

## CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

### WAYNE GILLEY AUDITORIUM

July 25, 2024

Minutes of the City Planning Commission meeting held July 25, 2024, in the Wayne Gilley Auditorium, City Hall, 212 SW 9th Street, Lawton, Oklahoma.

The agenda for the meeting was posted on the bulletin board in City Hall in compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by David Denham.

---

#### ROLL CALL

##### MEMBERS PRESENT

David Denham  
Melissa Busse  
Ron Jarvis  
Joan Jester  
Deborah Jones  
Michael Logan

##### MEMBERS ABSENT:

|                 |           |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Allan Smith     | (excused) |
| Darren Medders  | (excused) |
| Neil Springborn | (excused) |

##### ALSO PRESENT:

Christina Ryans-Huffer, Recording Secretary  
Christine James, Planning Director  
Kameron Good, Senior Planner  
John Andrews, City Attorney  
Robert Burns, Planner I  
Cindy Augustine, Real Property Coordinator  
Dewayne Burk, Deputy City Manager  
Kim McConnell, The Lawton Constitution  
David Locke  
Delman Bloom  
Willie Northington  
Rhonda Bell-Todd  
Deborah Bell  
James Davis  
Chris Nelms

**The meeting has established a quorum and was posted according to the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314.**

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

The following items are considered to be routine by the City Planning Commission and will be enacted with one motion. Should discussion be desired on an item, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda prior to action and considered separately.

- 2. Consider approving the minutes from the regular scheduled meeting from June 27, 2024.**
- 3. Consider approving the minutes from the special scheduled meeting from July 2, 2024.**

**Motion by Jones, Second by Logan to approve all items on the consent agenda  
Aye: Busse, Jarvis, Jester, Jones, Logan, Denham Nay: None **Motion Passed 6-0****

## **OLD BUSINESS**

None

## **NEW BUSINESS**

- 4. Hold a public hearing and consider a request from Deborah Bell on behalf of Win-Wal Properties LLC for an amendment to the 2030 Land Use Plan from Residential/Low Density to Residential/High Density and a change of zoning from the R-1 Single-Family Dwelling District to the R-3 Multiple-Family District zoning classification for an assisted living home to be located at 801-809 NW Pershing Dr, Lawton, OK, 73507 and take appropriate action as deemed necessary.**

Good stated we have a rezoning request for property located off of Northwest Pershing Drive. It is this triangle shaped property addressed as 801-809 NW Pershing. The request is to go from R-1 Single-Family Dwelling to R-3 Multi-Family Dwelling District. The proposed use for the property is an assisted living home. As you can see the current zoning for this is R-1 Single-Family Dwelling District. The surrounding zonings to the north, south, east and west are R-1 Single-Family Dwelling. The proposed is R-3 Multi-Family Dwelling District. The existing site plan is shown here, there is no proposed changes on the site plan, there's just going to be interior remodeling for this project. There was a petition turned in for this to the City Clerk's Office not in favor of this. This was provided to all of you in your packets. There was 12 properties that had the property owner's signatures against it and 8 signatures from non-property owners. This map depicts the 36 signatures total. The difference in numbers is due to duplicate signatures, like husband and

wife. The Land Use is Residential Low Density, there would be an amendment to change that to Residential High Density. This was mailed to 50 property owners within 300 feet on July 3<sup>rd</sup> and posted in The Lawton Constitution on July 12<sup>th</sup>. We have received a petition and another phone call today against this. We do have the property owner here for questions.

Denham asked any questions of Kameron before I open the Public Hearing? Seeing none, I will declare the Public Hearing open, anyone wanting to speak for or against this item please come to the podium and state your name and address.

Locke stated good afternoon ladies and gentlemen and Commission, I live at 806 NW Pershing Drive. My wife and I have lived in Lawton for over 35 years, raised kids and graduated from Lawton schools. We feel that this will definitely have a negative impact on the character of the neighborhood. The added traffic, utility use and flow of people, which we have to deal with already because Pershing is just a drag strip between Ferris and Cache Road. This is just going to make it worse. We are concerned about property value and the (inaudible) in the neighborhood, which is the main reason we moved there and many of the people that signed the petition said the same thing. We strongly oppose it even if they go through with the projected plan with what they want to build and if that doesn't work then something else can come in. Once it's zoned R-3 it's sky is the limit. I am directly across the street; it would be looking directly into our bedroom windows and right into the front door of my house. I understand something needs to be done with the property if they can build and remodel and stay within the current zoning that it is under, level one, I'm fine with that but increasing the capacity of how many people they can put in that small space it's just going to make everything worse. The crime is going to be worse. The traffic is going to be worse. The noise is going to be worse. The whole character of the neighborhood will suffer.

