

APPROVED MINUTES

MINUTES
Sherwood Planning Commission
November 18, 1982

In attendance at the meeting were Planning Commission Chairman Gene Stewart; Norma Borchers, Joe Galbreath, Ron Tobias, Diane Gothie, Norma Oyler, and Clarence Langer, Jr., members; and Todd Dugdale, City Administrator.

I. The minutes of the meeting of November 4, 1982, were read and corrected to include the list of Commission members in attendance at the meeting, as follows: Chairman Gene Stewart; Norma Borchers, Joe Galbreath, Ron Tobias, Diane Gothie, Norma Oyler, members; and Todd Dugdale, City Administrator. Joe Galbreath moved the minutes be approved as corrected, the motion was seconded and carried.

II. Todd Dugdale announced the completion of the Rock Creek sewer trunk and said there would be a formal dedication ceremony on Tuesday, November 23, at 10:00 a.m., at the pump station.

Mr. Dugdale said the Old Town revitalization process is continuing and that the consultant firm is completing the inventory phase and will have a formal presentation of their findings. After the inventory phase is completed the study will turn to determining the direction the Old Town portion of Sherwood should take economically.

Diane Gothie raised a question concerning the situation at the intersection of Oregon and Lincoln. Todd Dugdale responded that a request for a minor land partition would be on the December 2 Planning Commission agenda and would be before the Design Review Board on December 6 if accepted by the Commission.

III. Public Hearings - City Case No. PMA-82-04. A Planning Commission initiated request to amend the Plan Map to change 100 acres of land in the S. W. area from LDR (Low Density Residential) to LI (Light Industrial). (Remanded by City Council for further hearing and findings.)

Chairman Stewart asked that people giving testimony give their name, address and state whether they live within the UGB, on the UGB or outside the area altogether. A question was raised from the floor as to why information other than the name and address of a speaker was relevant. Chairman Stewart responded it was for general information. The hearing was opened by Chairman Stewart who requested that new testimony be presented and not go over testimony previously presented.

Proponent Testimony. Fred Anderson, Tigard, introduced himself as owner of 70-some acres in the controverted area and asked if testimony given at prior hearings would be incorporated into the record of the proceedings. Chairman Stewart responded that prior testimony was part of the record. Mr. Anderson presented two documents to the Commission for inclusion in the record: (1) Petition in Support of Redesignation from Low Density Residential to Light Industrial; and (2) Statement of Facts and Arguments in Favor of Redesignation from LDR to LI as Part of the Comprehensive Plan. He indicated that Dr. Merle Pennington and Dr. Harvey Baker were in attendance and with him own the former Edstrom property (west of the railroad to the Middleton Road), and that his brother, Nels Anderson, was in attendance and owns the piece between the Middleton Road and the old highway. Mr. Anderson said the Statement presented to the Commission was inclusive of his testimony and that he would read portions of it to give those with opposing views the opportunity to know what it says. Mr. Anderson indicated that the area owned by Walt Hitchcock (east of the railroad) was included in the Statement. Mr. Anderson read from the Statement with the following commentary: that the proposal to designate the area for LI originated in the Planning Department of Washington County and was not his idea; that Richard Meyer, County planner, had confirmed at the previous Commission hearing that the proposed area was the only large, undeveloped area meeting the required criteria (as professed by members of the County planning staff) in the Sherwood UGB; that included in the Statement were goals and guidelines as outlined in Part II of the City of Sherwood Community Development Plan; that no mention had been made previously for the record that all developments, other than residential, require approval of the Design Review Board and the Statement contained excerpts from Part III of the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan pertaining to such approval. Mr. Anderson closed his testimony saying he did not know what the future of Sherwood holds, but that taking everything into consideration it is more probable if the area is made into light industrial, there would be more controls, more benefit to the community, provide more opportunities for the tax base problems and otherwise make it a better area than if somebody were to buy it and stack 500 or more houses or apartments there; that he would not be putting anything in his pocket by reason of the proposal and that he and the other two owners had bought the property in 1965, paid their taxes every year and that no one gave him anything at any time; that the proposal should be looked at realistically and that in answer to the argument of how families and children in the area might be adversely affected that children were growing up at such a rapid pace they might well be long gone before there is a problem in the area.

