

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: August 12, 2021

M I N U T E S – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met on August 12, 2021 in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Vice-Chair, Ken Felger, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following Board members present: Felger, Mahlberg, Thompson Kaczmarek & Bravinder. Absent was Dan Mol. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning office; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was legal counsel present.

CHENEY PROPERTIES LLC, represented by Joe Cheney – Cont. from 7/22/21

LOCATION: XXXX Dague Avenue SE - Part of Gov't Lots 1 & 2, Section 9; N ½ of SE ¼, except tract.; also S ½ of SW ¼ west of road, except..., Section 10, all in Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, MN. (Dean Lake- Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-100-094100 & -103300

Petitions to rezone approximately 63 acres from AG General Agriculture and S-2 Residential-Recreational Shorelands to A/R Agricultural-Residential and S-2 and also for a Conditional Use Permit for a two-lot unplatted subdivision (1-10 acre and remainder 53-acre lot) as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.029, 55.047 & 155.057, Chapter 154 & 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances & Subdivision Regulations.

Present: Applicant not present

- A. Kryzer – explained the public hearing was closed and Staff directed to draft Findings consistent with the record for a denial of the request to rezone. There are documents provided the Commission for action on the recommendation to the County Board. The Commission has had time to read those, and everything was articulated in the Exhibit. If there are any questions he would address those.
- B. Felger hearing no comment or questions indicated action is in order.
- C. Thompson moved to adopt the Findings and Recommendation to the County Board of Commissioners for denial of the request to rezone. Kaczmarek seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED, Thompson, Kaczmarek & Mahlberg
NAY: Felger & Bravinder

Kryzer asked if the applicant or his representative were in the audience, hearing no response he indicated the applicant would be mailed the Findings.

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: July 22, 2021

M I N U T E S – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met July 22, 2021 in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Vice-Chair, Ken Felger, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with Board members present: Mahlberg, Kaczmarek, Thompson, Tanner and Bravinder. Absent was Dan Mol. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning office; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was legal counsel present. Kryzer announced to the audience the items to be continued and not heard.

CHENEY PROPERTIES LLC, represented by Joe Cheney – Cont. from 7/1/21

LOCATION: XXXX Dague Avenue SE - Part of Gov't Lots 1 & 2, Section 9; N ½ of SE ¼, except tract.; also S ½ of SW ¼ west of road, except..., Section 10, all in Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, MN. (Dean Lake- Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-100-094100 & -103300

Petitions to rezone approximately 63 acres from AG General Agriculture and S-2 Residential-Recreational Shorelands to A/R Agricultural-Residential and S-2 and also for a Conditional Use Permit for a two-lot unplatted subdivision (1-10 acre and remainder 53-acre lot) as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.029, 55.047 & 155.057, Chapter 154 & 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances & Subdivision Regulations.

Present: Steve Cheney & Joe Cheney; Paul Otto, Otto Associates

- A. Riley displayed location map, the current zoning and land use is AG General Agriculture. The Commission made a site inspection to consider the request to rezone to A/R zone with a minimum of ten-acre lots. The concept proposed is one ten-acre lot on the lake and the balance of 53 acres, everything north, with lake frontage and entitlement. A previous request in 2010 was noted, action on an Environmental Assessment Worksheet may still be in play from that hearing, depending on what the Commission decides tonight.
- B. Otto noted most Commission members met at the site. Felt two homes would fit into the area well. They feel the proposed rezoning and subdivision will lock up the property for the future. If someone were to try to do more, they would have to come back to the Commission and try for a smaller residential zoning district. S. Cheney added he bought the property from Bjorkedal before he passed away and has been trying to market the property the last 10-12 years. Everyone that looks at the property feels it is too big and splitting the property will make it more affordable. He noted if this is allowed it would complete the development around the lake and just adds one more home. He noted currently there are 54 homes built around this lake.
- C. Bravinder asked if under the AG zone there is one "entitlement"? Riley - correct.
- D. Kaczmarek - asked Riley to speak to procedure and the comments the Commission heard at the last meeting and at the site inspection. If this were approved, would it make the process easier or harder to get more development in the future. Riley - the theory is once rezoned to residential it allows the next step to allow a subdivision. If there were not a subdivision before them, would it make it easier? The standards have to meet to fit the number of lots proposed. The applicant is proposing two in this case and it is up to the Commission on how they feel about that. Felger - the A/R zone is minimum ten acre lots. Riley - that is right, but that does not mean the total acreage is divided by ten; but reviewed all the standards and buildability issues that must be met to determine the number of lots. J. Cheney - in talking with Otto, they could not further subdivide because of the amount of road frontage. Otto - noted the large parcel theoretically could split, but it would not have the lake frontage. They purposely located the division line with less than 600' wide, noting 300' is required on width for a ten-acre lot. Although a new request would have to come back to the Board, they are "burning up" the property, that is what it will be until something else happens. J. Cheney - if it were re-subdivided it would have to be non-lakeshore, building roads, etc. Otto - noted it would have to be on the north side of the wetland, without access to the lake and with his experience with the Board, did not think that is something this Board would consider. Felger - currently there is one "entitlement", if they rezone they are looking at two. Riley - they would rezone the entire parcel to A/R and as proposed the likely outcome is two lots.
- E. Patti Rich - 2932 24th St. SE - resident on the lake - the residents spoke against the petition at the last meeting and the previous hearings. There have been three proposals to rezone this property. They strongly recommend it stay zoned AG for the reason to protect the severely stressed Dean Lake. She reviewed the previous plan and residents asked for an Environmental Assessment worksheet be done in 2010 that was granted. Now looking at two lots with entitlements. Want a clear understanding of the proposal and the EAW. How will potential runoff and pollution affect the lake. During an onsite tour in 2010, the Commission walked the ridge and reviewed the entire property. The Commission voted against rezone because it is not suited for residential development. Nothing has changed, the lake is on the MN DNR "impaired" lake list. Noted the public access increases use of the lake. She referred to large wetlands on this property are important to maintaining lake water quality. The wetlands on this property is a natural filtration system and very important to the lake. She asked what would the benefit of rezoning be? For a third time the Town Board turned down rezoning and based it on the County's Land Use Plan. She questioned why have a Plan if it is not followed? In 2010 a long and tedious process was worked on to submit a request for an EAW by Wayne Nelson for the Lake Association, he is present to answer any questions. She urged the Commission to turn down the rezoning and protect the wetlands. They want to follow through with the EAW if this moves forward. A petition was submitted, signed by the majority of property owners on the lake in opposition and respectfully ask for denial of the rezoning.
- F. Wayne Nelson - spoke on the wetlands involved that pose a unique problem compared to others entering a large water body. These are surrounded by woods. The water draining into the lake is high in phosphates. He explained how the loads could be that high and a single channel to the lake that is

only 60' and is not long enough to do a mitigation project. Only option is to limit development and allow the wetlands to continue purging excess nutrients. Leaving this agricultural would be the best. Felger asked if he was the person referred to on the UAW process? Nelson yes, but even rezoning for one more lot, once rezoned it opens the door for bigger things. He does not think it matters if people can build on the lake; but building and comprising the watershed will impact the lake. Mahlberg asked Nelson if they would consider just two lots and not the previous 40, vs. the one house they can do today. Nelson – did not think anyone opposed two homes, it is the rezoning and the possibility that it opens to something more in the future. The best option is to keep with the Land Use Plan.

- G. Heather Niemczycki 2501 20th St. – responded to Mahlberg's question and stated it is the rezoning that is issue. They asked if the applicant could get two and keep it AG. Karen McDougall, Township Supervisor, had suggested giving a variance, lot line adjustment and leave it AG. That would be their preference. McDougall is not in the audience.
- H. Greg Underdahl - President of the Dean Lake Association – referred to the importance of improving lake quality as it is a valuable resource. He referred to the impaired lakes list by the MN PCA which this lake is on. In 2008 the lake was tested and is the worst in the County. An over-abundance of nutrients runoff from surrounding lands, super charges the algae blooms and turns the lake into a sloppy mess. He referred to water monitoring tests since 2008 show the high levels in the lake. The lakes are supposed to be clean enough for fishing and swimming and State governments are supposed to figure out how to fix those that don't meet Federal standards. There is a public access, swimming is less common on the lake and problematic as algae blooms. People are depending on the County to protect and improve the lake. The Town Board has turned down rezoning three times, the County Board ordered an EAW in 2010. Any rezoning to residential opens the possibility of land development and that would be harmful. How can it be approved when the lake has been deemed impaired? They have partnered with SWCD, are making efforts to slow runoff and develop MN Filter on a main creek draining into the lake. Aeration is used during the winter and a significant amount of time and money is spent on improving the lake. They are committed to improving the water quality and opening the door to more development will undermine their efforts. The activities involved in development will add further stormwater and clearing of shoreland vegetation have a negative impact. There have been 47 signatures on a petition that shares these concerns. A printout on the applicant's website advertising this as a great development property is a concern. That is in conflict with what they have said at meetings. Ask the Commission to do what is in the best interest of the lake.
- I. Clairice Kessler – noted she spoke at the last meeting, moved out here last October and it was important to them that this land was agriculture and want to keep it that way.
- J. Otto asked if their application would have been more appropriate to have asked to rezone just the 10 acres and leave the balance AG. Riley – he would need time to consider that; but does not preclude someone from coming back and rezone the balance to A/R or a higher density zoning. The Office cannot refuse applications and that option does preclude anything in the future. The way to make it more difficult is to configure it so it would have the "entitlement" and have that lot include the riparian portion. Mahlberg – asked if the division were to include all the riparian? Riley responded, enough so that it could not be further divided. Otto – sounds as if two lots would be acceptable and they are trying to lock this up. He was not part of the proposal in 2010, but the one before that. They may be able to configure two riparian lots leaving the balance on the north restricted and does not come back again. Looking for direction and then they could explore options to see how it can be achieved. J. Cheney would agree and make a third lot on the north, there is already an access there. Riley – appreciates the effort to compromise, but this is not the forum for it. The only way to get an additional building site is to rezone.
- K. Kryzer – a continuance would be in order if there is going to be a new plan and a new notice might be necessary. Mahlberg – stated they could continue for a different plan; but he is having an issue on whether this is "shoreland that is especially suited for residential". He wants to better understand the calculus for a parcel like this. Asked how an impaired lake and this shoreland is especially suited to residential. Otto – noted this is not the only impaired lake in the County. Buffalo Lake is also impaired along with several others; but they are still seeing development around them. He noted there are standards for stormwater required around the lakes that must be put in place. Each lake has different challenges. When he looks at what is especially suited, he looks at the lake. This one is designated a Recreational Development with homes on 50-100' lakes and what did that lakeshore look like at one time. With two parcels proposed on 1500' of shoreland, there should be room for a 50' strip to access

the lake and not negatively impact the lake. Not always the lake but the density put on the lake. Noted these are not sandy beach shores, but not sure existing lots on the lake were originally. The criteria he looks at on the lake is the density on the lake. Mahlberg – a comment was made you look at lots that overlook the lake as not much different. That is the problem, they hear everyone that comes before them, it is shoreland especially suited and that it is in the “beauty of the beholder”. If it is not much different, how can it rise to the threshold to “especially suited for residential” and warrants the zoning change. Otto – if this lake is so bad, then why are people living out here. He feels people will want to live on this land. The Commission rezoned a parcel on Fountain Lake where they got on site and found it was a beautiful site. There is something to say about viewing the lake too. Mahlberg – there could be dozens of examples, but at what point do they say the exception swallows the rule because people enjoy different things. Otto his rationale is all lakeshore is beautiful in some respect. He looks at the number of homes and how much destruction. Is it especially suited for two or twenty lots and he would argue this is suited for two.

- L. Discussion on a continuation. J. Cheney – they are not looking to continue the hearing. Have agreed to do a wetland buffer and the A/R would make it impossible to get another lakeshore lot. Appreciates the time and asked for a decision on the request.
- M. Felger – Otto mentioned the inlet through the wetland and with the proposal that would not get encroached on? Otto that is on the western or near the property line. J. Cheney it is on the parcel already sold. Felger – asked if it is possible to even open up more lots. Riley – rezoning makes it possible, until he sees a specific plan cannot be certain, but the physical restrictions and requirements would make it difficult to further subdivide. He cannot speak to the concerns of opening the door and noted forever is a long time. The access is shared and they will be using most of the shoreland and the wetland is protected by State law. He could not predict the future. Felger – this is addressed in the Zoning Ordinance and in the policy to rezone to other districts that he read. If an individual had 40 acres across the street there is no way to open the door if it is not riparian. There must be an avenue to consider rezoning and with this parcel it is the riparian. Cannot say never and years down the road things can change. Patti Rich stated if anyone wants to see the record in 2010 she has the record when there was an in-depth conversations on when they voted down the rezoning.
- N. Thompson – asked about the reference made to giving a variance for a second home. Riley – explained under the AG zone there is only one left. The only way to increase the density is rezoning.
- O. Felger asked whether there is any further public comment. Hearing none returned to the Commission noting the applicant has asked to move forward on the request.
- P. Tanner – his opinion is that he takes the Town Board’s recommendation seriously, this is not in the Land Use Plan and would not want to vary from that and set that precedence.
- Q. Bravinder asked for a full reading of the policy on rezoning option on “especially suited to residential”. Mahlberg when you are talking about rezoning the riparian is separate in the policy. Bravinder – referred to two developments on Cokato Lake, one did not require mitigation because there was not a large watershed. On the other side it was required and in that situation has improved the lake because it held back water from running directly into the lake. Much discussion on phosphates and what is the source, the home sites or is it the AG land. He viewed the watershed on his own since he did not make the site inspection. He did not think two more lots will impact the watershed.
- R. Felger asked if any of the open land has been under cultivation? S. Cheney not since he has owned it, other than hay taken off. Felger noted row crops create more erosion than a lawn or hay field. He relayed his experience on his 40 acres that he never puts into a row crop, too steep and how it relates to a neighbor that adds chemicals for his row crops. They need to weigh that in their decision. The door is open because it is riparian, there is a potential although remote that it can be rezoned further down in the future. This is a growing population and will be faced with more development, in the 30 years he has lived in Wright County he has seen it. The owners have property rights also and want to get the best gain, struggles with the “NIMBY”. He relayed a property experience with two development proposals he made. The objection to a neighbor wanting to develop because they want to look at the ag land can be solved by buying it. He asked there may be a huge watershed feeding into this lake and there could be lands way beyond that might want to develop.

- S. Riley a decision on the rezoning, with no conditions and not on the EAW is what is before them. Felger asked about the EAW status. Kryzer –Staff cannot decide on the EAW ordered in 2010. The RGU has to decide that because they have significantly different proposals.
- T. Thompson agreed this is a difficult decision. In adopting the Plan that has given them direction and should abide by those. Cannot predict the future or what the next owner might want to do.
- U. Thompson moved to recommend the Staff to draft Findings according to the record for a denial of the rezoning and close the public hearing. The hearing is continued to August 12, 2021 to review and adopt Findings. Tanner seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Bravinder if they are always going to follow the rule or the law, why are they sitting on this Board. They are allowed to rezone under the riparian clause. He does not support the motion because they can look at the riparian aspect. Mahlberg – agreed it is not just saying it is not in the Land Use Plan goes far enough. Felt where they will struggle is they have established in many cases a lack of predictability. They may have approved others that are further from this standard than this one.

VOTE: CARRIED, NAY: Felger & Bravinder

Kryzer informed the public there is no further comments or written documents accepted because the hearing was closed. The matter was continued for Findings on August 12 and will be referred to the County Board for a final decision.

