MINUTES
Administrative Board of Appeals
July 23, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT:
David C. Levy, Chairman
Ann O’Connor, Vice Chair
Brian W. Kruse

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
Mark Santo
Jeffrey Beals
Ryne Bessmer, Alternate

STAFF PRESENT:
Mike Wilwerding, Planning Department
Will Acosta, Law Department
Clinette Ingram, Board Secretary

Mr. Levy called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm. The Board received as Exhibit 1 the contents of the City's file on each case.

Cases:

1. 18-07-057
Hannah Mecham
1308 N. 109th Plaza #405
Omaha, NE 68154

At the Administrative Board of Appeals meeting held on July 23, 2018, Hannah Mecham appeared before the Board. Mark Langan appeared on behalf of the Nebraska Humane Society.

Mr. Langan reported that on May 12, 2018, the NHS received notification from Jenny Butler that she had been bitten by a dog the day before (May 11, 2018) at approximately 10:00pm in her apartment building. Mr. Langan shared the details of the report as follows:

Ms. Butler stated that she entered her apartment building when she saw a man and woman across the common entry hallway with their medium sized dog, which was determined to be Tut. Jenny noticed right away that the dog was off leash and she states that when the dog saw her, it came running over, chased her up the steps and bit her lower, right calf.

Mr. Langan provided photos of the bite to the Board and described the bite as being substantial in nature.

Mr. Langan reported that based on the incident, Tut was placed on a mandated, 10 day, rabies quarantine with Ms. Mecham, a citation was issued for improper restraint, and a Potentially Dangerous Dog declaration was issued. Ms. Mecham appealed on June 6, 2018. The appeal was heard by the NHS Board of Appeals. During that hearing, Ms. Mecham admitted to dropping her dog’s leash in the hallway and that she did see Ms. Butler in the hallway before doing so, and that the dog did run towards the victim. Ms. Mecham stated that the victim was being untruthful and that Tut did not bite her. Even after being shown the photos, Ms. Mecham continued to state that the victim was being untruthful in her report. The appeal was unanimously denied. The NHS Board agreed that the dog’s actions met the definition of Potentially Dangerous Dog under the sections related to 1) inflicting an injury on a human being, and 2) chasing or approaching a person on streets, sidewalks, or any public grounds in a menacing fashion or apparent attitude of attack. Mr. Langan quoted from his report that the NHS felt that Ms. Mecham was refusing to accept any responsibility for the attack, particularly given the fact that she continued to deny that the victim was even bitten. Mr. Langan stated that the NHS feels that a 2 year probationary period is
warranted for public safety as well as to force Ms. Mecham to take the steps to prevent the same thing from happening again. The NHS feels that Ms. Mecham has demonstrated that she is not a responsible enough dog owner to prevent this from happening again on her own.

Upon request from the Board, the applicant stated that her full name and address is Hannah Mecham, 111 E West Plaines Road, Apt 201, Gretna, Nebraska 68028. Ms. Mecham responded to a question from the Board to state that this is a new address and that they had moved from the location where the incident had occurred after being assaulted three times by Ms. Butler.

Ms. Mecham stated that the basis for her appeal is that she does not believe her case was heard at the previous hearing. She stated that there was only testimony as to whether the incident occurred or not. Ms. Mecham reported that she had provided 15 letters from friends, neighbors and other people who are familiar with Tut and she does not feel they were considered in the previous hearing. Ms. Mecham informed the Board that Tut had been around the victim previously and there was no problem. She stated that on the date of the alleged incident, she and her boyfriend, Jared, were outside with Tut who was on a leash while they were outside. She stated that upon entering the apartment building she let Tut off the leash so he could run to their door with Jared who was in front of her. Ms. Mecham states that she did not see Tut bite Ms. Butler, and she stated she saw no blood, no tears and no immediate reaction from the victim. Ms. Mecham states that they take Tut everywhere with them, to public places where he just lays at her feet or walks calmly beside her, they have him around children and he has no reaction to them either. Ms. Mecham believes the victim is being untruthful. She believes that her witness statements and her personal experience prove that Tut is not a Potentially Dangerous Dog.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Langan stated that the applicant is apparently still refusing to accept responsibility for the incident and he believes that the above stated recommendation is appropriate. Ms. Mecham stated that she is only appealing because she saw with her own eyes that her dog did not bite Ms. Butler. She stated that Ms. Butler was standing at her apartment door when Tut went past her, Ms. Butler stated in her report that Tut chased her up the stairs which Ms. Mecham says is untruthful.

