

# EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

October 9, 2023

The East Bethel City Council met on October 9, 2023, at 7:00 p.m. for the regular City Council meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kevin Lewis Brian Mundle Bob DeRoche  
Tim Miller Jim Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator  
Eric Larson, City Attorney  
Aaron Berg, Community Development Director

## 1.0 Call to Order

The October 9, 2023, City Council meeting was called to order by Mayor Lewis at 7:00 p.m.

## 2.0 Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

## 3.0 Adopt Agenda

**DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to adopt tonight's agenda. Miller stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

## 4.0 Presentations and Public Hearings

### 4.0 A East Bethel Fire Relief Association – PERA Pension Presentation

Mr. Troy Lachinski indicated he had previously attended a Council meeting where he asked for the Council's permission to explore moving the East Bethel Firefighters Relief Association from a self-managed plan over to the State Volunteer Firefighter's Plan. He noted at the time, Council gave him permission to explore the different options which he has done.

Mr. Lachinski recommended they move forward with the State plan. He stated it was beneficial to the City to make sure they are able to recruit and retain the most talented firefighters and one of the ways they do that was through a pension plan. He summarized the pros and cons of the Firefighters Relief Association versus the State Volunteer Firefighter's plan.

Mr. Lachinski indicated the East Bethel Firefighters Relief Association consisted of all volunteers and it was meticulous and tedious. He noted nobody had a financial background and did not know how to invest and manage the funds. He stated they also paid their financial advisor in excess of \$10,000 per year. He noted they also had to go through several State audits, which also cost a lot of money. He indicated under the current plan, they assumed a 5 percent annual return on their investments and with the State plan they would assume a 6 percent annual return on their investments.

Mr. Lachinski believed for those reasons, now was the time to move to the State plan. He noted moving to the State plan would help them recruit and train firefighters who come from different cities because firefighters could move wherever they wanted to on the State plan and their years of service would move with them. He noted while he had originally not been in favor of the State plan, he now supported it and all of the objections he had in the past had been cleared up.

Davis pointed out that the Fire State aid the City received for this year would go away with the conversion to the State plan. Mr. Lachinski responded the plan would still get the money, but instead

of him receiving the money that he needed to then deposit, the money from the State would go directly to the State plan. He stated the \$14,000 the City paid to the Plan would go into the State plan also instead of into the Firefighters Relief Association plan.

Mr. Lachinski stated this was before the Council for approval at this meeting and there was some time sensitivity as they needed to have it approved by the Council to move forward by November 15. He indicated they could only join the plan on January 1 and the cut off to move forward was November 15.

**DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to adopt Resolution 2023-70, A Resolution Opting to Join the Statewide Volunteer Firefighter Plan. Smith stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Lewis stated thanks for all of your work on behalf of all your colleagues and the City Council and everybody. Mr. Lachinski stated firefighters appreciate the backing of the Council and it is very much appreciated. Lewis stated thank you.

#### **4.0 B Tobacco Violation Hearing – Hwy i65 Dollar General, Res.2023-66**

Davis stated that an employee at Dollar General #22023 on 1300 209<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE in East Bethel is reported to have sold tobacco products to a minor. As part of a compliance check by the Anoka County Sheriff's Department on August 2, 2023, Ms. Emma Bookwalter was approached by an underage individual and sold the tobacco products to the underage buyer in violation of City Code, Chapter 18, Article IV, Section 18-176, Prohibited Sales. A copy of the Sheriff's Report is included as Attachment #1.

Davis noted the City has provided the license holder the opportunity to be heard. Notice was provided to the store manager on September 12, 2023 of the compliance violation hearing scheduled for the September 25, 2023 City Council meeting.

Davis stated no representatives from Dollar General appeared at the September 25, 2023 Hearing. City Council tabled the hearing until October 9, 2023. On September 27, 2023, the store manager for Dollar General #22023 was re-notified of the hearing that was rescheduled for October 9, 2023.

Davis indicated City Council has several options with respect to administrative action. Any person, including an individual licensee, who sells any tobacco product to a person under the age of 21 years is subject to an administrative penalty. This is Dollar General #22023's first violation of the ordinance. For a first-time violation, the city may impose a civil fine of up to \$150.00. In addition, the City may also suspend the license for a period up to 20 days. The City may agree with the licensee to waive up to ten (10) days of suspension at a rate of two days for every eight hours of community service performed by the licensee's employee.

Davis recommended Council review the Resolution and make a determination of the appropriate penalties to be imposed. Staff is recommending Council conduct the hearing and provide staff with direction on the penalties to be administered with adoption of Resolution 2023-66.

Lewis opened the public hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Jessica Constable stated she was the Dollar General's store manager. She noted at the time of the incident she was on vacation and Ms. Bookwalter operated the store during her absence. She indicated Ms. Bookwalter was overwhelmed and exhausted and misread the ID. She believed it was an honest mistake and noted Ms. Bookwalter did card every person for tobacco sales. She asked for

forgiveness and stated that would not happen again. She stated Ms. Bookwalter is a great worker and is very dedicated to her job.

DeRoche thanked them for showing up at the meeting and noted everyone makes mistakes. He asked what kind of training they did. Ms. Constable responded they did computer-based learning training, which was up to 10 hours of training, depending on their position. She noted there were tobacco compliance training videos where they are told to card every customer no matter what their age was.

Emma Bookwalter stated she understood how important it was to check ID's, especially when it came to minors and it was never her intention to sell to a minor. She indicated she will do everything she can to prevent this from every happening again and will take more time in checking the ID's.

DeRoche stated he did not think this was an intentional act and he wanted to waive the penalties this time. He noted though if this happened again, the penalties would be doubled.

Miller believed they both sounded sincere and he also believed it was an honest mistake.

Smith thanked them for showing up at the meeting and also agreed this was an honest mistake.

Larson stated he heard that Council wanted to waive the administrative penalty with respect to DG Retail, LLC d/b/a Dollar General #22023.

Lewis closed the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

**DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to waive the administrative penalty with respect to DG Retail, LLC d/b/a Dollar General #22023, 1300 209<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, East Bethel, Minnesota. Miller stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

## 5.0 Public Forum

Derrick Lind and Lisa Hendrickson. Mr. Lind stated they were from a citizens advocate group called ASIC and they were pushing for election reform in Anoka County. He noted they were primarily focusing on the County level and they have been dealing directly with the County Board.

Mr. Lind stated the purpose of them being at the meeting was to introduce who they were and what they were trying to do.

Mr. Lind stated there were three main problems with the elections. He noted one problem was that they lived in a world where somebody was always going to try to cheat in elections; the second problem was that no electronic technology was totally secure; and, the third problem was that the current system was not transparent.

Mr. Lind summarized six things they were trying to get the County to do, which he handed out to the Council. He noted the way to solve this was to get it back to the local level.

## 6.0 Consent Agenda

~~Item A: Approve Bills~~

Item B: Approve Meeting Minutes September 25, 2023 City Council Meeting

~~Item C: Res. 2023-69, Setting Public Hearing Date: Delinquent Accounts - Utility~~

~~Item D: 2024 Anoka County Law Enforcement Contract~~

~~Item E: Liability Coverage Waiver Form~~

Item F: Pay Estimate No. 2 for the 183rd Surface Reconstruction Project

Item G: Final Payment for the 2022 Street Surface Improvement Project

Smith requested to pull Items A and C. Miller requested to pull Item A. Lewis requested to pull Items A, C, D, and E.

**DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to approve Consent Agenda Items B, F, and G. Smith stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

#### **6.0 A Approve Bills**

Smith asked with respect to the Fire Department pension, was that received from the State. Davis responded those were the fund they received and were passed through and paid to the Relief Association.

Smith inquired what the Fire Department charge to motor vehicle services was for. Davis responded those were pump tests for three different pumper trucks. Smith asked about the Verizon bill and inquired how many of those were given to the firefighters and how did that work. Davis responded it was for the firefighters pages that went to their phones.

Miller asked about the \$4,000 electric bill for the arena. Davis responded they start putting in the ice the first of September and this was the cost for the cooling of the ice. He noted the electric bills for the area would probably run around \$35,000 to \$40,000 a year. He noted as soon as it got cool outside, the cost would start to go down.

Miller inquired about the management fee cost for the ice arena. Davis responded that fee went up and down during the year, but it stayed within the yearly \$87,000 contract amount.

DeRoche inquired about the Connexus charge. Davis responded those were the siren costs for the electricity for the tornado warning sirens. He noted Connexus billed out each meter.

**DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to approve Item A of the Consent Agenda. Smith stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

#### **6.0 C Resolution 2023-69, Setting Public Hearing Date: Delinquent Accounts - Utility**

Smith asked if these delinquencies involved the water/sewer or was it just electricity and/or gas. Davis responded these were essentially water and sewer bills.

Smith asked how long did the residents have to take care of these bills before they were assessed. Davis responded this was done every year. He noted many balances were assessed this time of year so they could be put on taxes for the next year.

**Smith stated I'll make a motion to approve Item C of the Consent Agenda. Miller stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

#### **6.0 D 2024 Anoka County Law Enforcement Contract**

Lewis stated the reason he pulled this was to make come comments. He noted he had spoken with Commander Paul Lenzmeier and Lieutenant Derrick Peters recently and the number they gave him if they went from 36 hours per day of deputy sheriff to 32 hours a day with four hours of Community Service officers the cost impact would be \$80,000. He indicated he had also asked them if they had seen any impact on the increase of 14.5 percent pay rate and they said there had been a positive impact in terms of attracting and retaining qualified personnel. Lewis stated it was good news that it was having a positive effect. He indicated over the next few months some of the Mayors would be talking about this topic more and discussing options.

**Lewis stated I'll make a motion to approve Item D of the Consent Agenda. Mundle stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

#### **6.0 E Liability Coverage Waiver Form**

Lewis asked for an explanation of the waiver form. Davis responded this came from the League of Minnesota Cities and the City had handled it this way since 2011. He noted he had spoken with the City Attorney about this and Larson may want to also make comment.

DeRoche asked if this was an umbrella policy. Larson responded it was not. He explained the policies for Council. He noted generally the City has not waived the tort cap liability cap at \$1.5 million. He noted he had spoken with Mr. Davis earlier regarding this and he liked to have all of the protections possible, so it has not been waived.

**Lewis stated I'll make a motion to approve Item E of the Consent Agenda. Mundle stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

### **7.0 New Business. Commission, Association, and Task Force Reports**

#### **7.0 A Planning Commission**

##### **7.0 A.1 Variance Hearing: Driveway Entrance, 3<sup>rd</sup> St. and 195<sup>th</sup> Ave**

Berg stated this property is located in the City of Oak Grove abutting the Bear Hollow subdivision in a Rural Residential Zone of East Bethel. The property is approximately 40 acres and is located adjacent to the right of way on 3rd Street NE (PID #36-33-24-14-0001). The applicant is looking to subdivide the property to build two single family homes. The City of Oak Grove has advised the applicant that permission from the City of East Bethel would be required prior to moving forward with a subdivision application. Berg indicated the East Bethel City Code Appendix A- Section 42 -7. A (2) – Rural Residential Development regulations require a minimum lot width of 200 feet at the public right of way.

Berg noted the applicants parcel has a total of 105.88 feet of frontage on the 3rd Street NE right-of-way and he is requesting a variance to the standard of 200 feet of frontage to a reduction of 52.94 feet in order to subdivide the property allowing for two access points/ driveways through the East Bethel 3rd Street NE right-of-way to the parcel located in Oak Grove.

