



VILLAGE OF PALATINE

VILLAGE HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBERS 200 E. WOOD STREET
PALATINE, IL 60067-5339 – (847) 359-9050
<http://www.palatine.il.us>

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES • MAY 8, 2018

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Brent Larson	Commissioner	Absent	
Cindy Roth-Wurster	Commissioner	Present	
Jan Wood	Commissioner	Present	
Jerry Luszczak	Commissioner	Present	
Theodore McGinn	Commissioner	Present	
Kevin Cavanaugh	Commissioner	Remote	
James Dittrich	Commissioner	Present	
John Pirog	Commissioner	Present	

Staff present: Ms. Lyn Bremanis

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Zoning Board of Appeals - Regular Meeting - Apr 24, 2018 7:00 PM

Mr. Luszczak made a motion to approve the minutes of April 24, 2018; seconded by Mr. Dittrich.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 630 S Stegen Street

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on April 23, 2018 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application for Special Use
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Subdivision
4. Site Plan
5. Elevations
6. Public Notice
7. Objector's Letter - Cronin

Sworn in Staff- Ms. Lyn Bremanis

Sworn in petitioner: Mr. Greg Rose KF Walter 21 N Brockway Palatine, IL

Mr. Rose gave a brief background of the request. He stated the subdivision is a PUD that was done last year. He stated most homes have been sold. He explained the buyer for this slot wants to put a porch on the home. Mr. Rose spoke to the issues they face with the monotony code. He stated they have sold 9 of the lots and are trying to ensure they meet the monotony code which requires some lots to have porches and some without. He pointed out the porch would be nice for the client and with monotony code. Mr. Rose stated he is required to work within the monotony code to ensure variation within the community. He spoke to the front setback being 30ft. and explained he is asking for approx. 3ft. of encroachment. He pointed out the home is similar to others in the subdivision and feels it will blend in perfectly.

Mr. Pirog asked if the buyer would want to reduce the size of the home by 3ft.

Mr. Rose explained they have a 50ft depth that we are using for these homes and to reduce the home by 3ft. would change the whole dynamic. He pointed out on this plan it doesn't make sense.

Mr. Luszczyk asked what the square footage of the home is.

Mr. Rose explained it is just less than 3900 sq.ft.

Mr. Pirog stated it is a large home and asked what the square footage would be if they reduced it by 3ft.

Mr. Rose explained it would reduce it by 75 sq.ft. He further explained it would change the whole plan. Mr. Rose stated reducing 3ft on this plan would be dramatic would necessitate a different plan.

Mr. Pirog clarified construction hasn't started.

Mr. Rose stated that is correct

Mr. Cavanaugh clarified this plan is consistent with the other homes in the development with the majority having covered porches.

Mr. Rose explained as part of the monotony code all of the homes cannot have covered porches.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked how many homes are in the development

Mr. Rose stated there are 11

Mr. Cavanaugh asked how many of the 11 have covered porches

Mr. Rose explained as of now 5 and 2 remain unsold

Ms. Wood asked for clarification on the monotony code and how it can include more than just porches.

Mr. Rose explained he has a set number of plans for the community and the buyer has selected this plan #80. He further explained due to the pressure of the monotony code a porch is needed in order to build this home at this location. Mr. Rose stated every other item is consistent with the original intent of community. He pointed out this will help with the village requirements, the monotony requirements and the customer requirements.

Mr. Luszczyk asked if the rear setback is right at 40ft

Mr. Rose answered yes

Mr. Luszczyk asked about the lot coverage

Mr. Rose stated they are well under what is required

Ms. Bremanis stated she ran the lot coverage and doesn't have the exact numbers but agrees they are well under.

Mr. Rose explained this lot is wider than the typical Palatine lot.

Ms. Wood asked staff if other homes in the area that have asked or have received similar front yard setbacks

Ms. Bremanis explained many homes have not been built in the area and she is not aware of any that have received relief. She stated they did go to plan commission to change the rear yard setbacks.

Ms. Wood stated she struggles with this because it is a large lot and a large home and doesn't understand why it needs additional relief when it is still in the design stage.