The Board reminded Ms. Mecham that while they do not have the authority to make laws, they work with ordinances that are put in place by the City Council. In situations where the Board believes there are extraordinary circumstances, they can grant appeals to the application of those ordinances. The ordinance which applies to this incident is one which states that a dog who meets one or more conditions can be deemed a Potentially Dangerous Dog. One of the conditions is that the dog inflicts injury on a human being that does not require medical treatment, much less an injury which does require medical treatment. Ms. Mecham stated that she understood this, Tut has never bitten anyone, and she refuses to take responsibility for the incident because she was standing right there when Ms. Butler claims she was bitten and that Tut did not bite Ms. Butler.

In response to a question from the Board, Ms. Mecham stated that prior to this incident, they had a neighborly relationship with Ms. Butler. They said hi in the hall, Ms. Butler’s children knew her, they knew Tut and said hi to him, sometimes the children would mock Tut by barking at him from below but nothing ever came of it. Ms. Mecham states that after the incident, Ms. Butler had threatened to beat her up, she had spit towards Ms. Mecham, and had threatened to urinate in Jared’s shoes which were left outside due to his working with fertilizer (this threat was recorded by Ms. Mecham). In addition, Ms. Mecham stated that Ms. Butler had pushed Jared, poured her drink on him, spit in his face and stated that she would have her “hands” F*** him up. The threats and assaults were reported to the Police. The Board stated that they do not have any copies of police reports, though they questioned whether they would be germane to the case. Ms. Mecham reiterated that Ms. Butler was being untruthful in her report, she again stated that she was there at the time of the alleged incident and that Tut never opened his mouth anywhere near Ms. Butler.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Mecham stated that she had seen the photos of Ms. Butler’s injury. She stated that she did not know where the injury came from, at the time of the incident the injury
she was shown by Ms. Butler appeared to be the type of injury a woman sometimes gets when she cuts herself shaving her legs. When Ms. Mecham saw the photos of the injury Ms. Butler alleges were caused by Tut, she was surprised as they do not show the same injury she witnessed at that time.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Langan stated that Ms. Butler went to the hospital for treatment of the wound, but he did not have any medical records denoting the cause of the injury. In his opinion, Mr. Langan stated that based on his experience, he believes the injury in the photographs was due to a dog bite, he pointed out that one photo shows a puncture wound which could not be explained by a shaving injury. In response, Ms. Mecham stated that after the alleged incident, Ms. Butler walked past her to the parking lot where she sat in her car for 10 minutes with the lights on before her boyfriend came to get her. When her boyfriend arrived, Ms. Mecham states that Ms. Butler then got out of her car screaming that a dog had attacked her before getting in her boyfriend’s car. Ms. Mecham states that she does not know what Ms. Butler was doing in her car for 10 minutes with the lights on, but the wound in the photos is not the same wound Ms. Mecham saw before Ms. Butler went to her car. Ms. Mecham stated that the hallway where the incident occurred is well lit, but that it was dark outside. In response to further questions from the Board, Ms. Mecham stated that Ms. Butler was standing at the doorway to her apartment at the time of the alleged incident.

At the request of the Board, Ms. Mecham’s boyfriend, Mr. Jared Nikman (sp), 111 East West Plains Road, Apt 201, Gretna, NE, stated that he was in front of Ms. Mecham in the hallway approximately five feet away at the stairs. He advised that Tut was between them. Mr. Nikman stated that he was very close to where Ms. Butler was standing when the dog allegedly bit her. He stated that the dog looked at Ms. Butler and walked past her to where he was standing at the stairs. Mr. Nikman stated that Ms. Butler was on the phone at the time and he heard her say that she had to get off the phone because a *&#$ had just bit her. He stated that Ms. Butler did not show any reaction to indicate that she had been bitten by the dog other than telling someone she had to get off the phone. Mr. Nikman stated that he was essentially standing next to Ms. Butler and that the dog did not charge up the stairs at her. Tut ran towards Mr. Nikman. At the time Mr. Nikman heard Ms. Butler state that she had been bitten, he grabbed Tut by the neck. Ms. Butler then pulled up the leg of her pants to show him the injury and he saw what appeared to be a scab on her leg and he gave her a puzzled look. Ms. Mecham at that time indicated that she is frightened by Ms. Butler who is a large and intimidating person.

