

CORINNA TOWNSHIP  
MINUTES  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT / PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
April 12, 2016  
7:00 PM

Charlotte Quiggle called meeting to order at 7:00 PM on April 12, 2016

Board of Adjustment/Planning Commission Members Present: Larry Smith, Al Guck, Trish Taylor, Barry Schultz, Lee Parks, Dick Naaktgeboren, Charlotte Quiggle (chair), Ben Oleson (Zoning Administrator)

Absent: None

Others in Attendance: Diane Foster, John Kittok, Gretchen Kittok, Chuck Carlson, Glen & Vi Combs, Brian Paumen, Nick Pietsch, David Ransom, Sandra Ransom, Tom Neu, Cole Loewen, Jeff Steinhoff, Jackie Steinhoff

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda: Smith made a motion to approve the agenda. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearings

Preliminary plat application to re-plat and combine the existing outlot with an existing undeveloped lot within the "Cedar Creek" subdivision into one outlot to be owned in common by other landowners in the same subdivision.

Applicant: Clearwater River Watershed District

Property address: None

Sec/Twp/Range: 34-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206113002010

**Present:** Cole Loewen - Administrator with the CRWD

**Loewen:** As noted on application we are seeking a replat to merge a portion of the lot that was bought a few years ago the remaining portion of Outlot A that the district reached with the residence for a water quality improvement project. The project was going to be only on the lot that we purchased however as the plans changed they allowed us to have a portion on their Outlot A in exchange they would like our lot to be added to their outlot and made into one for a park. That was fine with the Watershed District as we try not to own land long term. The project was built and after a year of warranty it was deemed it was time to move forward with the plat process. Talked to Ben to get the paperwork done to get the replat done.

**Oleson:** This was originally platted as 5 lots with a common Outlot with a creek running through. All they are asking to do is merge Lot 1, Block 2 with Outlot A. It requires the replat since it would clarify the ownership and who had responsibility for the Outlot. There were a few conditions that the county put on that I think are still valid. I did have a call from MDOT asked for more detail, I believe the concern is that there is no access onto Hwy 55. The access will be on the township road. The only real issue is the soil from the excavation from the water quality work that was done and making sure it does not erode. Otherwise it meets all the requirements.

**Audience:** They built a berm and it backs water up into our yard. It was not supposed to do that. We are on the other side of the road.

**Loewen:** We have meet and discussed this it has been clarified, the water does mound about 1 ft more, however, the elevation of the driveway is higher. Any flooding issue may be the hydraulic system that cannot be handled by the culvert. We took cautions and did a post construction survey.

**Paumen:** I own the farm land on the south east of Illsley south of Hwy 55 by them damming up that water they put the outlet to my tile underwater. Creating one more foot of water my outlet are now under water. They should not be able to dam up water like that.

**Loewen:** That was checked again with the survey. Again due to the hydraulic system and the culvert cannot handle. One goes under Illsley Ave and I believe the other is a private culvert.

**Quiggle:** I believe that this has more to the township than with this board tonight.

**Naaktgeboren:** The property owners need to meet with CRWD to make sure it is taken care of. My question is what is going to happen with that pile of dirt?

**Loewen:** The pile of dirt will be owned by the property owners as they requested. It will be up them to take care of it. Our issues is to make sure it does not wash away. We had initially wanted to remove the soil, however, we were asked to leave it. We will be making sure that it does not erode and if it does we will be working with them. It was seeded but it did not work very well and we are looking at re-seeding.

**Smith:** How many yards do you think is in there?

**Loewen:** I'm thinking it is a couple hundred yards and that it could be a condition.

**Parks:** No issue with the re-platting just making sure the soil is taken care of.

**Taylor:** I do not have a problem with the re-platting just with the large pile of dirt and making sure we give them a time limit.

**Smith:** Do the property owners know what they want to do with it?

**Loewen:** I think moving to some fields and possibly in their yards.

**Schultz:** I have one more concern as to what you are going to with the property that is near Hwy 55. Are you going to allow trees to grow up?

**Loewen:** It will be owned by the property owners we will not be doing anything with it.

**Guck:** All property owners have access to the lot and use the lot?

**Loewen:** Yes

**Quiggle:** I am agreement that something needs to done with stock pile of dirt and then get graded and seeded to stabilize it with a time frame.

**Loewen:** Considering the property owners any extra month you can grant them for final stabilization would be appreciated. I understand the concern.

**Quiggle:** If you're going to get it vegetated and get growing early on but it needs to move.

**Taylor:** Do they know they are limited in the amount of soil they can move.

**Oleson:** They are not in shoreland district so they can be up to 500 cu yards.

**Taylor:** I feel that it has to be gone before the snow falls so you have time to seed it.

Smith made a motion to accept the Preliminary plat application to re-plat and combine the existing outlot with an existing undeveloped lot within the "Cedar Creek" subdivision into one outlot to be owned in common by other landowners in the same subdivision with the following conditions:

1. There shall be no direct access to Highway 55 for Outlot A;
2. Outlot A shall be common open space in accord with section 614.9 of the Corinna Township Zoning Ordinance, and the purpose of the open space shall be primarily to

preserve and enhance the natural character of the creek valley, protect the water quality in the creek and prevent development of the outlot;

3. The soil pile must be maintained in perpetuity such that it does not erode or become overgrown with weeds and must be removed by September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016, reseeded and brought back to natural habitat. Any excavation or use of the soil pile is subject to permitting requirements of the Township as a Land Alteration;
4. The following conditions related to the approval of the original Cedar Creek plat shall remain in effect and are not altered by this approval:
  - a. Lot 1, Block 3 shall be Restricted Lands in accords with section 614.10 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance and only one farm residence and no further non-farm development shall be allowed on this lot;
  - b. Due to the lot sizes, a side yard setback of 20 feet shall be allowed for principal uses on lots 1 through 5, Block 1, but a 50 foot setback shall be maintained on the rear property line, and there shall be no land alteration for any reason within the rear yard setback.

Taylor seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Variance to construct a 1750 sq ft attached garage/dwelling addition to the existing dwelling approx. 13.6 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) and 45.4 feet from Sugar Lake (min. 75 ft required).

Applicant: Jeff and Jackie Steinhoff

Property address: 10724 IMHOFF AVE NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 10-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206083000110

**Present:** Tom Neu; Jeff Steinhoff; Jackie Steinhoff

**Neu:** We started looking at this as they needed a little more room in the house and the only way to go is to the right hand side. The garage is lower so by moving that up and bringing it forward we could get a little more room. We did not realize that the existing garage is at an angle. At the lake side it is more than 15ft however, at the road side it is 13.6 from the side lot line so that is one of the requests. The other variance we do not want to encroach any closer to the lake than it already is. Instead of taking it down and build a new house we have a lot of issues with disturbing the lake sure so we thought it would be better to just add on. If we come any closer to the road we have issues with the septic.

**Oleson:** The variance is the side yard setback it meets it on one side of the garage now but not on the other corner. They will be taking this garage down so the question is can they shrink up to meet that set back or are you ok with the 13.6 which it is now. The lake set back is 45.4 and the minimum is 75ft. They do have calculations of the impervious/building coverage and they would be 14.4% on building coverage and right at the 25% on impervious cover. The sewer is designed and I talked with Bernie miller, he is trying to avoid the low area and he said that it was a little more difficult to find a spot and that is what preventing them from moving the addition back further. The primary question is the side yard setback and if you're ok with that and the lake setback having more structure within the setback. They could not meet the 75 foot set back even if they were to rebuild. Talked with Mr. Steinhoff on the phone, they are not doing any additional excavation it will stay the slop that it is.

Steinhoff: It will be a lookout wall at 3 – 3.5 ft. just like it currently shows, what is walk out now will be the same.