Ms. Wood clarified there are 11 homes in the area

Mr. Rose answered yes.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief background on project. She stated it has been reviewed by Community Services and Engineering. She stated the porch is approx.. 24 ft. and is open air. She referred to the slide with the Special Use standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed new residence is requesting to encroach 4 feet into the required front yard. The home is already at the maximum required rear yard setback of 40 feet. The encroachment is only for the front porch that is approximately 28 feet across and the porch is an open air style. Front yard setback reductions for open air porches are not uncommon and the proposed home should not cause substantial injury to the value of other property in the neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plan and elevations prepared by KF Walter Homes, submitted 04/04/2018, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

Mr. Pirog asked about the wording “substantial injury” and how it is harder than normal wording.

Ms. Bremanis explained it should not be read into it just means it will not have a negative impact to values

Mr. Pirog asked if any homes are built

Ms. Bremanis referred to slide to show what homes were built

Mr. Pirog asked if any needed a variation

Ms. Bremanis answered no

Ms. Wood asked which homes have porches

Ms. Bremanis stated the petitioner can answer.

Ms. Wood asked is the address of the objector

Ms. Bremanis stated she is not aware but he is not part of the 250 ft. mailing.

Mr. Rose clarified there are 6 homes under construction, 2 more in for permit and a 3rd that is a custom home. He stated none required a special use. He referred to slide to show the lots that have porches (lots 1, 2, 5, 7, and this one)

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Cavanaugh made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Mr. McGinn.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Cavanaugh spoke to the unique situation and pointed out the purpose of a special use has to do with the existing vistas and not detract from the values. He pointed out they are creating the value and what the neighborhood will be. He stated this request is consistent with what the 11 home neighborhoods will be.

Mr. McGinn spoke to the standards and stated there is no issue with public health safety and welfare. He stated the only issue is with the impact of value

but because the lots are large this won't have an adverse impact.

Ms. Roth-Wurster spoke to the size of the lots, the size of homes and the monotony code and why it is in existence. She pointed out porches create neighborhoods and requests come in a lot in older neighborhoods. She stated if this was a huge garage it would be different but taking the one at a time she is in favor

Mr. Pirog stated it doesn't conflict with the standards but being new construction and 3900 sq.ft. there is no reason not to meet code

Mr. McGinn pointed out it is not a requirement and that is why they are asking for a special use they just need to meet the standards.

Mr. Pirog stated the negative impact is unknown.

Mr. Luszczyk agreed with Mr. Pirog pointing out it is a big home and shaving off 75 sq. ft. shouldn't be a problem.

Ms. Roth-Wurster pointed out the home is sold and the buyer chose a plan that would have to change to include the porch and they may have second thoughts knowing the layout would have to change. She pointed the neighborhood is in construction and being open air it should not have a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Ms. Wood stated it meets the standards so will vote in favor. She stated usually in new construction they look at the requests tougher because they are able to make the modifications. She pointed out with it being open air it is not a large encumbrance. Ms. Wood stated she will vote in favor because it meets the standards but thinks council may have a different opinion on properties keeping with the standards at a conception point when they can be changed at the design point.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was approved by a vote of 4-3. This item will go to Village Council on May 21, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [4 TO 3]
MOVER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Theodore McGinn, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, McGinn, Cavanaugh
NAYS:	Luszczyk, Dittrich, Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson

2. 1007 W Willow Road

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on April 23, 2018 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application for Special Use
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Survey/ Site Plan
4. Floor Plan
5. Elevations
6. Public Notice

Sworn in petitioner Ms. Jane Manda 1007 W Willow St and Mr. Dan Cunningham architect 814 Concord Lane Barrington

Ms. Manda explained the reason they want to add a screened in porch is because their house faces the south and gets sun all day. She further explained it gets so hot that she can't keep the blinds open. Ms. Manda stated this way they can open the sliders and get air ventilation. She stated the deck is 19 years old and needs to be repaired or replaced.

Mr. Cunningham explained the deck currently sticks out 8.5 ft. and in order to allow room for furniture they want to extend to 10ft so they are requesting the additional 4ft in the rear yard setback. He stated this will provide shade and will allow borrowed light to come in through skylights and windows.

Mr. Pirog asked if there is currently concrete there

Mr. Cunningham stated there are piers for the deck that would be removed

Mr. Pirog asked if they would have to lay a foundation

Mr. Cunningham explained he spoke to Sanyo and she said they could use 12inch piers.

Mr. Pirog asked why they don't need a cement foundation

Mr. Cunningham stated they don't need it for the loads they are carrying. He explained if he had to he would build the footings out but after doing his calcs there isn't enough there to warrant putting a footing on. He explained it is non-conditioned and will not have any insulation on the underside unless they can drape in plastic to keep the critters out. Mr. Cunningham stated there will be an apron around whole thing so nothing can get under there.

Ms. Bremanis clarified an enclosed porch would be better term than a sunroom since it will not be heated or cooled.

Mr. Luszczak asked if they have spoken to the neighbors

Ms. Manda stated yes she knows 3 of them well and have discussed this for many years and they have no objections

Mr. Luszczyk asked if she spoke to the neighbor directly next door.

Ms. Manda answered yes she spoke to all three that border her lot. She stated she went over to the house that is diagonal to her explain. She referred to the aerial indicating the home in question. Ms. Manda stated the neighbor said she was opposed to all variances so that is why they were unable to go through with the administrative variation.

Mr. Pirog asked if the whole yard is fenced in

Ms. Manda answered no

Ms. Wood asked which neighbors she spoke to.

Ms. Manda referred to slide indicating which neighbors had signed off on the request.

Ms. Bremanis explained the administrative variation process and how since one neighbor would not sign off they have to come before the board to get a full variation.

Mr. Pirog clarified the request is for 4 more feet.

Mr. Cunningham stated it is just to accommodate a normal size room.

Mr. Luszczyk asked what the setback will be.

Mr. Cunningham explained the deck is right at the 40ft setback and they are asking for approx. 2.5 ft. He stated that will give them a little more room clarifying the overhangs doesn't count.

Ms. Bremanis stated the overhangs do not count.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief summary of request. She stated the lot follows the R2 standards. She stated the peak height and the lot coverage does meet code. Ms. Bremanis referred to the slides pointing out other homes in neighborhood that have porches that encroach similar to the request. She stated the one directly across Middleton received a special use. Ms. Bremanis stated community services and engineering have reviewed and have no issues. The standards were shown on a slide.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioners are proposing to replace an existing deck with a sun room that will have a similar encroachment into the required rear yard. The existing deck already encroaches in this area. In addition there are several properties in the neighborhood that have rear yard encroachments. The proposed addition should not cause substantial injury to the value of other property in the neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plan and elevations prepared by Dan Cunningham, Architect, submitted 04/05/2018, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Pirog made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Mr. Luszczak.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Pirog stated it is very straight forward. He pointed out there is already something there and other homes have similar structures. He stated it will not have a negative impact on the values but rather should increase it.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0. This item will go to Village Council on May 21, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	John Pirog, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Jerry Luszczak, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson

3. 2017 N Rand Road

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on April 23, 2018 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application for Special Use
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Survey
4. Site Plan
5. Business Plan
6. Public Notice

Sworn in petitioner Mr. Jeff Mullins and Wilma Diaz 220 Honeylake Court North Barrington

Mr. Mullins explained they are looking to open a used car lot. He stated this location had a used car lot in the past and Harley Davidson is next to it. Mr. Mullins explained they are looking to run a family business with late model cars but no junk. He stated they will ensure everything will be per code if approved. Mr. Mullins explained the building is already setup for their needs. He further explained they will have no outside service at this time but if they add in the future they will make sure we follow village codes. Mr. Mullins stated they want the lot to look nice. He stated it won't affect the neighbors behind. He spoke to the easement along the property behind them and how the extra lighting they will install will make the area safer to people who walk at night. He stated he understands the easement will be left open for them.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief summary of the property and request. She stated the property is zoned B5 and because the request is for only used cars it is required to get a special use. She stated if it was for both new and used it would be permitted. Ms. Bremanis spoke to the hours and the business plan and stated they are not changing the interior of the building. She spoke to the required parking and the location of the cars that are for sales. Ms. Bremanis stated staff have reviewed the request and have no issues. The standards were shown on a slide.

Ms. Bremanis stated the property was approved back in 2007 for a used car dealer but never opened and until recently have been operating a landscaping business.

Sworn in Ms. Ms. Barb Kubala 1032 E Jules St Arlington Heights, IL. owns multiple units in the Fox Fire Complex across the street.

Ms. Kubala explained her concerns with traffic. She stated there are many used car lots on Rand and many people use Fox Fire lot to test drive the cars. She stated her renters have complained and is concerned this business will increase traffic and hurt her investment. She expressed her concern with the upkeep and appearance of the property. Ms. Kubala further explained her traffic concerns.

Ms. Wood stated she understands the traffic concern but stated it seems like this property would not increase it that much. She stated she can see overall everything is cumulative

Ms. Kubala stated Harley brings in a lot of traffic on the weekend

Ms. Wood stated if she was looking to buy a car she would drive around on an expressway. She stated it is hard to believe they go in a parking lot.