Ms. O’Connor inquired as to whether it mattered that the applicants now live in Sarpy County rather than Douglas County where the incident occurred. Mr. Langan stated that Gretna does have a Potentially Dangerous Animal ordinance and normally when someone moves from one jurisdiction to another, the ordinance continues to be enforced as it is all under the prevue of the Nebraska Humane Society. The Board inquired as to whether the incident would be treated the same under Gretna’s ordinance, to which Mr. Langan replied that the ordinance was the same as the one in Omaha.

Mr. Kruse inquired as to whether there was a leash law in existence which meant that Ms. Mecham should have kept Tut on the leash while she was in the hallway to which Mr. Langan replied that yes there was an ordinance under which the dog was required to be leashed whenever he was outside his home. Mr. Langan stated that Ms. Mecham was issued a ticket for not having Tut on a leash. Ms. Mecham stated that she has paid that ticket. Ms. Mecham again stated that she was only two doors away from her apartment when she released Tut from the leash, he had encountered Ms. Butler before and had never showed any sign of aggression towards her or anyone else in the past.

The Board advised Ms. Mecham that if her appeal is denied and the dog is declared potentially dangerous, she, as the owner, will be subject to the five following requirements;

1. The dog must be spayed/neutered and microchipped
   a. Ms. Mecham stated that this had already been done.

2. A Potentially Dangerous Dog license must be purchased from the Nebraska Humane Society.
   a. Ms. Mecham stated that she had already purchased this license.
   b. Mr. Langan stated that he did not have evidence of this, but trusted Ms. Mecham if she says she has purchased it.
3. A $100,000 Public Liability Insurance must be purchased and maintained.
   a. Ms. Mecham stated that she does have Renter’s Insurance but has not obtained the Public Liability Insurance.

4. The owner must attend a responsible pet ownership and dog behavior class
   a. Ms. Mecham interrupted to disagree with the assertion that she was not a responsible pet owner. She states that she is a responsible pet owner and that everyone who knows her would agree that she takes good care of her dog. She drives from college to Gretna to let him out and spend time with him before she drives back to Omaha to work, and she keeps him current on all of his shots. Ms. Mecham was advised that no one is disputing those facts, but that is the name of the class she will be required to take.

5. The dog must be under control on a leash at all times.

The Board stated that although these requirements are objectionable to her as she maintains that the dog did not bite Ms. Butler, the photographs indicate otherwise. Ms. Mecham stated that her aunt works for an attorney who stated that he was just wanting to know whether she had insurance. Ms. Mecham went on to state that the attorney she consulted stated that, while he had not seen the injury, it sounded to him like it was self-inflicted. Mr. Kruse and Mr. Levy advised Ms. Mecham that the Board is not necessarily her last stop regarding this matter. If she does not like the outcome, she and her attorney can pursue the case to District Court.

Ms. Mecham stated that she had worked very hard to get letters from the community, including friends, neighbors, and the vet, stating that Tut was not dangerous and she wanted to make certain the Board had read the letters. Mr. Levy indicated that the Board had received the letters and that he had read them.

Mr. Kruse moved to DENY the appeal. Ms. O’Connor seconded the motion.

AYES: Kruse, O’Connor, Levy

MOTION CARRIED: 3-0. Appeal denied.

2.
18-07-058
Dustin and Hollie Hopkins
18111 Howe Cir.
Omaha, NE 68130


At the Administrative Board of Appeals meeting held on July 23, 2018, Mr. Mike Bianchi, 2712 South 87th Avenue, Omaha, Ne, stated that he is the attorney for Mr. & Mrs. Hopkins who are out of town on a trip which had been planned for some time but wish to be at the hearing. Mr. Bianchi stated that he is requesting a layover to the August 27, 2018 meeting. Ms. Bianchi stated that he spoke with Ms. Ingram before the hearing who advised him that on occasion the Board will entertain this request. He requests that the case be laid over to allow his clients to appear and also because there is not a full Board present to hear the case.

Mr. Mark Langan, Nebraska Humane Society, stated that he is prepared to present his case. He was not informed of any delay prior to the hearing and objects to the case being postponed to August. If the case is laid over, someone will be present from the Humane Society in August.

In response to a question from Mr. Levy, Ms. Ingram stated that she had no indication from the applicants or their attorney, prior to the morning of the meeting, to indicate that they would be unable to attend. She stated that she had always only spoken with the attorney, never with the applicants themselves.

Mr. Bianchi stated that there are efforts being worked on by his clients which could lead, potentially, to the dismissal of this appeal. Obviously there are things that have to be worked out, but he is working on it. The Hopkins have purchased a residence outside the city limits and a closing date has been set, in
addition, negotiations are underway with the City as well. Regardless of what is going on in the background, the applicants wish to be at the meeting. Mr. Bianchi stated that his clients only reminded him about their vacation on Friday late in the day.

In response to a question from Mr. Levy, Mr. Bianchi stated that the applicants are negotiating with the City Prosecutor with regards to the criminal charges that are included in this matter, as well as with the Nebraska Humane Society.

Mr. Levy stated that the facts of the case are troubling, whether the applicant’s live inside or outside of the City limits. However, as an attorney, he can understand the place Mr. Bianchi is in with regards to his request to postpone the case.

Mr. Bianchi stated that it is difficult for him to proceed with his case without his clients in attendance.

Mr. Kruse stated that he believes they should proceed with the case. Ms. O’Connor agreed and asked whether Ms. Ingram had information regarding when the applicants had been notified of the meeting. Ms. Ingram stated that both the applicants and the attorney had been mailed certified letters on the 17th, a voicemail had also been left for the Hopkins on the 17th, and an email had been sent to Mr. Bianchi as well.

Mr. Levy stated that he believes it is important to hear from all of the parties in the case. He confirmed with Mr. Langan that the dogs continue to be held at the Humane Society.

In response to questions from Mr. Levy, Mr. Langan stated that regardless of where the Hopkins live, inside or outside the city limits, the dogs will remain in the custody of the Nebraska Humane Society, until their appeal is granted or the criminal case is resolved in their favor. Mr. Bianchi stated that the dogs could also be released to the Hopkins through negotiations with the Humane Society and the Prosecutor. Mr. Langan replied that though the Humane Society takes their cues from the Prosecutor, they would be very reluctant to release the dogs back into the public. Mr. Levy stated that his concern is also that the dogs would be released back into the public before the appeal could be heard in August. Mr. Langan stated that it is very unlikely that could happen, short of Mr. Bianchi negotiating their release through the Prosecutor, which he felt was unlikely. The recommendation of the Nebraska Humane Society continues to be that the dogs be kept in their custody.

Mr. Levy stated that he believes it is important to have testimony from all parties to the case. Mr. Kruse stated he agrees.

Mr. Levy moved to LAYOVER the case to August. Mr. Kruse seconded the motion.

AYES: Kruse, Levy

NAYES: O’Connor

MOTION CARRIED: 2-1. Appeal laid over to August 27, 2018 meeting.

3.
18-07-059
Lucas Weatherly, P.E.
Olsson Associates
2111 S. 67th St.
Ste. 200
Omaha, NE 68106

REQUEST: Appeal Public Works Department denial of a driveway permit dated 6/26/18.
(RE: Centris Federal Credit Union – 19431 Polk Street)

At the Administrative Board of Appeals meeting held on July 23, 2018, Mr. Chris Faulk (Public Works Department) appeared before the Board on behalf of the City of Omaha and Mr. Lucas Weatherly of
Olsson Associates appeared on behalf of Centris Federal Credit Union. Mr. Mike Eckman, Holland Basham Architects, appeared on behalf of the applicant as well.

Prior to hearing the details of the appeal, Mr. Levy stated that Centris Federal Credit Union is a client of his law firm; therefore he recused himself from the hearing.

Mr. Faulk stated that the site plan presented by the applicant could not be administratively approved as submitted as it does not meet the City’s driveway requirements for drive-thru stacking. The site plan provides for 100’ stacking for each drive thru lane, the City’s requirement is for 200’. The Public Works Department is not opposed the waiver because they recently performed a traffic study to show that 100’ of storage per drive thru lane is sufficient and the Department is working on updating their driveway requirements.

