

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
OF SOUTH BEND AND ST. JOSEPH COUNTY

September 16th, 2019
13th Floor Conference Room
County – City Building
South Bend, IN 46601

I. CALL TO ORDER

Commission President Gelfman called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Members of the Public Present:

Joanie Downs, 849 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN
Andrew Polianecki, 809 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Michele Gelfman, President; Elizabeth Hertel, Vice President; Sarah Ponder, Secretary; Lesley Annis, Assistant Secretary; Eric Stalheim.

Members Not in Attendance: Mary Brazinsky.

Staff Present: Elicia Feasel, Historic Preservation Administrator; Adam Toering, Historic Preservation Specialist; Sandra Kennedy, Legal Counsel.

Staff Not in Attendance: N/A

III. PUBLIC HEARING

A. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Commissioner Annis made a motion to rearrange the order of the reviewed projects. Seconded by Commissioner Hertel. Motion to approve the rearrange the order of the agenda is approved.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. 809 Forest Avenue is to be heard before 605 Rex Street.

- 1. 809 Forest Avenue #2019-0903A #9574-05 Chapin Park**
Local and National Register of Historic Places
Representation: Andrew Polianecki, 809 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN

**STAFF REPORT
CONCERNING APPLICATION FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Date: September 12, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0903A

Property Location: 809 Forest Avenue

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: American Foursquare / 1890

Property Owner: Andrew and Sherri Andre' Polianecki

Landmark or District Designation: Chapin Park Local (Ordinance #9574-05) and National Historic District

Rating: *Contributing*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: The home is a two storey with an irregular floor plan set upon a brick foundation. The roof is hipped with side gables and cornice returns and covered with asphalt shingles. The chimney is slightly offset with

corbelled brick. The exterior walls are 4 1/2" wood clapboard with frieze and moulded cornice and corner boards. There is a full width front porch with four slender turned spindle columns, a concrete floor and moulded cornice. The windows are 1/1 double hung with moulded entablatures.

ALTERATIONS: The rear porch was enclosed and a one storey addition built onto the rear of the house. A bay window was added to the west side of the house. The barn noted in the 1987 survey card has burned. There are aluminum storm windows and a new roof. The original wooden porch has been replaced by concrete. A second storey addition in the rear of the house was approved by the Commission in April 2009. COA 2009-0601 allowed for the installation of a wooden spaced French Gothic fence. RME 2017-0831 allowed for the removal and replacement of the asphalt shingle roof and flashing. Two upstairs windows were removed, restored, and rehung by the homeowner (with assistance from neighbors) in early Spring of 2019.

APPLICATION ITEMS: *"A bay window exists off the dining room of this house and is not original to the house (built in 1894-1896). This bay window is not in good shape and continues to separate from the house. A significant amount of cold air enters the house during the winter, reducing energy efficiency. Parts of the wood in the window are rotting. This window continues to deteriorate to the point where it is possible that it is causing other damage to the house and it is necessary to replace it. A wooden bay window will likely be expensive enough to prohibit our replacing the window at all."*

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for improvements on the structure including:

1. Reconstruction of a non-original bay window on the south side of the structure with three Royal Wood by Polar Seal brand windows. The windows – per the manufacturer's documentation – are vinyl. Further installation information is as follows:
 - a. The existing windows will be removed,
 - b. The new vinyl windows will be installed into the existing frame,
 - c. Insulation will be packed around the perimeter of the window,
 - d. Silicone will be used to seal around the windows,
 - e. The exterior sills and frame are to be wrapped in aluminum

SITE VISIT REPORT:

Specialist Toering and Inspector Szaday visited the house December 18, 2018 at the request of the property owners to consult on the condition of two upstairs windows. During the course of the site visit, the property owner informed HPC staff of their concern for the bay window on the main floor. Photographs were taken to document the condition at that time. The non-original bay window is comprised of four fixed panes (two on each side) mounted on either side of an operable window in the central section constructed out of wood. Exterior framing and finishing is also wood.