Ron Tobias said he was having trouble reading the signatures on the Statement and asked for clarification. Mr. Anderson said it was signed by Merle Pennington, Fred A. Anderson, Nels O. Anderson and Harvey W. Baker. Mr. Tobias further asked if Fred Anderson was speaking for the people who had signed the Petition; Mr. Anderson responded that he had prepared the Petition but that he was speaking only for the people signing the Statement.

Fred Anderson said that Nels Anderson had taken the Petition around to be signed because last time they were confronted with the proposition that there were 200 signatures on a Petition and from his experience you could take any piece of paper and go out on a street corner and get any number of people to sign it. Mr. Tobias asked if the two documents were related and Mr. Anderson responded that one was a Petition signed by a number of people and one a Statement that was a presentation of the owners.

Walt Hitchcock, Route 3, Box 209, introduced himself as a property owner within the Sherwood UGB and within the area under consideration and that he lived just outside the area. He first addressed what constitutes light industrial: It is not smoke stacks and big factories billowing out fumes -- it is what the newspaper and all the economic development specialists in the state of Oregon say is what we're after. It is electronics, non-polluting and is generally employment intensive; it lives frequently in the new industrial parks which are landscaped, well maintained, well policed, clean, odor free, etc., very much like a neighborhood. He said that no development, however, without the applications of standards, design review and a strong review process as it is occurring will necessarily be pleasing and esthetically attractive. He said the protection is design review. He said it bears repeating that the reason that the issue was proposed at all is the ability of the City of Sherwood to provide urban level services and to be able to pay for them. It is the aggregate assessed value available within the City and thus the resulting tax burden for providing services that is placed upon each individual citizen within the City; typically the assessed value for industrial land is dramatically higher than for residential; typically industrial users are not consumers of significant services, such as libraries, sewer and schools; urban services are largely used by residential people--they consume more tax money than they pay. In the absence of the balance of high value commercial and industrial land to offset the financial drain of residential you get tax rates going up, service levels going down, bond issues being defeated and the future vitality of the City's growth constrained because there is no money and no way to get money. This results in inadequate police services, unmaintained roads and the inability of the water system to handle major fires. Mr. Hitchcock further questioned whether Sherwood would become, or remain, a bedroom community of Portland, or would maintain its own identity as a stand-alone community, a focal point for the area around it. He said on the matter of location he would defer to the findings of Washington County and the City of Sherwood staff. He said that the Commission action must be based upon fact and not upon attitude or emotion; that the State of Oregon and the LCDC has directed that the land inside the UGB will be developed in terms of density; and that the issue is not development versus no development, but what will go there. He said he believes it essential that Sherwood have more higher value land use regardless of where it is located; he said the Commission decision represents a commitment to the future of the City and stressed that representation of the citizens within the UGB that are paying for services that those living outside the boundary are consuming must be made.

He further stated that leadership is required in order to make a decision on behalf of the whole community; that vocal minority opposition is typical whenever land is being converted from residential use to higher value land use; and that the decision must be based upon the needs of Sherwood and on behalf of those that will be paying for the expansion and the continued use of Sherwood by those outside the urban growth boundary. He encouraged a finding of more industrial land inside the UGB and designation as such and that the proposed area, in this particular case, is the best land for that purpose within the UGB.

Diane Gothie had a question for Mr. Hitchcock. She said that she recalled when the plans were being made up in the 1970's that Mr. Hitchcock was "jumping up and down and screaming" that he did not want industrial land within his area and asked what changed his mind. He responded that he was not jumping up and down and screaming, but had said that he didn't believe it fit in the general area and continues to have that belief. A comment from the floor indicated he had changed his mind because he had moved. He said again he did not feel that industrial land fits that well in the area but that since work on the comprehensive plan had started that Tualatin has managed to gobble up all of Sherwood's natural industrial land and the proposed area is the best place that is left. There was some discussion concerning Tualatin's acquisition of natural industrial land from Sherwood.

Nels Anderson was the next proponent speaker and said he lives within the city growth area and said that he was well acquainted with the Middleton area having graduated from the Middleton School, having used the Middleton depot as a transfer point when he was going to Newberg High School, and that he had paid for his own education with the benefit of board, lodging and farm work by his parents. He said he did not circulate the Petition that Fred Anderson, his brother, thought he had passed around, but that he was lazy and had an able daughter do it for him. He said he believed in using his children when he can, it's good for them to work, doesn't tire him out so much and enables him to carry the weight that he does.

