

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI**

**MEETING MINUTES
January 19, 1999**

ROLL CALL:

COMMISSIONER	PRESENT (P)/ ABSENT (A)
JULIUS FRAGER	A
AGNES GARINO	P
DOUG GELDBACH	P
GWENDOLYN GERHARDT	P
DENISE HADDOCK	A
PAT MERRITT	P
SCOTT MIDDELKAMP	P
CHARLES SAULSBERRY	P
ANNA MARIE WINGRON	P
DON WOJTKOWSKI	P
LARRY YOUNGBLOOD	P

OTHERS PRESENT:

Carl Ramey - Executive Director
Steve Martin - Legal Counsel

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Middelkamp at 6:00 p.m. on January 19, 1999. The meeting was held at the office of the Boundary Commission, 1516 S. Brentwood Blvd., Brentwood, Missouri.

ROLL IS CALLED - QUORUM DECLARED

Carl Ramey called the roll and a quorum was declared.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Wingron made a motion to approve the revised agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Youngblood. Voice Vote: Ayes: All Nays: None *The motion passed.*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes December 29, 1998 - Public Hearing: BC9818 - Hanna-141

A motion was made by Ms. Wingron to approve the minutes of the Public Hearing for BC9818 - Hanna-141, held December 29, 1998. The motion was seconded by Mr. Geldbach. Voice Vote: Ayes - All Nays - None *The motion passed.*

B. Approval of minutes January 12, 1999 - Public Hearing: BC9817 - Parker Road/New Halls Ferry

A motion was made by Ms. Garino to approve the minutes of the Public Hearing for BC9817 - Parker Road Halls Ferry, held January 12, 1999. The motion was seconded by Mr. Youngblood. It was pointed out that the list of members should reflect Mr. Geldbach's presence and his name should replace that of Mr. Rehagen's. Also, Ms. Haddock was incorrectly listed as being present. It was agreed that the motion to approve should reflect those changes. Ms. Garino indicated that on page 6 of the minutes in the section where she was questioning Mr. Powers, the word zone should be plural. Voice Vote: Ayes - All Nays - None *The motion passed*

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dale Hartmann, 2806 Oledez Road. Mr. Hartmann indicated he was a resident of unincorporated St. Louis County. He was present to let the Boundary Commission members know he supports the legislation which gives them the right to remain unincorporated. He stated he would be presenting the Boundary Commission a proposal to have all of the 6th Council District remain unincorporated.

Oscie Whatley, 3 Fairway Ct. Mr. Whatley stated, the 835 citizens who signed the petition to remain unincorporated in the Parker/New Halls Ferry area did so because they wanted the right to vote on any annexation attempts and they are aware of the county services and wanted the right to choose to have those services for five years. Mr. Whatley spoke that the number of people who spoke at the public hearing against the unincorporated zone proposal totaled fifteen, significantly less than the number of citizens signing petitions. He stated that the County Police recently received accreditation, which should be an indication of the County's ability to provide quality police service. He encouraged the Board to approve placing the zone proposal on the ballot.

Marvin Meyer, 3910 Woodcrest Dr. Mr. Meyer indicated he supported placing on the ballot the proposal for the unincorporated zone for Parker Road/New Halls Ferry. He stated at the public hearing the County departments indicated they could continue to reasonably provide service for a minimum of five years and beyond. He stated those who spoke against the proposal did so because in the past they had been on the losing end of other attempts at annexation. He stated the group followed all the rules of the Commission and the state law. Mr. Meyer asked the Commission to place the matter on the ballot and allow the people the right to vote.

Jerry Rich, 1510 Ploma Dr. Mr. Rich stated he spoke in favor of the annexation to the City of Manchester. He stated there was little benefit to the area from the unincorporated zone proposal. Mr. Rich read from a

prepared statement. He indicated the proposal does not have sufficient signatures to be a valid petition before the Board. The names on the petition to revoke their signatures had been certified on the original petition. The petition organizer was given copies of the petition of those people who wanted to have their names removed. He stated the number of signatures seeking to have their names removed represents one-fourth of the number signing the original petition.

Fred Mayer, 924 Courtland Place. He indicated he was a proponent of annexation to the City of Manchester. Mr. Mayer stated that on Sunday, December 13 he submitted to Mr. Omgvig the petitions of those seeking to have their names removed from the original petition. These were the same names found on Mr. Omgvig's petition. Forty-nine signatures were certified as registered voters on December 14. Those signatures were delivered to the Boundary Commission on December 14.

Mary Miller, 837 Pontoison Dr. She stated she was in favor the annexation to the City of Manchester. It was her belief that the issue before the Commission was whether there is a valid petition under the law. Ms. Miller reviewed what she believed were improper tactics used in collecting signatures on the original petition. She encouraged the Commission to allow them to vote on the annexation.

John Perkins, 919 Courtland Dr. Mr. Perkins indicated he lived in Chadwick Estates. He stated he did not believe Mr. Omgvig spoke for the residents of Chadwick Estates. He indicated his neighbors want to vote on annexation to Manchester. He also stated that if deceit was used in collecting signatures, it meant you did not have the majority supporting you.

Jon Omgvig, 915 Hazel Falls. Mr. Omgvig distributed a time line of events surrounding his submittal of the unincorporated zone proposal. He stated that on November 17 the Board of Election Commissioners certified their petitions. Mr. Omgvig indicated on that night a draft of a proposal, along with the certification and legal description was submitted to the Commission at their business meeting. He indicated he received the uncertified petitions from Mr. Mayer on December 13, but argued that it was unreasonable for him to be expected to act upon uncertified petitions. He stated that after that the plan of intent was submitted, a public hearing held and then on January 11 he received certified petitions seeking removal of names from the petition. Mr. Omgvig indicated that based upon the time line and previous legal opinion they became a proposing agent when they relied on the petition to request a public hearing. He stated that the attorney for the Commission has indicated that any petition to remove signatures must be submitted to him and not the Boundary Commission. He indicated that he believed his petition to be valid as no certified signatures were submitted to him prior to November 17, the official submittal or the public hearing.

Debbie Merkel, 710 Reed Ave. She indicated she lived in Lemay and was concerned over the City of Bella Villa annexing their community. They have met with the Mayor of Bella Villa and feels he was not responsive to their community, their needs or interests. She indicated they are working with the County regarding improvements to their community. She asked the Commission to give them fair consideration when they come before the Commission.

Debbie Mizerany, 952 Big Bend Station Dr. She stated that she was a trustee in the Big Bend Station Subdivision, which is in the Carman-Dougherty Ferry annexation area. She indicated she was totally in favor of placing the annexation proposal on the ballot. Those who do not want the annexation can vote against it. She encouraged the Commission to place the Carman-Dougherty Ferry proposal on the ballot.

Mike Leavitt, City Administrator, City of Manchester. Mr. Leavitt stated he was there on behalf of the City of Manchester. He stated that the petitions to remove signatures, speak for themselves, as they were certified. Mr. Leavitt referred to a recently issued opinion of the Boundary Commission's legal counsel, which he suggested indicates that the signatures were properly removed. He stated the petition lacks the number of required signatures under the state law for a petition. The Commission has no choice, but to reject the proposal. He indicated that the Commission's attorney has issued his opinion and encouraged the Commission to follow that advice. To act to the contrary, he stated, could be detrimental to the Commission members, particularly if there was legal action arising out of this matter. He recommended that the Commission follow the advise of their legal counsel and reject the proposal. He asked the Commission to place the Manchester proposal on the ballot for April.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Ramey indicated that because of the heavy agenda, there was nothing to bring to the Commission's attention at this time.

OLD BUSINESS

A. *Summary of Decision re: BC9812 - Southwest Annexation - City of Ballwin*

A motion was made by Commissioner Garino to approve the Summary of Decision for the Southwest Annexation, City of Ballwin. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wojtkowski. Mr. Ramey brought to the Commission's attention a letter which was not in their weekend packet from the City of Ballwin. He explained the letter asked the Commission's consideration for an effective date for the annexation of February, 2000, assuming voter approval. Their proposal did not anticipate a decision by the Commission placing the proposition on the April ballot. The Ballwin proposal called for annexation to occur six months after voter approval. Ramey reviewed the statutory provisions regarding the effective date for annexations when voter approval is required, which is six months or the date found in the proposal, whichever is later. The Commission deliberated on the issue whether they have the authority to grant the City's request. Mr. Wojtkowski indicated based upon the comments he was withdrawing his second to the motion. He stated that consistency is important. Although the Commission has the choice of accommodating the City of Ballwin, the real choice is for the City to accept implementation in November or to delay the election to push the implementation into the next year. It is inappropriate to circumvent the statute. Mr. Wojtkowski suggested the Commission table the action pending an expression from Ballwin on which choice they would like to make. Ramey indicated he already had that discussion with the City and they expressed their preference to have it on the ballot in April, as opposed to delaying the vote to a ballot which would be costlier for the City and County. Ramey stated that after tonight there is no further option for the April ballot. All propositions for the April ballot must be certified by January 26. Ms. Wingron indicated she agreed with Mr. Wojtkowski. Six months is a valid amount of time for the City to be prepared to grant service.

A motion was made by Ms. Garino to approve the Summary of Decision with the effective date being six months after voter approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wojtkowski. Roll Call: Ayes: Garino, Goldbach, Gerhardt, Merritt, Middelkamp, Saulsberry, Wingron, Wojtkowski, Youngblood Nays: None
The motion passed.

B. Summary of Decision re: BC9813 - Greenbriar Estates Addition - City of Des Peres

A motion was made by Mr. Youngblood to approve the Summary of Decision for BC9813 - Greenbriar Estates Addition - City of Des Peres. The motion was seconded by Mr. Saulsberry. Roll Call: Ayes: Garino, Geldbach, Gerhardt, Merritt, Middelkamp, Saulsberry, Wingron, Wojtkowski, Youngblood Nays: None *The motion passed.*

C. Summary of Decision re: BC9814 - Virginia Lee Manor - City of Ballwin

Mr. Ramey pointed out in this particular matter the Commission has the election of determining the effective date of the proposal. Ramey reviewed the statutory provisions concerning simplified boundary changes, distinguishing that effective date from the earlier conversation in the Southwest annexation proposal. Ramey noted the Ballwin's proposal suggested a ninety day delay in the effective date, if the Commission approved the proposal without requiring voter approval. In the City's proposal to annex the Northwest area, they did not spell out a ninety day delay, but rather upon the Commission's finding. The City has expressed their desire to have both areas be annexed at the same time, March 1. Ramey pointed out it was the Commission who determined the effective date.

A motion was made by Mr. Wojtkowski to approve the Summary of Decision for BC9814. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wingron. Roll Call: Ayes: Garino, Geldbach, Gerhardt, Merritt, Middelkamp, Saulsberry, Wingron, Wojtkowski, Youngblood Nays: None *The motion passed.*

D. Summary of Decision re: BC9815 - Northwest Annexation - City of Ballwin

A motion was made by Mr. Youngblood to approve the Summary of Decision for BC9815. The motion was seconded by Ms. Garino. Roll Call: Ayes: Garino, Geldbach, Gerhardt, Merritt, Middelkamp, Saulsberry, Wingron, Wojtkowski, Youngblood Nays: None *The motion passed.*

E. Discussion of Decision re: BC9817 - Parker Road/Halls Ferry Unincorporated Zone

A motion was made by Mr. Youngblood for approval to put BC9817 on the ballot. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wojtkowski.

Ms. Garino stated she believed the information which would be necessary for her to make a decision was not there. She indicated that the speakers at the public hearing spoke strongly that they were not being reasonably served. Also, there appeared to be misunderstanding about what really was the issue. She stated she was surprised at how few turned out in support of the zone. The log information provided by the County was insufficient in order for her to evaluate whether the area will continue to be reasonably served. She referred to the proposal, stating the information received was incomplete. Some of the information was not specific to the area.

Mr. Wojtkowski stated the Commission has received considerable written comment indicating satisfaction with County services and they cannot be discounted. Mr. Wojtkowski stated that one of the issues overlapping this proposal was the desire of the City of Florissant to annex their golf course. There appears to be a move on the way to put together a simplified boundary change in the area. Many people who spoke

at the hearing were part of that process. Mr. Wojtkowski indicated in the past the City of Florissant stated they were not interested in pursuing annexation to the east, but now want to annex their golf course. Mr. Wojtkowski stated he thought a more prudent question to ask is what evidence is there that the services by the County are not appropriate at this time. He questioned how turning down the proposal because they are inadequate at this time will change anything in the future. The proposal does not change the status of the area. It remains being served by St. Louis County. Any question regarding adequacy of service would certainly be resolved at an election.

Mr. Geldbach stated that he feels St. Louis County has the means to provide the municipal services they are currently providing. The County is bound by their charter to provide those services. He stated he did not believe those services would be diminished over a five year period, unless there is a catastrophic loss in revenue. Even then the services would be diminished county-wide. Whether the county can maintain the current level of services, whether it is lower or higher than another municipality, Mr. Geldbach stated he believed the county could do so for the next five years or more. While Mr. Geldbach questioned the value of the unincorporated zones. He stated that if he is to base his decision on whether the county can provide a reasonable level of service for the next five years, then he believed they could.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that from public comment during the hearing and communications there appeared to be a great deal of misunderstanding concerning the proposal. She also questioned the large size of the proposal area. The area is very large and diverse.

