

**Planning Commission Meeting
MINUTES**

March 2, 2005

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Walt French, Vice chairman, and opened with the *Pledge of Allegiance*. Walt then welcomed Stefanie Campbell & Bobb Carson, newly appointed Planning Commission members.

Members present: Jim Brownlow, Stefanie Campbell, Bobb Carson, Scott Douglas, Walt French, Pete Lamana and Barbara Lindtner. Bryan McAdams, representing C. Robert Wynn, Township Engineer, was present.

Planning Commission Comments: Pete Lamana asked Bryan McAdams how long after a project is completed the developers have to complete any road improvements, etc., involved in the development. Additionally, at what point does the developer have to change the storm water retention basin to its final configuration? Bryan suggested that a reasonable time after the development is completed (6 months to a year), the engineer and/or the solicitor could send a letter requesting when the final plan components will be completed. Bryan added that most developers are anxious to complete all details so that the escrow funds being held by the Township can be released to him. These funds are held to guarantee satisfactory completion of all plan requirements.

Scott Douglas noted that Bucks County has revised their 100-year storm calculations. He noted that it is up to local municipalities to adopt them. Scott inquired how this adoption process would begin. He has provided copies of this information to the Supervisors. Bryan said he will discuss with Bob Wynn whether an official notification has been received. When this official notice is received by Bob Wynn's office, they will inform our Supervisors by letter that they need to adopt these new standards if we wish to use them.

Walt French questioned why Rolling Hills was on the agenda as a sketch plan and also on the agenda as an item of New Business. The secretary explained that the applicant had submitted a formal subdivision application, thus it was being accepted pending our Engineer's review for technical completeness. The applicant requested to have their second sketch plan, requested by the Planning Commission, reviewed tonight as previously planned.

Approval of Minutes – Pete Lamana, moved, Scott Douglas seconded, that the minutes of the February 2, 2005, Planning Commission be approved. After a few minor corrections by Scott Douglas, the minutes were approved unanimously.

The minutes of the January 20, 2005, Zoning Revision Meeting were held for approval at the March 17 Zoning Revision meeting.

Public Comment on Agenda Items

Christine Taylor (Haupts Bridge Road) – Questioned whether the Rolling Hills Plan would be approved tonight. Walt French stated that the sketch plan would be discussed this evening, but the subdivision application would not be discussed. Ms. Taylor held her comments until later when the sketch plan is discussed.

Gary Grime (Lehnenberg Road) – Has traffic concerns about the Shipman plan that was heard by the Zoning Hearing Board on February 21. Since this has not come before the Planning Commission, the secretary suggested that Mr. Grime call and discuss his concerns with Jeff Mease, the Zoning Officer, during business hours.

Walt French turned the meeting over to Jim Brownlow, Chairman.

Sketch Plans

Rolling Hills Estates – Rte 212 & Slifer Valley Road – Attorney Robert Gundlach, Attorney, presented. Bob Harrington, representative for the applicant (HMH Limited Partnerships), was present as well as Judy Goldstein, Land Planner, and Valerie Spooner, Designer (Boucher & James, Inc.).

This is the second sketch plan presented. They presented a sketch plan last month with lots on both ends of the property and open space in the middle. At that time, the Planning Commission indicated they would prefer having the homes on one end of the property, thus conserving the good agricultural soil in the middle and on the Slifer Valley Road end. Subsequently, Boucher & James reconfigured the layout and Judy Goldstein reviewed the new sketch plan for those present.

This 78.3 acre site fronts on Route 212 and Slifer Valley Road. The applicant is proposing 32 lots, utilizing the single-family detached cluster B-12, Option 1, with all lots located on the Route 212 portion of the tract. The intent of the current plan is to conserve more of the agricultural soils and a larger portion of the site. The open space parcel is being viewed as a farmstead parcel

with the portion of the land adjacent to Slifer Valley Road designated for one dwelling for someone who would work the farmstead lot.

Bobb Carson questioned whether the 78.3 acres comprises this whole parcel, including the farmstead portion. Judy affirmed this, stating that the size of the farmstead portion of the lot was 51.45 acres.

Judy presented smaller, colored sketches of the proposed design to the Planning Commission.

