficulty was found to support the request. The Planning Department recommended denial of the request.

   Mr. Rebrovic stated that there was a practical difficulty due to the irregular pie-shape of the lot. He explained that the request was consistent with other properties in the area and would not negatively impact the neighborhood.

   Mr. Mahlendorf agreed that there would not be little to no impact to the neighborhood and noted that that situation is existing.

   Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

   AYES: Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Freidman, Lanoha

   MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
3. Case No. 19-081
Steve Huber
c/o Curt Hoffer Construction
16820 Francis Street
Omaha, NE 68130
REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-740(e) - Variance to the hard-surface driveway requirement to allow for the construction of a lower level garage.
LOCATION: 23021 J Plaza
ZONE: DR

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Steve Huber appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new home that included a secondary, lower-level garage without a hard-surface driveway. He noted that the request resulted from a design preference and no hardship or practical difficulty was found to support the request. He explained that the garage could be designed with a 6’ or smaller door which would eliminate the need for a waiver. The Planning Department recommended denial of the request.

Mr. Huber explained that the garage would not be used to store a vehicle but would primarily be used as a wood shop and to do repairs on a tractor. He stated that the goal in that area was to eliminate as much hardscape as possible, adding that any driveway would need to be about 150’ long from the street. He added that a driveway would hurt the root structure of existing, mature trees.

In response to Mr. Lanoha, Mr. Huber stated that there would be approximately a 14’ elevation change from the driveway to the garage. In response to Mr. Kelley, Mr. Huber re-stated that the shop would be used not be used to store a vehicle.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Lanoha seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
4. Case No. 19-082  
Mary Clare Marsh  
1702 Ridgewood Avenue  
Omaha, NE 68124  

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-786(e)(1) - Variance to the residential fence regulations to allow a 6' tall, privacy fence within the street side yard setback.

LOCATION: 1702 Ridgewood Avenue  
ZONE: R2

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Mike Boyle appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant who was unable to appear.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant had begun to install a 6' privacy fence in the front yard that did not meet the required 20' setback. The building permit that had been issued to the applicant clearly stated that the fence was to be installed at least 20' from the street side lot line along Hickory Street. The applicant could have installed a 4', 50% open fence along the property line without the need for a waiver. He noted that the request resulted from a design preference and the Planning Department found no hardship or difficulty to support the request. The Planning Department recommended denial.

Mr. Boyle explained that if the fence was placed according to zoning regulations, it would reduce the privacy of the yard.

Mr. Kelley indicated that he had driven by the home and he agreed with Mr. Boyle that, due to the topography of the site, a waiver was needed to provide privacy for the homeowner.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Friedman seconded the motion.

AYES: Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
5. Case No. 19-083
   Jay Noddle
   10604 Frances Street
   Omaha, NE 68124
REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-786(e)(1) - Variance to the residential fence regulations to allow a 6' tall, 50% open fence within the front and street side yard setbacks.
LOCATION: 10604 Frances Street & 2009 Mullen Road
ZONE: R1

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Jay Noddle appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant wanted to construct a 6' tall, 50% open fence within the front and street side yard setbacks and also within the Frances Street and Mullen Road right-of-way. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support this request, noting that it was a design preference, and the need for the requested variance was created either intentionally or inadvertently by the actions of the applicant. He noted that if the request were granted, the applicant would need to have an approved right-of-way lease request for this fence from the City of Omaha before any building permits are be issued. The Planning Department recommended denial of the request.

Mr. Noddle explained that he wanted to install a transparent fence. He stated that his property was exposed to foot traffic and his driveway was exposed to vehicular traffic off of 106th Street that goes right into his driveway. He proposed that the existing wooden fence on the north side of the property would be extended to the corner. In addition, a 6' tall, black chain-link fence was proposed for the east side that would be built through the landscaping for the benefit of the applicant and his neighbor. Finally, a steel fence would be located along Frances Street and Mullen Road. He indicated that his neighbor to the east had some concerns about the location of the fence between the two properties and in response he stated that he rerouted the fence so that it would not extend all the way to Frances Street. Instead the fence would cut back through the yard so that the existing landscaping would not be affected. It would also provide stacking space in the driveway. He stated that on the Frances Street side he would add a canopy over the gate to prevent large trucks from entering the property. He intended for truck and delivery traffic to enter from Mullen Road. He indicated that the fence would provide him with security since he lives alone and has had some health issues. He mentioned that letters of support had been submitted from the six neighbors across from him on Frances Street and Mullen Road.