Chairman Stewart read into the record a letter signed by Chuck Kennerly, Route 5, Box 58, dated November 18, 1982, containing Mr. Kennerly's reasons why he feels the land should be designated light industrial.

Chairman Stewart called for opponent testimony.

Opponent Testimony. Sally Howard, Route 5, Box 85, said she represented the close to 200 neighbors of the proposed area listed on the Petition received by the Commission about a month ago. She said there had been a neighborhood meeting on November 15 at the Legion Hall because they thought it important to visit together as neighbors in light of research they had done in the past three weeks and to examine the possible impact of the industrial area as outlined by Todd Dugdale and the possible impact of a residential development, also outlined by

Mr. Dugdale. She said they also had met with some major developers that have done both industrial and residential developing and discussed their findings and feelings. She said they understood that Washington County and the LCDC have still not come to grips with the future of this area and asked Todd Dugdale if the urban growth boundary has been adopted as part of Sherwood's comprehensive plan. Mr. Dugdale said the UGB has been adopted by Metro and that has been submitted to LCDC and formally acknowledged. There was some discussion concerning terminology and Mr. Dugdale explained that the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan sent to LCDC has been acknowledged only for the area within the city limits and the area between the city limits and the UGB has not been acknowledged. Sally Howard stated their group had a question as to whether it might not be a cart before the horse matter if the UGB has not been formally adopted by LCDC. She went on to say that their group recognizes the fact that the area will grow, she said they are not a zero growth group and that they know that realistically it won't remain wide open space or be designated as 5 or 10 acre residential parcels. She said she and her husband have lived out there 14 years and many of the people they know have lived there from 7 to 10 years. She said she and her husband knew when they moved there that although much of the area was zoned 5 to 10 acres, that zoning in the area in question was for low density residential and that when economic conditions permitted the land would be developed. She said the group is concerned about the residential investment that has been made in the last 10 to 15 years; that there are new, \$100,000 homes; homes put on the hillside that look down directly into the area that would be impacted by a light industrial situation. She said they question the capability of the City to meet the costs incurred to support such an area. She said they understand that Wilsonville Road will be a main arterial and expanded, but they feel that an industrial situation would be more appropriately located on the other side of town, closer to I-5 and closer to the services light industrial users would need. She said they consulted with two major developers who assured them the chances of attracting a large company into the area were slim for two reasons: they doubted that 120 acres was enough land to attract a large company and that more likely small companies would go in there and that there was the possibility of their running night shifts. She said they have been told Sherwood does not have adequate water to service such an area. She said she wanted to point out that they were outside of the voting area and that at times the people in that area feel very helpless because they can't vote for the people that seem to have a yea or nay say over them and that it bothers them alot. She said when this was being considered that most of them didn't know about it and had not been notified; that the law had been met, but that people adjacent to the railroad tracks that run through the property were not notified and that the mere space the tracks took up satisfied the notice requirements and said that bothers them quite a bit. She stated that they, as a group, would like it to remain residential with the full understanding that homes will eventually go into the area; that it could be in several different ways, such as, common areas with homes or condominiums, that would satisfy the density requirements. She said they would like to propose that Sherwood is without a "higher economic residential neighborhood," i.e., not 5 to 10 acres on the hills, but areas on the flats with common parks and development of some type. She said they are not

saying, "hurray, let's get that in tomorrow," but that they are realistic and that it's going to go one of two ways and at this point they are saying, "please, give us a say as far as our own area goes." She said that they have investments in that area and that once an industrial area goes in it makes it easier for more to go in, i.e., the Cereghino property that was just annexed to industrial on the argument that it abutted an industrial area and the 30 acres could just be added on.

Norma Oyler asked Sally Howard if she was speaking for all the 200 people that signed their Petition; Sally responded that she was speaking for about 90% of those people and at the meeting there were about 10% or less that said they were on the fence. She said they saw problems with it going either way, but that it had to be approached realistically and about 10% abstained from the vote. Norma Oyler asked if all 200 people were involved in the meeting; Sally Howard responded that about 50% attended.