Jim Brownlow questioned how sewage for the homes would be handled. Attorney Gundlach stated they are still working with DelVal Soils regarding the type of community septic facility. It has not yet been determined if this will be a community sand mound, drip system or spray system. Although this system will be placed on the open space, Judy understands from our ordinances that up to 20% of the open space could contain stormwater management and/or sewage management facilities. DelVal confirmed that the soils in this tract are very good and thus, the sand mound (if it is implemented) would not need to be large.

Walt French questioned who would be responsible for maintaining the sewage system. Attorney Gundlach stated that would be determined during the preliminary approval process. Maintenance of the system would be offered to the Township Authority or Bucks County Water & Sewer. If they would not accept the system, the applicant would have to assume ownership of it, probably utilizing a Homeowners Association and entering into an Operation/Maintenance Agreement with them.

Jim Brownlow questioned the traffic safety factor relating to the various existing roads and proposed access roads out of this development onto Route 212. Judy noted that the access road near the curved portion of the development had been placed as far as possible from the other road while still meeting sight distance requirements around the curve on Route 212.

Pete Lamana questioned the water source for the new development. In reviewing the actual subdivision submission that has been turned in, he noted that it proposed using public water from the Springtown Water Authority. Attorney Gundlach said they were proposing the extension of the water system in Springtown to service the property. Pete noted that Springfield Township was in the process of determining whether to keep or to sell the Springtown Water System, and that this could take some time. Attorney Gundlach indicated they were willing to participate in that process with us. Hopefully, this will help that process in that the developer might construct some infrastructure here at their cost and perhaps contribute some connection fees. There may be funds made available to assist the Township with this decision/process.

Jim Brownlow asked what the alternatives to public water were. Attorney Gundlach stated the alternative was to put in an onsite community water facility that would be dedicated to someone else, which basically then becomes a public water system under the Township or another water authority. If this would be required, it would probably mean that one lot would have to be used for the community water facility, or perhaps purchase a lot across the street for this private water facility and/or the private sewage facility. There are many options which would need to be explored. The preferred plan is public water extended from Springtown with on lot septic tanks on each property utilizing a community disposal area.

Jim Brownlow asked for clarification on how the farmstead portion of the site would be set up. Attorney Gundlach stated the farmstead portion would be one large lot, privately owned, with one home constructed on it. The owner of that land would be subject to a conservation easement/deed restriction limiting future development/subdivision of that lot. He noted that our ordinance gives options for different alternatives for agricultural use of the open space. They are selecting private ownership of the agricultural land in order to be consistent with our district. What type of farming operation will be determined as the subdivision process goes on.

Jim Brownlow questioned the scenic vista status of the development and questioned what the plans were to preserve this view and hide the homes. Judy Goldstein shared that a double row of deciduous street trees along the road line were planned to filter the view of the homes, yet still maintain all the scenic vistas and view scapes of the majority of the site. When questioned about using evergreen trees to better hide the homes, Judy stated that evergreens do not give as natural a look as deciduous trees, which filter rather than hide the homes. Deciduous trees would more likely be found by roadsides in rural townships.

Bryan McAdams discussed the sightline impediment that would be created on the right side of the access road on the curve of Route 212 by either evergreen or deciduous trees being planted as shown. Judy stated that the tree line would be moved further back on the lots in future drawings.

Barbara Lindtner questioned why the applicant had submitted a preliminary subdivision plan when sketch plans were still under discussion. Attorney Gundlach responded they originally planned to take their time and submit sketch plans until the Planning Commission and the community were comfortable with the plan. However, they were disappointed that no one on the Planning Commission mentioned the pending ordinance that was being considered that would substantially impact the permitted density yield for a cluster development; in fact, reducing the density by about 50%, or from 31 lots to 18 or 20 lots in the Rolling Hills Estates. Barbara stated it was not the intention in the ordinance to decrease the density. Attorney Gundlach said that upon learning

of this pending ordinance change, they had a responsibility to the applicant to engineer the site and file the plan in order to come in under the current ordinances. However, they will continue to work with us on the plan and make adjustments as needed.

Jim Brownlow stated there was no intent on the Township's part to try to conceal anything .

Bobb Carson commented that the current plan was much improved over the 1990 subdivision proposal, in that the cluster option is being utilized and much of the property will remain open space and hopefully, viable agricultural land. However, he feels that the design could be much improved so that it doesn't appear like the standard subdivision seen in other townships. He suggested clustering 6 to 12 homes around cul-de-sacs, perhaps utilizing some flag lots to better situate some homes, so that all of the homes could enjoy the vistas instead of just a few, as would be the case with the current design. Pete Lamana asked if they would be willing to come up with a few sketch plans incorporating Bobb Carson's suggestions. Jim Brownlow asked that the Commission Members need to decide what they want—preservation of agricultural soil and/or open space, preservation of the scenic vista, or the design of the development, so that the applicant understands what the group as a whole would accept.

Following a reminder from Bryan McAdams that a preliminary plan has already been submitted and the clock has started to run on that plan, Attorney Gundlach noted that if there was a consensus among the Commission to consider a more flexible layout, they would consider extending the review period and tabling the submitted plan during some additional sketch plan discussions. However, this Commission would ultimately have to recommend to the Supervisors that they amend the ordinance to institute a provision in the district where this subdivision would be placed that allows a reduction in the required 70% agricultural requirements in exchange for better scenic vistas and more flexibility in the layout. A provision would have to be made in the ordinance to give the Supervisors the right, by conditional use or by right, to grant that flexibility. There would have to be a partnership between the applicant, the community, the Commission, and the Board, for them to proceed in this direction.

Jim Brownlow opened the floor for comments from residents in attendance.

Pat Raynaud (Gruversville Road) – She is confused with all the discussion about how many units will be in this development before settling some fundamental questions such as:

1. How much of the land is actually developable? How much is watershed, stream land, land that does not perc, etc.?
2. Has there been a soil or geology survey done?
3. Where are the preliminary plans that should be in place before the proposal of a number of units in a cluster?
4. In the presentation of the cluster, two of the most important components—protection of the watershed that lies directly behind the homes and determination of what type of a water system will be utilized—are addressed incompletely. It has been stated that there will be some sort of disposal system, as yet unknown, and it may be placed on some of the agricultural land, possibly spraying effluent on the land which will ultimately affect the watershed. Secondly, the water system is not properly addressed in the preliminary plans, keeping in mind that in this area with a possible fragile underlayment no study has been completed to determine if it would support the number of homes being planned.

She feels that before the number of homes that are proposed for this development can be presented for any kind of approval, there should be proper notations of the natural structures and features of the land in place.

Judy Goldstein apologized that she had not given a detailed presentation of the sight analysis work that has been done on this site, noting that there are detailed calculations on the plan mapping all the soils on the site. She stated that the net buildable site acreage is 21.3 acres. Jim Brownlow added that the applicant is complying with the existing ordinances.

Patrice Ryan – She has lived for the past 14 years on a property on the northeast corner of this proposed subdivision closest to Springtown. She has experienced major drainage problems on her property and has communicated this to Jim Brownlow and Bob Wynn in a letter. Every year, she loses portions of her driveway and/or trees and her pond overflows from runoff from a portion of the Rapp property. She has communicated this to Mr. Rapp as well. She has photographs showing the problem, and has attempted to buy a strip of the property to try to do something about the drainage, because it is so bad. She stated that if this issue is not addressed in the planning for this development, there will be many unhappy people with drainage problems and wet basements. All of the adjacent properties near her home are downhill from the proposed development and will be affected not only by the runoff but also by the many springs underground that add to the water problems during wet times. She is concerned that between sewer problems from this many homes, more blacktopped area and more grass, there will be some major problems. Judy assured her that her concerns had been noted and would be shared with Boucher & James engineering staff to review. Judy highlighted some of the planned stormwater design issues already planned, but stated that these issues were exactly what needed to be brought up now so that they could be addressed in the early planning stages.

Barton Fleishman – He owns the farm that borders the upper border of this site (his farm is preserved under the Heritage Conservancy). He also has concerns about stormwater issues. He said every time it rains significantly, his pastures get flooded because he is downhill from the site being developed. He is concerned about the septic system proposed, because there are many underground streams and springs which will carry sewage into the two streams on his property which ultimately feed into Cooks Creek. He is concerned as well about whether, when scenic overviews are discussed, we are concerned about the scenic overviews for the new homeowners or for the township residents. If the new homeowners are given the overview, all the surrounding

properties will be overlooking the new houses that would now be located in the scenic vista area. He is also concerned that if the houses are spread over the property on larger lots in the manner suggested that the resulting properties will be priced too high for our own people to purchase.

Steve Wetzel – He lives on the opposite side of Route 212, across from the proposed subdivision. He also is very concerned about the water problem. He said, referring to the comment made earlier about putting the septic system on a property across the street, to do that would place the septic system on his land in the middle of his wife's wildflower garden!

David Smith – He owns the property on Route 212 which will be completely encompassed by the proposed development. He was confused by the number of homes being considered, as he understood that one home was permitted on three acres in the Agricultural District, and with 71 acres, this would figure out to about 21 homes, not 32, as were being suggested. Barbara Lindtner clarified for Mr. Smith that in the clustering option, which is what this plan is utilizing, additional homes can be built on a smaller segment of the tract in order to conserve a large portion of the tract for agricultural use.

Connie Morgan – She questioned whether the lots could be expanded to one acre instead of one-half acre.

Christine Taylor – This is the first meeting she has attended here and she was impressed with all the work that has been done so far. She lived in Buckingham Township for 25 years right next to Peddler's Village. She is very familiar with Peddler's View, having lived in an old farmhouse near the stream there. She watched the stream go from having trout and sonnies to being basically a drainage ditch because of Peddler's View. She feels that until the water and sewage issues for this development are resolved, we shouldn't even be discussing other details. It is important to know where water for the subdivision is coming from and what will be done with sewage. Barbara Lindtner said that this is the preliminary discussion stage, but that the Commission is very concerned about the same issues, and these will ultimately all have to be resolved.

Jim Brownlow drew the discussion to a close and Pete Lamana summarized that the Members would like to review multiple options. Attorney Gundlach stated again that he is trying to understand the general consensus among the Commission. Would they be receptive to recommending zoning revisions in exchange for a different, better plan as suggested by Mr. Carson that would involve a reduction in the set-aside requirements for the agricultural preservation? Scott Douglas said that if we could better serve the Township by permitting a plan which would be in contradiction to some of our ordinances, then we would need to do something to enable that to happen. He clarified that this would not be an across-the-township change, rather it would depend on whether this particular subdivision would be one for which we felt that type of recommendation would be warranted.

Attorney Gundlach stated he would discuss the request for additional sketch plans with the applicant and respond by letter on Monday, March 7, whether they would present additional sketch plans at the April 6 Planning Commission meeting. If they decide to do that, he will grant an extension of time for review of the preliminary subdivision plan.

At 8:55 p.m., Jim Brownlow called for a 5-minute break, indicating the meeting will reconvene at 9:00 p.m.

Confirmed Appointments

Springtown Country Manor – (Walt French excluded himself from the Commission for this presentation.) Attorney Brad Lare opened on behalf of the applicant, Reshetar Realty. Also attending for the applicant were Scott Mease (Mease Engineering), Ron Ritchie, Structural Engineer (Ritchie Engineering); Rudy Reshetar (Reshetar Realty) and Alex MacPhee, Geologist (CVM Industries). Attorney Lare reviewed that at the January 5, 2005, Planning Commission meeting, it was determined that Kent Littlefield, SAIC, had some specific questions about several lots in the proposed development, and they planned to address those concerns at this meeting.

The discussion tonight will cover Comment 1 of Bob Wynn's July 1, 2003, review letter, which pertains to geological issues, and also the January 26, 2005, letter from Mr. MacPhee to Reshetar Realty, which again, is addressing the type of materials on the four lots for which additional information was requested. Specifically, the type of grouting that would be done on these lots, the type of bearing walls requested on these lots and Mr. MacPhee's opinion regarding those issues. Attorney Lare distributed copies of Mr. MacPhee's January 26 letter to the Commission.

Mr. Brownlow clarified that the issues he recalled involved more than 4 lots. One issue was that the rock layer on some lots was very close to the surface which generated the question of whether or not a basement could be installed on those lots. Conversely, on other lots, the rock layer was 30 feet down and raised the issue of pressure grouting being required. Attorney Lare clarified that the pressure grouting issue involved four lots and the elevated bedrock issues occurred in additional areas. There was a table in Mr. Littlefield's November 28, 2004, letter indicating which problems occurred on which lots. They plan to discuss at this meeting the recommendation for compacting grouting on Lots 14, 16, 17 and 18. If desired, they will also discuss how the applicant plans to deal with the high bedrock level on some lots. Jim Brownlow added that the waste located underground on Lot 2 was also an issue of concern to the Members, and that would need to be cleaned out. Mr. Lare stated they understand that cleanup of the waste on Lot 2 would be a condition of any recommended approval of this plan.

Jim Brownlow expressed concern about how the water pipes could be put underground to supply the planned public water to this development with the bedrock so close to the surface in several areas. Rudy Reshetar stated they plan to use a hydraulic jackhammer which will break this shale-type rock out easily. Blasting will not be required.

Attorney Lare presented copies of the following to the Members: Reshetar Realty's February 10, 2005, letter to Mr. Littlefield responding to some of his concerns about Lots 14, 16, 17 and 18; the resume of Mr. Ritchie, who will speak to the structural issues raised and his February 8, 2005, letter with his calculations attached. Members were encouraged to ask questions as during each specialist's presentation. Barbara Lindtner questioned if everyone had Mr. Littlefield's February 15, 2005, letter. They had, and Attorney Lare indicated that they were also prepared to address the issues raised in that letter. .

Mr. MacPhee presented first, covering questions the Commission had at the January 2005 meeting as well as responding to the questions Mr. Littlefield raised in the matrix he had prepared that related to the individual lot reports that were done for this subdivision. Reviewing his own January 26, 2005, letter to Reshetar Realty, he covered the following:

1. Lots 1 and/or 2 will be cleaned; completely removing the material that is found, under the supervision of the Township Engineer. Some material may be salvageable as clean fill; others would have to be removed and taken to a licensed facility. Lot 3 will be investigated as well. If any deleterious fill is located, it will also be removed at the direction of the Township Engineer. After the removal is complete, the lots will have to be resurveyed to see what the actual physical shape then is. At that time, the house locations may have to be moved because the soil that would have supported it is no longer there and additional borings would be done on the site to check the subsurface for the house.
2. Two of the lots—Lots 17 and 18—have identified weaknesses in the subsurface, generated by low density soils between the rock and the soil interface. Compaction grouting is proposed for those lots, which involves drilling a hole in the ground in the rock structure and injecting a 500 – 600 PSI mortar mixture into the holes under high pressure. The spacing of the grouting holes depends on the conditions that are observed, but the holes will probably be about 7 feet apart. This process will accomplish two things: compact low density soil and close down any openings in the top of the rock to stop any future sink hole development. This process has proven to be a very successful and flexible system, far superior to liquid grouting.

They will also investigate Lots 14 and 16 for weaknesses and will use compaction grouting if it is called for.

The Commission referred Mr. MacPhee to Kent Littlefield's letter of February 15, 2005, the second paragraph of page 2 referring to the compaction grouting being done in the construction phase. He acknowledged that this is how it would be done. The applicant will also comply with all the recommendations listed (1 – 8) in Mr. Littlefield's letter.

Ron Ritchie, Structural Engineer from Ritchie Engineering, testified next. In reviewing the foundation of the Haverford model home, which is typical of the homes to be used in the development, he determined that the walls and wall footings can be modified slightly—adding four rebars; two to the top and two to the bottom—to provide the extra capacity needed to bridge over a possible soft soil condition for a total clear span distance of 12 feet. His calculations to support this were attached to the letter provided to each Commission Member. This process will give substantial strength to the foundation walls while incurring minimal cost.

There being no other questions, Pete Lamana moved that a recommendation to grant preliminary approval be given to the Supervisors conditioned upon completion of the conditions in Bob Wynn's July 1, 2003, review letter and Kent Littlefield's February 15, 2005, letter. Bob Carson seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Thornton Land Development (Mine Road) – Paul Dietz, Engineer (Urwiler & Walter, Inc.) presented for the applicants Troy and Lisa Thornton, who were present. Mr. Dietz indicated his applicants' compliance to most of the issues raised in the township engineer's February 17, 2005, review letter. With regard to #3 regarding the plantings, Mr. Dietz asked for guidance from the Township as to whether they wanted landscape plantings other than the ones already described on their plans. The Commission indicated that the plantings shown on the plan were adequate and no additional plantings were required.

Regarding Comment #5 A, B & C (regarding sight distance issues), Mine Road is an unposted road; as such, the speed is 55 mph. In reviewing this with Bob Wynn's office, he was not willing to go any lower than 35 mph, and at that speed, the driveway sight distance was not adequate. For that reason and upon Mr. Wynn's recommendation, a speed study was performed which proved that the speed of 85% of the vehicles passing this driveway from either direction is less than 35 mph. Thus, the driveway is designed with sight distance at less than 35 mph. Bryan McAdams clarified that a vertical profile was still required (which Mr. Dietz said would be provided) as well as clarification that the brush line at the driveway entrance will be maintained as it is, since that property does not belong to the applicant. They are concerned that if the other property owner does not keep that brush cut down or permit the applicant to do so, the sight distance will not be adequate.

Walt French visited this site the day before this meeting. He does not have confidence that this driveway sight distance issue has been resolved satisfactorily. Mr. Dietz stated that his clients will be approaching the neighbor to request a sight distance easement, for which they would then be responsible, as suggested by the Township Engineer. Bobb Carson felt that it was critical that the easement be officially in place to ensure future legal ability to maintain the sight distance area. Walt French added that the sight distance problem is compounded by the narrowness of the existing 21-foot driveway. Mr. Dietz indicated that the pole would be moved, as noted in 6B of the Engineer's review letter.

Bryan McAdams agreed that it would not be good to grant approval before the easement to maintain the sight distance is obtained and this easement should be noted on the final plan. Mr. Dietz requested preliminary conditional approval of this plan. Barbara Lindtner moved that we recommend preliminary approval conditioned upon satisfactory compliance with all the issues in the Engineer's February 17, 2005, review letter and that a sight-distance easement be obtained and be placed on the plan before final recordation. Bobb Carson was uncomfortable with giving preliminary approval of this plan considering the unresolved engineering issues that exist. Pete Lamana was uncomfortable too, with the recommendation in 6B to grant the waiver to have a 21-foot driveway instead of the required 24-foot. Barbara Lindtner withdrew the motion to give preliminary approval to this plan. The Commission then requested the applicants to talk with their neighbor about purchasing an additional 5 feet of property from him to widen the driveway to 24 feet. The Thorntons will also request a legal easement from the neighbor so that the brush in the front area can be maintained at a safe height. They will provide the vertical profile requested by the Township's Engineer. The applicant provided an extension until April 13, 2005.

Brian Lloyd Subdivision (Salem Road) – Todd Myers, Engineer (Cowan Associates, Inc.) presented for the applicants. Reviewing the Township Engineer's February 16, 2005, letter, Mr. Myers indicated that all the issues noted therein would be completed as suggested. Mr. Myers indicated that the drafting details noted in 9A, B & C would be included on the final plans.

Barbara Lindtner moved that a recommendation be given to the Supervisors to grant preliminary/final approval conditioned upon satisfactory completion of the items noted in the Township Engineer's review letter of February 16, 2005. Pete Lamana seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

New Business

Rolling Hills Subdivision – The plan was accepted by the Township subject to the Township Engineer's review to ensure completeness of plan components. Barbara Lindtner requested clarification from our Township Engineer about Attorney Gundlach's statement that the proposed ordinance would cut in half the number of lots Rolling Hills could have, thus causing them to submit the preliminary plan early to be under the existing ordinance. She would like clarification of exactly how many homes are permitted under the current ordinance and also, what would be permitted under the proposed ordinance.

Public Comments - None

Planning Commission Comments – Walt French had some concern about the wording in the upcoming High Priority Zoning Ordinance, specifically 5.10.E, which indicates in the last sentence that storm water detention basins shall (not) count toward the agricultural easement. It was the consensus that the word "not" should follow storm water detention basins shall (as indicated in brackets in the text above. The secretary was instructed to communicate this omission to Charlie Schmehl of URDC.

Old Business

The sixth meeting of the Joint Zoning Ordinance Revision group will be held on Thursday, March 17, 2005, from 7 – 9:00 p.m. and the public is invited to attend.

Bobb Carson has concerns about flag lots (as seen in the Brian Lloyd Subdivision) exiting onto Township Roads and feels this matter needs to be addressed in the zoning ordinance revision.

Adjournment

At 10:30 p.m., Pete Lamana moved to adjourn the meeting. Barbara Lindtner seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Everitt
Secretary
Next Meeting: April 6, 2005