Paint flaking and chipping is visible on the exterior of the bay window.

Most of the other windows on the house have storm windows. The bay windows do not have a storm windows. Temporary weather stripping to mitigate heat-loss has been installed.

Adam Toering, Historic Preservation Specialist

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: CHAPIN PARK

General Definitions

(B) PRESERVATION GUIDELINES

(b2) Rehabilitation (ADOPTED)

Maintaining the existing character of the district, and whenever possible returning it to its original condition. Any rehabilitation would not require the removal of all non-original materials but would encourage the removal of all such materials which are incompatible with the defined elements of preservation for the district. The design of new construction or alteration would not require the duplication of the original design and construction, but should be compatible with existing structures and the district's defined elements of preservation. The use of original materials or construction techniques would be encouraged, but contemporary methods and materials would be acceptable when compatible.

II. EXISTING STRUCTURES

A. BUILDING MATERIALS

Original exterior building materials in the district include brick, stucco, clapboard, wood shingles, and brick or stone masonry. In some instances, vinyl, composite and aluminum siding have been applied over the original material.

Required

Original exterior building materials shall be retained when possible. Deterioration of wood materials shall be prevented through repair, cleaning and painting. The existing architectural detail around windows, porches, doors and eaves shall be retained or replaced by replicas of the same design when deteriorated beyond repair.

Masonry, including brick and stucco structures, shall be maintained, and properly cleaned only when necessary to halt deterioration or to remove stains and shall be done in a method acceptable for the preservation of the surface: i.e. low-pressure

water and soft natural bristle brushes. Brick or masonry mortar joints should be repointed only when there is evidence of moisture problems, or when sufficient mortar is missing to allow water to stand in the mortar joint. Existing mortar shall be duplicated in composition, color, texture, joint size, method of application and joint profile.

When repairing stucco, stucco mixture shall be used. A professional shall make a study of the old stucco, to determine the exact mixture and underlayment used in the original work. Some repair methods are not compatible with the original techniques and may cause early disintegration of the repair work and the original work.

Ample ventilation must be afforded the structure when siding is installed, in order to prevent increased deterioration of the structure from moisture and insects.

Recommended

Whenever possible, the original building materials should be restored. When maintaining or repairing original siding is not feasible, aluminum, vinyl or composite siding may be used. When used over wood surfaces, this siding should be the same size and style as the original wood. Every effort should be made to retain the original trim around windows, doors, cornices gables, eaves and other architectural features.

Property owners should contact the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County prior to initiating any restoration or rehabilitation effort. [Address and contact information is listed in the front of the Guidebook.] The Commission is an invaluable source of information about all facets of rehabilitation and restoration – materials, methods, contractors and the like.

Prohibited

Wood siding shall not be resurfaced with new materials that is inappropriate or was unavailable when the building was constructed, such as artificial stone, brick veneer, asbestos or asphalt shingles.

Sandblasting or the use of harsh detergents shall not be used on masonry including brick, stucco, limestone, flagstone and sandstone. This method of cleaning erodes the surface material and accelerates deterioration.

Repointing shall not be done with a mortar of high Portland cement content which can often create a bond that is stronger than the building material. Usage of Portland cement can cause deterioration as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and porosity of the historic masonry unit and the mortar. This most often results in serious damage to adjacent brick.

Unpainted masonry surfaces shall not be painted unless they had been painted originally. Paint shall not be removed from masonry surfaces by any means that damage the surface.

Not Recommended

Waterproof or water repellent coatings or surface consolidation treatments should not be used on masonry surfaces unless required to solve a specific problem that has been studied and identified. Coatings are frequently unnecessary and expensive and can accelerate deterioration of the masonry. Mortar joints, which do not need repointing, should not be repointed. Wood siding should not be power-washed.

II. EXISTING STRUCTURES

C. WINDOWS AND DOORS

Window and door frames are in most cases wood and vary depending upon the style of the home. Many are double-hung windows with wood trim and sills. Brick structures have stone sills and brick lintels. In some cases where aluminum siding has been applied, the window and door trim has been covered. About half of the structures in the district have aluminum storm windows; the other half have wood storm windows.