Ron Tobias said that the main thrust of the group's argument seemed to be that the change to light industrial would create a situation that would be incompatible with the existing structures in the area. Sally Howard responded that they feel that and that a greater number of people would be impacted than is realized; that many of the people involved do not abutt the property and that the Petition represented people living perhaps a mile in all directions from the site -- she said at the City Council meeting it was mentioned that the Petition covered too much area and another person mentioned that input from a greater area was desirable. She said they turned down many signatures of people that did not live in the area so the Petition would represent the area in question.

Ron Tobias again mentioned the matter of incompatibility and read Policy 1 from Sherwood's industrial land use policy in the Comprehensive Plan regarding compatibility of industrial uses with adjoining uses.

Chairman Stewart asked a question regarding impacting property value and cited the Street of Dreams being across from an industrial park and said he didn't see how the value of the land would be lowered. Sally Howard responded that she went to see the Street of Dreams and remarked at the time that she wouldn't buy there simply because of what she had to drive through to get there. She said that while they knew many homes had sold there, that as a neighborhood group that it would have an adverse impact and that new residential construction would not take place because of the direction it was going. She mentioned that she had not seen any new homes constructed in that section of Sherwood for 8 or 9 years; people saw the way it was going, held onto their land for industrial reasons; and that there are several new homes on the hill overlooking the area and their view would be down on the light industrial park and that it's simply not compatible. Norma Oyler asked if Doroti Ridge and April Meadows would be overlooking the industrial land at Cipole; it was confirmed that they would; Ron Tobias said that because some situations are not perfect we don't have to continue to accept the same type of situations.

Jack Peterson, Route 5, Box 62A, introduced himself and said that unlike some of the proponent speakers he not only owns property in the area, he lives there. He said he wanted to speak to the following facts: that the plan map shows the area to be low density residential and that there must have been some thought that went into that process and now we are looking at a new concept; that he bought the 2 acres he has in 1975, it was zoned residential and he paid taxes on it as residential property and that adjoining agricultural land now being considered for LI pays much less tax than he does; that the LI area may look good from the outside if we're lucky enough to have a fine arts graphics development, which we won't have, but that he doubts that they're going to haul away whatever they build in light trucks; and that one of the reasons the development is being considered is because it is accessible the train tracks and he doubts they will be light trains. He said they have been told that when the development gets going there will be a design review board and that the people on the Design Review Board would have some very definite self interests; that they will be the people developing in that area and will go with whatever is expedient at the time and the rest of the people will not have that much input. Once industrial use is started it will grow. He said he works for Tektronics, that he works very closely with the corporate real estate group, that Tek owns about 700 acres in Oregon and they wouldn't be buying any property in this area. He spoke to Mr. Hitchcock's concern that Sherwood maintain its identity and said his concern was that people in the affected area be allowed to maintain their own identity. His last point was a reference to the election that took place and said it was a very real signal to the Planning Commission and City Council that there is opposition to what is going on.

Ron Tobias commented that he didn't think Mr. Peterson had fairly described the Design Review Board; that they were the watch dogs of the community and they don't represent self interests, but represent the City and do a good job of making sure that the concepts are followed that are in operation.

Mary Tobias, 435 S. E. Roy, said she lives within the City limits. She asked a question in response to Fred Anderson's testimony concerning whether the proposal was brought up by Washington County or originated within the City of Sherwood; that the zoning is LDR on the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan, so who initiated it. Joe Galbreath responded with an article from the Tigard Times which said that the Washington County Planning Department initiated the proposed rezoning. Ron Tobias said that the Community Development Code states quite clearly that a change may be initiated by the City Council, the Planning Commission, a property owner or an authorized agent; that in going through the minutes of the Commission he had become confused because they seem to indicate the Commission initiated it and he couldn't answer the question because he's not sure they did. Todd Dugdale said that the County is involved in a process that will lead to the development of a land use plan theory between Sherwood city limits and the Sherwood UGB; that it is their responsibility to plan for this area and designate future land uses for the area; but it is clearly not their responsibility to direct the planning jurisdiction of Sherwood. He said the County process began formally with a series of three Townhall Meetings hosted by the County; he said

that for at least one of the meetings the City took it upon itself to direct mail notices to certain persons directly affected by an issue that was raised in the initial round of meetings; the City did not raise the issue in public hearing and that he could not say who raised the issue but that it would be in the County records of testimony presented at the Townhall Meetings. In response to the issue raised at the meeting, the County contacted the City asking what the City's plan shows for meeting the need for additional industrial use and what the City's input is on the issue. The County asked what process the County and City could enter into cooperatively so that the Board of County Commissioners can make an informed decision based on the findings. Mr. Dugdale said at that time he suggested that they cooperatively conduct a series of hearings to determine the need for additional industrial land, to investigate what the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan says about the issue, and to allow affected property owners to express their opinions at the local level. Mr. Dugdale recalled that there wasn't oral testimony at the initial Townhall Meeting but there was an opportunity for those present and those not present to submit written suggestions as to ideas and positions concerning what was appropriate land use in the Sherwood/Tualatin unincorporated area. He said that the City of Sherwood, through its staff, did not officially submit testimony. Mr. Dugdale said that when the County came to the City and requested input concerning this matter he brought it before the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission acted to initiate the process of amending the plan from LDR to LI with the knowledge that it would be an advisory action only. Ron Tobias asked if Mary Tobias had gotten the answer that this was a Planning Commission initiated change in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Dugdale confirmed it was initiated by the Commission. There was further discussion concerning the County/City processes.

Mary Tobias asked a further question concerning the testimony read by Fred Anderson from the Statement presented to the Commission regarding whether the statistics he referred to proposed total industrial versus total residential area already zoned into the existing plan, or did he refer to existing mixes. Joe Galbreath responded by reading from the minutes of October 15, statistics provided by Todd Dugdale, that the City's goal is 60% to 40% and the current ratio is 80% to 20%. It was confirmed that when the zoning is total there will only be 20% industrial and commercial zoning in the Comprehensive Plan for Sherwood. If the proposed area is changed to LI the ratio will change to 74% to 26%; the ideal ratio is 60% to 40%.

Mary Tobias responded to the statement made by Walt Hitchcock that whatever is decided by the County is what we're going to have to live with and she recalled that the County planner indicated that the County anticipates having to redo their Comprehensive Plan by the year 2000. She said that no one expects that there will be no development, but the City is under an obligation to zone according to the wishes of a majority of the citizenry. She said Mr. Hitchcock had stated it was a vocal minority but that it seemed to her the terms were turned around in this case.

Mrs. Tobias said that speaking as a private citizen of Sherwood she thinks the area is a really lousy place for industrial development and thinks that it is not in the best interest of the City to put industrial where it is totally divorced from all other industrial development, where it is in the middle of agricultural and residential land and that the logical place for industrial is out on 99 where you have immediate access to the trucking industry.

Mrs. Paul Garstka, 24575 S. W. Ladd Hill Road, introduced herself and said that she and her sister-in-law, Kayron Garstka, had gone to see Richard Meyer, County planner, and he had said that the County is on the fence regarding development of the area and that the County would take the direction the City gave them. She said she didn't see how it could be said that the County brought the issue up. Ron Tobias said that that was exactly what he told the City Council at the Council hearing on the matter. Chairman Stewart said that they were on the fence on how they're going to draw it in, but that the proposal was brought up at one of the County Townhall Meetings. There was a request from the floor for information on the meetings so the record could be examined as to where the proposal came from and Chairman Stewart suggested that either Larry Sbart or Richard Meyer be contacted at the County for information. Todd Dugdale commented that because the Planning Commission acted to initiate the process it did not prejudice their feelings as to the outcome. and explained further the reasons for the hearing process at the local level.

A question was raised from the floor as to why the property between Middleton Road and 99W was included as it is not open area and has houses on it. Chairman Stewart explained City probably won't give their decision to the County by December 1 and the County is to make their presentation to the County Commissioners on December 7 and will probably propose that said property be left out of the LI area. There was further discussion concerning the County deadline and planning process.

A question came from the floor that if the area is changed to LI what is the density of light industry, how many businesses can be put on that acreage. Chairman Stewart responded that there are certain setbacks, 40' setbacks from all residences, height limits, have to qualify for light industrial and Todd Dugdale further explained the zoning requirements and said there is a standard lot coverage of 60% (a limitation on how much property can be covered by buildings).

Ted Swenson, Route 5, said he lives across the street on Wilsonville Road from the proposed area and is a property owner. He said he had just come from a meeting in Hillsboro, hadn't heard the previous testimony and his first question was who initiated the proposal. He also questioned the 80% residential to 20% industrial ratio and wanted to know if the 80% included commercial with residential; it was confirmed again that the 20% figure includes industrial and commercial. Mr. Swenson further spoke on sound problems and regardless of buffering, sound travels.

Mr. Swenson said that other than money talking he didn't know why the area had been proposed for LI. He said that if the railroad is so desirable why don't they zone 500 yards on each side of the railroad so industry would be where it belongs. He said he really doesn't understand the whole argument, other than who, and someone must have, dropped the word industrial into the County's ear. He said he opposes it.

Norma Oyler asked Fred Anderson that if the area is zoned LI would he and the other owners sell to the first buyer or would they give some consideration to approving yourself for protection of the people. Mr. Anderson responded that it was a difficult question to answer; that they are not developers; and that the reason they bought the property in the first place was because he used to fly quite a bit and so did one of his partners and they had in mind an airstrip with the takeoff point at the SW-most corner. He said what they would sell it for or when they would sell it he couldn't say because it was vague and indefinite; he said give us an offer that makes sense and we'll take it. Norma Oyler further asked if they would give the City time to find an appropriate industrial buyer. Mr. Anderson responded if they have one in mind or find one, send him around, but that it would be abstruse to suggest that; that he dislikes admitting it but he's 72 years old and doesn't intend to get any benefit out of this himself at all; and that he doesn't like the implication from anyone that he talked to the County, he has not talked to the County at all, that he was asked to come to the CPO5 meeting with Merle Pennington, they gave no testimony at all and he was told by Richard Meyer that it originated in the County. He said further that if anyone wants an option on the property so they can predispose it for certain uses, that's fine, but he can't say whatever it's sold for, even if it is earlier value is residential, and that he just doesn't know and you might have to ask his children and grandchildren by that time.

Joe Galbreath asked Sally Howard about the impact on the schools and how her group would feel about it if they put in 500 homes, which would be the equivalent of another school, and in view of the bond issues voted down in this district for schools would her 200 members be willing to go out and work for bond issues to put in two more schools. She responded that she's a teacher and that "you'd better believe I would." She said that she thought they could count on the fact that when the population moves in and the true needs in the schools arise the community will rise to it. Mr. Galbreath said his concern was the people out in the school district that will have to support the schools and if they will be able to afford to keep their property. Discussion was held concerning the school district and availability of other land for industrial use.

The hearing was closed.

Diane Gothie made a motion that the Commission not accept the change of the property from LDR to LI; Ron Tobias seconded the motion, a question was called for and the aye vote taken. Todd Dugdale suggested that the Commission briefly state the findings or have the staff develop the findings so the motion is more specific. Diane Gothie withdrew her motion. Ron Tobias made a

motion that the Sherwood Planning Commission revoke and rescind all previously passed motions and recommendations as to Sherwood City Case No. PMA-82-04, i.e., an amendment to the Plan Map to change 100 acres of land in the S.W. area from Low Density Residential to Light Industrial, after due consideration of conformity to map and text portions of the Comprehensive Plan which are not being considered for amendment, the public interest and how it is best served or not served by this proposed amendment, the suitability of the area for the particular proposed use, the land uses and improvements in the area, the trends in land development, the density of the development, property value, the needs of economic enterprise in the future development of the area, transportation access, natural resources and the public need for healthful, safe and esthetic surrounding conditions; Mr. Tobias said he would also point out to the County that the policy goal of our land use plan is to create a balanced, livable urban environment where people may live, work, play and shop and to locate land uses so as to minimize the adverse effect of one use on another and that he, Mr. Tobias, does not feel that the proposed change accomplishes this goal; and that Policy 1 of our industrial land use policy as set forth in our Comprehensive Plan states: "Industrial uses will be located in areas where they will be compatible with adjoining uses and where necessary services and natural amenities are favorable."; and that such proposed change violates this compatibility and, therefore, as such Mr. Tobias makes the motion and moves that the Sherwood Planning Commission deny the requested amendment. Diane Gothie seconded the motion, a roll call vote was called for: Joe Galbreath, nay; Norma Borchers, nay; Norma Oyler, nay; Diane Gothie, aye; Ron Tobias, aye; Clarence Langer, nay; Gene Stewart, nay. The motion failed.

The meeting was recessed. The meeting was called back to order. It was moved by Joe Galbreath to postpone the rest of the agenda to the next meeting, the motion was seconded and carried.

The meeting was adjourned.