Eric Noll (10560 France Street) appeared before the board in opposition to the waiver request. His issue was with the wording in a letter that the applicant submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals which were "as it is described". He believed that Mr. Noddle intended to make permanent changes to the landscape of the neighborhood with no oversight. He indicated that the letter that Mr. Noddle wanted him to sign only mentioned the request to change the height of the fence from 4' to 6' and that it made no mention of the right-of-way request or the variance to the setback. He believed that the request was in violation of the R1 zoning regulations, that it was a personal preference that was not justified by a hardship or practical difficulty and that it would set an unnecessary precedent. He also believed that the proposed changes would reduce the value of his property and put his retaining wall and mature landscaping at risk. He stated that their neighborhood is very safe and that the placement of the fence along France Street would put individuals in the neighborhood at risk since the street is a gravel road with no sidewalks. He believed that a solution could be negotiated and that he would be willing to do so with a mediator. Mr. Noll indicated that the fence in question had already been built without proper permits and in spite of his concerns. He requested that the board deny the appeal. He submitted a picture from a house in the area (2402 South 103rd Street) that he believed was an example of a fence that would be more appropriate for the applicant’s property.

In response to Mr. Kelley, Mr. Noll stated that he believed that Mr. Noddle could come up with a fence plan that he felt was reasonable even if it were not built according to zoning regulations. He stated that if the fence were located on the applicant’s side of the existing shrubbery it would be less visible from his side of the fence.
In response to Mr. Lanoha, Mr. Noll admitted that his main concern was with the fence along his property. Mr. Lanoha stated that if the applicant’s request was granted, Mr. Noddle would be required to go through the Public Works and the Planning Departments to lease the right-of-way. Public Works would specifically ensure that there was proper visibility for car that approached the stop sign.

There was some discussion about the exact location of the fence that had already been installed. Mr. Todd also explained Section 55-126 of the zoning code with regards to a fence in a R1 district. Mr. Noll insisted that the fence be set at least 5’ off of the property line. In response, Mr. Noddle stated that he was not willing to remove mature trees, settle for a 4’ fence since he believed that it would not make his property safer or install a wrought iron fence since he did not think it would be visible through the existing landscaping.

Mr. Mahlendorf noted that, as the board had discussed, the portion of the fence that Mr. Noll was opposed to was actually legal. He also noted that many of the neighbors that would be impacted by the fence had expressed support for it. He indicated that he had visited the site and he understood why the fence had to be placed as the applicant proposed. He acknowledged that the issue with the right-of-way would need to be finalized through Public Works and with a right-of-way lease.

Mr. Lanoha stated that his biggest concern was with precedent; however, he acknowledged that the board did not have authority over the right-of-way. Mr. Kelley supported the request and he encouraged the applicant to limit the impact of the fence by placing it a few feet from the property line if possible. He also noted the support from the other impacted property owners.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE the variance to allow a 6’ tall, 50% open fence within 0’ of the front and street side yard setbacks in accordance with the revised plans submitted. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
6. Case No. 19-084  
Bret Linden  
1227 South 109th Street  
Omaha, NE 68144  
REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-126 - Variance to the front yard setback from 50' to 17’ to allow for the construction of a detached garage.  
LOCATION: 1227 South 109th Street  
ZONE: R1  

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Bret Linden appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant wanted to construct a new detached garage and pool house that would not meet the required setback. There was no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request. He noted that this was a design preference and he stated that new construction on an undeveloped property should meet all of the applicable requirements of the R1 district. The applicant was aware that if the waiver request was granted, he would be required to submit an Administrative Subdivision in order to replat the two lots into one singular property before any building permits would be issued. The Planning Department recommended denial of the waiver request.

Mr. Linden explained that the garage would actually be placed on the adjacent lot (1217 South 109th Street). He added that there was a hardship because the lot could not be developed under the R1 regulations since a portion of it had been used for right-of-way. He indicated that the property at 1215 South 110th Street received waivers to the front, side and rear. He also noted that the property to the south had an existing garage that would be situated where he was proposing to place his garage.