Required

Original windows and doors shall be retained including sashes, lintels, sills, shutters, decorative glass, pediments, hoods and hardware. When deteriorated beyond repair, they shall be replaced with units and trim resembling the original.

Recommended

Wood storm windows and doors painted or finished to match the original should be used but should not damage existing frames. If new sashes or doors are installed, the existing or original materials, design and hardware should be used.

When metal storm doors are used, they should be painted, anodized or coated to match the existing. When awnings are used, they should be of canvas material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff does not favorably recommend the proposed project, as the installation of a vinyl window in the proposed configuration – even a later, non-original addition – is perceived to be a regression in material.

Staff would prefer to see either A) a wooden (or other material) replacement proposal or B) the installation of storm window(s) on the exterior of the bay window.

Written by
Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist
Approved by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Polianecki informed the commission that they did get a quote for wood windows, and that it was twice as much than the existing quote. The current window is rotting and leaking. There is concern that the additional cost may mean that they cannot keep the bay window.

Commissioner Gelfman asked if the bay window is original.

Mr. Polianecki stated that they do not think so.

Commissioner Gelfman asked if aluminum-clad windows had been considered for installation.

Mr. Polianecki stated that he could not remember if aluminum-clad windows had been discussed with Pella or Barany.

Commissioner Hertel stated that, because the window is visible from the street, a vinyl window would detract. Commissioner Hertel asked if the applicant could look into another option, an aluminum-clad window or other options. Vinyl is not a good option for historic preservation purposes.

Mr. Polianecki stated that he could not remember what Pella's response on aluminum-clad windows in this space, and that he didn't feel comfortable speaking on their behalf.

Commissioner Hertel expressed interest in Andersen aluminum-clad windows.

Mr. Polianecki stated that he believes Barany suggested contacting Andersen windows.

Commissioner Gelfman asked if there was any interest in removing the bay window and replacing it with what may have been there before.

Mr. Polianecki stated he wasn't really certain on what was there before.

Commissioner Hertel expressed that she could envision that the window would have matched the surrounding windows.

Commissioner Hertel expressed interest in seeing additional quotes, and that she would feel comfortable remanding the approval of the proposed windows to staff.

Specialist Toering stated that there were a number of options before the Commission: one, rebuilding the bay window with new options, requiring different specifications and manufacturers quotes. A second option would be to remove the bay window and insert new windows in the space matching the other windows.

Mr. Polianecki stated that they do use the bay window, and that they enjoy looking out on the adjacent yard.

Commissioner Gelfman expressed that they would suggest either an aluminum clad option, or taking the windows out and reconstructing it with maybe two windows, or perhaps one.

Commissioner Hertel expressed that she would not rule out wooden windows, as there may be better options.

Specialist Toering stated that any reconstruction of the existing bay window raises some concerns that the contractor doing the work will need to reconstruct the 'structure' of the bay window itself (as there are concerns as to its structural integrity). We have some existing windows in our stock of original windows, and that skilled craftsmen exist in your neighborhood that could reconstruct that window enclosure with rehabbed windows instead of new replacements. A reconstructed/rehabilitated window would still need an aluminum storm window on the outside to combat moisture and drafts.

Mr. Polianecki agreed that there were a number of factors of concerns with this bay window.

Specialist Toering stated that the bay window differs from other bay windows he is aware of are structurally built differently than this one.

Commissioner Annis recommended a structural engineer (Rick Keller) regarding the viability of the bay window.

Mr. Polianecki stated he was happy to contact an engineer, that he was happy to confirm other window options.

Commissioner Annis stated she would recommend North Coast Windows, as they can replicate and reproduce windows as needed.

Specialist Toering again expressed concern that he is hesitant to make recommendations for certain products because he is concerned that products will fail in a few years.

