



City of Granite City

Building and Zoning Dept. 2000 Edison Granite City, IL 62040 Phone:(618) 452-6218 FAX:(618)452-6246

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

August 7, 2008

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL** Chair Sharon Ryan called the August 7, 2008 Plan Commission meeting to order with roll call at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sandra Crites
Frank Greathouse
Ben Ward
Sharon Ryan

John Janek
Don Luddeke
Tim Elliott

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Shirley Howard (ex)
Mark Davis (ex)
Mark Wilson (ex.)
Jack Taylor (ex)

OTHERS PRESENT Alderman Dan McDowell, Brad Eavenson, Asst. City Attorney Laura Andrews, City Engineer Joe Juneau, attorneys, engineers, specialist for petitioners and approximately 50 rezoning protesters, residents and observers.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance, Comments, Swear in:** Chair Ryan swore in those present, explained the board is a recommending body to the City Council who has final say on all petitions. Next council meeting is August 19.
3. **Approval of Minutes, and Agenda.** Motion by John Janek seconded by Ben Ward to approve the July minutes and tonight's agenda as presented.
4. **Council Report** Alderman Dan McDowell stated that the council concurred on everything presented at the July meeting except the request by Arch House which will be reviewed by the council in committee on August 19.
5. **PETITIONS:**
 - a) **Re-Zone approximately 8 acres North of Wal-Mart off Rt. 3** from "A Agricultural" to "C-5 Highway Commercial". Request by owners Herbert Bischoff, Tracy Rich Wilson and Patrick J. Rich to rezone their "A" property to "C-5".

Attorney David Antognoli, representing the owners, addressed the board and reported his clients are under contract to Wal-Mart. He explained that this property is a small sliver of land between commercial properties and is no longer suitable to them for agricultural use. Keith Hazelwood representing Wal-Mart handed out information booklets containing photos of the acreage with commercial developments around site. Wal-Mart and car dealerships are to the South and Lowe's has 35 acres to the North under commercial development. He answered questions in our ordinance's Advisory Report as follows:

- a) Existing use and zoning of property: *"Zoned Agricultural no farming going on at this time"*, b) Existing uses and zoning of near future other lots in vicinity: *"commercial (C-5) and industrial (M-1/M-3/M-4) with more C-5 planned for"*. c) Suitability of the property in question for uses already permitted under existing regulations: *"Suitable, but by nature of commercial development growth around them this 7 acres will no longer be suitable"*.
- d) Suitability of property in question for proposed use: *"Suitable, rezoning to C-5 will continue the zoning change to commercial use that is planned for the area"*. e) The trend of development in the vicinity of the property in question, including changes (if any) which may have occurred since the property was initially zoned or last re-zoned: *"Trend is clearly towards commercial use with Wal-Mart, car dealers and recent changes"*.
- f) The effect proposed re-zoning would have on implementation of the City's Comprehensive Plan: *"in some of the pages of your Comprehensive Plan it spoke to the development of this area for commercial and or industrial. New commercial development verifies that this rezoning is absolutely in compliance with the plan"*.

Bomani Lee Civil Engineer for Wal-Mart presented maps and site plan of the area showing how the proposed development will fit the overall plan for the Route 3 corridor. Board Chair Sharon Ryan thanked him for the added information and stated site plans were not needed for tonight, only the rezoning request is under consideration.

Comments/Objectors:

Brian Hitpas of Posey, IL, with offices in Edwardsville IL said he represents Granite City 1st and union members. He passed out a report supporting why they feel Wal-Mart and any expansion has an adverse effect on local communities. He asked the board to review the report and deny the petition for re-zoning based upon the proposed use's adverse impact on local economy, traffic, and increased crime.

Jeff Rains, 2401 Illinois Ave., said, as a long time resident he knows West Granite needs to be re-vitalized. I wish I could say this would be an asset, but we need more small businesses. We don't need Wal-Mart. It will shut down local businesses, it is not a good corporate partner, their workers are not union and the city will be the loser.

Ken Aud, 3305 Village Lane, said he is a 40 year resident, and is with Granite City 1st, a group of individuals representing churches and unions in the area. He said they are very opposed. This will adversely effect our city, grocery stores, and good paying jobs. Thousands of people have signed petitions against Wal-Mart. It is time for the city to correct the mistake they made years ago letting Wal-Mart locate here. The store doesn't buy American. They will be a negative impact not only on the downtown but will leave areas vacant when grocery stores close causing a loss of taxes. He sited traffic, crime, and economic harm. He asked this be left as a "green space" as memorial to the mistake of letting Wal-Mart come into our area.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Mrs. Crites said the board is only here to address the request for re-zoning by the property owners. Assistant City Attorney Laura Andrews agreed that is the only issue the board has before it tonight. Mr. Janek asked, what would the owners do with a strip of property like this anyway, the area is ready to boom. This is not just for Granite City it (development of the Rt. 3 corridor) will bring in people from all over, more people more taxes. I ask you, the people here against Wal-Mart, are they against Walgreen's, Aldi's, etc.?

Chair Ryan re-stated that the discussion is not about Wal-Mart it is about rezoning. Laura Andrews asked Mr. Antognoli how long the property has not been used for farming. Mr. Antognoli said the last 2 or more years. The Bischoff's have sold much of their property over the years, much of which has been developed. This small strip is no longer useful to them for farming.

MOTION by Janek, seconded by Ward to approve the property owner's request for rezoning from "A" Agricultural to "C-5" Highway Commercial. Roll Call Vote: Crites, Janek, Ward, Elliott, Luddeke, Greathouse, and Ryan – Yes **MOTION PASSED**

b) Request change in approved plat Lowe's development along Rt. 3

BOARD DISCUSSION: Joe Juneau, City Engineer stated that the request for the change came about during the recent rains which caused a high water table. The basin in the back of the property will still be in place but because of the high water table it will be at a shallower level. They are proposing a "dry basin" with the bottom to be rip-rap for the front of the property. Landscaping the front is planned, but it may be modified later. Mr. Willaredt commented that Lowe's is very specific about not wanting any drainage to go across their property.

The dry basin was discussed along with water flow in the area. Tim Elliott asked if there would be water in the front and rear basins all the time. Mr. Juneau re-stated there will still be a pond in the back, that one will be wet. The one in front is a dry basin, once it builds up it will percolate by culvert, or drains, to the South, I don't believe it will have water all the time, only during water events. There are 3 ponds; the one to the back will now be shallower, the one to the side of their property is to maximize storage and the one in front will be a dry basin.

Sandra Crites asked about screening from the highway and if the board could require them to come back with a landscaping plan for this basin. Laura Andrews said they could make it a requirement. Mr. Juneau said Lowe's have already asked for a modification of the landscaping for a later date. Mr. Willaredt said that he didn't believe this would be a problem, Lowe's is very concerned with aesthetics.

MOTION by Sandra Crites, seconded by John Janek to approve the request for re-design of the drainage plan for the Lowe's Property on Rt. 3 with the contingency that they bring back a landscaping plan to us for approval. Roll Call Vote: Crites, Janek, Ward, Elliott, Luddeke, Greathouse, and Ryan – Yes. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUS.

c) NonConformity Special Exemption for CIS "Telecommunications Tower" at 2301 Washington Ave. Property zoned "R-3" Residential

CIS Communications, LLC request 120' monopole tower for telecommunications carriers supporting at least 3 carrier antennas at 2310 Washington Ave. Property owner is P&S Amusement Co.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Mike Seamands, Brick Storts, and William Jenkins represented CIS Communications and introduced themselves to the board.

Mr. Jenkins presented a packet and presented their case for approval: Page one contained aerial views in which he pointed out property location. He said currently there is a 140' self supporting tower that has been there for at least the last 20 plus years used for 2-way radio mainly by P&S Amusement. We plan to replace it with a 120' high monopole tower 20' shorter than what is there currently. The existing self support tower that stands today was designed more for use of lighter 2-way radio. The more modern cellular antennas used for everyday communications are actually larger antennas that require a more substantial type tower. In a lot of circumstances we use monopole towers and look to replace older towers with lower monopole cell towers that in my opinion would be less intrusive.