In response to Mr. Kelley, Mr. Linden stated that the garage would include an arts and crafts area for his children. The pool house area would include a bathroom, a pantry and a bar top.

Ms. Moore moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Lanoha  

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
7. Case No. 19-085
Mary Our Queen Church
C/O Katie Murphy
3535 South 119th Street
Omaha, NE 68144

REQUEST: Waiver of Sections 55-146 & 55-735(b) - Variance to the maximum impervious coverage from 40% to 45% and to allow parking in the front yard setback to allow for the construction of a new primary educational facility.

LOCATION: 3404 South 119th Street
ZONE: R2

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Approval, subject to the plans submitted and the applicant submitting an application to re-zone the property by adding the MCC overlay district to this specific location.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Brent Beller (11440 West Center Road), Father Mark (Pastor), Dan Vlasik, Vanessa Schutt (DLR) and Katie Murphy (Director of Development) appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new primary education facility that would include an off-street parking lot. A hardship existed due to the residential zoning district that did not take into consideration large civic uses such as schools and churches. He noted that this property is adjacent to South 120th Street which is designated as an MCC-Major Commercial Corridor and the applicant would be required to add the MCC overlay to this property. The Planning Department recommended approval in accordance with the plans submitted, subject to the applicant submitting an application to re-zone the property by adding the MCC overlay district to this location.

Mr. Beller elaborated on the reasons why the waivers were needed. He explained that, although the retention basin created the impervious coverage issue, it would sit under the parking lot and collect the water as it rolls of the property. He stated that the applicant was in agreement with adding the MCC overlay to the property.

In response to Mr. Kelley, Mr. Beller stated that the applicant would be installing a 6’, privacy fence as a buffer for the residential property owner to the southeast.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted subject to submitting an application to add the MCC overlay district. Mr. Lanoha seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
8. Case No. 19-086
Pebblewood Group LLC
c/o Andrew Koster TD2
10836 Old Mill Road
Omaha, NE 68154

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-740(f)(4) - Variance to the minimum perimeter parking lot landscaping from 10’ to 2’ to allow for construction of a drive-thru lane.

LOCATION: 225 North 80th Street
ZONE: CC-ACI-2(65)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Doug Dreessen (TD2) appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new commercial building with a drive-through lane for a building tenant but could need meet the minimum perimeter parking lot landscaping requirement. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request since it was the result of a design preference and financial conditions could not be considered as a hardship. He noted that new construction on an undeveloped property should meet all of the applicable requirements of Section 55-740. He further noted that if the waiver was granted, the applicant must be aware that the drive-thru would be required to comply with all stacking requirements as determined by the Public Works Department. The Planning Department recommended denial of the waiver request.

Mr. Dreessen explained that the drive-thru would also serve as an access to the units that are in the building. He stated that there was a hardship due to the shape and elevation challenges of the site.

Mr. Kelley noted that he supported the request since Mr. Dreessen explained that there would more landscaping than what is required with the exception of the 10’.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Lanoha seconded the motion.

AYES: Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
9. Case No. 19-087
   Donna Collins
   503 South 57th Street
   Omaha, NE 68106

   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-166 - Variance to the
           impervious coverage maximum from 45% to
           57% to allow for the replacement and
           expansion of an existing detached garage.

   LOCATION: 503 South 57th Street
   ZONE: R3

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Donna Collins appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to replace the existing, detached garage and replace it with a garage that would exceed the maximum of 45% impervious coverage for the R3 district. Based upon the size of the existing garage, the property was already considered to be non-conforming as it related to impervious coverage. The applicant had indicated that the current garage could house either her vehicle or seasonal yard items but not both together. She also mentioned that she had a number or items taken from her yard and wanted a secure space to lock them up. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that it was a design preference, and recommended denial.

Ms. Collins stated that her current garage was structurally unsafe. She explained that the proposed garage would not reduce the amount of current greenspace since it would be built on an existing concrete pad. She was also concerned about the safety of her home and the neighborhood where she indicated that several crimes had recently occurred. She mentioned that she had shared her plans with the neighbors and none were opposed.