Commissioner Hertel stated that she would be comfortable relegating to the Staff.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

N/A

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

Mr. Polianecki joked that his son turned eight on Sunday, and he would just give you a thumbs up.

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to remand COA#2019-0903A to Staff once the homeowner has further investigated the options and approached them with materials. Should the COA come before the Commission again, the application fee will be waived. Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to remand COA #2019-0903A to staff is passed.

2. 605 Rex Street #2019-0830 #9574-05 Chapin Park Local
and National Register of Historic Places
Representation: Joan Downs, 849 Forest Avenue

**STAFF REPORT
CONCERNING APPLICATION FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Date: September 11, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0830

Property Location: 605 Rex Street

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Gabled-front / 1899 or 1905

Property Owner: Joan M. Downs

Landmark or District Designation: Chapin Park Local (Ordinance #9574-05) and National Historic District

Rating: Contributing

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: The house located at 605 Rex is a gable-front one and a half-story structure with original shingles in the gable and clapboard siding and corner boards. There is a full width screen enclosed porch with wood supports set on brick piers and rail with stone caps. There is wood and chain link fence along the side yard on the west and a stockade fence along the east side.

ALTERATIONS: Original second floor street-facing window (described in the survey card as “very long paired windows in gable”) was replaced sometime after it was photographed in 1987. COA 2008-0903 allowed for the installation of the wooden and chainlink fence around the rear of the property. COA 2011-0607 allowed for roof, soffit, and gutter repair following ice melt damage. COA 2018-0530A allowed for the replacement of the second story front façade window, as well as the installation of new railings at each of the entrances. RME 2018-0530B allowed for the construction of custom wooden storm windows.

APPLICATION ITEMS: “See attached sheets.”

“Exterior work at 605 Rex Street will include:

Back of the house:

- replacement of the missing skirt board around the back of the house,
- reframing of the back door and insertion of new historically appropriate door to match the existing kitchen door (single pane glass half the door’s height approximately with coffers below),
- construction of a small deck to make access to the back kitchen door possible (porch to be low and have low historically appropriate railing and 2-3 steps to the garden, with lattice below porch floor, see drawings),
- construction of a window immediately to the east of the back door to add light to the interior of the kitchen / mudroom, wi(n)dow will measure approximately 1 x 2 feet and be double hung wood clad by Marvin.

East side of the House:

- addition of a simple metal decorative railing to the house at the front kitchen door (see specs),
- addition of a railing to the front porch on the house side of the door to the screen porch we will add a simple railing (see drawings),
- reconstruction of the entrance wall to the screen porch to include proper siding but retain the general plan which is currently there with windows above a low wall,
- replacement of the stylistically inappropriate second floor front window (see photo) new window will be good clad double hung window to match existing windows from Marvin Windows (see specs),
- construction of a small garden shed along the fence in the back garden which is closest to the northeast corner of the house (see drawings),

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for improvements on the structure including:

2. Modifications to the rear (north) of the house, including:
 - a. Replacement of the missing skirt board (with wood),
 - b. Replacing the existing rear door with a historically appropriate half-lite door,
 - c. Installing a new wooden 3’ x 2’ window in the wall beside the rear door,

- d. Constructing a new treated deck with steps, railings, and square ballisters,
- 3. Modifications to the East side of the house, including:
 - a. Addition of simple metal railings on both the front entrance steps as well as the kitchen entrance steps,
 - b. Reconstruction of the east wall enclosing the front porch by:
 - i. Reconstructing the lower wall sections and section beside windows to replicate the siding pattern of the remainder of the house,
 - ii. Reconfiguring the windows and door enclosures (see schematics – screen door and window size changes are minimal),
- 4. Replacement of the upstairs gable window (currently 6 over 6, vinyl[?]), to be replaced with wood 1 over 1 window, manufacturer to be determined).

SITE VISIT REPORT: N/A

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: CHAPIN PARK

General Definitions

(B) PRESERVATION GUIDELINES

(b2) Rehabilitation (ADOPTED)

Maintaining the existing character of the district, and whenever possible returning it to its original condition. Any rehabilitation would not require the removal of all non-original materials but would encourage the removal of all such materials which are incompatible with the defined elements of preservation for the district. **The design of new construction or alteration would not require the duplication of the original design and construction but should be compatible with existing structures and the district's defined elements of preservation. The use of original materials or construction techniques would be encouraged, but contemporary methods and materials would be acceptable when compatible.**

II. EXISTING STRUCTURES

C. WINDOWS AND DOORS

Window and door frames are in most cases wood and vary depending upon the style of the home. Many are double-hung windows with wood trim and sills. Brick structures have stone sills and brick lintels. In some cases where aluminum siding has been applied, the window and door trim has been covered. About half of the structures in the district have aluminum storm windows; the other half have wood storm windows.

Required

Original windows and doors shall be retained including sashes, lintels, sills, shutters, decorative glass, pediments, hoods and hardware. When deteriorated beyond repair, they shall be replaced with units and trim resembling the original.

Recommended

Wood storm windows and doors painted or finished to match the original should be used but should not damage existing frames. If new sashes or doors are installed, the existing or original materials, design and hardware should be used.

When metal storm doors are used, they should be painted, anodized or coated to match the existing. When awnings are used, they should be of canvas material.

D. ENTRANCES, PORCHES AND STEPS

Most houses in the district have either an open or enclosed porch across the front. Most porches have either hip or gabled roofs or are covered by the main roof of the house.

Required

When deteriorated beyond repair, existing or original porches, stoops, patios and steps, including handrails, balusters, columns, brackets, tiles and roof decorations, shall be retained or replaced by replicas of the same design or by a design more in keeping with the historic period of the structure.

Porches and additions reflecting later architectural styles and which are important to the building's historical integrity shall be retained.

Recommended

When enclosing porches for heat conservation or for other reasons, it should be done in a manner that does not alter the architectural or historical character of the building.

Not Recommended

Original porch details should not be replaced with materials representing a different period or style from the original.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the project, as it conforms to the Standards & Guidelines of the Chapin Park Local and National Historic District.

Written by
Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist
Approved by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

Administrator Feasel expressed that Staff considered administratively approving the project, but there were many minor projects that accumulated to create a major project.

Specialist Toering expressed that this project is related to and an extension of her project approved last year. The newly proposed window is different than the previously approved window (believed to be for cost reasons), but is still in keeping with the Standards and Guidelines and is approvable.

Commissioner Hertel asked if the project could be discussed and was confirmed that it could be. Commissioner Hertel expressed the desire to remain consistent for all applicants, and that all details should be received by staff before approval happens. That the door at the rear was not visible from the street, and that the submission did not seem problematic.

Ms. Downs arrived in the proceedings.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Commissioner Hertel explained the rear window could be considered the same and would desire to remand it to staff. The decorative railing was also a concern, however.

Ms. Downs stated that it was to be a simple design and affixed to the building. Both railings are to be installed on the east side of the house (at each porch).

Commissioner Hertel expressed concern about the look of the railing.

Ms. Downs stated that she had installed a railing on 803 Leland, and it was minimal and barely noticeable. For the rear door, that should not be noticeable. Removing the large railing on the other side will make it even less noticeable. Different designs were considered. The front porch was not originally screened in, so there isn't a regular place to attach the railing. The goal of these projects is to be minimal and unseen.

Commissioner Hertel again explained that she was wanting to be consistent with the review of these applications, that these unknown details should be brought before staff upon approval.

Ms. Downs expressed that she had trouble getting the exact profiles matched with the front window, and she now has a new window contractor who has assured her that he can manufacture the indicated window configuration. She was shocked that the previous window manufacturer (a Pella representative) was unable to do what she had asked. The door will look like the picture indicated, but more information will be forthcoming.

Commissioner Hertel expressed concern about the shed and the fence.

Ms. Downs expressed that the shed has a 'shed' roof, sloping behind, sided in wood matching the house, with doors that swing open (similar to barn doors), that open out. It will be painted to match the house. It's at the rear of the lot, close to where you would want your tools / barbecue equipment. She further expressed displeasure on the railing that was rendered by the AutoCAD design. The porch can be lower, it will have a step all the way around it.

Commissioner Hertel expressed concern regarding the distance between the shed and the porch.

Ms. Downs expressed that the details of the porch can be brought back to Staff.

Commissioner Hertel summarized the project, and asked Staff if they had any concerns regarding the enclosed porch.

Specialist Toering expressed that his understanding of the proposed front porch improvements would be an improvement on the existing design and would be reversible were it to be wanted to be an open porch in the future.

Ms. Downs expressed that she felt the previous format of the enclosed porch was not logically made, with poor materials, and that her renters utilize the front porch regularly. She looks forward to replacing the screen door and improving the space. All of these projects were precipitated by the reconstruction of the foundation brick, as there was deterioration and spalling in the brick. One project leads to another, which leads to another. She wants to improve the house.

Commissioner Gelfman expressed, on behalf of the Commission, appreciation for all the hard work that she spends on all of her homes.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

N/A

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

N/A

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to approve COA#2019-0830 with the condition that the doors, windows, railings, and the final plan for the deck be remanded to staff. Seconded by Commissioner Ponder.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0830 with conditions is passed.

IV. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

V. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- i. Commissioner Hertel made a motion to approve the August meeting minutes as circulated.** Seconded by Commissioner Stalheim.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve the minutes passes.

B. STAFF REPORTS

i. Administrative Approvals

1. 721 Lincoln Way East – Commissioners Ponder and Hertel expressed interest and concern for the continued progress on the project. HPC Staff stated they would follow up with the property owner.
2. 801 W Washington – Administrator Feasel explained the ongoing projects being prepared there, including administratively approved window restoration and rehabilitation. TIF funding is believed to be utilized for this project.

Commissioner Hertel expressed interest in Staff continuing to monitor this ongoing project for insights that could be applied on other rehabilitation projects.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS

i. Disposition of Historic Preservation Assets

1. N/A

ii. Standards Update

1. Administrator Feasel stated that there will be a meeting scheduled in the near future.
2. Administrator Feasel stated that she will distribute the work on Standards and Guidelines that the HPC Intern had generated.
3. Commissioner Hertel and Commissioner Ponder inquired about the idea ensuring that information related to Historic status of individual properties should be readily available.
4. Administrator Feasel explained the role of Indiana Landmarks and Notre Dame's Architecture school in the standards update process.
5. Commissioner Hertel asked about the county-wide survey process.
6. Commissioners Hertel and Gelfman asked about the ways through which information related to the locally designated properties and the National Register of Historic Places. Concern was raised that we are not explaining what either of those categories entail sufficiently.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Commissioner Hertel asked about whether the Commission had the ability to connect with property owners within in our Local Historic Districts. A mailer was requested.
- B. Commissioner Ponder asked about tying into DTSSB events to promote understanding the status of individual properties.
- C. Commissioner Ponder inquired as to the status of the Birdsell Mansion, 511 Colfax. Staff have had no interaction with the property owner as of late. Staff believes that Code Enforcement has an open file on the property.

- D. Commissioner Hertel asked about the status of filling the void from the resignation of the Historic Preservation Inspector. Staff is working with their Department of Community Investment to see when the position can be posted.
- E. Administrator Feasel stated that the former HPC Inspector applied to the Common Council for one of the vacancies.
- F. Commissioner Hertel asked about the Architectural Historian vacancy on the Commission. Commissioner Annis stated that she had a contact in mind who worked at Notre Dame.

Commissioner Gelfman requested that Staff reach out to the Architecture department at Notre Dame to see if anyone on the faculty or staff would like to be on the Commission.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Annis made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Hertel.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Meeting adjourned at 6:46 pm.

Attest:


Sarah Ponder, Secretary

10-21-19
Date