Bloom stated my name is Delman Bloom, I live at 1717 Ash. I live right up the street from this area. I'm a Real Estate Broker. I take care of my property. We don't need apartments on that street. There is already enough street walkers, we don't need anymore. I don't think it would be a very good idea. A multi-plex apartment, low income, people visiting isn't good for our neighborhood. The property value will go down. There will be more crime.

Northington stated I live at 1740 NW Ash. I have been there for over 32 years. I agree with everything the others has stated. We don't need any more traffic.

Bell-Todd stated My name is Rhonda Bell-Todd, I am the owners sister. The property is going to be for senior citizens. It will be their home not apartments. It will be for seniors that are handicapped, elderly, it will be an assisted living home. She is just changing the interior of the building to accept patients.

Denham asked how many units are you looking at?

Bell-Todd responded she has to have less than 19 (nineteen). 19 to 20 patients no more. We are both CNAs. We have a nurse already to start. It's not going to be an apartment

building. It's not going to have riff raff just family members coming to visit their sick elderly parents.

Denham asked what was the prior use of this building?

Bell-Todd responded it was a computer store, a doctor's office, it had several different things.

Bell stated I wasn't going to speak until I heard everyone's opinion whether to let the place open or not. I'm just trying to help out the seniors and help people who wants family members stay out of commercial buildings to an assisted living building which is more like a home setting for elderly to get more proper care instead of being left there. So, it wouldn't be a lot of traffic because the time set is a certain base hour. They have a time to come visit and a time that visiting hours are over. There will not be a lot of traffic. It wouldn't be, it wouldn't bring property values down. It might be going to bring the value up. They would see their family members being taken care of and you're invested in their family. The crime was already there before I tried to start the assisted living facility. We are trying to help the elderly in a home-based setting.

James stated Mr. Chairman I just want to clarify this would be a binding site plan. The binding site plan would list this as an assisted living and even if it does get re-zoned to R-3 it would be limited to the assisted living because of the binding site plan.

Jones asked are the elderly going to your facility as clinic and then leaving? This is more a kin to a nursing home perhaps?

Bell responded we are doing less people than a nursing home in order to give them the proper care that they need.

Jones asked but they're in residence?

Bell stated yes.

Denham asked how many units?

Bell stated not units but rooms.

Jones asked how many employee?

Bell responded 1 nurse and 2 employees.

Davis stated crime is everywhere. This is to help families. Sometimes families need help taking care of their loved ones.

Northington asked what about security?

Locke asked does the applicant own the building? There is no way 18 people is going to fit in there.

Denham stated this is presented with a binding site plan. The only thing that can go on the property is according to what that site plan says it will be.

Good stated the amendment to the binding site plan process is if there was any change that was requested to this we would have to go through the same process as the Re-Zoning or Use Permitted On Review. There would be 2 notices sent, 2 Public hearings for any change to the proposed use. All the property owners that got noticed for this would get noticed again and Council would have ultimate say on that.

Locke stated there is many other places in the City they could go that is right on the front door step of residential homes. I still say it will increase traffic and I believe there will be an increase in criminal activity and destroy the character of the neighborhood.

Denham asked and the building is currently vacant?

Locke stated it's been vacant for many years.

Bell-Todd responded she owns the building. They purchased it January 31, 2024.

Denham asked and Security when you become operational?

Bell-Todd responded we could possibly get a Security Guard but we are not responsible for the crime that is already there.

Denham stated they're just making sure your residents are protected. Your business hours I know is 24/7 but most assisted living places have certain visiting hours. What are those operating hours?

Bell-Todd responded operating hours for visits will be from 8:00 to 7:00. Staff will be 24 hours.

Denham asked are residents free to come and go?

Bell-Todd responded only for Doctor appointments. We will arrange the transportation to take them and pick them up.

Denham asked how do you select your clientele?

Bell-Todd responded from working at other facilities we have patients that wanted us to take care of them.