Berg stated Sec. 4 - 10. - Variances. To hear requests for variances from the literal provisions of the ordinance in instances where their strict enforcement would cause practical difficulties because of circumstances unique to the individual property under consideration, and to grant such variances only when it is demonstrated that such actions will be in keeping with the spirit and intent or the ordinance. "Practical difficulties," as used in connection with the granting of a variance, means that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by an official control; the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner; and the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.

Berg noted on September 26, 2023, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing. Eight residents of the Bear Hollow Subdivision attended and voiced their concerns about added traffic, driveway proximity, road repair and maintenance, tree clearing, utilization of city resources without the ability to collect tax revenue, and emergency response times. The applicant/owner was provided an opportunity to respond to the concerns. At the conclusion of the Public Hearing, the Planning

Commission made a findings of fact and recommendation to the City Council to deny the variance request as presented in Resolution 2023-68 B.

Berg requested the City Council review the variance request, consider the Planning Commission's formal recommendation, and approve or deny the variance as presented in Resolution 2023-68 A or 2023-68 B. Berg stated if the variance request is denied under Sec. 4, Sub. 10. I. Reapplication, no application for a variance for a particular use on a particular parcel shall be resubmitted for a period of one year from the date of denial of the previous application unless a decision to reconsider such matter is made by a majority vote of the full City Council. The applicant is requesting a reconsideration decision be made in order for him to reapply for a variance for a Front Lot Line reduction from 200 feet to 105.88 feet, for a single access point as appose to two in his current request.

Mundle requested clarification. He noted they had a variance request for two accesses. He asked if this was denied could the applicant reapply for a variance for one access within one year.

DeRoche stated he was at the Planning Commission meeting and he was surprised the applicant had not shown up at this meeting. He noted there were concerns from the neighbors including traffic headlights coming in and out going directly into their homes, along with if they gave him one entrance what would prevent the applicant as soon as they got inside the lot from splitting it off into two driveways. He stated he did not see the advantage of allowing the variance for the driveway on the street. He also noted the neighborhood had a concern about the wear and tear on the road.

Smith stated he was also at the Planning Commission meeting and he agreed with DeRoche. He noted the residents of East Bethel had a lot of legitimate concerns. He noted East Bethel did not benefit from this either. He indicated he agreed with what the residents had said.

DeRoche noted the applicant could come in from the backside, even though it would cost the applicant more money.

Mundle stated he was not in favor of the split and that was too much of a big stretch. He stated he was not in favor of granting the variance.

DeRoche asked if they had to give the applicant access. Mundle noted the applicant did have access on the parcel to the west.

Larson stated he did not see that the City had any obligation based on the facts before them to give the applicant access. He noted the Council could either affirm and agree with the denial, which was the Planning Commission's recommendation, or they could reverse it.

Miller noted the Planning Commission had voted unanimously to deny the request. He asked if the applicant had said anything about a reapplication. Berg responded that was not brought up to the applicant. He noted the applicant had called him the next day after the Planning Commission meeting and asked what his options were. He stated he informed the applicant that the City's Ordinance stated that he could not apply for 365 days unless the Council gave him permission to do so. He indicated the applicant wanted to run with the variance tonight and if the denial was confirmed, he then immediately wanted to request the Council's permission to reconsider so that he could apply for a variance for reduced access or reduced frontage.

DeRoche noted that even if the applicant applied for a different variance, the issues from the neighbors were still the same.

**DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to deny the variance request. Smith stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion?

Berg asked if the Council would be willing to allow the applicant to reapply for a variance for one access point. DeRoche responded that the applicant could reapply again, but his comments would not change.

Lewis stated he also wanted to get the Planning Commission's advice on this if the applicant reapplied again.

To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

#### **7.0 B Economic Development Authority**

None.

#### **7.0 C Park Commission**

None.

### **8.0 Department Reports**

#### **8.0 A Community Development**

None.

#### **8.0 B Engineer Report**

None.

#### **8.0 C City Attorney**

None

#### **8.0 D Finance**

None.

#### **8.0 E Public Works**

None.

#### **8.0 F Fire Department**

None.

#### **8.0 G City Administrator Report**

##### **8.0 G.1 Reserve Capacity Loan Amortization Proposal**

Davis stated the City of East Bethel entered into the Wastewater Service Rates and Sewer Service Charges Agreement with the Metropolitan Council in 2010. This agreement established an annual quota requirement and set a contract schedule for the Sewer Availability Connections/Charge (SAC). This quota increases at 17% per year to amortize the cost of the Met Council Wastewater Treatment Plant and effluent disposal system that serves the City of East Bethel.

Davis indicated the agreement created a Reserve Capacity Loan (RCL) that accumulates the unmet goals of the annual SAC quota over the 20-year term of the agreement.

Davis noted in 2013 and 2015, the City and Metropolitan Council (METC) executed amendments to the original agreement. The 2013 amendment allowed for a modification of SAC charges if the City could work out an agreement to connect Village Green to the City sewer system. The 2015 amendment approved a not to exceed cap of \$2,000,000 on the Reserve Capacity Loan. This amendment limits the City's liability to a maximum exposure for the loan repayment to \$2,000,000. Prior to this amendment the City could have faced a worst-case scenario of up to a \$19,000,000 debt obligation to the METC in 2032.

Davis stated the City of East Bethel did not meet the SAC quotas for fiscal years 2012 through 2018 and 2020 through 2022. Only In 2019, were equivalent connections made to the system which exceeded the SAC contract requirement for that year. The SAC contract requirement for 2023 is 208. As of 9/19/23 the City has secured 17 SAC units so the City is anticipating reaching the \$2 million cap at year end, which would initiate the repayment of this loan starting in 2024. The Reserve Capacity Loan balance is projected to increase to \$2,130,693 at the end of December 31, 2023.

Davis noted there is a loan amortization agreement with the MCES that was approved in the 2015 amendment that allows the City to select a term between 10 - 20 years for a payback period at a fixed interest rate of 2.73% to satisfy the debt. City Staff has provided an amortization schedule that would pay the loan off in 10 years and proposes an annual payment of \$231,241.76 (principal and interest). The City has earmarked the City Sewer Fund as the source of money to pay this loan and that payment was included in the approved 2024 Preliminary Budget.

Davis stated going forward with a ten-year amortization period (Attachment 2 to Council's packet), the development of the Elevage and Capstone projects will generate \$1,433,250 in residential connection charges, which will cover this payment over the next 6 years, assuming 75-unit charges are received per year. Davis noted the proposed Osborne project could generate an additional \$875,875 in residential charges which could pay the balance of the debt between years 7 -10 of the loan. This scenario would utilize the SAC revenue stream for these developments to pay back the loan, leaving the current balance of the City Sewer Fund untouched and available for system maintenance, operation, and improvement costs.

Lewis asked what the deadline was for approving this. Davis responded if staff could have a decision by the next Council meeting that would be good.

Lewis stated it was worth looking at the different scenarios and he found it useful if they could prepay the loans if they wanted to.

### **8.0 G.2 City Administrator Job Description**

Davis stated Mundle has requested that the job description for the City Administrator be added to the agenda for the October 9, 2023 council meeting. The current description was approved on January 24, 2022 replacing the one adopted in 2003. As their will be a change of personnel in this position, effective January 1, 2024, the Council may wish to review and update the job description.

Davis stated staff is seeking direction as to any updates to the City Administrator job description and any further directives as to the process of filling the position.

Lewis stated he had met with Jeziorski as he was the Deputy City Administrator to see if he would be interested in the City Administrator's position, but Jeziorski had no interest. However, Jeziorski stated he could fill in as the City Administrator until one was hired.

Mundle asked if the job description was accurate and current, when would they start advertising for the City Administrator's position. Lewis noted he had spoken with Larson about this and there was no State requirement for any method of advertising or publicly soliciting resumes.

Lewis stated he had identified somebody who seemed to meet all of the criteria extremely well, but he was keeping the name of that person confidential right now as that person was employed and they did not want it revealed. He stated at the appropriate time, this person could come before the Council, but he doubted they could possibly find someone better qualified for the job. He indicated he would reveal that person's information as soon as he could, but if it fell apart then

they could go back to the typical advertising, soliciting, and accepting applications. He noted they still had time as Jeziorski had agreed to function as the City Administrator until a new administrator was hired.

Mundle stated he believed they should advertise for the position. Lewis stated if they had someone who was extremely qualified it would not be fair to waste an applicant's time.

Mundle indicated they did not know who else was out there and if there was someone better. Lewis requested he be trusted on this one and he believed they would be pleasantly surprised. He indicated he would keep them all updated and as soon as he was able to reveal the information, he would.

## **9.0 – Other Items**

### **9.0 A Staff Report**

Davis stated he had no report.

### **9.0 B Council Reports**

Smith stated he understood they are not doing Work Meetings any longer. He stated he believed the Council should be receiving their packets on Wednesdays and not on Fridays. Davis noted a lot of that depended on what was going on and a lot of times they were waiting for consultants and other people to furnish staff the information. He indicated staff would try and get the packets out as soon as they could, but sometimes it was not possible to get them out on Wednesday.

Davis asked if it was helpful to the Council to get the agenda out early to see the topics. Lewis responded that was helpful. Davis stated staff could get the agenda out to Council on Wednesday, but the chances of getting the packets out on Wednesdays was slim, but they would do their best to get it out.

Lewis noted he wanted to get away from every month Council Work Meetings, but they might be necessary every so often.

Smith stated the Fire Department had an open house and had a good turnout. He requested the next open house not be held on a Council meeting night. Davis responded staff would check and noted the reason they were held on Mondays was due to fire training.

Miller stated he attended the Fire Department open house and everyone was enjoying themselves. He recommended residents attend future open houses to show support for the Fire Department.

### **9.0 C Other**

None.

### **9.0 D Closed Session**

#### **9.0 D.1 Purchase or Sale of Real Property – M.S. Section 13D.0 subd. 3(c); Discussion of Sale of City Properties: PIN 36-33-23-34-0002 and PIN 29-33-23-22-0002**

Larson stated thank you Mr. Mayor. For the benefit of the public, we'd note that at this time the Council's about to go into Closed Session to review M. S. Section 13D0 subd 3(c); discussion of sale of City properties.

This Closed Session will be tape recorded as required by Statute with that tape being maintained for a period of two years. The Council will come back into Open Session after having concluded its Closed Session and announce if there are any actions taken during the course of the Closed Session. With that being said, Mr. Mayor, I recommend that a motion be made to go into Closed Session for the purposes I've indicated.

*(Council moved into Closed Session.)*

*(Council reconvened Open Session.)*

Larson stated thank you Mr. Mayor. For the benefit of the public and for the record, we note the Council is back in Open Session after having concluded a Closed Session. The Closed Session was attended by the entire Council, City Administrator Davis and himself and with respect to the first property, Council direct staff to engage in an independent appraisal and upon obtaining the appraisal to inform the market that the property was on the market, approve the appraised amount, and then engage any willing and interest purchaser about the possibility of an actual negotiated purchase of that property.

Larson stated with respect to the second Closed Session item, Council directed staff to enter into negotiations with the adjacent property owner for the sale of that property from the City to those individuals with all costs with respect to that sale to be imposed upon the purchasers as well as any other reasonable sale items that staff felt was appropriate and when the purchase agreement was agreed to be done, to bring that purchase agreement to Council for their review, decision, and action.

#### **10.0 Adjourn**

**DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to adjourn. Mundle stated I'll second.** To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:02 PM.

Submitted by:

Kathy Altman

*TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*