Mr. Lanoha mentioned that Mr. Todd has recently received an email from someone in opposition to the request who lived at 5615 Howard Street, directly to the east of the garage. The individual was concerned about the height of the proposed structure and stated that they did not want to look at a garage with a second story.

In response to Mr. Mahlendorf, Mr. Todd stated that a two-story garage could legally be constructed as long as it met all other requirements. Mr. Mahlendorf noted that there would be no increase in impervious coverage.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted.

AYES: Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
10. Case No. 19-088
Seven Group LLC
4504 Cuming Street
Omaha, NE 68132

REQUEST: Waiver of Sections 55-716, 55-717(c) & 55-786(f)(2,3) - Variance to the required bufferyard between GI and R5 from 50' with screening to 0' with no screening and to the maximum height for a fence in the front or street side yard of an industrial district from 6' to 7' to allow a 7' tall solid fence for screening at the exterior boundary of the buffer yard.

LOCATION: 4505 Izard Street
ZONE: GI

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Ted Ostronic (14405 Calhoun Road) appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant wanted to replace an older, deteriorated fence with a new, 7' solid fence with no screening in the required bufferyard. The applicant believed that the new fence would improve the overall look of the neighborhood. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that the waiver was the result of a design preference. He explained that, for aesthetic as well as safety reasons, the fence needed to be constructed at the correct location, with the required bufferyard and at the allowed height. The Planning Department recommended denial of the waiver request.

Mr. Ostronic explained that he wanted to replace the existing fence in its current location. He stated that the existing fence was 6' tall with an 8' section. He explained that the height was needed to protect the property from theft, which had happened several times in the past. He also mentioned that there have been several homeless individuals living near his business. He indicated that if fence was placed legally many trees would have to be removed to make it work.

Mr. Kelley stated that the fence would be a huge improvement to the area.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Lanoha seconded the motion.

AYES: Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
11. Case No. 19-089
Emma Erickson
7902 Harney Street
Omaha, NE 68114

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-786(e)(1) - Variance to the residential fence regulations to allow a 5' tall, 50% open fence within the front and street side yard setbacks.

LOCATION: 224 North 32nd Avenue
ZONE: R7

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on August 8, 2019, Emma Erickson (224 North 32nd Avenue) appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant wanted to construct a new fence in the front and street side yard setbacks that exceeded the maximum allowed height of 4'. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that the waiver was the result of a design preference. A 4’ - 50% open fence could be constructed in the same location without the need for a waiver. He noted that, regardless of the style of gate installed, if the waiver was granted any driveway gate must be located a minimum of 20’ from the back of the curb as per the Public Works Department. The Planning Department recommended denial of the waiver request.

Ms. Erickson submitted more pictures of the proposed fence (Exhibit B). She stated that she wanted the fence for safety reasons. She explained that her home is located on the corner of the block and there was a lot of pedestrian traffic. She added that she has had break-ins and individuals passed out in her yard in the last 3 years. She indicated that she tried signage and video cameras but decided on a fence after the safety issues worsened. She attempted to choose a fence that fit the historic character of the home and neighborhood. She wanted to be allowed to have the gate extend up to 6’ since it would arch upwards in some locations.

In response to Mr. Lanoha, Ms. Erickson explained that the four proposed locations where the fence would reach 6’ were the two walk-in gates and the two driveways. In response to Ms. Moore, Mr. Todd stated that the applicant was aware of the requirement that the gate be located at least 20’ from the back of the curb.

In response to Mr. Todd, Mr. Carter stated that, due to the 6’ sections of the fence that had not been advertised, the case would have to be laid over and re-advertised.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted subject to four decorative, artistic areas on the fence that will extend up to 6’ tall. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE the June 13, 2019 meeting minutes. Mr. Lanoha seconded the motion.

AYES: Kelley, Mahlendorf, Lanoha

ABSTAIN: Moore, Friedman

MOTION CARRIED: 3-0-2

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE the July 11, 2019 meeting minutes. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

AYES: Friedman, Kelley, Moore

ABSTAIN: Mahlendorf, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 3-0-2

ADJOURNMENT

It was the consensus of the Board to ADJOURN the meeting at 2:49 p.m.

____________________________________________
Approved (date)

____________________________________________
Jason Lanoha, Chair

____________________________________________
Clinette Ingram, Secretary