Ms. Kubala stated she has not witnessed herself but she receives complaints from her renters and have had break-ins so they are alarmed at strange cars

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there are any signs in their lot

Ms. Kubala stated she thinks there are towing ones. She spoke to the layout of the lot exits and the issues 200 families exit the one exit-390 units in whole complex. Renters have raised concern- on wants to leave they had it with the car lots down the street - not the nicest car

Mr. Pirog clarified her concern is with making a making a left on Rand.

Ms. Kubala stated making a left is nearly impossible and spoke to the trouble she had today and on occasions when dropping her son at Hertz. She stated her concern is this area is already heavily used and this will bring more traffic. Ms. Kubala asked if there will be cars parked out front.

Sworn in Mr. Jeff Dziabacinski 694 E Whispering Oaks Dr.

Mr. Dziabacinski expressed his concern with people walking back and forth and with property values. He stated he purchased hoping to raise a family. He stated they have a lot of noise issues with cars being dropped off from transportation vehicles at 10:00 pm, Harley Davidson at 8:00 am and from Toyota. He stated it seems like it never ends.

Ms. Wood asked how long have you lived there

Mr. Dziabacinski explained 3 years but recently bought a few months ago

Mr. McGinn clarified he rented but now bought

Mr. Dziabacinski answered yes

Mr. Luszczak asked where the people are walking

Mr. Dziabacinski referred to the aerial slide and explained there is a walkway.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the easement runs along the whole property to route 12.

Ms. Bremanis answered yes

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if it allowed vehicle traffic

Ms. Bremanis answered no and explained there is a gate. She referred to the existing conditions slide and explained the Fire Department has access to be able to open or close which is the reason for that easement.

Mr. Luszczak asked if the gate is left open.

Ms. Bremanis explained it should be closed and locked at all times.

Ms. Wood asked where they are walking

Mr. Dziabacinski explained there is a paved walkway that goes around the gate.

Mr. Luszczyk asked whose gate it is.

Mr. Dziabacinski stated he is unsure

Ms. Wood asked if they are trying to get on to Rand Rd.

Mr. Dziabacinski answered yes

Mr. Dziabacinski spoke to the noise from Toyota and Harley both starting at 8:00am.

Ms. Bremanis asked if they have called the Village to report the noise.

Mr. Dziabacinski stated he is just one man.

Ms. Bremanis explained as complaints come in staff follows up and would speak to the owners but if no one reports staff would not know.

Ms. Wood stated there are regulations on noises and times so the issues expressed would have to be dealt with for those particular businesses.

Mr. Dziabacinski stated his concern is with the constant beeping of the car every time they take it for test drives.

Mr. Cavanaugh pointed out Rand is a very busy road and this is an ideal use for this property. He asked if he had issues when it was a landscaping business.

Mr. Dziabacinski answered no.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if his concern is just with the cars.

Mr. Dziabacinski expressed his concern with safety and with the demographic they are trying to reach.

Discussion on the type of cars being sold and how it relates to his concerns.

Mr. Mullins stated the traffic will probably decrease because the landscaping company had multiple trucks with trailers. He stated they are looking to have a small lot and are not looking to sell old junk. Mr. Mullins restated this is a family name business. He stated they have 11 kids and understands where Mr. Dziabacinski's concerns are coming from. Mr. Mullins pointed out the people walking in the easement are the people who live back there coming back from getting groceries. He stated they will have cameras facing Rand, the back lot and the side lot which will bring additional safety. Mr. Mullins stated test drives are done with employees so they won't go on other properties.

Ms. Wood clarified they require employees to go on the test drives.

Mr. Mullins stated yes no one will be driving without an employee with them.

Mr. Mullins stated the entrance to the apartment is a little farther down. He pointed out he doesn't have trailers like the landscaping company making noise every morning. He spoke to Hertz location being quite large and compared the

traffic it brings compared to the possible 5 customers a day they plan to have. Mr. Mullins stated they will bring in more security with more lighting for the walkway easement. He spoke to the cars out front being from Hertz because they sell as well as rent. Mr. Mullins explained they are leaving the 2 spots in front of their business for handicap and will have 95% of their cars in the back. He stated he can see what they are saying about Harley starting early.

Ms. Wood asked when the landscaping company closed.

Mr. Mullins stated they moved 3-4 days ago. He spoke to the lease details and pointed out this location is ideal since it is close to home allowing them to keep an eye on with the camera systems. He stated he knows Rand Road is busy but thinks this will decrease traffic since he has no trailers behind the trucks.

Ms. Wood asked when deliveries of vehicles would be.

Mr. Mullins explained most vehicles will be brought in from employees. He stated they would expect 3-4 a week so would not have any tractor trailers parked out front.

Ms. Wood asked about the hours of the deliveries

Mr. Mullins explained the auctions would end around 12-1:00. He stated they would drive them back when the traffic is least because they don't want to be making a long trip in traffic. He restated they will be increasing security with lighting and cameras and decreasing traffic and noise.

Ms. Wood asked what type of vehicles they will offer.

Mr. Mullins explained mostly the latest models being 5 years old or newer. He stated he is looking for a variety but not looking for any with rust or holes. He stated he doesn't want to attract the wrong crowd explaining he wants family traffic since he will have his kids there occasionally after school and would never want to put their lives in jeopardy.

Mr. Luszczyk asked if the gate is closed how people are walking through.

Mr. Mullins explained it is an easement for people to walk through. He stated the people who live there use it to walk to shopping. He spoke to the setup of the easement pond area and how you can walk around the gate.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there is a limit to how many cars they are allowed

Ms. Bremanis stated the special use is tied to their business plan which states they will have 35.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated the business plan stated 30-50

Mr. Mullins explained they did adjust so 35 will be max they would be able to carry on that lot.

Mr. Cavanaugh pointed out the drawing has 36 spots.

Mr. Mullins explained they are trying to keep 25-30 to leave room for people to park.

Ms. Bremanis pointed out they will be limited because Fire has have access to

that easement. She stated that is a condition in the recommendation.

Ms. Kubala asked if they will be selling cars out front. She stated Hertz does sell cars but they are 1-2 years old. Ms. Kubala pointed out on the aerial the location of her entrance. She expressed her concern with customer traffic.

Ms. Wood clarified her question about cars being for sale in the front.

Ms. Kubala stated she doesn't think it will look nice. She stated Hertz has them in front but theirs are newer.

Ms. Bremanis clarified there is nowhere to park in front of the building. She referred to the site plan showing they have 2 handicap cars so there is nowhere to park a car.

Ms. Kubala stated it doesn't matter since Hertz is doing it anyway. She restated her concern is the traffic this business will attract. Ms. Kubala stated she thinks a business that doesn't have customers would be better.

Mr. Mullins stated there is no room in the front right now. He explained in order to do that he would have to cut back more frontage which would require a permit so they are not looking to do that right now. He stated Hertz does have some older cars there right now. Mr. Mullins spoke to the landscaping business hours and the traffic of equipment and employee cars.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The subject property was approved for a used auto sales facility in 2007, but the business never opened. While the property was previously occupied by a landscaping company, the proposed use should not impact the surrounding properties or cause substantial injury to the value of the Rand Road Corridor. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Special Use, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plan and business plan submitted by the Petitioner, Wilma Diaz, submitted on 03/23/2018, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. A parking lot lighting and photometrics plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer prior to the issuance of a Business License.
3. Restrictions for storm water must be confirmed by inspection.
4. Easement access shall remain clear, including the loading with snow.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Dittrich made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Mr. McGinn.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Dittrich stated this property is located on Rand Road which happens to have a lot of automotive related businesses adjacent. He stated they are increasing the public health safety and welfare by adding lights and security cameras. He stated the people walking through the gate are residents of the area. Mr. Dittrich pointed out the biggest complaints of both objectors were from neighboring

businesses and those should be directed to the businesses discussed and not held against the petitioner.

Mr. McGinn stated the petitioner has experience in this type of business so it meets the standard of operating in a manner consistent with public health safety and welfare. He spoke to the concerns of objectors and understands them but stated they are part of where there properties are located. He stated this use will not adversely impact that and the standards have been met.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0. This item will go to Village Council on May 21, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	James Dittrich, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Theodore McGinn, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Bremanis stated the 2 items approved by council are as follows:

553 E Dundee Rd- special use for Rockin the Spectrum

2161 N Rand Rd- special use for the used car dealer

She stated the meeting scheduled for May 22, 2018 has been canceled. The next meeting will be June 12, 2018.

V. ADJOURNMENT

1. Motion to Adjourn

Mr. Cavanaugh made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Dittrich.

RESULT:	MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
SECONDER:	James Dittrich, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson

