

VEVAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting/Public Hearings
Wednesday, August 3, 2016
Vevay Township Hall – 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Members present: Jack Cady, Richard Lacasse, John Lazet, Pattie McNeilly, Ilene Thayer, Wayne Uzzle, and Bruce Walker.

Members absent: None.

Other Persons present: Supervisor Jesse Ramey, and Legal Counsel David Revore.

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Thayer.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

The audience joined the Commission in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Set/Amend Agenda

The agenda was accepted as submitted.

IV. Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting/Public Hearing July 6, 2016

No amendments were offered.

MOTION Walker, seconded by Cady, to approve the July 6, 2016, regular meeting/public hearing minutes as submitted.

CARRIED 7-0.

V. Brief Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VI. Recess to Public Hearings

**A. Special land Use permit Application – Beauty Salon (single chair)
Mike Buchman at 1159 S. College Road**

In response to Commission comments last month, the Buchmans had submitted a revised site plan. It was noted that Debi Buchman needs to sign the SLU permit application as she is a co-owner the property.

There were no comments from the public.

B. Special Land Use permit Application for Renewal of a Gravel Mine

Richard Lyon/Sunrise Aggregate LLC

John Warvel, operator of the gravel mining operation – truck traffic has slowed down as product has been exhausted, and the variety of product has decreased. Mostly sand is left, whereas roadbuilding needs more stones and gravel. As the market for sand is limited, the product on site lasts longer. He expects the sand to definitely be exhausted within 5 years.

Doyle Newman 1275 Ives Road – Asked if operations will definitely be done in 5 years? He has been hearing this same comment for 20 years, and now yet another 5 year ~~extensions~~ *extension* is being sought. Mr. Warvel – he is 95% certain that all of the remaining product will be sold, the only unknown factor being the demand for the product. Mining operations are coming to an end. On-site operations used to entail 12-13 employees, but so much product has been exhausted that there is now only one employee on-site. Revised 9-7-16

Tim Sweeney, 1263 Ives Road – Noted that dust remains an issue. Mr. Warvel – commented that he uses a chloride treatment; he can chloride to Ives Road, but it makes the pavement slippery. He offered his personal cell phone number to Mr. Sweeney, saying he can call anytime, and Mr. Warvel will ensure that the appropriate areas are treated.

Chair Thayer – noted that the Township had received a letter from Jean and Dave Gruber that included three questions, which she asked:

- “Has the operator been pumping water from the pits? If not now, will they in the future?”
 - Mr. Warvel – There is currently no pumping of water, and none proposed for mining purposes. They may pump water to wash materials, with the run off going to settling ponds for clarity, and then returning the water to the pond itself.
- “The operator has stated during each of the past two permit renewal hearings, that, that would be the last time yet he is asking again for another five year renewal. We would like to know what a realistic timeframe for completion of operations there would be.”
 - Mr. Warvel – Again, he is 95% certain that all of the remaining product will be sold, the only unknown factor being the market for the product. But at this time he does not anticipate a need for another renewal.
- “What are his plans for remediation of the land for both the north and south pits? Is the amount of the required bond still adequate given the size of those pits?”
 - Mr. Warvel – When the land was purchased several decades ago, it had been mined for over 20 years and had numerous pits and areas needing rehabilitation. He has been rehabilitating the property on the west side, and continues to rehabilitate the property as the operations exhaust the product in a given area. All areas will be graded and seeded as required by Ordinance and law. The required bond of \$20,000 is adequate to finish all rehabilitation efforts. The adjoining operation to the north has different owners, Diana Russell and Gary Darling. There is probably up to 5 years of material left for that operation.

Richard Cooley, consultant for Mr. Warvel – asked that it be noted in the minutes that he had received the Commission list of concerns and questions from last month’s meeting, and he has responded in a memorandum dated July 29, 2016.

VII. Adjournment of Public Hearing and Recommencement of Regular Meeting

There being no further public comment, the public hearings were ended at 7:18 pm, and the regular meeting recommenced.

VIII. Reports

A. July, 2016 AGS Building/Zoning Report

The written report indicated that there were seventeen building/zoning permit actions, involving: a new deck; re-inspection of a fire remodel; ten placements of mobile homes; four demolitions of trailers; and a deck. A blight violation has been remediated and the complaint resolved, and a barking dog complaint has also been resolved. Four authorizations to enforce the Zoning Ordinance are pending: two blight violations, to which legal counsel has sent each a letter seeking remediation; a sign and trash violation, which the resident has agreed to clean-up; and a barking dog complaint, the owner having been sent a letter by the Township to which there has not yet been a response.