**Audience:** Diane Foster I have the property just south of them and I am full support of them moving forward with this. One other written comment in support of the variance.

**Parks:** I don't know that they can do much else with the set back from the lake so I am ok with the side yard and the lake.

**Taylor:** I would like to see them gain more on the side yard setback, however, I am not sure if they can do that.

**Neu:** We are looking at using the existing footings if we can just putting up new walls. So if we have to move it in we will have to do new footings.

**Smith:** If I am looking at the print that will be all garage on that side of the house.

**Neu:** That's all garage

**Smith:** I know it is a bit extra but I would like to see the side yard setback. I am ok with the lake setback since the house is already there.

**Schultz:** I'm ok with both.

**Guck:** I think you did your best to get that in there, not sure what else you can do.

**Neu:** It makes it tougher with some of the new building codes.

**Taylor:** What would it do to your pitch if you have to move it in?

**Neu:** Not too much, we will just have to shorten it up.

**Naaktgeboren:** I have no problem with either, but a compromise would be to jog in the garage where it ends now so that the new garage would be at 14.5ft so that you're not encroaching any further than you are now.

**Neu:** It would different but it could be done.

**Quiggle:** I'm the lonely person that has less of an issue with the side yard but have a bigger problem with the addition of the house close to the lake at 45 ft. I don't like that much house that close to lake or maybe not have two garage's and turn into living space.

**Neu:** That is why we did not want to make more walk out and putting gutters on the house with rain barrels.

**Quiggle:** That area of the lake used be more cattails and with wave action the shore line is going to get closer and closer to the house. So my concern is the future erosion.

Taylor made a motion to approve the Variance to construct a 1750 sq ft attached garage/dwelling addition to the existing dwelling 14.5 feet from a side lot line and 45.4 feet from Sugar Lake with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant directs all water from the roof of the dwelling/attached garage to the road side of the property in a manner which allows for maximum reasonable infiltration without negatively affecting the lake or neighboring properties. A plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. Building and impervious coverage on the lot must be compliant with the requirements of the Land Use Ordinance (15% max for buildings, 25% maximum for total impervious)
3. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have be stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences between any areas of disturbance (if there will be any) and the lake as well as to any neighboring properties which are downslope of the disturbed areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with

mulch, erosion control blankets, hydroseed or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.

Parks seconded the motion. Motion passed 4 to 1 with Quiggle voting against.

Variance to replace the crawlspace with a full basement and increase the roof pitch from 4/12 to 8/12 on an existing dwelling approx. 3.7 ft from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required). Variance to construct a 12' x 16' screen porch and 3'4" x 12' open deck approx. 70 ft from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required).

Applicant: Nick Pietsch

Property address: 10955 108TH ST NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 8-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206051001050

**Present:** Nick Pietsch

**Pietsch:** We bought a place on Clearwater Lake and would like to remodel it. We have some energy concerns with the home now. We would be adding a couple rows of block to make it higher it is 6.8 now and the trusses would be a vault ceiling. It would be demolished and rebuilt. The porch would be over the existing deck and the front entry would be added since there is no entry now.

**Oleson:** "Showed site plan" The dwelling is 3.7 ft from the side lot line right now and 22 ft on the other side. They will keep well and foundation. The variance is for the side yard setback and the creation of the basement and the vaulted ceiling it is considered an expansion. They have submitted a survey showing existing impervious coverage. They are over right now and they would not have any net increase. Lake setback is almost met, they are at 70ft from the existing deck and 73 to the proposed house. There is no issues in the flood plain.

**Audience:** None

**Taylor:** I know where the well is you really cannot move it over, have you looked at moving it back towards the road?

**Pietsch:** We would like to keep the same foundation.

**Taylor:** You are still over the impervious and with building new I would like to see that met.

**Pietsch:** We bought it that way. We are all for getting within the requirements and if we have to eliminate the impervious I am all for that.

**Taylor:** As long as you're building on the same foundation I'm ok with the side yard if we can get within the 25%.

**Smith:** I am with Trish on getting within the 25%. Why you went to the 8x12 pitch?

**Pietsch:** Just for the vault inside make it look more like a cabin.

**Smith:** There are a few house down the way that have a higher pitch, however, I would like to see a 6x12 pitch. It makes the neighbors dwarf.

**Pietsch:** There is a neighbor right next door that is a two story. I don't know that I would rebuild without the 8x12. Only getting 5-6 pitch to create the look

**Schultz:** I'm ok with the pitch I would like to see impervious at 25%

**Guck:** Same and back to Larry's on the pitch raising it up 2 courses neighboring house is a two story so I guess I'm ok with that.

**Pietsch:** Would still be under the neighbor's house.

**Naaktgeboren:** I would like the 25%, I have no problem with the roof pitch, the neighbor is 2 story.

**Parks:** Same

**Quiggle:** I know it's going to be taller but it's not right on the shore line; set back to the lake is almost met, ideally I would like to see the 75 ft set back but I can live it. I would like to see the 25% met.

Schultz made a motion to approve Variance to replace the crawlspace with a full basement and increase the roof pitch from 4/12 to 8/12 on an existing dwelling approx. 3.7 ft from a side lot line. Variance to construct a 12' x 16' screen porch and 3'4" x 12' open deck approx. 70 ft from Clearwater Lake with the following conditions:

1. That the impervious coverage on the lot be no greater than the maximum allowed 25%. This shall be confirmed with an as-built survey within 60 days of the variance approval.
2. The entryway addition must be at least 10 feet from any septic tank.
3. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have been stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences between any areas of disturbance (if there will be any) and the lake as well as to any neighboring properties which are downslope of the disturbed areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets, hydroseed or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.
4. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of rainwater from the lot prior to it flowing into the lake. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, or other acceptable best management practices. Once approved, the plan should be implemented at the time of construction or within a reasonable time period after construction is completed and maintained indefinitely.

Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Conditional use/Land Alteration to bring in approx. 150 cubic yards of material to fill around proposed dwelling expansion.

Applicant: Nick Pietsch

Property address: 10955 108TH ST NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 8-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206051001050

**Present:** Nick Pietsch

**Pietsch:** What we are looking at doing is we are bring in rock face block we would like to cover the exposed old block and will work with the neighbor to see if we can help him with water. He gets water that pools up and I thought we would work with him to see if there is something we can do together. If we need a retaining wall we can do that.

**Oleson:** The main concern would be if this is going to create any problems for the neighbors on either side.

**Pietsch:** We don't have any water sitting in our yard. We would like to level the lot out and put gutters in that could pipe back towards the road.

**Audience:** None

**Smith:** Looks good I would just say use as little as fill as possible and come up with a storm water management plan.

**Schultz:** I'm good.

**Guck:** Good.

**Naaktgeboren:** I question if you need that much fill. I would say on the 3ft side I wouldn't do anything. On the West side I would also be careful because it could slope over to their property. Road side I think you would be fine. I just don't think you need that much.

**Pietsch:** I'm not sure how much we need this is just a guess. I don't want to do anything that would affect the neighbors.

**Parks:** Good

**Quiggle:** I'm good, you will need a storm water management plan and make sure the water is staying on your property. I agree with what Dick is saying, you have so little land on the 3ft side and it is very limiting and would avoid if possible. Do we need a grading Plan?

**Oleson:** Depends what the board wants. This basically shows what the grade will be just not how much fill it will take.

**Pietsch:** Explained the grading information on the plan.

**Trish:** My Suggestion is use as little as possible and to not use a retaining wall.

**Naaktgeboren:** Personally what you're showing I would cut it in half.

**Taylor:** What if it's approved on the condition that they bring in a grading plan with the storm water management plan. I would like to know how much fill is going to be in there. I would like to know where the water is going to go.

**Quiggle:** I want to see what the topography is going to be at the end.

**Naaktgeboren:** I just feel we should keep the amount of fill less than 150 cu yards.

Board had discussion regarding if it should be tabled or if approve with conditions and should owner talk to neighbors or if it could be done administratively or if they limit it to less than 150 cu yards.

**Smith:** If it comes down to a number tonight I think we limit it to 75 cu yards.

Smith made a motion to approve Conditional use/Land Alteration to bring in approx. 75 cubic yards of material to fill around proposed dwelling expansion with the following:

1. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have been stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences between any areas of disturbance and the road and neighboring property to the west, seeding of all disturbed areas and installation of erosion control blankets as identified in the submitted erosion control plan, or as otherwise recommended by Wright County SWCD and/or approved by the Zoning Administrator.
2. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of runoff from the site prior to it flowing onto the township road and/or the neighboring property to the east. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, or other acceptable best management practices. Once approved, the plan should be implemented at the time of construction or within a reasonable time period after construction is completed.
3. The applicant shall submit a stormwater mitigation plan that identifies additional best management practices that could be taken to address stormwater containment that may be necessary if the fill were to negatively impact the neighboring property or the lake if the approved plan proves to be inadequate.
4. If, at any time within five years of the approval of the placement of the fill the Zoning Administrator determines, after consultation with the Wright County SWCD and the landowner, that significant erosion, drainage or other negative impacts from stormwater

runoff are occurring as a result of this project, the applicant shall implement best management practices sufficient to mitigate those negative impacts, whether or not such necessary practices were contained in the original or mitigation plan identified in #3 and 4 above. This may include the removal of fill placed during this process to restore an area for flow or detention of water.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Variance to construct a dwelling approx. 30 ft from a rear lot line (min. 50 ft required).

Applicant: John Kittok

Property address: 8372 STATE HWY 24 NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 20-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000202104

**Present:** John Kittok & Gretchen Kittok

**Kittok:** We would like to build in back of the lot and the set back from the rear is 50ft and we are asking to go 30ft. The side lot is on 15ft. This is the best spot to stay out of the wetland and away from the feedlot. We did have a survey done and he marked the 30 foot line and then one 70 ft - those were the stakes that you would have seen. If we go towards the wetland it drops off quite a bit with an 8 ft. slop. It puts the house in the wrong way on the survey, it should be turned. I wouldn't mind 15ft so that we can stay even further from the wet lands.

**Oleson:** They have a number of setbacks to meet one is the road, one is the feedlot which is 500ft and they have met that so they are not asking for that. So it does push them over to the side and it is getting close to the wetland even if there is not a setback for that.

**Kittok:** When Bernie came out and did the site plan he noted that it could work at 30ft however, 15ft would be better.

**Quiggle:** Is that something we could do at this meeting since it was not indicated in the notices?

**Oleson:** I he really wanted too I would say that no we could not without noticing it again. The risk is if we do not re notice someone could argue they did not receive notice.

**Quiggle** What constitutes the rear vs the side set back.

**Oleson:** The road is what determines that.

**Naaktgeboren:** What is the opportunity to build on the property the is to the back of this one

**Oleson:** It is a land locked piece of property right now with no entitlements.

**Naakgeboren:** What if you have Dougherty's sign off on them having a 15ft setback since he is the only party that it would affect.

**Oleson:** So you're indicating that you would approve the 30ft with the condition that they could go 15ft with Dougherty's approval.

**Naakgeboren:** Correct

**Audience: Ransom:** -We have been in here on this property before. The County Board of Commissioners and looked at the property and our property since it is next to the feed lot and my understanding was that they going to place a deed restriction on property indicating that the building site had to be by the highway. When the highway came through we had to move out feedlot and built a new milking parlor with the assurance that the only place the property could be built was near the road. So my question is how you can vacate a deed restriction that is recorded. The new home would be moving closer to our current set up.

**Oleson:** In the 2005 variance it talks that residence has to be at least 300ft to the feed lot. The feedlot is a county set back.

**Ransom:** What about the deed restriction? Wouldn't that be legally binding?

Discussion with Ransom & Board regarding where the current feedlot is and if there is or is not a deed restriction on the property. Oleson went back to the County meeting minutes and looked at the previous variance and nothing was indicated that a deed restriction was placed on the property.

**Smith:** What would the house impact that?

**Schultz** – well

**Smith**– 125ft from the feed lot

Quiggle made a motion to approve variance to construct a dwelling approx. 30 ft from a rear lot line with the stipulation should applicant receive a notarized letter from rear property owner that is agreeable to a 15ft rear lot line the board is ok with that. With the following conditions:

1. That the exiting abandoned home on the property shall not be converted to living space except as allowed by the Township Land use Ordinance or the Wright County Feedlot Ordinance. (Note: the only allowance for it being used as dwelling space in the land use ordinance is a guest cottage, which is limited to 750 sq ft in size and must not have a kitchen. The exiting building is 768 sq ft in size – 24' x 32'). Staff is checking with the County to determine if a guest cottage would need to meet the feedlot setback.
2. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have be stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences between any areas of disturbance (if there will be any) and the lake as well as to any neighboring properties which are downslope of the disturbed areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets, hydroseed or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.
3. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to ensure the stability of the slope leading to the wetland.

Smith seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Ordinance amendment to Corinna Township Subdivision Ordinance to clarify allowances for cul-de-sac design and when allowed during subdivision of property.

Applicant: Corinna Township

**Oleson:** Proposing changes that would clarify the definition to different shape cul-de-sac designs.

**Schultz:** The round ones are good but sometimes there are no room and you need to go with a hammerhead design.

**Smith:** With Rachel's they are going to do a T so that it does not affect the wetlands.

**Oleson:** Just to clarify when the board can approve along as it is acceptable to the township it can do that so that alternatives can be approved.

Schultz made a motion to approve Ordinance amendment to Corinna Township Subdivision Ordinance to clarify allowances for cul-de-sac design and when allowed during subdivision of property.

Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Ordinance amendments to Corinna Township Land Use Ordinance, amending Sections 302 (Definitions), 506 (Permits and Fees), 606.3 (Suburban Residential R-2/Accessory Uses), 704 (Screening and Fences), 724 (Sign Ordinance), and 761 (Wind Energy Conversion Systems) and adding a new Section 762 (Solar Energy Farms and Solar Energy Systems). The amendments are for the purpose of considering recent ordinance amendments made by Wright County regarding the minimum size building requiring a building permit, the maximum size accessory building in an R-2 zoning district, **allowing for electrified fencing for agricultural** uses and power safety covers for swimming pools, correcting references to various state laws or building codes, for amending Township sign regulations, to allow for solar energy farms and solar energy systems under certain conditions and for creating or amending definitions related to the above changes.

Applicant: Corinna Township

These are changes that the county has made and we are deciding if we are going make these changes too. Some of them we have to change. Electrified /barbwire are restricted in residential, however, if animals are permitted in residential then electrified can be used. Building code changed from 120ft to 200ft shed – they do not require 200ft or less. Do we want to do that or keep the 120ft, we could say we require a zoning permit for 120ft. Board feels that we may want to reduce it even lower to make sure they are not over building & impervious coverage. Oleson – we are going to create some confusion.  
Table until April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. 7pm

Smith made a motion to approve the March 9, 2016 meeting minutes. Taylor seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

#### Zoning Administrator's Report

Permits

Correspondence

Enforcement Actions

Findings of Fact – Previous PC/BOA Decisions

#### Other Business

Discussion - Erosion protection requirements and enforcement

Review of previously granted variance requests (if time allows)

Smith made a motion to adjourn. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously at 9:28pm.

Prepared by: Jean Just