Bloom stated I believe City Code will not allow what they are talking about, house that many people, a kitchen, plus parking and they didn't say anything about security. The park is right down the street & I know the Home-less sleep at that park.

Denham stated it would have to meet all Building Codes, that's another step down the road.

Bloom stated that looks like a big area but you start getting the measurements you're not going to have much space.

Nelms stated hello I'm Chris Nelms. I live across the street from this property and I bought my house 24 years ago. I bought it because it's quiet and I really would like it to stay that way. If that is a 24 hour operation, I'm sure there is going to be ambulances with assisted living. They are going to be getting calls through the night so we will be having ambulances running up and down. I think there's going to be other effects. Somebody is got to deliver food, so there is going to be trucks coming in and out doing deliveries. Like my neighbors stated I think there is other places better suited for something like that.

Denham asked anyone else that would like to speak for or against this item? Seeing none I will go ahead and close the Public hearing.

Jones stated I move that we recommend to the City Council for an amendment to the 2030 Land Use Plan from Residential/Low Density to Residential/High Density and a change of zoning from the R-1 Single-Family Dwelling District to the R-3 Multiple-Family District zoning classification for an assisted living home to be located at 801-809 NW Pershing Drive, Lawton, OK, 73507 based upon there are 21 existing parking spaces on the site plan. There appears to be adequate space for maneuvering for deliveries. It is a residential activity. We want to keep residential activities next to residential activities. We don't want to turn them into commercial uses which do generate an odor and noise and traffic. This particular use does not seem to create noise, odor, the lighting will be regulated based upon the City Code. As the owner said she'll try to be responsible for any crime on her premises but she is not responsible for the crime in the neighborhood and finally this applicant has to meet all the Oklahoma Department of Health regulations and the City Code regulations dealing with assisted living.

Denham stated we have a motion. Is there a second? Motion dies without a second. Is there another motion?

Jarvis stated I'll make a motion to deny the request.

Denham stated we have a motion for denial. Is there a second? Ladies and Gentlemen, Council has advised that we send the Council that CPC does not make a motion on this item. Ladies and Gentlemen I am absolutely shocked this has never happened in my over 20 years on this Commission, that we've not been able to come up with a pro or con motion.

Andrews responded what I would recommend is watch the agendas because it will move to City Council. We will do notices and everything and it will go to the City Council and they will not get a recommendation from CPC.

Denham stated you will be re-notified when this item goes to Council.

Andrews stated watch for that because they probably will have a Public hearing at that point as well. You'll want to be here to make those arguments as well because it's totally different people.

Denham stated it will be like this. It will be like today.

Andrews responded you'll make the same arguments just a different set of people.

Denham stated they are the final authority, regardless if we did make a motion, they could have accepted the recommendation, they could reverse the recommendation but in this instance this Body has chosen not to make a recommendation, for that I apologize for your time and I do appreciate you all coming and presenting your case, both pro and con.

No recommendation was made by the City Planning Commission to the City Council.

**5. Consider approving offsite improvement construction plans for an extension to SW Gilbert Gibson Rd, water line, and sanitary sewer to serve Fisher 59 and future development within the Airport Industrial area, subject to the conditions listed.**

Good stated this area is located in the Airport Industrial area. This is just north of the Highway off of SW 11<sup>th</sup>. The proposed improvements would be an extension of SW Gilbert Gibson Road, along with an extension of approximately 2,900 linear feet of 12-inch sanitary sewer line and approximately 1,683 linear feet of 12-inch water line to serve this area for future development and to serve Fisher 59's building. So, Fisher 59 as you can see on this aerial is already existing. They're proposing on building a brand new facility to the west of this on SW Gilbert Gibson Road. Here is a proposed site plan of their warehouse. The road will be extended to the west along with a temporary turnaround. The Public Utility lines will extend to the west from the existing one and loop all the way back down to Rex Maderia Road. That is why there is an excessive linear footage of that, it is also to serve future development as well. There is the condition that they obtain their ODEQ Permit which they have submitted paperwork and have had the signatures on that. So, they just now have to get it approved by ODEQ and then there is a condition from Public Utilities that they get PI testing done for the road construction.

Denham asked is there any further questions or discussion for Kameron?

Jones asked is this an existing plat or do they intend to plat after the off-site improvements?