Mr. Weatherly, stated that he is the Civil Engineer working on the project. He stated that he and the architect had numerous conversations with the Public Works Department on the project and that this appeal is the final hurdle in getting the necessary permits to complete the project. Mr. Weatherly states that they knew the driveway policy was being re-done and this requirement for an appeal “snuck up” on them. He stated that they are in compliance with the future requirement for 100’. He stated that Centris has numerous locations throughout Omaha and that many have less than 200’ stacking and they have not had any problem with traffic.

Mr. Kruse stated that this appears to be a pretty straightforward matter which they have heard from the City about before in support of shorter drive thru lanes.

Mr. Kruse motioned to GRANT the appeal. Ms. O’Connor seconded the motion.

AYES: Kruse, O’Connor

ABSTAINED: Levy

MOTION CARRIED: 2-0-1. Appeal granted.

4.
18-07-060
Tracy Peak
4619 Browne St.
Omaha, NE 68114

REQUEST: Appeal of the Police Department’s denial of a firearm registration dated 6/18/18.

At the Administrative Board of Appeals meeting held on July 23, 2018, Lt. David Sedlacek appeared on behalf of the Police Department. Ms. Tracy Peak appeared before the Board on her own behalf.

Lt. Sedlacek clarified that the case before the Board is actually a revocation of Ms. Peak’s handgun registration, not a denial of a firearm registration. Office Sedlacek stated that on June 18, 2018 he sent Ms. Peak a letter revoking her handgun registration rights because she has an active protection order against her which is in effect until November 14, 2018. He advised that the City ordinance states that handgun registration may be revoked if an individual fails to hold all of the requirements set forth in the ordinance, in this case it was due to the active protection order.

Mr. Kruse asked if it was a judge who had issued the protection order, Lt. Sedlacek stated that it was.

Lt. Sedlacek read the information from the Police report which led to the protection order. On Saturday, November 4, 2017, officers were called to 30th and Bedford Streets for two females fighting in the street. On location, Trina Wells stated that there was no fight going on but that she had been threatened by Ms. Peak. Ms. Wells stated that Ms. Peak threatened her by stating, “You are going to die tonight, I have a
gun and I am going to shoot you.” Lt. Sedlacek stated that the case never went to trial, was never prosecuted, but Ms. Wells was able to get a protection order against Ms. Peak. Ms. Peak did have an opportunity to fight the issuance of the protection order but did not do so. Other than this matter, Ms. Peak only has a couple of misdemeanor offenses.

In response to Mr. Levy, Lt. Sedlacek stated that the protection order is in effect for 1 year. It was issued on November 14, 2017. He stated that it took until May, 2018 to track down Ms. Peak.

Ms. Tracy Peak, 4619 Browne Street, Omaha, NE, stated that on June 18, 2017, she was out with her daughter and friends to celebrate her 51st birthday. Ms. Peak stated that she does not even know Ms. Wells. She stated that she was not even aware of the protection order until she went to pick up her grandchild from daycare and her niece told her that she had a warrant out for her arrest. When she heard that there was a warrant, she assumed it had something to do with her estranged husband and his girlfriend. When she called to find out what was going on, she was advised that they were trying to serve her with a protection order. At that time she found out that it was from the lady at the club on her birthday. Ms. Peak stated that she never threatened Ms. Wells. She stated that she asked Ms. Wells why she was following her and that Ms. Wells said she was not following her, she was going to her car. Ms. Peak stated that she told Ms. Wells that she needed to straighten up because her car was in the other direction. After that, she went with one of her daughters and her friend left. Her other daughter, who does have a problem with Ms. Wells, stayed behind and Ms. Peak has no idea what happened after that.

Ms. Peak states that when she went to get the papers and read them, she determined that what Ms. Wells wrote in the papers were lies. She states that Ms. Wells is associated with her daughter because of her daughter’s boyfriend and there is a domestic situation. Ms. Peak states that the protection order was filed on November 14, which is 10 days after her birthday when the incident allegedly occurred. She states that on November 13, the man they are involved kicked in her daughter’s door and ended up going to jail. Ms. Peak states that this is how Ms. Wells got all of her information, because when her daughter sent the man to jail, he gave all of Ms. Peak’s information to Ms. Wells, who he is also involved with. Ms. Peak states that the reason she did not know about the protection order is that she does not know Ms. Wells. She further states that she does not even use her handgun, it was purchased for protection because she has two grandchildren who live with her. Ms. Peak states that she has taken classes at the gun range.