IX. Pending Business

A. SLU Application – Beauty Salon (single chair) – Mike Buchman at 1159 S. College Road

As the Buchmans were unable to make the meeting tonight, they requested through Clerk Kean that consideration of the application ~~by~~ *be* tabled until the next regular Commission meeting. The Commission tabled further consideration of the application. Revised 9-7-16

B. SLU Application – Gravel Mine – Richard Lyon/Sunrise Aggregates LLC at Ives Road

Summary of Issues of Especial Significance/Interest in gravel mining operations:

Pumping of Water – Mr. Warvel clarified that water will be pumped only for washing material, directed to settling ponds for clarity, and then returned to the pond. There is not and will not be any pond to pond pumping, and no dewatering off-site.

Crushing Operations – Mr. Warvel clarified that the only remaining product is sand, crushing is no longer needed, and no crushing is being proposed.

Length of Operations – Mr. Warvel clearly and repeatedly stated that most of the economically recoverable product is exhausted; only sand is left, and some clay; and he is “95% certain” that operations will be done within 5 years. That may be affected by the market demand for the product.

Truck Traffic – Mr. Warvel explained that he has a bond with the Ingham County Road Department to allow fully loaded trucks to travel north on Ives Road. He has no bond for trucks traveling south on Ives Road, so only partially loaded trucks may travel south. Truck traffic is

allowed in both directions, but the load varies. Both single bottom and double bottom trucks haul his product.

Dust Abatement – as noted above, Mr. Warvel will use industry best practice, and will personally address dust abatement if residents call him directly.

Discussion over adequacy of the materials submitted

Chair Thayer – noted that the Commission is required by the Zoning Ordinance to review all materials using the standards set forth in the pertinent sections of the Ordinance. Based on Commission comments and questions raised last month, Mr. Cooley had prepared a memorandum with his responses, though the submitted materials were not revised to reflect those responses. The information in the original materials and the July 29 memorandum will be the basis for tonight’s discussion, but the materials themselves are not ready for final review. She then led the Commission through a preliminary discussion by reading each Ordinance requirement, that it might be clearly understood what information is needed for review of the SLU permit application.

Throughout the meeting Mr. Cooley asserted that the mining plan was the same as the site plan and did not need to be submitted as a separate document. The Commission pointed out that site plan approval is by the Commission, and approval of the SLU permit application is by the Board of Trustees. As such, the required information is used for different purposes, and Commission approval of the site plan is not approval of a mining plan.

Mr. Cooley challenged the Zoning Ordinance requirement that the mining plan be drawn and sealed by a registered civil engineer. While the Commission had extensive discussion about this requirement, at the end of the discussion he was informed that the appropriate materials submitted needed to comply with this requirement.

Mr. Cooley’s response to the list of Commission questions from last month indicated that he decided the scale of the documents required by the Ordinance was inappropriate for the site plan (Sec. 14.03 (A)(1)), and he prepared the materials using a different scale.

The Township had forwarded to Mr. Cooley questions raised during the July 6, 2016 meeting. Instead of revising the original documents, he responded in his memorandum that “Once the Planning Commission reviews these responses at a public hearing and recommends approval as amended, I will amend the text and map exhibits according to their recommendations and forward final copies to the Township Board of Trustees for review.” It was explained that the Commission does not approve documents that have not been drafted, does not approve site plans that do not meet Ordinance requirements, and revised materials need to be submitted before any Commission decision and recommendations.

The Commission repeatedly told Mr. Warvel that they were looking to find a way to make this work for him, but the work products of his consultant need to comply with the Ordinance.

PRELIMINARY Site Plan Discussion

Sec. 14.03

- A general location sketch showing at minimum, properties, streets and use of land within 1/2

mile of the area. – Information INCOMPLETE. It was noted that a hand-drawn small scale map in the right hand column of Sheet Map 1 is labeled “Location map”, but fails to detail any land uses. The sketch also fails to include lands to the east of Ives Road.

