

**MINUTES OF THE
MIAMI COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 6, 2023**

**MIAMI COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
COMMISSION CHAMBERS
201 SOUTH PEARL STREET
PAOLA, KANSAS 66071**

ATTENDANCE

CHAIR:	John Menefee
VICE-CHAIR:	Kelli Broers
PLANNING COMMISSION:	Joshua Brown, Bret Manchester, Charles Armour, Joe Flake, Topher Philgreen, and Gary Brockus
ABSENT MEMBERS:	Randy Kitchen
EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS:	None present
PLANNING DIRECTOR:	Kenneth Cook
ASST. PLANNING DIRECTOR:	vacant
PLANNER:	Not Present
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER:	Not Present
PC SECRETARY:	Casey d'Augereau
COUNTY COUNSELOR:	Not present
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	Not present
COUNTY COMMISSION:	None Present
COUNTY CLERK:	Not Present
PRESS:	Not Present

**MINUTES OF THE
MIAMI COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 6, 2023**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman John Menefee called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Roll Call was taken with eight (8) members present.

DISCLOSURE OF ANY EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS OR POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Armour recused himself from 23004-SUB: Le-Bon Acres.

Manchester recused himself from 23005-SUB: Rascal Ridge.

Cook stated the Planning Commission made a recommendation of denial for the Always & Furever Conditional Use Permit application at the May 2023 Planning Commission meeting. Always & Furever withdrew their application prior to the Board of County Commissioners meeting with the intent to file an amended request. It is anticipated the request will come before the Planning Commission at the August 2023 meeting. Cook noted that while there is no application submitted, care should be taken to avoid discussions making statements and to make sure everyone keeps an open mind.

Philgreen asked if the application comes back will it be a public hearing.

Cook stated it will be a new case and will be treated as such will include a public hearing.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Philgreen moved to accept the Agenda as presented. Flake seconded; the vote was unanimous via show of hands (8-0).

CONSENT AGENDA

Broers asked if Bobby Wardecker was employed with Miami County at the time of the April and May Planning Commission meetings. Cook replied yes. Broers stated there are two (2) typos in the May minutes: the word "weather" was used instead of "whether" and the vote to adjourn was unanimous and should have reflected (8-0) not (8-1).

Philgreen moved to approve the Consent Agenda contingent on the corrections being made on the May Minutes. Broers seconded; the vote was unanimous via show of hands (8-0).

REGULAR AGENDA

Old Business: None

New Business:

Agenda Item 23001-SUBEX: Fannon Exception Request

Cook requested the Planning Commission to consider a request for an Exception to the Subdivision Regulations. The applicant meet with Staff to discuss their plans and options of what they desired to happen to the property. At that time there was no in depth research completed in regard to property records. Once the application was submitted it was discovered a couple of splits had occurred without going through the proper Lot-Split process. One Lot-Split occurred in the early to mid-1990s and included a tract located at Lookout Rd and K68 Hwy. Another lot was created through a Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA) process but when looking at the records the lot used for the BLA wasn't a legal lot. Cook noted this allowed for two (2) Lot-Splits to occur. The current Zoning Regulations only allow one (1) Lot-Split per property without going through the platting process. Cook stated he has had several conversations with the applicant and has been to the site. The previous Director, Reeves, had informed them to go through the Subdivision process. During Cook's visit to the site, he noted the road did not meet the County's minimum requirements for infrastructure. Cook stated the report from Road & Bridge stated the road is between 17 feet and 20 feet wide. While a minimum width of 24-feet is required by the Subdivision Regulations, an average width of 20-24 feet has been allowed in the past.

Cook noted due to the cost of a plat he would like the applicant to get an answer regarding the exception before spending more money. Cook stated generally an Exception Request comes attached to a Subdivision application and Cook believes in this case it's reasonable to allow an alternate method, so they aren't wasting money if they get denied.