Good responded the PepsiCo and those areas are platted. The buildings that are existing are platted but this tract of land is larger than 10 acres and is leaving larger than 10 acres. So, it didn't require a plat at this time.

Jones stated I would recommend the Commission consider requiring platting after the off-site infrastructure improvement is dedicated. We need to get everything platted and not have the mess we had at Lawton Industrial Park and if they need to re-plat or they need some adjustments then that's perfectly fine. The plat is so important.

**Motion by Jones. Second by Logan** to recommend to the City Council to approve the offsite improvement construction plans for an extension to SW Gilbert Gibson Rd, water line, and sanitary sewer to serve Fisher 59 and future development within the Airport Industrial area with the conditions listed from Public Utilities and a condition of Platting **Aye:** Jester, Jones, Logan, Denham, Busse, Jarvis **Nay:** None **Motion Passed 6-0**

**6. Discuss and determine the proper zoning district classification of an Electronic Data Processing use within the city of Lawton and take appropriate action as deemed necessary.**

Good stated we had an applicant call and requested what zoning was required for a bit coin mining operation, an electronic currency mining operations and the proposed area that they were looking at was off of East Gore and Southeast 60<sup>th</sup> Street. As you can see it is currently zoned Agriculture. This property is currently under contract with the contingency of the City's decisions on whether this is an appropriate zoning. So right now, the Land Use for that area is Residential-Low Density/High Density and Commercial. There is pictures provided of what other bit coin operations may look like, with the metal warehouses and some are smaller operations with just a moving, shipping container pods and then these facilities have electronic servers inside that are doing the operations. So, we're looking for discussion to consider where this would be placed in our zoning regulations, as of right now it is not listed and I'll let Christy go in to a little more depth with some research we've done.

James stated as of right now bit coin mining is not in a listed use but Oklahoma State Statute, they did pass a bill earlier this year that goes into effect on November 1, 2024 that will limit digital asset mining to Industrial Districts. Our recommendation would be to ask Staff to bring back a Code change. The Code change would require a Public hearing at the CPC and at City Council because this is a Chapter 18 change and that we add it to an Industrial Use in compliance with State Statute.

Denham asked what about data servers? The Cloud if you will, they don't mine but they are the exact same process. Do we have something for those as well?

Andrews responded this is a little bit more active than a Cloud Server. One of the pictures of the mining with the containers, if you look at the fencing around it, that is noise dampening fencing. So, this Law would require that as well, the State Law goes into effect on November 1<sup>st</sup>. The Law reads any person engaging in home digital asset mining has to comply with all of the noise ordinances, that's for home mining but these do generate noise. These that have been placed close to residential areas generate a lot noise, generate a lot of heat and so that's one reason they require that type of noise barrier. It's much different than a data center. A lot of the arguments surrounding this in many communities are that is this the same or different as a data center. A lot of places are zoning them like data centers, only to find out that they are way more noisy, they're way more intense. They're a little more dangerous. There's a lot of electric and A/C that goes into this.

Good stated I will state that I did speak with the Fire Marshall's Office and it would be classified as a business occupant class which there is no sprinkler requirement besides a very large facility and that would be the occupant class would be business. They still would have to get a fire hydrant within 400 ft of the facility and that's per City Code and Fire Code.

Denham asked out there where is the closest connection to that?

Good responded the existing utilities is in the neighborhood to the west of this, there would be a requirement of Off-Site Infrastructure, which they did state that they were aware of that and they also have a letter provided that says PSO can provide the power that they would need.

Denham stated and these things require a lot of power.

Jones asked Christy, you know if we put an Industrial Land Use out here in the middle of this A-1, is the A-1 tracts served by 9-Mile Creek Sewer? It already has sewer?

James responded I would have to look at the ridge. I would have to verify with Rusty if they're too far away to have to pump it over the ridge but our recommendation would be for Staff to bring back a Code change and we would let the applicant know to go ahead and to start for the re-zoning request.

Jones stated this is the problem that I am having, we're in the middle of the Land Use Plan, I don't want the citizens of Lawton to have spent on 9-Mile Creek to build residential housing on the east side of town to have a spot zone of Industrial which ends up being more Industrial and more Industrial because of the availability of infrastructure. We spent a ton of money out west. We have available Industrial Land and so I guess my opposition to just saying Industrial, which I think is the appropriate classification, is what does it do to this east side with regard to limiting development? I don't know nothing about these things but when you say it generates a lot of heat, a lot of noise, a lot of stuff then we should not shoot ourselves in the foot and maybe the way to do it is look at these individually in a re-zoning and we might be considering for the first time denial based

upon the Land Use Plan. I would rather not go to zoning until you all sit down and talk about the Land Use Plan and talk about it with Rusty and the Fire Department and amongst the family.

James responded right and that is in the works now. I don't know if we have the ability to hold back an applicant from requesting a re-zoning request though.

Jones stated I don't think we do but we need to be prepared.

James responded absolutely.

Jones stated because we're in the middle of this Land Use Plan. We just don't want to blindly do something. Usually when we get into re-zoning we act like the Land Use Plan doesn't exist because it hasn't existed in the last 20 years.

James responded that's why we're putting so much effort into getting this Land Use Plan updated so the amendments to that are far and few in between because it is updated.

Jones stated as I've said I think the State is right. It should probably be in I-4.

Andrews stated I will say that I am glad we're getting this later rather than sooner because a lot of places considered these data centers and zoned them as data centers where they put them close to residential areas and now have had to file suit because the use is so different than what they claimed. They're real protracted law suits settlements and these places have had to relocate to Industrial Zone and typically I-3.

Denham stated and I'm seeing on another map there are residents in some of the A-1 and you go putting an Industrial zoning out there, I pretty much can think that Item 4 would be an easy item compared to what that would be but this was something, again it's the future and that doesn't exist yet.

James asked is there a recommendation from the Committee on what Industrial zoning?

Busse asked you said this is currently under contract, right?

Denham stated yes.

Good stated that's what we were told today. They said there was a contingency on it.

Busse asked is there any plans that they presenting to show us like how big, square footage, anything?

Good responded they have not provided any of that. The pictures that were sent, were sent by them.

Denham stated it wasn't technically on the agenda. Their understanding was the discussion item was about where to put these things. I'm surprised we got as much info as we did frankly.

Question was asked but not audible due to the audio trouble from the dais.

Good responded not that I'm aware of. The only other information they provided was that they believe this would be 50 to 60 construction jobs that they hire locally and that they would have about 10 to 12 employees out there after it was opened.

Denham stated and one monstrous electric bill every month. My initial thought was a Use Permitted On Review like we have done in the past but with all the other contingencies with the new Law and everything thing else I hate the idea of not allowing business but I also understand this is a little different angle and maybe they're trying to get there first.

Jones asked would it be appropriate because this Law, that we make a recommendation to Staff to research impacts of the proposed site on the Land Use. I'm not talking about advising property owners or anything like that because at this point, this is a new use and get a little better information.

Denham responded you mean what does it actually do to the land.

Jones stated yes. As not compared to zoning.

Denham responded right. What would stop them from going into the Goodyear Park and putting one in there. What effect would that have there?

Jones stated and what impact on the site. They have named the site. They have a contract on a site and I don't think it's unfair in anyway.

James responded I think the big draw is that they're so close to the PSO sub-station. It's about a half a mile south of there. So, that could be the draw. We'll continue with John Andrew gathering data and some information, get an Ordinance put together to bring back to CPC again. We have a notice requirement. We are probably a month out from coming back to CPC and then again another month out to go to Council. If it does get passed then another month out before it goes into effect, we're at November 1<sup>st</sup>.

Jones stated I understand, I'm just going to say it out loud, there were protests over this cobalt issue in an I-4 District. You know most of it was because we couldn't answer the questions. We couldn't say if it's served by 9-Mile Creek. These people have development expectations or whoever they sell it to. What is the impact on the existing Land Use, what is the water impact? Now I don't represent PSO, they are tough cookies.

Denham asked alright, anyone else want to add anything to Staff directing them on how to research this? I would also hopefully while you're tackling this, it would probably be a different area but if you don't have something on the data centers, that needs to be addressed as well because that's another huge growing area.

Jones responded and they're distinct from things that we've called data centers like call centers.

Denham stated no these are like the Cloud. This is the Cloud, it's all, it's like that with all the data servers but all they're doing is storing stuff for people. They're not doing the math and the super.

Andrew responded storage is a lot more passive than this. This is, you actually have, typically really high-end graphics cards and one after another. The heat is times 500 compared to a home computer.

Good stated something we are also looking at addressing is, so I talked to the Fire Marshalls, they have had some fires at residences doing this.

Denham asked home mining?

Good responded home crypto mining.

Andrews stated it generates a lot of heat.

Good stated power extension cords over power extension cords running a lot of power and caught fire.

Jones stated I think David made a good suggestion.

Good responded what I've kind of heard would be what I've kind of heard is to put this in an Industrial area. Are we okay with all 4 (four) Industrial zonings? I haven't really heard a distinction on.

Jones stated I'm speaking for myself, I think it needs to be a Heavy Industrial area, whether it's a Park like 3 or Heavy Industrial like 4 (four).

Good responded Warehousing District?

Denham stated well John mentioned other municipalities steering them towards 3 (three) so, 3 (three) or 4 (four).

Andrews responded 3 (three) is what I've been seeing the most in just different articles where people have had to deal with this and relocate them.

Jones stated the reason I say we may tip into 4 (four) is other industries may not want them located next door to them.

Andrews stated just in my experience with what I know about this generates 3 (three) is probably most appropriate.

Denham asked Melissa with your expertise in Commercial.

Busse asked can't we put grows processing and facilities in I-1?

Good responded yes, currently.

Jones responded I don't see no nexus between the two uses.

Good stated they do generate a lot of power. The crypto currency do generate a little bit more but power is what you're comparing it to.

Jones responded the heat, odor.

Good stated it is a permitted use in I-1 and a Use Permitted On Review in C-5 for Medical Marijuana Grows.

Andres stated Fort Worth has one in their City Hall just so you know. A bit coin mining in the basement of their City Hall to utilize the space.

Good asked so would we be open for a Use Permitted On Review in the lower Industrial areas because I hear we are thinking I-3 and then maybe Use Permitted On Review in the lower Industrials?

Jones responded no; I don't agree with that.

Good stated no, okay.

Denham stated you can at least research it.

Jones responded you know research it but I don't know enough about use. I'm more terrified on the implications on the Land Use whether they're Residential or Industrial but it's always better, on the Industrial end to be cautious because it causes less nervousness from a surrounding property owner and Land Uses. Particularly if they have some future development aims, maybe they want to give it to their children, like a farm. I just don't see it anywhere near I-1 or I-2.

Denham asked anything else? Thank you all.

## **7. Commissioner's Reports or Comments.**

Denham stated I want to send my well wishes to the Henry Family. We had Pat Henry's funeral service today, it was lovely. She was a huge part of this Commission for many, many years. I still miss her but I guess she will not come and take my place anymore if she does I'm definitely out of here. Also, we talked about these items, they came up again today, I just wished the Public would realize that if an applicant wants to put a business or entity somewhere else, they would have bought the property somewhere else. If you are buying a piece of property to do something, I mean that is a commitment you are wanting to get it done. We have somebody applying for something that's in a vacant building, oh well anyway.

Jones responded well it could be a marijuana dispensary that could back.

Denham stated any place can be a medical marijuana dispensary according to Oklahoma State Law.

Andrews responded that is zoned. We still have some control. I fought that 5 years ago.

**8. Secretary's Report.**

James stated just a few things I want to mention. We have hired a Planner I, this is Robert Burns. Everyone please welcome him. We've had him all most a whole week and he keeps still returning, hopefully we're on a good path.

Denham stated most of our meetings we actually act on items.

James stated and secondly I just want to mention we are going to make a few adjustments to the agenda on how it looks. We are trying to be more consistent with the City Council. We are going to number just the actual items that you will be voting on.

Good stated I also wanted to mention we are meeting all next week with Garver. They are in town for the Land Use. We have these Stakeholders Group that we have compiled and reached out and so they're getting input for the different entities across the City and then also is Key Persons interviews. There is a laundry list of people that they are going to do one on one interviews with for the 2050 Land Use Plan.

James stated we have the Land Use Plan and the Transit Plan surveys going on at the same time. Two different plans two different surveys, please do both.

**9. Audience Participation.**

Denham stated thank you Ladies and Gentlemen for coming.

**10. Adjournment.**

**Motion by Jarvis. Second by Logan** to adjourn the meeting **Aye:** All in favor, Jones, Logan, Denham, Busse, Jarvis, Jester **Nay:** None **Motion Passed 6-0**

**With no further business the meeting was adjourned.**



---

**David Denham**

**Chairman**