- Legal description of the subject property. – Information ERRORS. It was noted that in three separate areas of his submittal, there are three different legal descriptions.
- The date, north arrow, and scale. – Sufficient.
- Name and address of the property owner or petitioner. – Sufficient.
- Name and address of the person and/or firm who drafted the plan and the date on which the plan was prepared. – Sufficient.
- Existing zoning and use of all properties abutting the subject property. - Information INCOMPLETE. While surrounding zoning is noted on the Sheet 1 map, surrounding uses are not noted.
- All buildings, parking and driveways within 100 feet of all property lines. – Information MISSING.
- The overall objectives of the proposed development. – Information INCOMPLETE.
- Size (in acres) of the subject property and approximate number of acres allocated to ~~size (in acres) of the subject property and approximate number of acres allocated to each~~ proposed use and gross area in building, structures, parking, public streets and drives, and open space. – Information ERRORS. There are conflicting narratives on the acreage of the parcels; the other required information is included. Revised 9-7-16
- Dwelling unit densities by type, if applicable. – Not applicable.
- Proposed method of providing sewer and water service, as well as other public and private utilities. – Not applicable.
- Proposed method of providing storm drainage. – Not applicable.
- Seal, name, and firm address of the professional individual responsible for the preparation of the site plan. – Sufficient.
- Property lines and required setbacks shown and dimensioned. – Sufficient.
- Dimensions of all existing and proposed structures on the subject property including dwelling unit densities by type, if applicable. – Information INCOMPLETE. The scale house and the fuel storage tank are not noted.
- Size and location of existing and proposed utilities, including any proposed connections to public, or private community sewer or water supply systems. – Not applicable.
- All existing and proposed drives (including dimensions and radii), acceleration/deceleration lanes, sidewalks, signs, exterior lighting, curbing, parking areas (including the dimensions of a typical parking space and the total number of parking spaces to be provided), fire lanes, and unloading areas. For projects on a collector or arterial road, see also Section 12.04. – Sufficient.
- Pavement width and right-of-way width of all roads, streets, and access easements within 100 feet of the subject property. – Information MISSING.
- Location and size of all surface water drainage facilities. – Not applicable.
- Location of all solid waste disposal facilities, including recycling, and screening. – Not applicable.
- Location and specifications for existing or proposed outside, above or below ground storage facilities for hazardous materials. – Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel noted there is a fuel storage tank on site.

- All existing vegetation and the location, type, and size of all proposed landscaping, and the location, height and type of existing and proposed fences and walls. – Sufficient.
- Recreation areas, common use areas, flood plain areas and areas to be conveyed for public use and purpose. – Not applicable.
- Exterior lighting showing area of illumination and indicating the type and height of fixture to be used. – Not applicable.
- Elevation drawings of proposed buildings – Not applicable.

D. Additional Information

No additional information was requested at this time.

Section 14.04 – Application and Review: It was noted that all required copies and fees have been submitted. New submissions will need to comply with these provisions.

Section 14.06– Review Standards: The Commission explained that the standards of this section and all other referenced sections of the Ordinance in this section will be utilized in performing the site plan review prior to any Commission action on any newly submitted site plan.

PRELIMINARY Sec. 16.06 (I) discussion:

NOTE: The Commission indicated that especially given the 2011 Tear Farm proposal for gravel mining off of Barnes Road, any Commission consideration must be in light of all existing and future operations, not just this application.

Both in writing and verbally, Mr. Cooley commented that the mining plan is the same as the site plan, and does not need to be a separate document drawn and sealed by a registered civil engineer. He insisted that the mining plan was really just part of the site plan; therefore, he did not need to meet this requirement. He asserted that the Ordinance was “inconsistent and exclusionary.” Legal Counsel corrected this misstatement. Mr. Cooley challenged the rationale for the requirement as a reason for the Commission to ignore this requirement. Finally, Mr. Cooley stated that because the Commission had allowed his materials to be used for a different 2013 gravel mining SLU permit renewal, this was a precedent that should allow him to again prepare all materials for this application. Legal Counsel noted that a previous error is not a precedent, and the civil engineer requirement is “black letter law” that cannot be ignored.

Relative to the SLU permit gravel mining requirements:

1. In addition to the information required for site plan review, the application for Commercial Extraction and Processing of Soil, Sand, Gravel, or Other Mineral Resources, shall include the following:
 - a. A written legal description of all of the lands proposed for the use. – Information ERRORS. There are three conflicting descriptions throughout the submitted narrative and Sheet maps
 - b. Twelve (12) ~~copies~~ *copies* of the mining plan, drawn and sealed by a registered civil engineer, and including the following, at a minimum: Revised 9-7-16
 - i. A north arrow, scale, and date; - Sufficient.

ii. Shading indicating the extent of land area on which mineral removal operations and activities will take place; - Sufficient on the maps; the narrative needs revising..

iii. The location, width, and grade of all easements or rights-of-way on or abutting the lands; - Information MISSING.

iv. The location and nature of all structures on the lands; - Information MISSING.

v. The location and direction of all water courses, flood plains, flood ways, and flood control channels that may be affected by the mineral removal operations; - Sufficient.

vi. Existing elevations of the lands at intervals of not more than five (5) feet; - Sufficient.

vii. All soil boring results and the resultant typical cross sections showing the estimated extent of overburden, and estimated extent of mineral material location in, or on the lands, and the water table; - Information MISSING. The narrative states, "Soil test not needed." Borings are not soil tests. The Commission had discussion on the over 50 year history of mining operations on these parcels. Both Mr. Lyon and Mr. Warvel commented that they had done countless borings, as had others. Mr. Warvel further stated that in his experience, a boring could show you what was in the bore hole, but it could be different material just a few feet over. For this particular operation, the practice has been to follow the vein of product and extract material accordingly. Borings on this site have not been economically useful.

viii Mineral processing and storage areas (including crushing, washing, asphalt plants, etc.); - Information MISSING. Washing and settling ponds missing.

ix Proposed fencing, gates, parking areas, and signs; - Sufficient.

x. Roads for ingress to, and egress from the lands, including on-site roads, other areas to be used for movement of vehicles and a description of the proposed measures to limit dust generated by mineral removal activities and movement of vehicles; - Information INCOMPLETE. Roads are indicated, but the narrative merely states that dust control will be "as needed." Mr. Warvel offered additional details during the evening; these comments need to be included in the submitted materials.

xi. A map showing access routes between the subject lands and the nearest (County) paved arterial or collector road; - Sufficient.

xii. Methods to be used for mine water management – Information ERROR. As noted previously, Mr. Warvel gave a detailed explanation verbally, but the narrative explains a very different process.

- Pond to pond method is preferred
- Offsite dewatering is prohibited.

xiii Proposed method of managing overburden (e.g., seeding, grading, erosion and sedimentation control, etc., and; - Sufficient.

xiv. The area anticipated to be mined in a five (5) year timeframe. Extraction operations encompassing more area than the initial 5-year estimate shall have a separate approval process. – Sufficient.

xv. Appropriate permits such as but not limited to those from MDEQ and MDNR. – Information ERRORS. Mr. Warvel explained what permits he had, but the narrative includes a different response.

2. A narrative description and explanation of the proposed extraction operations and activities, including:

- a. The date of commencement. – Information INCOMPLETE. No specific date or range of dates.
- b. Proposed hours and days of operation. – Sufficient, as amended.
- c. Estimate of type and quantity of mineral materials to be removed. – Information MISSING.
- d. Description of extraction and processing methods, including dewatering, proposed equipment and the noise rating of each type thereof. – Information ERROR, as the revised narrative on pumping water conflicts with comments by Mr. Warvel tonight.
- e. A summary of the procedures and practices that will be used to ensure compliance with the conditions of this subsection. – Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel explained his compliance practices, but this is missing in the narrative.
- f. Description of size of trucks and daily volume of traffic entering and leaving the site, and on-site circulation pattern. – Information INCOMPLETE. Mr. Warvel explained the size and loads of trucks, but this is missing in the narrative.