Cook noted according to Section 7-1.01 of the Subdivision Regulations a rule exception can be approved by the Planning Commission, provided that, in its judgment, such action will not violate the public interest, unnecessarily burden the County, or will annul the intent and purpose of these Regulations. A rule exception shall not be granted unless all of the following apply:

1. **Strict application of the regulations will create an undue hardship upon the subdivider.** Cook noted requiring the applicant to upgrade the road will be a substantial expense. Although this would be a costly expense to the applicant it is required by the subdivision process.
2. **The proposed rule exception is in harmony with the intended purpose of the regulations.** Cook stated specifically, Section 1-2.01 of the Subdivision Regulations specify that "once raw land has been divided into tracts, lots, blocks, and streets, the correction of defects is difficult and costly." Cook noted while the proposed rule exception will allow only one additional parcel the rule exception would not be in harmony with the regulations.
3. **The public health, safety, and welfare will be protected.** Cook stated there will not be a significant increase in traffic by allowing this. Cook also noted next to this property is a 19-lot subdivision that has access to this road and the subdivision was platted prior to the current regulations and there was no requirement for upgrading roads at that time.

Cook stated comments from Road & Bridge and the Emergency Management offices included, they were not necessarily opposed to the request. No significant concerns from either, but it just doesn't meet our current minimum requirements.

Cook noted should the Planning Commission approve the request; he would suggest the following conditions:

1. The lot created in 1993 be included in this subdivision request. This will correct the previous split that did not comply.
2. The proposed 15-acre tract be required to have an access easement with the property to the North. That property would not be a part of the subdivision plat and they would need to work with the property owner to record this easement.
3. It is recommended that a note be placed on the plat specifying no additional divisions of these properties shall be allowed without upgrading the road at that time.

Staff cannot make a recommendation to approve the application as it doesn't meet the criteria specified in the subdivision regulations, it does not appear to violate the public interest, burden the County, or annul the intent of the purpose of the regulations.

Cook stated the applicants are present for questions.

Flake asked questions regarding widening the road and about access off K-68 and to the West.

Cook stated it would be on Lookout Rd going North from K-68 and around the curve.

Menefee asked in the other exception cases, did most of them apply to what is referred to as "true subdivisions" or incidents similar to this...

Cook stated he believes most of them were for small subdivision plats.

Menefee clarified asking if exceptions have ever been on a plat for a signal family dwelling.

Cook stated yes and was only able to locate one (1) case that allowed for the road width to be less than 20-foot and it was a unique situation.

Brockus asked if the Planning Commission approves this and there is an accident on that section of the road could the County be held liable for the accident.

Cook stated he would be unable to answer that question. Cook noted that there have been many occasions when the road was allowed to be 20-foot to 22-foot wide and doesn't believe the County's approval of an exception would be the cause of an accident. If it is stipulated that they need to use the same access to the North, there is no added entrance to the road and if an accident were to occur in that area it wouldn't be due to a new entrance to the road.

Manchester asked if the only way around the split is to make it a subdivision since there was already a Lot Split on this property.

Cook stated yes.

Manchester asked if they would need to do a study for rural water.

Cook stated they will need to provide documentation regarding they have sufficient water regardless if they go with rural water or a well. Cook stated he is not anticipating that will be an issue.

Broers asked if it can be a requirement that there is some sort of County easement recorded where potential road would be widened.

Cook stated as part of the subdivision platting process it would be required for dedication of that half width of right-of-way. This is considered a local road so it would be a 40-foot half width and he would get the easement as part of the platting. The two (2) lots North of where the proposed lot would not be included as they are not part of the plat.

Broers asked if that would be sufficient.

Cook stated if something happens the County will need to acquire right-of-way or approach the property owner to see about having them dedicate additional property for right-of-way.

Broers asked if it would be better to make an easement requirement equal to the parcels in the plat. Broers wondered if that would be easier than revisiting the issue at a later time.

Cook stated his concern is that those lots aren't a part of the subdivision although Cook believes the lots are owned by family members.

Philgreen believes this is a commonsense issue, the traffic won't increase from one property. Philgreen stated if the Planning Commission is going to burden one (1) property owner to widen the road they should do an assessment on the other 19 property owners to widen the road.

Menefee invited the applicant to the podium at 7:31 p.m.

Jennifer Fannan, 310 W Piankishaw St, stated she believes there may be future plans to pave that section of the road and believes she read that in the paper. Since it is already in the plan to be paved Fannan believes they will have to widen the road when it is paved. Fannan stated she is available questions.

Broers asked if the shared access point comes off an already existing driveway.