He discussed the site plan showing a 42' x 49' fenced area which is to be updated. Within the fenced area around the proposed monopole he showed footprints of other proposed equipment facilities for other tenants. He said space is available for 3 platforms for other carriers. He said currently CIS has one tenant interested, which is AT&T, to be located at 110' mark. Other carriers will have the availability to any of the "rad" centers as required. A letter of Intent was shown and discussed from their main tenant, which will be AT&T. He pointed out the following in the booklet: Projected coverage; Engineering statement; "RF" which showed research coverage of area to determine the need; Report two of the main areas that need coverage are the Steel plant and the hospital; and two maps of coverage that show areas lacking in coverage and areas where more coverage is needed were discussed. He also explained projected coverage to cover the need. The last page had signatures of five (5) residents in favor CIS proposal. He said these were the only ones they were able to get, but no one he talked to had any objections

Mrs. Crites asked if they could identify the street location of the tower sites shown and if those shown are all or only AT&T towers? Mr. Jenkins said he didn't have the exact locations of towers indicated on the maps, but thought the one closest is on Rt. 162. He said the ones on the maps are active AT&T sites, some are co-locations, some we own.

Laura Andrews asked who and what is CIS Communications? Mr. Jenkins said they are more of a real-estate company, more involved with construction of infrastructure. We are a business of constructing towers and leasing space.

Mr. Storts reported that he was managing member of CIS Communications and they are a member of the Illinois Public Utility Commission, although not a utility, we are a company the same as American Tower and Crown Castle. With out companies like ours carriers could not transmit on a full basis, in fact the trend is towards more companies like ours. We spend our capital to get the infrastructure and design structures to hold multi-carriers. That is a good thing for us and for the community, cutting down on the number of sites needed. This proposed structure will hold a minimum of 3 wireless carriers and we can actually design more if required. We are designing for internet and wireless which will replace land lines. He discussed the growing need of cell sites for commercial and residential use. He said the more cell sites the lower the antennas can be. He said AT&T is their lead tenant.

Attorney Laura Andrews said what she wants the Plan Commission to understand regarding the coverage area they are showing, along with the letters from AT&T, is, *they are not AT&T*. To clarify procedure, what is before the Plan Commission today is a Non-Conforming Exemption. CIS Communications has not filed under Granite City's Telecommunication Ordinance because under that ordinance a cell tower would not be allowed in a residential area, which is why they filed a Nonconformity Special Exemption.

Attorney Andrews requested the petitioner answer a few more questions:

1. What date was the radio frequency engineering's statement dated and who did it?
Answer: July 2 and the study was done by engineer for AT&T.

. The AT&T letter to locate on your tower, how firm a commitment do you consider that letter? Answer: firm.

3. Do you have an actual signed contract? Answer: We have a MLA which is a master leasing agreement and we are satisfied if we have a letter of this nature.

4. Were any other locations other than the current location considered?

Answer: Yes, we represent a variety of other carriers in the industry we looked about 150 feet away at the Fire Station with room for about a 150' monopole but found the property was not clean, a clean bill of health is a requirement.

5. Any other locations other than the Fire Station? Answer: We and others looked at Barney's (across the street from the Fire Station) which had the same environmental problems, that was for Sprint.

6. Was Gateway Regional Medical Center (roof top) considered? Answer: I believe it was for AT&T, but I don't know all the details. I understand this location was preferable.

7. When you say AT&T considered that location (GRMC rooftop) did your company, CIS, consider that location? Answer: No, that would be their building. We build communication centers. That would be like building something on someone else's roof.

8. Alderman Dan McDowell asked; to follow up on the hospital location, could that have been rented or not?

Answer: Yes, but we wouldn't have done that. But I presume that AT&T, if they felt it worked with their network, could have done that, yes.

9. Attorney Andrews pointed out, to the board, the petition filed by CIS. She said, if you look at their letter dated June 18, 2008, you will see they were told the requirements and questions they needed meet and answer to file this petition.

As petitioner they have to show that their situation, whether lot or structure, is so unique they need relief from our Telecommunication Code. Article 7-8 of our Zoning Ordinance controls "Non Conforming Exemptions", and 7-8.5 "Requirement for Authorization". She read the following: *"there may, on occasion, be such unique features or circumstances with regard to nonconforming lots, structures, and uses of land or structures, that a party in interest and/or operator of a proposed structure or use will require relief from said non-conformities."* CIS needs to show us that their situation is so unique they don't have to obey our code requirements for telecommunications. So my final question is what makes your situation so unique?

Answer: We are not trying to be contentious but we have a client that is trying to provide coverage for the area. We have a feel for the geographic area and are trying to find a location with a clean bill of health that is was one of our challenges. We are not trying to skirt or disobey your Telecommunications Code in fact we have been consulted by several communities to help with codes. Not every code takes into consideration, every aspect. There is an old tower there and we want to replace it with a new shorter monopole cell tower basically a platform for telecommunications. There is a multitude of carriers interested in this area and more are coming. Whether approved tonight or not, wireless phones won't go away, they are here to stay. Land based communications sites are the telephone poles of the future, although there is not as many of them. We don't need this particular site, we will probably do a very good job of providing a multitude of wireless services to both residential and commercial, and to hospitals, steel plants, everybody in this general area. It will serve as a platform that people can use for a multitude of different antenna type attachments.

Sharon Ryan questioned "the uniqueness " and if it was answered. She asked the attorney if she felt his response answered the question.

Attorney Andrews said that it wasn't up to her if the board felt it was answered or not. But, I understand he answered that it is unique that there is an existing pole structure there.

Mr. Storts said basically it would have to be replaced because the existing tower couldn't operate as a cell tower it is too old. We were approved on the fire station property but couldn't use it and in that situation you would have had 2 towers closed to each other. We picked this location because that tower is going to remain. If it was capable of holding our equipment we could use it. We are trying to minimize the number of towers in town and that is why we are trying to replace it and use this site. So that is the unique feature we are talking about because it is already there.

Zoning Administrator Steve Willaredt made a few points: 1) Going back to the Fire Department property on Madison Ave., it was zoned and the site could have been used. 2) Saying that if a tower that exists was able to hold cellular equipment it would be allowed; is a false statement. That would mean that any 2-way radio tower that exists in the city now, no matter the district or zone, we could put cell tower use on it is not correct.

Mr. Jenkins said that wasn't exactly what meant. He went on to read the health and safety requirements stating that they meet those standards in that the tower meets strict standards they are made not to fall and if they did they fall within 30 or 40 feet of the tower. They will help public safety and welfare by providing cell coverage. An existing 140' tower is to be replaced by newer and smaller (height) tower. According to a general appraisal study conducted Sprint, the study, showed that even on vacant ground placement of cell towers in general, have no effect on property values and requested this appraisal be part of the record although it was not specific to the location requested in Granite City (placed on file). He also said that, in his opinion, the tower will not essentially alter the character of the area, it will make it better.

Mr. Janek stated just for the record the first signature on the 5 signatures approving the cell tower is not a resident of the city as stated on the signed petition.

Mr. Willardet said if approved or not, I have a few questions about the site. According to our code will you provide for municipal access? Mr. Jenkins said, yes absolutely we do this for all of our sites and will work with you. Mr. Willardet asked about the bonds, security fencing, landscaping etc. as required by ordinance. Mr. Jenkins said they would comply with all requirements.

Mrs. Crites asked, what are your set backs in the fenced area, from drawings doesn't look like you can meet any set backs required in the fenced area. How big are these facility areas?

Mr. Storts said basically there are different types, small shelters, concrete pads, depends upon the carriers, they vary 11' x 14' to 10' x 12', AT&T utilizes 10' x 12' this drawing is a concept we understand there are set backs required as well as other requirements. We want to utilize all the property we can.

Mrs. Crites said the set backs are 20' from the rear and 5' from the side lot lines this doesn't look like it can meet any of the set backs and is the tower being used at this time. It was not known if it was being used. If this was allowed, P&S Amusement has a gate to their property, and wouldn't this (tower and its co-locaters) take up all of their required room for loading and off street parking?

Laura Andrews said it was her understanding that a Non Conformity Exemption, if granted, would only be granting permission to build a tower in a residential zone. It would still have to meet all other requirements. Mr. Storts replied that he believes they can meet the 20' rear and 5' side set backs. Mr. Willardet asked, even if you had more than one carrier or the three? He said we would have to be very creative and hope you would work with us.

Laura Andrews said that she would like to clarify for the record what exhibits they have: The Non-Conforming Exemption Petition and its attachments; a map; the packet brought today from CIS Communications with a blue back cover; a WINSK case study 2 pages long; cell tower impact appraisal dated June 30, 1995; also communications back and forth attached to the petition.

Sharon Ryan stated that the purpose of the city's Telecommunications Ordinance and our Zoning Ordinance is to keep the integrity of the neighborhood and as things go out, which are non-conforming, that nonconformities don't get replaced if they don't conform to the zoning of the area.

Sandra Crites expanded on the purpose by reading from Article 7, Sect. 7-3 under Non-Conformities which states: *"no such structure shall be enlarged or altered in any way which increases its nonconformity"*. She said this would definitely be altering and increasing the overall base structure, not in height but in overall area. Also *"no such structure shall be re-located unless after relocation it will conform to all regulations of the district in which it is located"*. This particular application can not conform.

Sandra Crites stated that if you back up (in the ordinance) and take into account the first part of the sub-section in Article 7, it gives you the instructions that govern the rest of the article on how you may apply for a permit. But, you have to take in account the initial part, and that is what you are even allowed to apply. Nonconformity has never been intended to allow something to be larger or more intensified.

Mr. Storts explained that even though the Fire Station is a nice facility they could not locate there because it couldn't pass Phase 1. It is an EPA listed zone, tenants would reject it because of contamination, liability, and inability to get insurance. Even though the city approved the area for a tower we could not, it's a liability issue. This happens in communities all the time we don't mean any disrespect to the city.

Mayor Hagnauer stated that contamination was due to a past gas leak and he asked if AT&T would lease or own to locate on a tower. Mr. Storts said either one.

Mr. Janek asked why they didn't go about 150 yards towards Granite City Steel, towards Grove Plumbing or the old Right Electric building. That area is zoned for cell towers and much more compatible, have you looked that way? Have you considered that?

Mr. Storts said that since it is so close (to other towers) you probably wouldn't want 2 cell towers so close together.

Sandra Crites said, in our industrial or a manufacturing area you don't have to get Plan Commission approval to locate a cell tower in a manufacturing zoned.

Mr. Janek said this area is only a block away. Sandra Crites said, that is exactly what we are saying.

MOTION

Before stating her motion Mrs. Crites requested Ms. Andrews repeat the section in Article 7-8: *".....there may, on occasion, be such unique features or circumstances with regard to nonconforming lots, structures, and uses of land or structures, that a party in interest and/or operator of a proposed structure or use will require relief from said non-conformities."*

MOTION by Sandra Crites seconded by John Janek, to deny the Non-Conformity Special Exemption Permit by CIS Communications LLC for a Telecommunications Tower in an R-3 Residential Zone at 2301 Washington Avenue, in that it did not meet the required section in Article 7-8 *"there may, on occasion, be such unique features or circumstances with regard to nonconforming lots, structures, and uses of land or structures, that a party in interest and/or operator of a proposed structure or use will require relief from said non-conformities"*.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Crites, Janek, Ward, Elliott, Luddeke, and Ryan – Yes.) MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUS, PETITION DENIED.

(Greathouse left before vote)

6. NEW BUSINESS

7. OLD BUSINESS:

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Respectfully Submitted,

Plan Commission Secretary

cc: Mayor/City
Council/Attorneys
City Clerk/Commission

PLAN COMMISSION ADVISORY REPORT

August 7, 2008

Pg 8

PETITIONER: Herbert L. Bischoff, Tracy Rich Wilson and Patrick J. Rich owners

LOCATION: Approximately 8 ac directly North of Wal-Mart and West off Rt. 3.

REQUEST: Re-zone from "A" Agricultural to "C-5" Highway Commercial

FINDING OF FACT: Recommendations and reasons thereof: If the proposed amendment alters district boundaries or changes the status of any use, the Plan Commission may report findings concerning each of the following:

- a) Existing use(s) and zoning of property in question: Vacant unused farm land zoned "A" Agricultural.
- b) Existing use(s) and zoning of other lots in the vicinity of the property in question: Commercial C-5, and industrial M-3/M-4 uses.
- c) Suitability of the property in question for uses already permitted under existing regulations: Suitable
- d) Suitability of property in question for proposed use: Suitable
- e) The trend of development in the vicinity of the property in question, including changes (if any) which may have occurred since the property was initially zoned or last re-zoned: Change is towards commercial development.
- f) The effect proposed re-zoning would have on implementation of the City's Comprehensive Plan: Meets requirements

MOTION by Janek, seconded by Ward to approve the property owner's request for rezoning from "A" Agricultural to "C-5" Highway Commercial.

Roll Call Vote: Crites, Janek, Ward, Elliott, Luddeke, Greathouse, and Ryan – Yes
MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUS.

EX. Excused absence UN. Unexcused absence

ROLL CALL

Sandra Crites	yes	Jack Taylor	absent (ex)
John Janek	yes	Ben Ward	yes
Sharon Ryan	yes	Shirley Howard	absent (ex)
Tim Elliott	yes	Mark Davis	absent (ex)
Mark Wilson	absent (ex)	Don Luddeke	yes
Frank Greathouse	yes		

August 7, 2008

Chair: Sharon Ryan

PLAN COMMISSION ADVISORY REPORT

August 7, 2008

Pg 9

PETITIONER: THF – the Lowe’s development along Route 3.

LOCATION: West side of Rt. 3 between Wal-Mart and Northgate Industrial Center

REQUEST: Request for re-design of water basins. Change is to an approved plat to allow a “dry basin” along the front portion of Route 3.

FINDING OF FACT: Recommendations and reasons thereof: If the proposed amendment alters district boundaries or changes the status of any use, the Plan Commission may report findings concerning each of the following: Not an amendment or change in use.

Request is for re-design of Lowe’s water basins. Change is for a proposed “dry basin” with the bottom to be rip-rap for the front of the property along Route 3. Landscaping for the front is planned, but it may be modified at a later date. Change will be to an approved final plat for the Lowe’s development.

MOTION by Sandra Crites, seconded by John Janek to approve the request for re-design of their water basins with the “contingency that they bring back a landscaping plan for approval by the Plan Commission”.

Roll Call Vote: Crites, Janek, Ward, Elliott, Luddeke, Greathouse, and Ryan – Yes.
MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUS.

EX. Excused absence UN. Unexcused absence

ROLL CALL

Sandra Crites	yes	Jack Taylor	absent (ex)
John Janek	yes	Ben Ward	yes
Sharon Ryan	yes	Shirley Howard	absent (ex)
Tim Elliott	yes	Mark Davis	absent (ex)
Mark Wilson	absent (ex)	Don Luddeke	yes
Frank Greathouse	yes		

August 7, 2008

Chair: Sharon Ryan

PLAN COMMISSION ADVISORY REPORT

August 7, 2008

Pg 10

PETITIONER: CIS Communications, LLC for AT&T
LOCATION: 2301 Washington Avenue
REQUEST: Nonconformity Special Exemption Permit for a Telecommunications Tower in a R-3 Residential zone.

FINDING OF FACT: Recommendations and reasons thereof: If the proposed amendment alters district boundaries or changes the status of any use, the Plan Commission may report findings concerning each of the following:

- a) Existing use(s) and zoning of property in question: Zoned R-3 Residential, use is nonconforming for P& S Amusement Co.
- b) Existing use(s) and zoning of other lots in the vicinity of the property in question: Zoned R-3 Residential – residential and nonconforming commercial uses.
- c) Suitability of the property in question for uses already permitted under existing regulations: Suitable
- d) Suitability of property in question for proposed use: Not suitable in a residential neighborhood.
- e) The trend of development in the vicinity of the property in question, including changes (if any) which may have occurred since the property was initially zoned or last re-zoned: No trend
- f) The effect proposed re-zoning would have on implementation of the City's Comprehensive Plan: Not a re-zoning request

MOTION by MOTION by Sandra Crites seconded by John Janek, to deny the Non-Conformity Special Exemption Permit by CIS Communications LLC for a Telecommunications Tower in an R-3 Residential Zone at 2301 Washington Avenue, in that it did not meet the required section in Article 7-8 "there may, on occasion, be such unique features or circumstances with regard to nonconforming lots, structures, and uses of land or structures, that a party in interest and/or operator of a proposed structure or use will require relief from said non-conformities".

ROLL CALL VOTE: Crites, Janek, Ward, Elliott, Luddeke, and Ryan – Yes
MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUS, PETITION DENIED.

EX. Excused absence UN. Unexcused absence

ROLL CALL

Sandra Crites	yes	Jack Taylor	absent (ex)
John Janek	yes	Ben Ward	yes
Sharon Ryan	yes	Shirley Howard	absent (ex)
Tim Elliott	yes	Mark Davis	absent (ex)
Mark Wilson	absent (ex)	Don Luddeke	yes
Frank Greathouse	(Greathouse left before vote)		

August 7, 2008

Chair: Sharon Ryan