In response to Mr. Levy, she stated that she does not have a Concealed Carry Permit and that the gun stays in her house. She states that she got the gun after she and her husband split up because she as a single lady with her two grandchildren living with her, she feels she needs the protection in the neighborhood she lives in.

Ms. Peak responded to a question from the Board by repeating that one of her daughters stayed behind at the club with Ms. Wells and that she does not know what happened between the two of them after she left. In addition, Ms. Peak stated that Ms. Wells has a daughter who works at the daycare across the street from her home. She states that Ms. Wells is at that daycare all the time, but she could not even tell you what Ms. Wells looks like.

Again, Ms. Peak reiterated that she did not threaten Ms. Wells in any way. She was out with her daughters to celebrate her birthday and have a good time. She stated that she has not been in trouble with the law since she was a teenager and that she would not have even been at the club if her daughters had not talked her into going for her birthday.

The Board asked Ms. Peak whether she had been advised when she was served with the protection order, that she had five days to appeal it. Ms. Peak advised that she was not worried about that, she did not even know Ms. Wells and she was not concerned about the protection order.

Mr. Kruse inquired what would happen in four months, when the protection order expires, if the Board denied the appeal. Lt. Sedlacek stated that once the protection order expires, if there have been no other violations, Ms. Peak’s registration would be re-instated, there would be no charge to her for doing so. Lt.
Sedlacek stated that she is not required to surrender the gun, the Police would not come and get the gun and as long as she is not caught with it, there would be no problems with her still having it in the home. The Board and Ms. Peak agreed that did not sound like a perfect resolution. Lt. Sedlacek stated that while it may not be perfect, the police simply do not have the time to hunt down everyone and take their weapons, it would be different if she had multiple weapons or was in a different type of situation.

Ms. Peak stated that she has lived in Omaha since 1990 and she still does not know her way around the city. She states that she does not get out much or mix with a lot of different people. She stated that she never takes the gun out of the house and does not feel she is a threat to anyone. Mr. Kruse reminded Ms. Peak that if she just abides by the judge’s order for four months, everything will be fine. Ms. Peak agreed.

Mr. Levy reminded Ms. Peak that if they grant her appeal, it still has no effect on the protection order. Ms. Peak stated that she understood that. In addition, he advised Ms. Peak to be aware of the distance stated in the protection order for her to stay away from Ms. Wells, and to keep that in mind when Ms. Wells is at the daycare across the street.

Mr. Kruse motioned to DENY the appeal. Ms. O’Connor seconded the motion.

AYES: Kruse, O’Connor

NAYES: Levy

Mr. Levy reminded Ms. Peak that if she chooses not to surrender her gun, unless she appeals the Board’s decision to the District Court, she will be in possession of an unregistered handgun for the next four months. In addition, Lt. Sedlacek stated that she could also be cited if she violates the protection order and has the weapon on her as well. Ms. Peak stated that she understood.

MOTION CARRIED: 2-0-1. Appeal denied.

5. 18-07-061
Curtis Cooling 8009 Harney St.
Omaha, NE 68114

REQUEST: Appeal Police Department’s Notice of Nuisance dated 6/12/18. (RE: 8009 Harney Street)

At the Administrative Board of Appeals meeting held on July 23, 2018, Officer Stokes appeared on behalf of the Police Department. Mr. Curtis Cooling appeared before the Board on his own behalf.

Officer Stokes stated that he has gone out to the applicant’s residence and found that the house is set back much further than the required setback. He stated that there should have never been a citation as the boat is on a paved surface and is back even further than it needed to be in order to be compliant with the ordinance.

Mr. Cooling stated that he did not wish to add any testimony.

There was some discussion among Board members as to whether, given the circumstances, the appeal should be dismissed, withdrawn, denied, or approved. It was determined that if approved, Mr. Cooling would receive his fee back, and the Police Department would cancel the citation.

Mr. Kruse moved to GRANT the appeal. Ms. O’Connor seconded the motion.

AYES: Kruse, O’Connor, Levy

MOTION CARRIED: 3-0,
APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

It was determined that as Mr. Kruse was the only Board member present who had been at the previous meeting, a vote on the minutes would be postponed until the August, 2018 meeting.

ADJOURN:

It was the consensus of the board the ADJOURN the meeting at 1:51 p.m.