Mr. Plauche stated the number of members present constituted a quorum and called the meeting to order, advising all attending of the policies and procedures pertaining to the Planning Commission.

The Chair recognized Mr. Olsen who wanted to make the Commission and design professionals that were in attendance aware of some recent developments. Mr. Olsen made the following announcement regarding the same:

A. the staff, as of late, has had issues where site plans are being submitted for both Planning Commission applications and ultimately for permitting where trees and other infrastructure improvements were either not depicted at all or were erroneously located on the plan;
B. these types of errors in many cases have caused some very significant problems and he cited a site the staff had been dealing
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with where two trees (i.e. a 48" Live Oak and a 24" Live Oak) were depicted in the wrong location, with the actual location of the trees being where the proposed driveway was to be located and as a result, those trees had been damaged to the point they must be removed;

C. the design professional in the case cited not only illustrated them in the wrong location, but also sealed and signed the drawings;

D. as a result of this type of misinformation being given to staff, now there will probably be staff site visits to verify the accuracy of the information given to staff; and,

E. future site visits for field verification may include, but not be limited to, Planning staff or Urban Forestry staff prior to permitting as well, and the Planning staff will not sign off on permits until site verification has been made.

Mr. Olsen advised that as these visits are now necessary. He also added inaccurate information submitted for projects may cause additional delays as well.

The Chair asked if the Planning Department planned on distributing that information in written form to the design professionals and Mr. Olsen stated that could be done.

Hearing no further information, the Chair began the meeting in regular form.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Plauche moved, with second by Mr. Miller, to approve the minutes from the following, regularly held, Planning Commission meetings:

- May 21, 2009
- June 4, 2009
- June 18, 2009
- July 2, 2009
- July 16, 2009

The motion carried unanimously.
HOLDOVERS:

Case #SUB2009-00131 (Subdivision)
Woodland Glen Subdivision
Eastern terminus of Meadow Drive North, extending to the Northern terminus of Meadow Heights Drive, the Northern terminus of Meadow Run Drive, and the Northern terminus of Meadow Dale Drive and Meadow Green Court, extending to the Western terminus of Augustine Drive
Number of Lots / Acres: 275± Lots / 86.3± Acres
Engineer / Surveyor: Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc.

The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno, with second by Mr. DeMouy, to approve the above referenced subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1) dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 50’, as measured from the centerline of Schillinger Road South;
2) revision of the 25’ minimum building setback line for all lots with frontage onto Schillinger Road South to reflect the right-of-way dedication;
3) revision of Lot 2 to comply with Section V.D.2 of the Subdivision Regulations;
4) placement of a note on the Final Plat stating that direct access to Schillinger Road South is denied for any lots fronting onto Schillinger Road South;
5) placement of a note on the final plat stating that all lots (including corner lots) are limited to one curb each, with the size, design, and location to be approved by the Mobile County Engineering Department and in conformance with AASHTO Standards;
6) provision of traffic impact study and acceptence by the Mobile County Engineering Department prior to signing the Final Plat;
7) placement of a note on the plat / site plan stating that approval of all applicable Federal, state, and local agencies is required for endangered, threatened, or otherwise protected species, if any, prior to the issuance of any permits or land disturbance activities;
8) the applicant receive the approval of all applicable federal, state, and local environmental agencies would be required prior to the issuance of any permits or land disturbance activities;
9) placement of a note on the final plat stating that any lots developed commercially and adjoin residentially developed property shall provide a buffer in compliance with Section V.A.8 of the Subdivision Regulations; and,

10) submission of a letter from a licensed engineer certifying compliance with the City of Mobile’s stormwater and flood control ordinances to the Mobile County Engineering department and the Planning Section of Mobile Urban Development prior to issuance of any permits.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2009-02084 (Planned Unit Development)

St. Luke’s Upper School Subdivision

1400 South University Boulevard

South side of University Boulevard, 490’± East of Grelot Road

Planned Unit Development Approval to amend a previously approved Planned Unit Development to allow multiple buildings on a single building site and to allow the addition of new baseball, softball, and football fields, all associated backstops and dugouts for new fields, moveable bleachers and a new ground maintenance storage building

Council District 6

(Also see Case #ZON2009-02085 (Planning Approval) St. Luke’s Upper School Subdivision, below)

Mr. Watkins recused himself from discussion and voting on the matter.

The Chair announced the application had been recommended for approval, as well as advising the Commission members of several letters regarding the matter at their respective spots.

Doug Anderson, Burr and Foreman Law Firm, spoke representing the school. He stated that he had been in negotiations with Randy Spear, Richardson, Spear, Spear, and Hamby Law Firm, who represented the neighbors. He said they had reached an agreement in the few minutes prior to the meeting and made the following statements regarding that agreement:

A. the school agreed to the staff’s recommendations concerning the buffer issue (conditions 1 and 2);
B. on the south side of the property, behind the proposed football field, the school would construct a 20 foot vegetative buffer and an 8 foot high privacy fence, with the fence being constructed on the school’s side of the vegetative buffer;
C. on the west side, the school would maintain a 30 foot buffer with no fence because the current natural buffer in that area goes from approximately 80 feet in some areas up to approximately 170 feet
in other areas, and added that because of the natural vegetative buffer that already exists in conjunction with the topography of the site a fence would have no substantive value; and,

D. on the east side, the school would construct an 8 foot privacy fence with the natural buffer remaining in place as is.

Mr. Olsen clarified that the fences on the east and south sides would be located inside of the buffer to which Mr. Anderson stated that on the east side, the fence would be on or near the property line on the residential side and that on the south side, it would be on the school side of the buffer.

Mr. DeMouy asked if the buffer would require any maintenance or would it be allowed to grow naturally.

Mr. Anderson stated that it would follow typical City requirements that are required under the landscape ordinance.

Mr. DeMouy asked again who would be responsible for the maintenance of the natural buffer and Mr. Anderson stated the school would be responsible for it on the east and west sides, but on the south side the neighbors had agreed to be responsible for it based upon the location of the fence.

The Chair asked if that was the total recommendation and if both sides had agreed to it.

Mr. Anderson stated yes, both sides had agreed to those stipulations along with the other recommendations as given by the staff.

Mr. Spear stated that his clients were agreeable with the compromise as stated. He also thanked the Commission for their diligence in the matter, as he felt that without their guidance there would have been no way the issue would have been resolved by the two sides. He added that this agreement between the neighbors and the school was only for the proposal before the Commission that day and in no way reflected his clients’ agreement with any expansion to the plan the school might wish to make in the future.

Mr. Holmes asked if the Commission could have a copy of the agreement just presented by the two attorneys and was told it had not yet been physically drafted as it had just been reached approximately three minutes prior to the start of the meeting, but a copy of the written agreement would be sent to staff and the Commission.

Mr. Davitt, Mr. Miller, and the Chair commended both sides for coming together in mutual accord to resolve the matter.

Hearing no further opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Davitt, with second by Mr. Jordan, to approve the above referenced subdivision, subject to the following conditions:
1) placement of a note on the site plan stating that the buffer along the south end of the property is to be a 20’ vegetative buffer and an 8-foot high wooden privacy fence inside the buffer (on the north side of), with appropriate permits,

2) placement of a note on the site plan stating that the buffer along the West side of the property is to be a 30’ minimum vegetative buffer, with no fence due to existing vegetation and topography;

3) placement of a note on the site plan stating that the buffer along the East side of the property is to be an 8’ wooden privacy fence, and the vegetative buffer is to remain as is;

4) buffers to be completed prior to the football, baseball and softball fields;

5) lighting of parking facilities shall be provided in compliance with Section 64-6.3.6.c of the Zoning Ordinance;

6) provision of consultation with Engineering Department on the placement, design and construction of the sidewalks along University Boulevard South prior to October 15, 2010;

7) compliance with Engineering comments: (Must comply with all stormwater and flood control ordinances. Detention must be provided for any increase in impervious area added to the site since 1984 in excess of 4000 square feet. Any work performed in the right-of-way will require a right-of-way permit);

8) illustration of any additional dumpster or trash receptacle, with minor revisions to parking and circulation layout to be approved by Planning staff, if necessary;

9) submission of a revised site plan reflecting the conditions prior to the issuance of any permits; and,

10) full compliance with all other municipal codes and ordinances.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2009-02085 (Planning Approval)
St. Luke’s Upper School Subdivision
1400 South University Boulevard
South side of University Boulevard, 490’ East of Grelot Road
Planning Approval (Master Plan) to amend a previously approved Planning Approval to allow the addition of a new baseball, softball, and football fields, all associated backstops and dugouts for new fields, moveable bleachers and a new ground maintenance storage building at an existing school in a B-1, Buffer Business District
Council District 6
(Also see Case #ZON2009-02084 (Planned Unit Development) St. Luke’s Upper School Subdivision, above)
Hearing no further opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Davitt, with second by Mr. Jordan, to approve the above referenced Planning Approval, subject to the following conditions:

1) placement of a note on the site plan stating that the buffer along the south end of the property is to be a 20’ vegetative buffer and an 8-foot high wooden privacy fence inside the buffer (on the north side of), with appropriate permits,
2) placement of a note on the site plan stating that the buffer along the West side of the property is to be a 30’ minimum vegetative buffer, with no fence due to existing vegetation and topography;
3) placement of a note on the site plan stating that the buffer along the East side of the property is to be an 8’ wooden privacy fence, and the vegetative buffer is to remain as is;
4) buffers to be completed prior to the football, baseball and softball fields;
5) lighting of parking facilities shall be provided in compliance with Section 64-6.A.3.c of the Zoning Ordinance;
6) provision of consultation with Engineering Department on the placement, design, and construction of the sidewalks along University Boulevard South prior to October 15, 2010;
7) compliance with Engineering comments: (Must comply with all stormwater and flood control ordinances. Detention must be provided for any increase in impervious area added to the site since 1984 in excess of 4000 square feet. Any work performed in the right-of-way will require a right-of-way permit);
8) illustration of any additional dumpster or trash receptacle, with minor revisions to parking and circulation layout to be approved by Planning staff, if necessary;
9) submission of a revised site plan reflecting the conditions prior to the issuance of any permits; and,
10) full compliance with all other municipal codes and ordinances.

The motion carried unanimously.

EXTENSIONS:

Case #SUB2008-00212 (Subdivision)
Colonial Hills Subdivision, Unit 6
North terminus of Colonial Crossing, extending to the South side of Airport Boulevard, 220°± East of Snow Road South
Number of Lots / Acres: 23 Lots / 20.9± Acres
Engineer / Surveyor: Austin Engineering Company Inc.
County
The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Mr. Davitt, to approve the above referenced request for extension.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Case #SUB2006-00242 (Subdivision)**  
**Wynnfield Subdivision, Unit Five**  
West terminus of Wynngate Way, extending North and West to the South terminus of Widgeon Drive  
Number of Lots / Acres: 67 Lots / 70.5+ Acres  
Engineer / Surveyor: Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc.  
Council District 6

The Chair announced the matter had been recommended for denial, however, if there were those who wished to speak on the matter to please do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Dr. Rivizzigno, to deny the above referenced request for extension.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Case #SUB2003-00285 (Subdivision)**  
**Oak Grove Subdivision**  
South side of Firetower Road, ¼ mile+ East of Greenbriar Court  
Number of Lots / Acres: 119 Lots / 75.4+ Acres  
Engineer / Surveyor: Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc.  
County

The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Mr. DeMouy, to deny the above referenced request for extension.

The motion carried unanimously.
Case #SUB2008-00200 (Subdivision) Uniport Subdivision, Re-subdivision of and Addition to Lot 2
4616 and 4628 Airport Boulevard
North side of Airport Boulevard, 125’± East of South University Boulevard, extending to the East side of South University Boulevard 118’± North of Airport Boulevard
Number of Lots / Acres: 1 Lot / 1.8± Acres
Engineer / Surveyor: Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc.
Council District 5
(Also see Case #ZON2008-02188 (Planned Unit Development) Uniport Subdivision, Re-subdivision of and Addition to Lot 2, below)

The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Mr. Watkins, to approve the above referenced request for extension, and that the applicant is advised that future extensions are unlikely.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2008-02188 (Planned Unit Development) Uniport Subdivision, Re-subdivision of and Addition to Lot 2
4616, 4628 and 4640 Airport Boulevard
Northeast corner of Airport Boulevard and South University Boulevard
Planned Unit Development Approval to allow shared access and parking between two building sites
Council District 5
(Also see Case #SUB2008-00200 (Subdivision) Uniport Subdivision, Re-subdivision of and Addition to Lot 2, above)

The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Mr. Watkins, to approve the above referenced request for extension, and that the applicant is advised that future extensions are unlikely.

The motion carried unanimously.
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Case #SUB2006-00225 (Subdivision)
Belle Isle Subdivision, Re-subdivision of Lots 1-6
4710 Belle Isle Lane
North terminus of Belle Isle Lane
Number of Lots / Acres: 6 Lots / 3.3+ Acres
Engineer / Surveyor: Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc.
Council District 4
(Also see Case #ZON2006-01868 (Planned Unit Development) Belle Isle Subdivision, Re-subdivision of Lots 1-6, below)

The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Mr. Watkins, to approve the above referenced request for extension, with the advisement that future extensions will be unlikely.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2006-01868 (Planned Unit Development)
Belle Isle Subdivision, Re-subdivision of Lots 1-6
4710 Belle Isle Lane
North terminus of Belle Isle Lane
Planned Unit Development Approval to allow a private street single family residential subdivision
Council District 4
(Also see Case #SUB2006-00225 (Subdivision) Belle Isle Subdivision, Re-subdivision of Lots 1-6, above)

The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Mr. Watkins, to approve the above referenced request for extension, with the advisement that future extensions will be unlikely.

The motion carried unanimously.
NEW SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS:

Case #SUB2009-00139
Mobile Greyhound Racing Subdivision
7101 Old Pascagoula Road
North side of Theodore Dawes Road, 424’± West of Sperry Road, extending to the South side of Old Pascagoula Road
Number of Lots / Acres: 2 Lots / 54.9± Acres
Engineer / Surveyor: Engineering Development Services, LLC
County

The Chair announced the application had been recommended for approval.

David Diehl, Engineering Development Services, LLC, stated his client was in agreement with the recommendations; however, they requested a minor change to condition 3 and had discussed the same with Mr. Olsen before the meeting. He added that his client was only trying to remove the smaller lot 2 for a specific use and was agreeable to the limitation of one (1) curb cut to lot 2. He stated that regarding lot 1 (the larger, pre-existing parcel) it is hoped that there would be no need to encumber it with limitations to curb cuts as it is not known what would be developed regarding that parcel. He added that it was hoped that condition 3 could be changed to read “any additional curb cuts proposed on lot 1 shall be subject to approval by County Engineering and in conformance with AASHTO standards,” with the rest of the condition reading the same.

Mr. Olsen stated the staff had no real problem with the addition of that verbiage and stated the staff’s reason for limiting the lot to one (1) curb cut to each street was due to the fact as it was located in the county and there was no land use control in place in the county. He added that as lot 1 was the actual Mobile Greyhound Racing Park, the staff was comfortable with the limitation on the curb cut as long as everyone understood that any future subdivision must come back before the Planning Commission for changes to the curb cut.

Hearing no opposition or further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Holmes, with second by Dr. Rivizzigno, to approve the above referenced subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1) dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide a minimum 50’ as measured from the centerline of Theodore Dawes Road;
2) revision of the minimum building setback line to account for dedication along Theodore Dawes Road;
3) placement of a note on the final plat stating that any additional curb cuts to Lot 1 are subject to County Engineering approval, including size, location, and design, and are to conform to AASHTO standards; and Lot 2 is limited to one curb cut to Theodore Dawes Road, with the size, location, and design to be
approved by County Engineering and in conformance with AASHTO standards;
4) removal of the proposed curb cuts on Lot 2 from the plat;
5) placement of a note on the plat stating that the site must be developed in compliance with all local, state, and Federal regulations regarding endangered, threatened, or otherwise protected species;
6) placement of a note on the final plat stating that any lots developed commercially and adjoin residentially developed property shall provide a buffer in compliance with Section V.A.8 of the Subdivision Regulations; and,
7) submission of a letter from a licensed engineer certifying compliance with the City of Mobile’s stormwater and flood control ordinances to the Mobile County Engineering department and the Planning Section of Mobile Urban Development prior to issuance of any permits.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2009-00141  
**Murray Brigham Place Subdivision**  
4670 Hermitage Road  
West side of Hermitage Avenue, 150’± North of Andrews Road  
Number of Lots / Acres: 2 Lots / 0.3± Acre  
Engineer / Surveyor: Stewart Surveying Inc.  
County

The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno, with second by Mr. DeMouy, to waive Section V.D.2. and approve the above referenced subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1) dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 30-foot from the centerline of Hermitage Avenue;
2) depiction of the 25-foot minimum building setback line along all public rights-of-way reflecting required dedication;
3) revision of the lot size square footage to reflect dedication;
4) retention of the note on the Final Plat stating that each lot is limited to one curb cut;
5) retention of the note on the Final Plat stating that any lots which are developed commercially and adjoin residentially developed property must provide a buffer, in compliance with Section V.A.8. of the Subdivision Regulations;
6) retention of the note on the Final Plat stating that the site must
be developed in compliance with all local, state, and Federal regulations regarding endangered, threatened, or otherwise protected species; and,

7) retention of the note on the Final Plat stating that any new development will be designed to comply with the stormwater detention and drainage facility requirements of the City of Mobile stormwater and flood control ordinances, and requiring submission of certification from a licensed engineer certifying that the design complies with the stormwater detention and drainage facility requirements of the City of Mobile stormwater and flood control ordinances prior to the issuance of any permits. Certification is to be submitted to the Planning Section of Urban Development and County Engineering.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2009-00142
Ridgewood Acres Subdivision, Re-subdivision of Lots 5 and Part of Lot 6, Block A
6166 Woodcrest Drive
Northeast corner of Woodcrest Drive and Lucerne Drive
Number of Lots / Acres: 2 Lots / 0.9± Acre
Engineer / Surveyor: Rowe Surveying & Engineering Co., Inc.
Council District 7

The Chair stated the applicant was agreeable with the recommendations and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter to do so at that time.

Hearing no opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Davitt, with second by Mr. Miller, to approve the above referenced subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1) the depiction on the final plat of the minimum building setback line, as required by Section V.D.9 of the Subdivision Regulations;

2) placement of a note on the final plat stating that that Lot A is limited to the one curb cut to Woodcrest Drive, while Lot B is limited to one curb cut to Lucerne Drive, with the size, location, and design to be approved by Traffic Engineering and in conformance with AASHTO standards;

3) placement of a note on the plat stating that the site must be developed in compliance with all local, state, and Federal regulations regarding endangered, threatened, or otherwise protected species; and,

4) compliance with Engineering comments: (Must comply with all storm water and flood control ordinances. Add a note to the plat
that a land disturbance permit will be required from the City of Mobile for any addition of impervious area in excess of 4000 square feet, which will also require detention that will be required to be maintained by the property owner and not the City of Mobile. Any work performed in the right-of-way will require a right-of-way permit).

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2009-00140
Canal Subdivision
1452 Navco Road
Northwest corner of Navco Road and McLaughlin Drive
Number of Lots / Acres: 4 Lots / 4.0± Acres
Engineer / Surveyor: Byrd Surveying, Inc.
Council District 4

The Chair announced the matter had been recommended for denial, however, if there were those who wished to speak on the matter to please do so at that time.

Jennifer Becksley, 6161 Halle Court, Satsuma, AL, spoke on behalf of the applicant and addressed the issue regarding the staff’s recommendation for denial with the following points:

A. the staff’s comments regarding flag shaped lots indicated that there were not any in the area, but there are two, with one of those being adjacent to the property; and,

B. the modification of lot 3 to show 60 feet of road frontage to Navco Road is acceptable to the applicant.

Mr. Olsen stated the he had only found out there were problems regarding the application that day, and if the Commission wanted to consider what had been heard from the applicant, then the staff would like to see the matter held over until the November 19, 2009, meeting, so that a revised plat could be submitted to the staff by October 30, 2009, to allow for adequate time to review the same.

Mr. Vallas expressed his support of the hold over unless there were strong feelings against doing so by the rest of the Commission, to which several other members voiced some type agreement for the hold over.

Hearing no further opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Dr. Rivizzigno, to hold the matter over until the November 19, 2009, meeting, to allow the applicant to submit a revised plat and written justification for flag shaped lots with revisions and documentation to be submitted by October 30, 2009.

The motion carried unanimously.
Case #SUB2009-00143  
Tuthill Subdivision, Long Addition to  
250 Tuthill Lane  
East side of Tuthill Lane, 460’± South of Springhill Avenue  
Number of Lots / Acres:  5 Lots / 10.8± Acres  
Engineer / Surveyor:  Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc.  
Council District  7  

The Chair announced the matter had been recommended for denial, however, if there were those who wished to speak on the matter to please do so at that time.

Don Coleman, Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc., spoke on behalf of the applicant and requested that the matter be held over to address the issues brought up by staff as reasons for denial, with any revisions due to staff by October 30, 2009.

Mr. Watkins asked Mr. Coleman for clarification regarding where the vacation for College Lane started and ended.

Mr. Coleman indicated that it started at the property line and went to north to The Cedars.

Hearing no further opposition or discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Plauche, with second by Dr. Rivizzigno, to hold the matter over per the applicant’s request until the November 19, 2009, meeting, with any revisions due to staff by October 30, 2009.

The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Olsen advised the Commission that it was time for the annual election of officers.

Mr. Watkins moved, with second by Mr. Davitt, to approve the 2008-2009 officers as the slate for the 2009-2010 year, with the proposed officers being:

- Mr. Terry Plauche, Chair;
- William G. DeMouy, Jr., Vice-Chair;
- Dr. Victoria L. Rivizzigno, Secretary.

The motion carried unanimously and the slate was approved.

Mr. Hoffman let the Commission members know that he had gotten and was making available to them four copies of the book, The Citizen’s Guide to Planning: Fourth Edition, by Christopher J. Duerksen, C. Gregory Dale, and Donald L. Elliott, and if any one of them were interested in reading the book, to please see him after the meeting to pick up a copy.
Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED: January 7, 2010

Dr. Victoria Rivizzigno, Secretary

Terry Plauche, Chairman

jsl