3. A site rehabilitation plan including the following:

- a. A written description of planned site rehabilitation and end-use(s), including potential methods of accomplishment. – Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel gave a detailed explanation that is lacking in the narrative. The consultant verbally noted that end-uses will be determined by the owner, Richard Lyon Trust LLC, and not by Mr. Warvel. As the applicant is Mr. Lyon, the consultant was encouraged to talk with him about end-uses.
- b. A phasing plan, if the excavation of the site is to be accomplished in phases. This plan shall indicate the area and extent of each phase and the approximate timing of each phase. – Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel gave a detailed explanation that is lacking in the narrative.
- c. A plan showing:
 - i. Final grades of the lands as rehabilitated, at contour intervals not exceeding five (5) feet; - Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel detailed how the final rehabilitation would be accomplished, but the narrative contains only a hand-drawn cross-section of the pond; information on the rest of the site is missing. Final contours for the parcels were not submitted.
 - ii. Water courses, ponds, or lakes, if any; - Sufficient.
 - iii. Landscaping and plantings; - Information MISSING.
 - iv. Areas of cut and fill; – Information MISSING.

- v. All of the components of the proposed end-use(s); - Information MISSING.
- d. A description of the proposed methods or features that will ensure that the end-use is feasible, and can comply with all applicable requirements of this Ordinance. – Information MISSING.
- 4. Each site rehabilitation plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission and shall comply with all of the following standards and requirements:
 - a. Topsoil shall be replaced on the site to a depth of not less than six (6) inches, except where the end-use activities or features do not involve the planting of lawns or growing of vegetation. – Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel explained how the rehabilitation is already finished in some areas, and how he intends to finally rehabilitate the site, but his comments are not in the narrative or Sheet maps.
 - b. Slopes shall be graded and stabilized to such extent as will accommodate the proposed end-use. Final slopes shall have a ratio of not more than one (1) foot of elevation to three (3) feet of horizontal distance. – Information INCOMPLETE. Mr. Warvel explained his rehabilitation process to date, but this is lacking in the narrative or Sheet maps.
 - c. The plan shall indicate the phasing of site rehabilitation, if the same is to take place in phases, and if so, topsoil shall be replaced and slopes shall be graded and stabilized before mineral removal operations or activities are commenced in another area of the site. – Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel explained his phasing of the rehabilitation process, but none of his explanations are included in the narrative or Sheet maps.
 - d. Plantings of grass, shrubs, trees, and other vegetation shall be made so as to maximize erosion protection, screen less attractive areas of end-uses, and enhance the beauty of the site as rehabilitated. – Information INCOMPLETE. Especially without the contour map from 3 (c) (i), this determination cannot be made.
- 5.a. No machinery shall be erected or maintained within one hundred (100) feet of any exterior property line. No cut or excavation shall be made closer than fifty (50) feet to any road right-of-way line or property line in order to ensure subterranean support to surrounding property. The Planning Commission may require greater distances for the location of machinery, storage, or parking of equipment, or limits of excavation where the site is located within two hundred (200) feet of any Residential District or use. The Planning Commission may recommend and the Township Board may establish additional measures to minimize noise from equipment, including, but not limited to, generators. Crushing machinery shall be located as near as possible to the center of the property and shall not be located closer than two hundred fifty (250) feet to any property line. – Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel explained a conveyor system with product washing, but this is not included in the narrative or the Sheet maps.
- b. The Planning Commission may recommend and the Township Board may approve shorter hours of operation for crushing activities and special conditions for crushing activities, taking into consideration the character of land uses on adjacent property; proximity to residential land uses; noise levels of crushing activities and machinery; and such other criteria as may be deemed appropriate and relevant. – Not applicable.
- 6. No business or industrial buildings or structures of a permanent nature shall be erected, except when such building is a permitted use within the district in which the excavation pit is located. – Sufficient.

7. The Developer shall request that the Ingham County Road Commission identify and provide to the Township routes for truck movement to and from the site in order to minimize the wear on public roads, and to prevent hazards and damage to properties in the community. Access roads within the area of operation shall be provided with a dustless surface and the entry road shall be hard surfaced for a distance established by the Planning Commission to minimize dust, mud, and debris being carried onto the public road. Portions of driveways or roadways may be required to be paved to minimize nuisance dust. – Information INCOMPLETE. As noted above, Mr. Warvel detailed how he has bonded with the Ingham County Road Department for a portion of Ives Road. He has a permit from the ICRD. He explained how he handles dust abatement. His explanations need clarification in the narrative or Sheet map notes.

8. Proper measures shall be taken to minimize the nuisance of noise and flying dust or rock. Such measures may include, when considered necessary, limitations upon stockpiling techniques of excavated material upon the site. – Information MISSING.

9. Mineral resource extraction operations shall not occur prior to 7:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Saturday operations shall not occur prior to 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. Operations shall not occur any time on Sundays or holidays. Crushing operations are subject to separate approval. – Sufficient.

11. The Planning Commission may order studies regarding dewatering processes to ensure that groundwater and well water resources are not unreasonably disrupted by the operation. The cost of these studies shall be borne by the applicant. – Not applicable.

12. The Planning Commission may require compliance with such other conditions as may be necessary to ensure compliance with the terms of this subsection. Such conditions may include, though need not be limited to, weed control, erosion and sedimentation control, fencing and visual screening including berms, requirements for groundwater monitoring wells, preservation of trees and other vegetation, and fuel loading and storage requirements. – Information INCOMPLETE. Fuel loading and storage requirements are not included.

13. An applicant for a permit shall submit a performance bond in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance, naming Vevay Township as the insured party, and conditioned upon the timely and faithful performance by the applicant of all of the terms and conditions of the permit. The bond shall have such other terms and shall be in such amount as is recommended by the Zoning Administrator as reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with all of the terms and conditions of this subsection and the permit. – Sufficient.

14. The performance bond shall not be refunded, reduced, or transferred until the mineral removal operations and activities, land reclamation or restoration, and all other required activities have received final inspection by the Zoning Administrator. – PENDING. Without materials compliant with the Ordinance, this provision cannot be fulfilled.

15. The timely and faithful compliance with all of the provisions of the performance bond shall be a condition of any mineral removal operations. In the absence of any such compliance with the terms of the performance bond, or if the special use is revoked, expires, or is not renewed, the Planning Commission need not approve the renewal of any permit, even if the applicant has

otherwise complied with all other terms and provisions of the current permit. – PENDING. The SLU permit has expired. ~~Renewal~~ *A new SLU permit* is still under consideration. Revised 9-7-16

16. All owners/operators of property involved in mineral resource extraction operations shall be required to carry personal injury and property damage insurance while any unreclaimed or unrehabilitated area exists, in the amount of not less than \$1,000,000 for each person or property injured or damaged and not less than \$300,000 for injury or damage to more than one person or one person's property arising out of one occurrence. Such insurance shall cover injury or damage occurring upon the site of the operations as well as upon properties adjoining thereto, as a result of conditions or activities existing upon the site. A copy of the policy shall be submitted annually with the Township Clerk. – Information MISSING. Mr. Warvel gave an explanation of how he exceeds this requirement, but the narrative lacks his explanation. Mr. Warvel will forward copies of the policies to the Township.

17. To insure compliance with the permit, the Zoning Administrator shall conduct periodic inspections and shall file a written annual report to the Planning Commission. The operator shall be required to pay an annual fee to cover the cost of inspections and additional meetings of the Planning Commission. – Information MISSING.

After this discussion, Mr. Cooley offered to submit a new packet based on the review and comments from this meeting. He was informed that the Commission will further determine if this single packet submission meets Ordinance requirements, but that the Ordinance requirement that the mining plan be drawn and sealed by a registered civil engineer could not be ignored.

C. Revised Map Set for Master Plan – from Community Planner Mark Eidelson

Commissioners had received in their packets copies of the revised maps for the new Master Plan, dated July 20, 2016. The main change is that the maps are higher resolution and quality.

X. Any Other Business

Commission – added several possible Zoning Ordinance topics for discussion:

- Considering a lesser standard of site plan review for smaller operations, and in-home occupations. (Chapter 14)
- Clarifying the language on hours of operation for gravel mines (Sec. 16.06(I)(9))
- Consider clarifying the gravel mining plan language and what is entailed if anything beyond subsection 16.06(I)(1)(b)
- Possibly re-visit the matter of requiring a registered Civil Engineer to draft a gravel Mining Plan (Sec. 16.06(I)(1)(b))
- Do churches need to be added to the table of uses in any district?

Commission - had discussion on:

- application of the Open Meetings Act to Commissioner communications between meetings;
- draft documents – especially draft minutes - and how they do not reflect the thinking or decisions of the Commission until they have been approved at a public meeting;
- the confusion that can result from the Commission having SLU applications and site

plans that are not in a final form for consideration. The materials discussed tonight were not ready for review, and yet significant time was spent walking the consultant through the Ordinance.

XI. Additional Public Comment

There was no public comment.

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

John Lazet, Secretary