Fannan stated it is an existing driveway and belongs to her dad.

Philgreen moved to approve 23001-SUBEX as presented by Staff. Brown seconded; the vote was unanimous (8-0) via show of hands.

Menefee opened item 23004-SUB: Le-Bon Acres at 7:34 p.m.

Cook stated he would like to review some things about Subdivisions prior to presenting the Staff report.

1. The current regulations on roadbed widths and right-of-way widths, in order to approve a subdivision plat, requires a 24-foot wide roadbed and 80-foot wide right-of-way. Cook noted that while it was common for the Planning Commission to waive the right-of-way width requirement, the method used has not been consistent with some being approved as exceptions and others just being mentioned in the Staff Report. Cook stated there have been a number of these cases recently and needed to bring this to the Planning Commission's attention. Cook stated he is considering a couple of things:
 - Have a conversation with Road & Bridge and surveyors asking them to verify the roads meet the minimum requirements prior to the applicant coming forth with an application.
 - Requiring some sort of documentation with the application stating that the roads meet the minimum requirements.
 - The Subdivision Regulations allow us to grant rule exceptions and has a fee established for this. Cook is considering making this more official in the future requiring a completed application and fee be submitted.

Cook stated he has been reading Subdivision Regulations of other communities and noted Johnson County's regulations allow a 22-foot roadbed. Cook stated if the Planning Commission is going to continue to approve these exceptions maybe the regulations need adjusted and a decision needs made as to what the minimum requirement should be.

Philgreen asked how does Staff measure the roads.

Cook stated he calls Road & Bridge.

Philgreen stated he would be in favor of developing a new regulation regarding the roadbed and right-of-way requirement.

2. Cook stated requests later on the agenda have blanket easements associated to them. According to the Subdivision Regulations, when reviewing an application for the platting process, all easements need to be identified and blanket easements need to be redefined to identify exactly where the easement is. Cook has discovered a number of plats approved that had blanket easements, without requiring them to be redefined. Cook has discussed this with both the past and present legal counsel and everyone is in agreement that our regulations specify that blanket easement should be redefined. Cook noted as part of the final plats of small tracts the regulations provide the ability to the Planning Director to waive some requirements. Cook had a discussion with legal counsel and she recommended because of the wording he should have a discussion with the Planning Commission seeking direction and possibly coming back with a resolution as to "this is our intent moving forward".

Menefee stated things haven't always been consistent in the past and believes consistency would help with public perception. Menefee stated he would be in favor for defining the easements.

Cook noted when dealing with some of the easements such as Everygy there is an entity that the property owner can go to, and the entity will take care of the easement issue. Some of the older easements that have been abandoned, such as pipeline companies no longer in business, will take more time to get the easement addressed but it can be done.

Armour recused himself and left the meeting at 7:52 p.m.

Item 23004-SUB: Le-Bon Acres

Cook presented the Staff Report to the Planning Commission and noted that a person can see where 69 Hwy & Metcalf Rd used to cut through the middle of this property. Once 69 Hwy was built old Metcalf was vacated and taken back under the ownership of the individual that owns all the adjoining properties. Planning & Zoning has been assisting the owner to go through a number of Lot Splits (LS), Boundary Line Adjustments (BLA), and Mergers trying to reorient these properties. The applicant hopes to sell lots for residential building sites and part of the request is for a subdivision plat on the Southeast side of the highway. Cook noted an error in the number of lots shown and that the AG District only allows for three (3) lots. Cook has had discussions with the applicant about removing lot 4 making this a three (3) subdivision. Cook stated the applicant has agreed to allow an extension and waiver of the time limitation to resolve issues with the plat, including getting blanket easement defined or removed.

Cook noted when he received the comments from Road & Bridge it was not noticed the roadbed width was only 18-feet wide. Cook stated that Metcalf, it is an old highway approximately 550-feet to the North.

Cook referred to his previous discussion on exceptions and road right-of-way there are a few requests that have been submitted where the right-of-way adjacent to the subdivisions does not meet the 80-foot right-of-way. Most of them do have roadbeds that meet, at least the 20-foot requirement. Cook request the Planning Commission's approval on the 80-foot exception should the request for this subdivision be approved.

Menefee stated this one seems to be similar to the last application the Planning Commission reviewed but this time we are looking at two (2) additional houses on the road. Menefee stated there are a lot of roads in Miami County with a lot more houses on them that are only 18-foot wide.

Cook noted looking at the subdivision plat the North line of lot 2 is about 550-feet from the old highway right-of-way.

Brockus asked if the owner of lot 1 would be able to split the lot later down the road.

Cook stated it would require a rezoning in order for that to take place. Cook noted there were two (2) mistakes during the application process. When Staff approached them and explained they would only be able to get 3-lots instead of 4-lots they were disappointed but willing to move forward with this. The second involved the roadbed only being 18-feet wide.

Philgreen stated there will be more development on this road in the future. Will any part of this application create problems with future development.

Cook stated this subdivision plat would include the dedication of additional right-of-way, but for now there will be an 18-foot wide road. In the future if someone does a subdivision plat they will need to upgrade the road.

Philgreen asked if we are putting the County in the position of a future applicant stating, "they didn't have to upgrade the road, so we don't need to upgrade the road".

Cook stated he believes the County will still have the right to require the upgrade of future developments.

Philgreen moved to approve 23004-SUB: Le-Bon Acres, noting there is a typo on the Staff Report showing 23005-SUB, but it should be 23004-SUB, as presented by Staff and with Staff's recommended Conditions striking Condition #3. Flake seconded. Menefee asked if there are any more questions or comments for Staff.

Broers stated she is probably a yes on this because it is permitted but fundamentally, this size of a lot in an AG District doesn't align with AG Preservation Broers. Broers doesn't believe this is AG Preservation it's just two (2) houses that have no connection to AG at all in a very agricultural area.

Cook stated he has some of the same concerns. Cook's asked if it is better to have three (3) 20-acre lots or better to split off two (2) smaller lots and keeping one (1) large lot which will be easy to use as AG.

Broers believes there needs to be more caution when allowing more and more houses. When it is done one application at a time a person says, "that seems to be ok", and before you know it there is a checkerboard of little pockets of development.

Cook stated if there is a quarter section of ground with roads on the East and West side, because it has frontage on two (2) sides, it would be allowed to have an exempt lot split splitting it into four (4) 40-acres lots. Since this was an exempt split each of the 40-acres would be allowed to be split into two (2) 20-acre lots. All of this is done administratively, and the Planning Commission isn't involved.

Flake asked Broers what she would do differently.

Broers stated that is the other tug for her. People want a regime, consistency, and predictability but the facts and circumstances of every application don't always allow for that. Broers doesn't believe there is really enough acreage with this for even a horse or hobby.

Menefee stated he agrees with everything Broers has said but there have been discussions if the County does 10 or 20-acre lots they don't get used for AG either.

Brown stated one (1) thing to consider is: most of the subdivision application the Planning Commission is seeing are from families wanting to live next to each other, but the regulations don't allow multiple houses on the same parcel. Allowing multiple houses on a parcel would allow for farming families/communities, this allows it stay AG.

Philgreen agrees with Brown's suggestion and believes it is a good thought. Philgreen is concerned about Miami County's definition of AG, he doesn't believe AG means a big field. Philgreen stated Miami County is on the South side of a very large growing City.

Manchester read from page 20 of the Comprehensive Plan, "development should be planned to minimize the number of new access points along County section line roads" and this is why it is desired to have internal roads for subdivisions. Manchester read another section of the Comprehensive Plan at the bottom of page 20, "Unless a land division is a true fractional division, the boundary of lots should strive to follow natural and existing manmade features".

Cook noted the boundary line between lots 2 and 3 there is a sort of drainage line that goes through that area and that is one of the reasons why the lots are little bit different. Typically, it would be required to have shared access points between lots but because of the drainage area it was allowed for separate access points.

Flake asked if the drainage was the determining factor in the shape of the lots.

Cook responded yes.

Menefee noted this property has an old highway running through it, which is not normal.

Cook stated this property was a mess.

Broers asked if using the old highway wasn't an option for these two (2) lots.

Cook stated the applicant would have to rededicate the road right-of-way and the road right-of-way would have needed to be brought up to the County's current standards.

Menefee called for a vote for the motion on the floor moved by Philgreen to approve 23004-SUB: Le-Bon Acres with recommended Conditions, striking Condition #3 and seconded by Flake. The vote passed 6 – 1, Manchester voted against, Armour abstained, via show of hands.

Armour returned to the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

Agenda Item 23005-SUB: Rascal Ridge

Cook stated he received a letter from the applicant requesting this item be tabled until the July 2023 meeting because the letter received from the Rural Water District specified they could not guarantee water was available for all of these lots.

Broers moved to table application 23005-SUB: Rascal Ridge until the Planning Commission Meeting on July 5, 2023; Armour seconded. The vote was unanimous (8-0) via a show of hands.

Agenda Item 23006-SUB: Crescent Hills Estate, 2nd Plat

Menefee opened the Case 23006-SUB: Crescent Hills Estate, 2nd Plat at 8:19 p.m.

Cook presented the Staff Report stating this is a replat in order to do a Boundary Line Adjustment for this property. The plat will allow a 5-acre lot to become a 10-acre lot, this request also has a blanket easement involved. Cook noted the blanket easement is listed in his comments as needing to be defined. Cook stated there is a blue line stream that runs through these two (2) lots. Cook stated as we go through the replating process his recommendation is to place the easement along the streamline. Cook believes there is a pond that will impact the easement as well. Cook stated he reached out to the pipeline companies because there are a number of pipelines that cross this property. No response was received from any of the pipeline companies.

Cook stated his recommendation for approval will be contingent on the Conditions provided in the Staff Report and the Conditions will need to be met prior to the application going to the Board of County Commissioners meeting.

Broers stated she recalls having this issue before when an applicant agreed to complete Conditions and did not complete them. Broers asked if Staff foresee this as being an issue.

Cook stated the Board of County Commission has requested no application be presented to them that is not complete so the applicant will have no choice but to address the Conditions before Staff presents it to the BOCC meeting. Cook stated the applicant is aware that there are still a few things needing corrected/completed on the final drawing.

Broers stated the Staff Report indicates we need the consent and extension of waiver of the time limitation from the applicant, and asked if the recommendation for conditional approval is made by the Planning Commission...

Cook stated he has the applicant's consent.

Menefee stated if recommendation for approval by the Planning Commission then Staff won't present this to the Board of County Commission (BOCC) until all conditions are met by the applicant.

Cook agreed and stated when he requested the waiver be completed by the applicant it was partially because of this concern. The Subdivision Regulations in the State Statutes states once the subdivision application is submitted the Planning Commission is required to act on it within 60-days following the first Planning Commission Meeting after it is submitted. If it is not acted on within the 60-days then it is automatically approved. Cook stated this is why he now advises the applicant(s) that he can make a recommendation for approval if the applicant is willing to sign a waiver of the time limitations or he will need to recommend a denial to the Planning Commission.

Brockus asked for a definition of "Blue Line Stream".

Cook explained to look at a USGS (U.S. Geological Survey) Quad Map there are some streams that are blue and some that are not. The regulations state if the stream is blue then there has to be an easement. Cook's understanding is that there is a certain drainage area required of blue line streams.

Philgreen asked if the Corp of Engineers would be involved with this.

Cook stated if it included wetlands or something the Corp of Engineers might get involved but not sure to what extent.

Broers stated there was a Supreme Court Case recently that says no.

Cook stated there was a Supreme Court Case around two (2) weeks ago that...

Broers stated wetlands that are not otherwise connected to navigable waters...

Cook stated there are wetlands that are more seasonally connected to waters that were being considered waters of the U.S. and they are now saying that has to be a more substantial connection in order for it to be...

Philgreen stated if there wasn't a pond there and they want to put a pond there would the County be able to approve that.

Cook stated because there's not a Floodplain, the County would not require any permits. They might have to get a permit from the State of Kansas Department of Water Resources.

Menefee believes the Planning Commission already established precedents when approving the other Subdivision Application with similar issues. Menefee stated since a similar plat was approved earlier tonight and since the Planning Commission has been talking about consistency then this application needs to be treated the same way.

Cook stated since this is already a platted subdivision, and no new lots are being created he has less concerns with approving this application then he had with the other application approved earlier.

Menefee stated on this application the primary concern should be the blanket easement.

Cook agreed.

Cook noted there are some subdivision applications that are already in process and asked if the Planning Commission is wanting to make changes are they wanting to make the changes prior to the next meeting or is it something they would like to say, "if the application was received prior to June 6th, we will consider it in a similar manner".

Menefee stated he wasn't suggesting they change it, but he isn't necessarily opposed to the change.

Cook recommended not changing until Staff can present at a Planning Commission meeting.

Brockus moved to approve 23006-SUB; Crescent Hills Estate, 2nd Plat with conditions provided by Staff, Philgreen seconded. The vote was unanimous 8 – 0 via show of hands.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Cook stated he has had conversations with the Board of County Commissioners in a Study Session last month regarding the Solar Farms Moratorium. The direction he was provided was to come back with a 24-month moratorium to allow focus and completion of the Comprehensive Plan and then to update the regulations.

Cook stated although Teresa Reeves is retired she has agreed to come back to work part-time to assist in the larger special projects Planning & Zoning has going on. Reeves will be limited in the time she can work.

Flake noted they talked about Staff picking the most restrictive regulations from the surrounding counties and presenting that to the Planning Commission for review.

Cook stated that is correct and he believes the main counties discussed so far have been Johnson County and Douglas County. Cook stated he has been looking through other counties regulations outside of Kansas to get more examples of regulations.

Philgreen stated he heard Lynn County is about to adopt Solar Farm Regulations.

Cook stated he has received emails from Lynn County regarding this.

Flake stated he believes the moratorium is a good idea, he doesn't believe Miami County is close to being ready to adopt a regulation for Solar Farms. Flake asked if there will be professional/legal consultation available to the Planning Commission once they move forward with this. Flake noted he knows of an engineering firm that all they do is this.

Cook stated he believes there has been discussion on that and the Planning Commission had given Reeves that direction when she was with Planning & Zoning as the Director. Cook stated there are surrounding counties that have already adopted solar farm regulation and used consultants to help develop their regulations. Staff would like to compare their regulations in an attempt to develop Miami County's Solar Farm Regulations. The expense in hiring a consultant has not been budgeted and we don't necessarily have the funding in the budget to hire a consultant.

Flake stated he doesn't see how the Planning Commission can move forward without professional/legal consultation available.

PLANNING COMMISSION TRAINING

Cook stated through his membership with American Planning Association there is a multi-part training series for Planning Commissioners. Cook showed a video about what is a Planning Commission and what is the Planning Commission's responsibilities. Staff and Planning Commission had a brief discussion about the video.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY STAFF / COMMISSIONERS

Cook stated Planning & Zoning has received Conditional Use Permits from Living Proof and Chris Cakes for the July 2023 meeting.

Cook stated he has received word that Always & Furever plans to restructure and submit a new application for a Conditional Use Permit in time for the August 2023 meeting. No application has been received as of this time.

Menefee stated a quorum is needed to hold a meeting and asked if any of the Commissioners will be gone on July 5, 2023. Armour stated he will not be present for the July 5, 2023, meeting.

Manchester stated the training reminded him of the last meeting, "Fair Hearing, the number of people is not criteria for a decision". Manchester stated he wants to go on record about something personal. He stated his County Commissioner called him after the last meeting because he received some complaints about some of the things Manchester said at the meeting. Manchester believes it kind of fits in with the training video Cook just presented. Manchester stated he ate too early in the day and the late meeting without anything to eat affected his blood sugar and the low blood sugar had an effect on his rambling. He apologized and advised the Planning Commission he will be sure to eat closer to the meeting time and have snacks available in case it is needed.

Menefee thanked everyone for covering for him last month.

Possible Future Amendments to Zoning and Subdivision Regulations

- A. Common Access Easement requirements
- B. Sign Regulations
- C. Telecommunications Regulations
- D. Height limits for radio, television, internet antennas and satellite dishes designed for individual residences.

There was no discussion regarding these "Possible Future Amendments" to the regulations.

Philgreen moved to adjourn the meeting, Broers seconded. The meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m. with a unanimous vote (8-0), via show of hands.

Approved this 11th day of July, 2023.


Casey d'Augereau, Secretary


John Menefee, Chair / Kelli Broers, Vice-Chair

Minutes written by Casey d'Augereau