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting of: July 1, 2021
M I N U T E S (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met July 1, 2021 in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, Dan Mol, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following Board members present: Mol, Pat Mahlberg, Jan Thompson, Mike Kaczmarek, Ken Felger and Dan Bravinder. Absent was: Corey Tanner. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning Office. Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, provided legal counsel.

1. **CHENEY PROPERTIES LLC, represented by Joe Cheney** – New Item

LOCATION: XXXX Dague Avenue SE - Part of Gov't Lots 1 & 2, Section 9; N ½ of SE ¼, except tract.; also S ½ of SW ¼ west of road, except..., Section 10, all in Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, MN. (Dean Lake- Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-100-094100 & -103300

Petitions to rezone approximately 63 acres from AG General Agriculture and S-2 Residential-Recreational Shorelands to A/R Agricultural-Residential and S-2 and also for a Conditional Use Permit for a two-lot unplatted subdivision (1-10 acre and remainder 53-acre lot) as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.029, 55.047 & 155.057, Chapter 154 & 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances & Subdivision Regulations.

Present: Joe Cheney, Cheney Properties which Paul Otto, Otto Associates

- A. Riley displayed the location, zoning, and land use maps to show the property. The site is riparian on Dean Lake and the most recent hearing was before the Board of Adjustment to divide the entire property in half. The Board granted the division with an "entitlement" with each half both zoned AG. The proposal is to rezone the east parcel, approximately 63 acres, to A/R and a Conditional Use Permit for a two-lot lakeshore subdivision.
- B. Otto explained the west portion (approved by the Board of Adjustment) sold. There was a previous request before the Planning Commission, but the proposal now is to finish off the sale and realize their investment. He described the shoreline has a nice slope from the lake, there are many trees and the proposed homesite would be outside of the trees. The County Highway Department has approved a shared access. He pointed out the one on the south end would be removed. Other land features include a large wetland on the larger parcel. Proposed are a ten-acre and 53-acre lots. They are scheduled on the next Town Board meeting because dates did not line up.

- C. Felger questioned the boundaries of the area being considered. The common property line was pointed out and the area down to the lake. Otto pointed out a driveway to another owner on the south. The access on the common property line was noted and another to the north. One access would be closed. They had previously had the wetland delineated. He pointed out the likely building locations. Kryzer that would not have to go through a sequencing procedure on the wetlands? Otto – answered no.
- D. Patti Rich property owner at 2932 24th St. SE on Dean Lake – she read a 3-page statement (on file). She reviewed the history of requests to try to rezone this property a couple times in the past that were turned down, second one withdrawn. The importance of the wetland feature that is found on this property should be protected. The Dean Lake Property Owners Association have been working hard with SWCD to try to improve water quality, however, it will be a long process. Feels additional development would be detrimental to the lake. The lake is on the impaired waters list as one of the dirtiest lakes in the State. Commission in the past made a site inspection to view the property and felt it made a huge impact on their decision to deny. The Commission decided the property is not suited for development. The land features were described showing the division of the large wetland and the tillable field near the county road. There are no specifics on the subdivision. They are not opposed to the two lots zoned AG; however, there is a continued effort to rezone and develop. They are concerned once sold, there will future requests to subdivide the land. The design plans they have seen have been from 8 to 44 homes, they have been told this is not likely. But this gives an idea what a potential developer might think. If wetlands are protected is it not their job to protect them. Holding ponds can be incorporated, however, does that ensure the exact same quality of water and land. They are strongly opposed to rezoning because of the potential of more homes, roads, animal waste, lawn fertilizer, sheds. Because of the proximity to the City of Buffalo, the lake gets much use from residents that don't live on the lake. They urge the Commission to deny the rezoning that could impact the wetlands and the lake's health. The Town Board has turned down the request twice. If necessary they would pursue the Environment Quality Board's assessment worksheet. They will be submitting a petition in opposition by most of the lake owners.
- E. Kaczmarek do they have a measurement of the lake quality from 11 years ago and what it is today? Wayne Nelson –came before the Board and stated he has been a resident on the lake for 31 years. The president of the Lake Association is out of state and could not be present tonight. He emailed some comments he wanted read. The Association was developed to improve the lake. The lakes are the State's most valuable resource. Across the State water quality on many lakes have reached critical levels. The points he made are Dean Lake is one of the impaired lakes and in 2008 the water quality was tested that determined it is one of the worst in the State. Phosphorous has runoff from adjoining lands and overloaded the lake; has fed the algae blooms. Poor management practices have been the reason for phosphorus loading and deterioration of the lake. The public waters are supposed to be clean enough to fish and swim in and local governments are supposed to figure out how to improve lakes that don't meet Federal Standards. Effort has been made to partner with SWCD to create berms to reduce the flow into the lake. Also, a MN Filter on one of the main creeks feeding into the lake. He described how the filter works. The cost is substantial; however, the Association is committed to these projects. Approving more development on the lake will only set their efforts back, solid surfaces will only add runoff to the lake and add to the problem. It cost 20x more to restore the lake than prevent the harm. The measurement of the water quality shows it is holding, about the same shown by the mean level of total phosphates and chlorophyll. The measurements were 5.5 times higher than what it should be. One measurement of the runoff from a creek on the northwest side were very high. He showed the readings of the creek and wetland. He does not see how the lake can absorb more and will take a very long time to reverse what has happened. There are two "entitlements", and no one has a problem with that; but the rezoning/subdivision is more than the lake can handle. Noted the Town Board has not commented and asked the matter be tabled to allow for that.
- F. Fran Hanson – lives on the lake in Kel-Kary Acres. The County road has been under construction and addition of 30+ cars travelling that road is too much. The new residents are generally young families that order groceries and things from Amazon and that adds much more traffic. The lake cannot handle this. When they first started the Association and met with the DNR they were told the lake was dying off, this will make it worse. Mahlberg – clarified the current application is for a two-lot subdivision with one house on each lot. Hanson – but the rest could be developed later. Mahlberg – there was the suggestion there could be 30-40 lots, but the plan before them is for two homes.

- G. Clarice Kessler –just moved onto the lake last year. When they purchased the property there was an option of two homes and that was important to them. They don't know the background; but are opposed to the rezoning.
- H. Scott Swanson – resident of the lake as of six weeks ago. Does not have much experience with the lake but is an experienced swimmer and does open swimming and bagging lakes. Has done this for several years. Wanted to move on a lake with plans to continue his swimming. Compared the quality of Dean to a number of lakes; he can report swimming he cannot see his hand 6" away. Felt the lake is an extremely distressed lake which is a disappointment. His view is directly on this property. The hearing is premature because the Town Board has not heard the matter. He is not in favor, can tell it is a very distressed lake.
- I. Duane Rolstad – local farmer and contractor – there are 900 acres of watershed that go into the lake. There are many farms and other developments that drain into the lake. He drove around the lake with another resident and counted 20 homes around the lake that sewer systems are older than 1995 and are not to code. Based on a recent 3-day septic conference he attended, he learned the biggest phosphorous problem is runoff from people's lawns. He takes offense that it is the farmers, he practices conservation. Noted a 12" tile that comes from Highway 25 through the Carlson property, drains over 300 acres in one field. He farms land adjacent to the lake, explained how it drains. He suggested Staff look at the number of "entitlements" left for the property and felt there is one more. A division was not part of the original farm. What is being requested is not out of line.
- J. P. Rich – they are aware of sewer systems and they have updated them. Once the rezoning gets approved, that opens the door. Felger questioned the number of homes another person referred to. Rich – that speaker was referring to what the future might hold. They want to see it remain AG. They have seen a proposal with up to 40 homes, with lot lines going through the wetlands (this related to the original farm parcel). May have been at the Town Board and did not go any further.
- K. Rolstad – the wetland they are referring to is a farmable wetland and there is a busted tile that goes to the lake.
- L. Thompson moved to continue the hearing to July 22, 2021 for a site inspection. Mahlberg seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Kaczmarek – would like to see the Town Board's recommendation first. Mahlberg noted this Town Board often meets the Commission on site.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY