

LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
JUNE 22ND, 2021

THE LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MET IN REGULAR SESSION ON **TUESDAY, JUNE 22ND, 2021 AT 7:00P.M.** IN THE LAGRANGE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ROOM AT THE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING

CALL TO ORDER: Tyler Young called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Philip Bieberich, Nick Wilson, Lynn Bowen, Tyler Young & Jim Bugg.

ADOPT AGENDA: Lynn Bowen made a motion to adopt the agenda, Jim Bugg seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: None.

COMMUNICATIONS: None.

NEW BUSINESS

DEVELOPMENTAL VARIANCE

(Public Hearing)

HOCHSTETLER, JACOB & RUBY ~ By: Jacob Hochstetler (21-V-27): Clay Twp., Sect. 03, T37N R09E, zoned A-1. Located 3240 N 200 W, Howe. Application is for a proposed 46' side setback for 16'x40' shaving barn for an AFO.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Jacob Hochstetler, 3240 N 200 W, Howe, was present as the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition at length.

A roll call vote was taken:

Developmental Standard Variance

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal is for the construction of a new 16' x 40' barn for Petitioner's AFO operation. The proposal does not unreasonably interfere with the public or obstruct traffic at the property and poses no risk to the health and safety of the public.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The proposed new barn will have a minimal effect on adjacent landowners as the area is primarily agricultural and there are minimal residential structures near said location. The proposal does not interfere with neighboring landowners' use and enjoyment of their properties. No remonstrators appeared.

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance **will not** result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

That Petitioner could continue to operate the AFO as it currently exists without issues, and there is sufficient space on the property within which Petitioner could construct the proposed barn without the need for a variance.

4. The variance granted **is not** the minimum necessary and **does** correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

The Petitioner has sufficient space on his property where the proposed barn can be constructed without the need for a variance, the variance requested is not the minimum necessary. The Petitioner, by proposing a new barn in the proposed location, has created its own hardship

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has not met its burden of proof and hereby denies the variance as requested.

(Public Hearing)

HOCKEMEYER, JAMES ~ By: James Hockemeyer (21-V-28): Johnson Twp., Sect. 25, T36N R10E, zoned L-1. Located 5455 E 610 S, Wolcottville. Application is for a 21'6" roadside setback for a proposed attached garage & lot coverage exceeding 40% in an L-1 zone.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Jim Hockemeyer, 5455 E 610 S, Wolcottville, was present as the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance to the board.

Judy Hockemeyer, 5455 E 610 S, Wolcottville was also present as the petitioner.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition.

David Wackrow, a neighbor at 5485 E 610 S, Wolcottville, was in favor of the petition, stating it will improve their properties values.

Rhonda Bartlett, a neighbor at 5480 E 610 S, Wolcottville, was in favor of the petition.

Bryan Grubb, a neighbor at 5435 E 610 S, Wolcottville, was in favor of the petition.

Mr. Wilson asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition. Lynn Bowen asked the petitioner if any drainage issues have been considered. The petitioner stated they have a drainage plan in progress and will have that at time of permit application.

A roll call vote was taken:

Developmental Standard Variance

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal is for the construction of a house addition and attached garage structure on the roadside of Petitioners' residence. The proposed addition is located far enough off of the private roadway that it will not obstruct view on the road nor will it pose any risk to the public.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The proposed new construction would be aesthetically pleasing to neighboring landowners. The proposed setback variance will not intrude on neighboring landowners' properties, as it meets the required side yard setbacks. The proposed structure will be located further from the right of way than some of the neighboring auxiliary structures. No remonstrators appeared, however three people appeared in favor of the variance.

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

Given the size and layout of the subject lot it would be nearly impossible for Petitioner to construct the addition on the subject property without the need of the variance requested.

4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

The proposed construction is minimally intrusive and does not seek to encroach upon the private roadway any more than neighboring properties. The proposed location of the addition and attached garage is reasonably sized considering the lot size in question.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

(Public Hearing)

HOSSINGER, JON & DAWN ~ By: Jon Hossinger (21-V-29): Johnson Twp., Sect. 23, T36N R10E, zoned L-1. Located at 5869 S 455 E, Wolcottville. Application is for a proposed 25' waterside setback for 12'x20'6" deck in an L-1 zoning district.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Fred Kreigh, UrNest Construction, was present on behalf of the petitioner & explained the reason for the variance.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition.

Dawn Hoss, 5869 S 455 E, Wolcottville, was also present as the petitioner and explained the current deck is in need of replacement.

Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition.

Lynn Bowen made a motion to approve with the condition that the proposed deck is not enclosed or roofed. Nick Wilson seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken:

Developmental Standard Variance

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal is for the replacement and expansion of an existing deck on Petitioners' property to provide additional space for outdoor activities. The proposed new deck is located on the lakeside of the property and does not pose any risk of harm to the public or neighboring landowners.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The proposed new deck is in line with neighboring homes in an effort to not intrude upon or interfere with the view of the lake. The proposed setback variance will not intrude on neighboring landowners' properties or affect their use and/or property values. No remonstrators appeared, but one person did appear in favor.

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

Given the location of the existing home on the subject lot, Petitioners would be unable to rebuild/repair the existing deck without the variance requested.

4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

The proposed construction is minimally intrusive and does not seek to encroach beyond the lines of neighboring properties, thereby not interfering with or intruding on the neighboring landowners' view of the lake.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of July, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance subject to the following conditions: Petitioner is not allowed to construct a roof on the proposed deck; Petitioner is not allowed to enclose the proposed deck.

(Public Hearing)

KEELEY, BRUCE & DIANA ~ By: Bruce Keeley (21-V-30): Milford Twp., Sect. 11, T36N R11E, zoned L-1. Located at 3405 S 1095 E, LaGrange. Application is for a proposed 6' fence in an L-1 zoning district.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Diana Keeley, 3405 S 1095 E, LaGrange, was present and explained the reason for the variance to the board was due to their dogs and containing them to their property. Mrs. Keeley also stated they weren't aware of the ordinance.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition.

A roll call vote was taken:

Developmental Standard Variance

1. The Approval **will be** injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal is for a six (6) foot fence in an L-1 zone to provide privacy and maintain Petitioner's dogs. The location of the fence poses risks to the public and neighboring landowners. The proposed fence location may also interfere with travel on the adjacent roadway.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance **will be** affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The fence height and location, as proposed, will unreasonably interfere with the use and enjoyment of the neighboring property owners in the L-1 zone. The new fence may also affect the property values of neighboring landowners. No remonstrators appeared.

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance **will not** result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

Strict application would not prevent Petitioners from having a fence at the subject property or the continued utilization of said property for residential purposes.

4. The variance granted **is not** the minimum necessary and **does** correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

The proposed height of the fence of six (6) feet is not the minimum necessary. The Petitioner, by proposing/selecting the subject fence height, has created its own hardship.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has not met its burden of proof and hereby denies the variance as requested. Petitioner shall have the existing fence removed and/or brought into compliance with the zoning ordinance on or before September 1, 2021.

(Public Hearing)

SCHLABACH, LARRY ~ MASTERPIECE METALS ~ By: Larry Schlabach (21-V-33):

Clearspring Twp., Sect. 03, T11N R09E, zoned A-1. Located at 2510 S 250 W, LaGrange. Application is for a proposed 10' side setback for a 14'x14' phone shack for an existing business.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Larry Schlabach, 2510 S 250 W, LaGrange, was present as the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance to the board.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

A roll call vote was taken:

Developmental Standard Variance

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal will not be injurious to the public health and safety as Petitioner's proposed detached phone booth is located well off of the roadway, right next to his existing phone shack, and away from neighboring landowners.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The proposed structure will not interfere or intrude on the use and enjoyment of adjacent property owners as Petitioner simply seeks to add an additional phone shack at the subject location. The proposed new phone booth will be similar in size than the existing booth, and is screened by vegetation on the Petitioner's property line. No remonstrators appeared.

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

The strict application would result in practical difficulties as Petitioner would not be allowed to add the additional phone shack, thereby limiting the usability and full potential of the property. Based on the layout of the property, the existing phone shack and phone line access, it would be impractical to place the new phone shack in another location.

4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

The proposed construction is minimally intrusive and does not seek to invade neighboring properties. The proposed structure is similar in size as the existing phone shack on the property in the same location.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

LAND USE VARIANCE

(Public Hearing)

BONTREGER, HOMER & ERMA ~ By: Midwest Land Surveying (21-LUV-23/ 20-V-58): Newbury Twp., Sect. 23, T37N R08E, zoned L-1. Located at 0845 N 740 W, Shipshewana. Application is to house 1 horse in an L-1 zoning district. Also for a 21.6' lakeside setback for a 552' sq. ft. house addition.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Josh Lash, Midwest Land Surveying, was present on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Lash explained the reason for the variance to the board.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition.

Freeman Miller, neighbor at 0900 N 740 W, Shipshewana, had no issues with the house addition but expressed his concerns with having two (2) horses on the property. There was an error on the agenda and the board clarified that the petition was for the current horse only.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition at length, concerns including waste management and being located near the floodplain.

A roll call vote was taken:

Developmental Standard Variance

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal is for the construction of a home addition specifically, a three-season room on the lake side of Petitioners' property. The proposed addition poses no risk of harm to the public or neighboring landowners.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The proposed addition does not intrude upon or interfere with the view of the lake, as there are not any adjacent landowners whose view would be effected. The proposed setback variance will not intrude on neighboring landowners' properties or affect their use and/or property values. No remonstrators appeared.

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

Given the location of the exiting home on the subject lot, Petitioners would be unable to construct the proposed three-season addition on the residence without the variance requested.

4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

The proposed construction is minimally intrusive and does not seek to encroach too close to the lakeside of the property, and with minimal adjacent landowners, the expansion should not have any effect.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

The Board discusses the land use variance at length.

Lynn Bowen made a motion to approve, pending this owner, this use only, no future horses and no horses on the lakeside. Nick Wilson seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken:

Land Use Variance

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal is to house and maintain one (1) horse on a parcel of land zoned L-1 located adjacent to a neighboring lake. The proposed horse/barn is located on the back lot across the street and should not pose any health or safety risk to the public or surrounding properties.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

That there has been a horse at the subject property for several years, housed in a small barn on the back lot of the property. There are minimal neighboring landowners at this location so there would be a minimal effect on the adjacent landowners. One Remonstrator appeared with concerns regarding flies and the possibility of having a second horse on the property.

3. The need for the variance does arise from some condition peculiar to the property involved

Petitioners are Amish and a horse is their sole mode of transportation to and from the subject property. The fact that the property is in an L-1 zone prevents Petitioners from utilizing the property as a residence or from housing a horse on the lakeside or back lot of the property, without the variance requested.

4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.

Petitioners would be unable to maintain a horse at the subject property and continue to reside in the subject home without the variance requested.

5. The approval **does** interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan

The use requested by Petitioners is not common in the L-1 zone, as the L-1 zone is designated for primary lake residential development and is the most restricted zone in the LaGrange County Zoning Ordinance. The comprehensive plan clearly provides for the designation of agricultural uses, such as maintaining large animals and livestock, in A-1 zones and not in L-1 zones.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has not met its burden of proof and hereby denies the variance as requested. Petitioner must remove the horse from the property on or before September 1, 2021.

(Public Hearing)

NORTH SHORE PROPERTIES, LLC ~ HYDRO HEAD MARINA ~ By: Lakewood Surveys (21-LUV-25): Milford Twp., Sect. 29, T36N R11E, zoned A-1. Located West of 7290 E 600 S, Wolcottville (Parcel # 44-09-29-100-002.000-013). Application is for a proposed marina in an A-1 zoning district.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Ryan Webber, Lakewood Surveys at 4134 W 100 S, Kimmell, was present on behalf of the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance to the board. Blake Swogger, land owner at 7290 E 600 S, Wolcottville, was also present as the petitioner.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition.

A roll call vote was taken:

Land Use Variance

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal is to operate a marina business in an A-1 zone located adjacent to a lake. The proposal provides for an adequate driveway and turnaround for deliveries at the property without effecting traffic flow. The proposal poses no risk to the community and is well screened from the general public.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The proposed variance will allow for the construction of a brand-new structure that meets all required setbacks, thereby not intruding on any neighboring landowners. There are minimal neighbors located near the property, aside from the Petitioner herein, therefore there should be minimal affect caused by the marina. No Remonstrators appeared.

3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved

The unique characteristics and the geographical location of the property, as it currently sits in an A-1 zone, would prevent the Petitioner from operating a marina at the subject location.

4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.

Petitioner would be prohibited from operating his marina at the subject location without the requested variance, requiring Petitioner to find another suitable location.

5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan encourages a diverse economy and promotes growth in the county economy with the small business owners.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

(Public Hearing)

BEECHY, EARL ~ COUNTRY SIDE BUTCHER SUPPLIES ~ By: Earl Beechy (21-LUV-26):
Clay Twp., Sect. 33, T37N R09E, zoned A-1. Located at 3915 W 150 S, LaGrange. Application is for a proposed retail sales of butchering supplies for home processing.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Susie Troyer, 2675 E 050 N LaGrange, was present on behalf of the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance to the board.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition.

A roll call vote was taken:

Land Use Variance

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposal is to operate a small butcher supply shop with retail sales at Petitioner's home property located in an A-1 zone. The business will have minimal deliveries and expects patrons to be primarily by buggy or bicycle, therefore the property allows for safe flow of traffic and sufficient turn around. The proposed business poses no risk of harm to the general public.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The proposed auxiliary structure is small in size, blends well with neighboring properties and there is minimal traffic at the location. Petitioner's proposed business will cause minimal noise and intrusion upon neighboring landowners. No Remonstrators appeared.

3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved

The location of the subject property as it currently sits within an A-1 zone would prevent Petitioner from operating with retail sales of butchering supplies as proposed.

4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.

Petitioner would be prohibited from operating the proposed retail sales of butchering supplies at this location without the requested variance, requiring them to locate another suitable location away from their homestead.

5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan encourages economic growth and rural-based cottage industries similar to that which Petitioner is proposing. The proposed usage is not dissimilar from other rural businesses in the surrounding area.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

(Public Hearing)

GOSHORN, LARRY & SUSAN ~ By: Larry & Susan Goshorn (21-LUV-28): Milford Twp., Sect. 15, T36N R11E, zoned L-1. Located across from 4870 S 930 E, Wolcottville (Parcel # 44-09-15-400-005.005-013). Application is for a proposed 952 sq. ft. auxiliary building without a residence in an L-1 zone.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Larry & Susan Goshorn, land owners at 4870 S 930 E, Wolcottville, was present as the petitioners and explained the reason for the variance to the board.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition.

A roll call vote was taken:

Land Use Variance

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The proposed auxiliary structure is modestly sized and is to be placed on a vacant buildable back lot in an L-1 zone. The variance requested does not interfere with neighboring properties, does not increase traffic or create hazardous situations to the public.

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

The proposed structure would be used for storage of items that would otherwise be stored outside, making the proposed use more aesthetically pleasing to neighboring properties. The

proposed auxiliary structure meets side yard setbacks and does not otherwise encroach on neighboring landowners. No Remonstrators appeared.

3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved

The geographical location of the property, as it currently sits in an L-1 zone, would prevent the proposed auxiliary structure to be placed on the vacant lot as it currently exists without the construction of a residence.

4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.

Petitioner would be unable to place the proposed auxiliary structure on the vacant lot as it currently exists without the requested variance. Strict application would require the construction of a home on said lot in order to place the proposed auxiliary structure.

5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan

The proposed variance and the proposed auxiliary structure requested is not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and is not uncommon usage for similarly situated parcels in the surrounding L-1 zone. The structure is proposed in such a way that a primary residence could be added to the property in the future.

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 22nd day of June, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

OTHER BUSINESS: Robbie Miller explained repetitive variance approvals could be updated in the Zoning Ordinance to fit the constraints for the new Comprehensive Plan, if the board sees fit.

ADJOURNMENT: Lynn Bowen made a motion to adjourn, Nick Wilson seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

LAGRANGE COUNTY, INDIANA
ANTI-DISCRIMINATION NOTICE STATEMENT

The County of LaGrange does not illegally discriminate because of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, disability, or age with regards to admission, participation, or treatment in its facilities, programs, activities, or services, as required by Title III and Title VI of the American Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and their related statutes, regulations, and directives. The County has established an Anti-Discrimination Compliance Division to ensure compliance with these laws. If you would like more information concerning the provisions of these laws and about the rights provided thereby, or if you have a suggestion on how the County can better meet the needs of persons protected thereby, please contact the Division at 300 E. Factory St., LaGrange, IN 46761 or by telephone at (260)499-6352.

LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

BY: _____
Tyler Young, President

BY: _____
Nick Wilson, Vice President

BY: _____
Lynn Bowen, Member

BY: _____
Jim Bugg, Member

BY: _____
Rich Sherman, Alternate Member

BY: _____
Freeman Miller, Alternate Member