

## BZA MINUTES

June 17, 2025

Members present: Jason Allen, Bill Davis, Jim Hufford, Jason Hawley, Jon Peacock, and Drew Cleveland

Members absent: Don Calhoun

Legal Representation: Jason Welch

Staff present: Debra Johnting, Area Planning Director and Kristi Halloran, Recording Secretary

Others present: Kirstin Wallace, Canon Briggs, Elizabeth Briggs, Ed Thornburg, Claudia Thornburg, Bill Bush, Matt Cook, and Bob McCoy

Chairman Hawley: Hi, good evening. It is 7:00 o'clock on June 17, 2025. This is the Board of Zoning Appeals. First order I would like to call the meeting to order. I'd like to have every member state their name for the record so we can definitely keep a better record for that. My name is Jason Hawley, Bill Davis, Jim Hufford, Drew Cleveland, Jason Allen, Jon Peacock. Thank you so much. First order on the agenda tonight is the approval of the minutes from April 22, 2025. I know those have been sent out. Have we all had a chance to read those and look over those minutes?

D. Cleveland: I move that we approve the minutes.

Vice Chairman Davis: Second.

Chairman Hawley: Alright. Have a motion to accept the minutes as presented? All those in favor?

All: Aye.

Chairman Hawley: All those opposed? (None) Motion has been carried. Before we get started tonight I would like to kind of make a few rules made clear. Petitioners will have 15 minutes to present their petitions during this time there will be no interruptions or questions. After the presentation the board may ask questions anyone wanting to speak for or against will have three minutes each and then the petitioner will have an additional five minutes to respond to comments. With that being said I would like to take this opportunity to announce tonight that Mr. Briggs and I have personal relationship outside of this so I will be abstaining from the vote. I wish that in no way, shape, or form that my abstaining from this should be seen as a motion in favor or against the proposal. I hope everyone has a chance to ask questions and to vote as they see fit. With that being said I will step aside.

D. Johnting: Bill, do you mind.

Vice Chairman Davis: You will keep track of time for us.

Chairman Hawley: I'll be out in the audience.

D. Johnting: She's got it.

Vice Chairman Davis: Our first and only case we have tonight is BZA2025-13-V, Canon Briggs. Please come forward.

D. Johnting: Would you mind setting this on the table for me?

C. Briggs: It's going to cost you.

D. Johnting: I know, thanks.

Vice Chairman Davis: And if you would for the record state your name and address please.

C. Briggs: My name is Canon Briggs. I live 307 East Franklin Street here in town.

Vice Chairman Davis: Have you sent notices for certified mail and returned the receipts to the Area Planning?

C. Briggs: I have. We've done that twice.

D. Johnting: There was a there was a mistake and that was corrected and sent out prior to the deadline.

Vice Chairman Davis: And we've received Article V Conduct Hearing?

D. Johnting: Yes.

Vice Chairman Davis: Please tell us what you like to do.

C. Briggs: OK if you turn to page three that's a demonstration overview of my house or our house as my wife's here. If you look at the back of the house that is an addition that was done back in the day prior before I owned it and if you've noticed the main house versus the addition there's a small cut out there. That is a small deck that leads up to my back door into that addition. Currently just I guess south of that cut out is my basement door. What that is the basement door goes a foot below my concrete driveway So what I'm wanting to do I've got some play toys, she's got some play toys we want to keep everything under lock and key and cleaned up so it's not sitting in the driveway. I would like to go from the left of that door so it's inside the new garage, straight over to the edge of the property five feet of course and go back to where my current barn is now that's currently five feet from the back of the property and come over to the corner of the addition and head north. That would be all garage. Then directly behind the house I'd like to square that on up and build a nice family room. As you know my house is (our house) is 1800s built. There's no furnace, there's no air so we'd like to have a family room we can put AC in and go out and just enjoy time and have get togethers out there instead of being in the hot house all summer long.

Vice Chairman Davis: Thanks for the briefing. Questions by the board? Comments at this time?

D. Johnting: So if this were detached, it could be five feet from the property line. Because it's attached it's part of the house and the restrictions on the house are 20 feet in the rear and 10 feet on the side. If he didn't want to attach them he could do what he's got drawn out there right now.

Vice Chairman Davis: So you said 20 feet from the rear end.

D. Johnting: And 10 feet on the side.

C. Briggs: I was told the main reason that law is in effect or rule whatever you want to call it is so that you have plenty of grass for kids. That way people aren't taking their backyard up and putting garages. If you look to the west of our house we have a whole extra side yard plus a whole extra lot that Bob Barnes and Don Matchett bought previous and tore the houses down made the yard bigger. So I've got plenty of yard plus on the east side we still have yard we'll take a little bit of that out for a driveway of course but not a lot. So I've got plenty of yard for the kids to still play. My plan is to fence in the west side that way we can all play and not have to worry about running out in the road or anything.

D. Cleveland: This current garage, when was it built?

C. Briggs: It's got horse stalls in it and so I don't know when they poured the concrete but it's the old hand-hewn. It's leaning, it's actually leaning toward my neighbors to the north, Oswalts. I just look at it as a hazard and I'd like to just take it down and start over something clean, simple and the reason I'm doing it this big is one just to streamline effect clean simple I'm going to put five garage doors in service door and that way I can like I said I've got an old dually and she's got a Cadillac and we got our personal trucks we got personal trailers. I just want to put everything inside shut doors so the property's clean.

J. Peacock: So I haven't had a chance to drive by it. I'm sorry. To the north is it a fence between you and the adjacent properties or is it.

C. Briggs: Yes there is a six foot privacy fence down the whole property line.

J. Peacock: And immediately north of your garage. It looks like a structure there.

C. Briggs: Is Oswalt's garage.

J. Peacock: And how close does it sit to the property line?

C. Briggs: It sits on the property line.

J. Peacock: It looks close.

C. Briggs: But it was built 18-1700s. It's probably an old horse stall too.

J. Peacock: And to the east. What is to the east?

C. Briggs: The east is the Cook's property.

J. Peacock: Is there an alley there?

C. Briggs: That is personal property as of right now.

Vice Chairman Davis: I've always led to believe that was an alley. What happened to that?

D. Johnting: It was never an alley.

Vice Chairman Davis: It was never an alley?

C. Briggs: It was a public drive for the funeral home with allowed access by the public. Once that got sold and became a personal residence that freelance was vacated. It's been currently blocked off since last October since the Greenville Pike addition, July there you go.

J. Peacock: So it is Cook's private property.

C. Briggs: Cook owns half that and I own half of it or we own half of it I'm like—you're going to get me in trouble tonight.

J. Peacock: And there's proof that it's private property.

C. Briggs: The city has had Beals Land Surveying come in and told us and the city that it is private property. It's never been platted an alley. It is a personal drive. That is the only drive to Cook's house and that is a circle drive for me, us. Might need a divorce lawyer after this.

Vice Chairman Davis: Any further questions by the board? Comments?

J. Allen: The only question I would have only because I've listened to the City Council meetings lately. Is there going to be anything brought up with the council on vacating that alley to make it a right-of-way for the city?

C. Briggs: The only thing that has been said last night at the meeting is they voted to potentially look into a lawyer and how much it would cost to possibly go after us. But if you look at the codes a city alley is supposed to be a minimum of 16 feet wide. Between Cook's barn and the telephone pole that's currently there, that I doubt is going to get moved, is only 13 feet.

J. Allen: True but I doubt there's many alleys in this city that's over 16 foot anyway. I still don't want it to get to a situation that it gets vacated to city alley when you're too close to the alley and then then you get somebody that complains about it and then we end up back in this situation again.

C. Briggs: Well here's my question to that. Right now it's personal product. And as you guys well know Building Commission if I come into your bathroom and redo it I have to bring everything up to code right. If I build I have to bring everything up to code. So if that is not ever been an alley it's just been a public driveway that has been allowed then if it becomes an ally at this point we should bring that up to code and if it's not 16 feet wide there's no reason for that to be an alley. And what this does is if it is an alley then it takes 5 feet by 50 feet of my garage.

J. Hufford: And what is the alley used for now?

C. Briggs: It's just a driveway. It's all it's ever been.

J. Hufford: Just a driveway. It didn't go completely straight through?

C. Briggs: It did but we've had it blocked off since July. That's when we found out it was ours and then that's when it was petitioned and the city has hired Beals to come survey it. They have okayed it. It is personal property. They cannot find anything in the platt books it's ever been an alley. Now the city owns beyond the alley north of that the city owns, but ours has always been personal property.

J. Hufford: Yeah there's not even implied as an alley you can't even get it vacated you know this.

D. Johnting: I think that alley is 16 feet wide to the north.

C. Briggs: From the barn to the pole, we measured it last night.

D. Johnting: No not yours. The one across Washington.

C. Briggs: Oh I doubt it. I haven't measured that side.

D. Johnting: Well it's supposed to be. It measures that on the GIS map. Most of them do. They may not look like it now but most of them measure that.

C. Briggs: So that pole is on our my side of the line so that might be 16.

D. Johnting: But across Washington where there are three alleys, not on your side but the north side, in the plat book those measure probably 14-16 feet. But not on your street there aren't.

Vice Chairman Davis: So that's a good point that you brought up. But it sounds like we've got the right answer on that or unless somebody can counter that I can't. Any further questions or comments?

C. Briggs: I'm ready to build. If we had this meeting last month it'd already be built.

D. Cleveland: One more question. It doesn't look like it but are there any drainage issues between the two properties.

C. Briggs: Not that we have noticed. I've been there, we have been there 5 years, 6 years never had any. The only thing that holds water is my main driveway which is another reason I want to get this because I'm going to put a new driveway in and raise that. Because my yard is higher than my driveway right now, our driveway.

Vice Chairman Davis: Anymore?

J. Peacock: There's people here from the city. The city agrees this is a private property instead of an alley.

B. McCoy: The survey showed that it is private property. There is, I don't know if you want to call it a dispute, but the council is questioning whether they should further investigate to make sure this is the fact. But the survey and I was trying to pull it up, the e-mail about the survey does show.

J. Welch: Bob come up to the table and state your name. This is being recorded and if there's going to be an issue with you make sure it's.

B. McCoy: Sorry Bob McCoy, Winchester mayor get that? So the survey does show that basically Cook's property line and Canon's property line goes to center of the alley right.

C. Briggs: Center of the drive.

B. McCoy: Center of the drive. Anyway then on the north end it does show an alley and the survey does reference an alley on the north end but it does not reference an alley. It's exhibit A & B on the survey. So this was all somewhat a dead issue and then it was brought up again and now council has decided, which I called an attorney today from Muncie—Brook law firm.

J. Welch: John Brook.

B. McCoy: John Brook. Anyway so their question was what would it cost if they were to further investigate and what their procedure would be. So that's kind of where it stands. I guess my biggest question is, if you're building a garage is it going to your perceived property line at this point?

C. Briggs: It's going five feet from the property line.

B. McCoy: Five feet from so technically if you want call the alley/drive whatever it would be in the current drive.

C. Briggs: No, it'd be on the edge.

B. McCoy: It'd be on the edge?

C. Briggs: Actually be if you look at Cook's building right now.

B. McCoy: It's no different than your barn that's there.

C. Briggs: It'd be five foot towards Cook's. So it would if you look at the alley picture it's hard to tell because the red dots are there. Cook's garage is right on the edge and basically that's what mine would be. And that would give us 13 foot 3 inches in between the buildings because he owns 8 foot 3 inches from the barn to the property line.

Vice Chairman Davis: Question for Deb. If he's saying. You said five feet right? Didn't you say it needs to be ten feet?

D. Johnting: That's what the variance is for. To be five and five instead of ten and twenty and I said he could do it if it was detached. The problem not detaching it is just to fix that uneven entry.

J. Allen: So theoretically if you were to build a five car garage detached from his house he could have built it five feet from the alley.

D. Johnting: He could have done it last month.

J. Allen: It's just the fact that he's tying the family room and the garage into one building now and now it's just going to be a big L he has to ask for a variance of five feet so that he could be five feet closer to the drive.

D. Johnting: A fence could go right on the line.

C. Briggs: I'm lazy. I want to walk out my back door into my garage.

J. Allen: So that's really the only reason why.

C. Briggs: Yeah if we had this meeting last month and you guys would have okayed that I it probably would already been built. I'm excited. I'm ready to do this.

Vice Chairman Davis: You know I'm just really surprised that you can get by with a little...if it's attached it's going to be an issue if it's detached it's not an issue. I don't think going forward that I don't like that rule.

C. Briggs: That's why I brought up the yard. I think that's the only reason it's in there.

D. Johnting: Attached means it's part of the house.

Vice Chairman Davis: I'm just saying, I don't know if I agree with that rule. It is what it is. We've got to honor it but there's a loophole right there in my eyes.

D. Johnting: Well I mean people will build all the way to their back property line and then come in and say well I'd like to put a swimming pool in front of my house. You have house behind your house so. It enforces leaving green space somewhere.

Vice Chairman Davis: Any further questions while the board comments or if not we'll have questions at this time for the audience.

D. Johnting: Anybody has to come up here and speak or it won't be in the minutes.

Vice Chairman Davis: Please state your name and address for the record please.

K. Wallace: Kirstin Wallace. I live at 879 East Short Street. My mother is Rita Heidi Oswalt she lives at 318 East Washington Street and she's the property north of this property. She wanted me to state that she is not in favor of the variance. In addition you mentioned the drainage. She hadn't even thought about that. She does have drainage problems into her basement and the alley with the part of hers that is considered the alley does have drainage issues along there but the concern being to the size of this. It just doesn't seem you know stated that these are three different originally three different lots that are all one so if you're looking at a residential neighborhood this just doesn't fit

into that and then the additional that if needing all the way from one side of the lot to then into the alley you know for a residential use. That just doesn't make sense but for that neighborhood too that's a historic neighborhood it doesn't fit into what that neighborhood is.

Vice Chairman Davis: I'm going piggyback on that thought there. If at any time, if this is strictly residential use what happens if it's discovered that it's beyond residential use. If it's being used for his business. What happens if it comes to that? Is that an issue?

J. Welch: It depends on whatever the business qualifies under the home exception and then residential. There are some home businesses as you can have and those are kind of specific rules that.

D. Johnting: He can park his equipment in the garage. In fact, that's better than leaving it set out.

Vice Chairman Davis: Right I just brought that up.

J. Hufford: On a business I know we had that problem in Union City. They don't have people coming to the business to do business there at the residence it's really not considered residence.

D. Johnting: Right. They would never need to come to his house. He goes to there.

J. Hufford: They might have parts and everything else, but it's not a business.

K. Wallace: My mother has also been there for 49 years and so you know before that was blocked off, Franklin Street was our neighborhood growing up in town there so even though we're cut off from that now that was the neighborhood and I just don't feel that it fits in happens speaking on her behalf too that it doesn't feel like it fits into residential but then you brought up about the flooding and that got me concerned I haven't thought about that sitting back there. I believe those were the things.

Vice Chairman Davis: Canon, you want to come back up. You got three minutes to or 5 minutes I'm sorry to respond to that.

C. Briggs: Canon Briggs, 307 East Franklin. So we're in Indiana. There's water in basements. I've got water in my basement. There is no standing water on our side, on the south side of the property line. So I don't think drainage is an issue regardless. Just to elaborate on the business, I actually dissolved the business. I do not have Briggs Construction anymore. I'm actually going to work with Jeff Mills with Platinum Construction and Roofing using his equipment. I am keeping a few pieces of equipment but like I said I want to put them in the garage for that reason. So I am not running a business out of there and even if I was multiple people in town have done that and even out at the golf course, not the same construction but selling objects and having people come and pick them up throughout the day because my wife has ordered off this lady. So I don't see that being an issue. A garage that big, I don't understand how Derry Hobson can build one and I can't. It's not going to obstruct any other view than what's already there now. The Tartar Realty has, I think it's Matt Tarter



that has a quadruplex or triplex beside Oswalts. They currently sit in their back porch and stare down at me in my backyard. I've had people throw cheese over the fence. This is basically for my dogs to eat that had mold on it. Basically I'm wanting to enclose my little section and what this does is push my yard beyond Tarter Realty and behind Jeff Mills's son actually lives in the greenhouse beside Derry Hobson. That's all I'm trying to do.

Vice Chairman Davis: Thank you. Anyone else in the audience?

M. Cook: My name is Matt Cook. My wife and I own 327 East Franklin Street. I'll keep this short. It's their property they should do whatever they want to to enjoy it.

Vice Chairman Davis: Short and sweet. Anyone else? Questions further questions by the board? Comments?

J. Peacock: My main question still is there any question that you guys are going to look at this look into this being an alley or not.

B. McCoy: Yeah I mean it's. Bob McCoy, Winchester mayor again. Yes I mean that's where it's at that's why I was asking for a resolution last night when we had our meeting and council decided to still investigate further so. I don't, I mean they are the governing body. I mean I do not have a vote in it but they could come back, the lawyer could come back and say hey, you're talking about land acquisition if you want to call it easements whatever you want to call it but I mean they could possibly look at it as well it was used as an alley or a road through that neighborhood for the last 100 years. And say we want it open. Or they could say we don't want to pursue this and that's nothing saying they could say we don't want to pursue it and another owner at some point that live along that road could say I don't agree it was used as an alley for many years and we want to see it open. I really don't know where it will go.

J. Hufford: I know. We had the same problem and we have some alleys over in Union City that the city maintained them alleys and we come to find out they weren't alleys. They were agreements between property owners to put it in to get to their garages or something built from themselves back in the 1800s.

B. McCoy: And we have the same situation over on East Street right across from where Sanders is got the lot behind the Masons. There's a house that sold recently right beside that house Jones I think owns the property. There was what they thought an alley beside their house and it's not an alley it was just some agreement somebody had way back. When he bought the property he blocked it off they do not have access to their backyard. They have to go through the other actually what is an alley to get back there but it was never an alley and it's kind of the same situation they're going through here. It never really was an alley but people treated it such.

J. Hufford: One way we found that out was that these people had old abstracts and brought them in and showed where the property owners agreed to do these things.

Vice Chairman Davis: Jason, as council for the board here do you have any input or anything you'd like to share or with us?

J. Welch: The legal property line is what it is right now. I mean he could build it 10 feet away right now if you wanted to and there's it just is what it is. So basically what he's talking about is moving at five feet closer to the center where this alley is. And if it's his property right now it's his property right now. That's your decision whether you want to consider that or not that's completely your decision. But as far as it is right now that's the legal property line the center of what used to be the alley.

D. Cleveland: So the City Council is considering researching this further on the idea that the surveyor was wrong?

B. McCoy: Was wrong or maybe I really don't know. I mean we have three that are steadfast and wanting that alley/road/whatever opened up. And you got the other two say no that the survey shows it's not an alley. So that's kind of where we're at.

D. Cleveland: The survey company has already said it's private.

B. McCoy: Yeah I think it's Beals and Moore. Was that right?

D. Johnting: Yes.

B. McCoy: It's Beals Moore that did the survey and I mean it says exhibit A and exhibit B and it shows it, I mean it shows the property line on their side. And on the other end it shows that there was an alley. But again we're kind of back what you said you know this stuff was treated as an alley for many years and then later found out so.

Vice Chairman Davis: And I agree 100% what's been said it's just. In my eyes it I know it's just I don't know probably three months ago or so that I thought why in the heck is that blocked off. I thought it was an alley. I thought how in the heck can I was going to ask you about how in the heck can this be blocked. Now I understand and like Mr. Cook said it's his property he can do with the it's just too bad that in my eyes that this couldn't be back opened up to where the public uses it but I understand why I mean.

B. McCoy: And I mean we got in deep over the past couple of meetings about this and I think. I think it was Mr. Cook's wife that brought it up about having a grandchild. People were just getting stupid going up and down there and I mean even if it was open back up we have no way of controlling people driving on other people's property. It just it's an unfortunate mess that resulted from Greenville Avenue being closed and later found out that it wasn't an alley.

D. Johnting: So when Beals and Moore, may not know this I don't who did the research I could find out. They will either go back 25 years, 50 years, or 75 years however many you want to go back. That's their due diligence. Do you know?

B. McCoy: I don't know the answer.

M. Cook: Back to around the 1830s because the research the city had done was on all three properties through the corner house.

D. Johnting: I searched back to the 60s and we don't have a vacation of that alley

B. McCoy: No, there's nothing recorded.

D. Johnting: Because they're nothing and on my platt map it's recorded as an agreement and not as an alley. And it's not as wide as an alley.

B. McCoy: There was never a vacation on record that he found and that anybody we talked to found and again it was always treated as an alley and that's just kind of been the argument that's the way it's always been.

D. Johnting: Yes, that's what we found.

Vice Chairman Davis: Let me propose this out here. If this was tabled until we, this is big if, if it was decided to table this until we get further view from the report from Mr. Cook in Muncie. If it comes back in favor saying that you know it is an alley—what does this do to?

B. McCoy: They're not going to come back with that determination. They're going to come back with what it would cost to litigate it if somebody was to pursue it. They're going to say it's going to cost let's just throw the number \$30,000 out there because you're going to have to acquire property. And whether it's through I don't know I mean I've heard the word eminent domain brought up I mean. Again as it shown now it's their property so I think the council's wanting to know since they're steadfast on opening it up what it would truly cost what the cost would be and what the procedures were to open it up. And then I'll have that number from the attorney and then we'll have to have another meeting. And then they'll say well, what do you guys want to do?

J. Hufford: And we might have a problem with that with the lawyers that since there was a property line going down the middle of these alleys that we wanted to vacate if we want to maintain them we were told we'd have to buy that right away from each property and that they refused to sell it what you're going to do.

B. McCoy: That's a good question. That's a legal question.

J. Hufford: And you're going to have to fight that for years.

B. McCoy: Oh exactly and I can tell you and I mean we've had conversations before I think they're pretty adamant it's their property and they're going to fight for it. So that's where you're at now. Where this all ends up like I said we went back and forth. You know Mr. Cook could call me the next day after that last the meeting before last and said hey I thought this was done. I said well it was brought up by a concerned citizen and it got all brought up again.

D. Cleveland: I feel like we have enough information in front of us to make a decision.

Vice Chairman Davis: Any final thoughts?

J. Allen: Here's the thing like if hypothetically if it becomes deemed an alley. And it has to be opened up, what's the footage from the alleyway that the property can be built on? If it's still five foot then it defeats the purpose of the whole process.

J. Hufford: It can't be deemed an alley if it's on the record right now.

J. Allen: Even if it becomes an alley, can he still build five foot from?

D. Johnting: I can't answer that because it really isn't. That's not what they're going after.

J. Peacock: Young Mr. Briggs can build his garage ten feet from the property line right now.

D. Johnting: Right now if it's detached.

J. Peacock: If it's attached? Say it again.

D. Johnting: A detached structure, I'm sorry I think I said it wrong, detached structure is five feet. Attached is ten because then it's considered the house.

J. Welch: So if he doesn't if he wasn't going to attach it, he wouldn't be here right now. He would already have built it.

D. Johnting: I apologize I said it wrong.

K. Wallace: Clarification too aren't you voting coming towards my mother's property right now not so much that alley? I didn't want to speak out of turn the clarification you're talking, discussing coming towards the alley. But aren't you also discussing the variance towards my mother's property towards the north.

D. Johnting: Yes but I don't think it would even be as close as what the fence is now. I think the fence is six feet off. I think, I can check that.

K. Wallace: But we received that it was a variance of 15 feet but right that you're voting on.

D. Johnting: But detached he could be five and yeah because either way it could be there 20 feet away or 5 feet away.

K. Wallace: OK I wanted to make sure since you were discussing the alley.

C. Briggs: OK I don't want to be mean or anything but here's the deal. This issue with the alley was dead. I applied for this. Mr. Welch was on vacation or something and we couldn't have this meeting last month. Last month we possibly could have had this already passed. I would already been built. Regardless of what this happens tonight I'm literally going to start building this next week. So I'm going to build a four car garage away from my house and then literally come back here again and

ask for a variance to attach later on. I can build five feet right now. I need a bigger barn. I don't like the old one. It's leaning. I'm a contractor. To me it's unsafe and I'm trying to do the right thing get it tore down and building a new one. Thank you.

Vice Chairman Davis: Thank you. Final questions? Comments? Going once, twice. All right I'll entertain a motion for a roll call vote.

J. Hufford: I'll second that.

K. Halloran: Jim Hufford, yes. Bill Davis, yes. Jason Allen, yes. Jon Peacock, no. Drew Cleveland, yes. 4-1.

Vice Chairman Davis: Alright. The variance has passed. Does he need to see you for anything?

D. Johnting: Not tonight but permits.

Vice Chairman Davis: Permits forthcoming. Any other questions or meetings or anything we need to bring up for new business or old business.

D. Johnting: Meeting next month. Randy's party is the 30th of June, 1-3 pm in the office. If you get a chance to come by and have a cupcake.

Vice Chairman Davis: I'll entertain a motion to adjourn the meeting.

J. Hufford: So moved.

Vice Chairman Davis: All those in favor?

All: Aye.

Vice Chairman Davis: Meeting adjourned.

---

Chairman, Jason Hawley

---

Kristi Halloran, Recording Secretary

---

Vice Chairman, Bill Davis