Mr. Wojtkowski stated whether she agreed conceptually with the unincorporated zone or not, the Commission's charge is to vote based on whether the county can provide the services. Ms. Gerhardt questioned whether the Commission should consider the quality of service in comparison to municipalities. Mr. Wojtkowski stated that was not what the Commission was to make its determination. Ms. Gerhardt stated she believed the Commission should consider the question of quality of service, particularly when the Commission is locking the area into a service provider for five years.

Ms. Garino stated that based upon what she heard was there were a number of areas where people were saying they were not being reasonably served. She felt the people were strongly saying they were not receiving the kind of services they want, particularly in the area of planning and zoning. She also said this came through strongly in the letters received by the Commission.

Mr. Youngblood stated that if there is this much discontent, as is being suggested, then the people in the area will vote it down. He suggested the Commission should allow them to vote on the proposal. Mr. Middelkamp asked for the motion to be restated. Mr. Ramey stated the motion was to approve and place on the ballot BC9817. Mr. Youngblood agreed that was the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Geldbach, Middelkamp, Saulsberry, Wojtkowski, Youngblood Nays: Garino, Gerhardt, Merritt, Wingron *The motion failed.*

F. Discussion and Decision re: BC9818 - Hanna-141 Unincorporated Zone

A motion was made by Ms. Garino for the dismissal of BC9818 for lack of jurisdiction. Ms. Garino referred to the draft finding which was distributed to Commission members at the last meeting, stating this is the

document upon which she is basing her motion. She stated the blank sections of the document need to be completed and include as the number of votes cast in the last gubernatorial election as being 1419, the number of petitions required for the 15% was 213, the number of petition signatures contained in the proposal was 214, prior to official date the number of signatures withdrawal was 52 and on December 22 the petition submitted contained 162 signatures not previously withdrawn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Geldbach. Ms. Garino indicated that the Commission lacks jurisdiction over this matter.

Mr. Youngblood stated the comments made by Mr. Mayer earlier in the meeting confirmed that certified petitions for withdrawal were not submitted to Mr. Omvig in a timely manner. They were submitted to Mr. Omvig after the submittal. The time line found in Mr. Martin's opinion was moot, because the petitions were not given in a timely manner.

Mr. Martin responded that the rules of the Commission do not deal with the manner in which withdrawals are to be made, including whether they should be certified or not. Mr. Martin questioned Mr. Mayer as to when the petitions were submitted to Mr. Omvig. Mr. Mayer commented they submitted copies of the petitions to Mr. Omvig prior to his submittal, but they were not the certified copies. Mr. Martin stated the question for the Commission is whether it believes the withdrawals need to be certified. The requirement for certification is what the Commission put into its rules for the petition being submitted to the Commission. The issue dealing with the withdrawal of signatures has not been written.

Mr. Wojtkowski stated there is a number of omissions by the Board of Election Commissioners, which should be an indication of the importance of the certification.

Mr. Youngblood referred to the statutory requirements for submittal of petitions. He stated he believed the petition met that requirement and the Commission should make the determination of whether it should be placed on the ballot.

Ms. Garino asked whether the petitions to withdraw were certified prior to the official submittal date of December 22. Mr. Mayer stated they were so certified. If the signatures were withdrawn prior to the official submittal date, then the Commission can not act upon the proposal.

Mr. Wojtkowski stated that based upon the opinion of legal counsel, signatures for the withdrawal of petitions would have to be presented to the originator of the proposal. Mr. Martin responded it is good policy to have the signatures certified and the Commission knew of that well in advance of the official submittal. The question is what did the proposing agent know. Mr. Ramey indicated that at the December 15 meeting certified copies of the withdrawal were submitted to the Commission, but he was not directed to provide them to the proposing agent, because it was stated then by the people collecting the signatures that they were providing Mr. Omvig copies.

Ms. Garino asked when Mr. Omvig received the certified copies. Mr. Omvig stated it was January 11. Ms. Garino asked whether at the time of submission of the proposal on December 22, whether we knew the signatures had been withdrawn. Mr. Ramey indicated that was the case. Mr. Martin reviewed his opinion regarding the withdrawal of petitions. Mr. Martin stated his belief that the signatures on the petition should either be certified or notarized to be considered valid.

Mr. Saulsberry stated that it was difficult to balance the issue of withdrawal of signatures and whether what has been submitted is valid or not in light of the absence of Commission pronouncements on withdrawals. He stated that given the facts, the Commission should proceed with a vote.

Ms. Wingron stated she was concerned about Mr. Omgig's disregard of Commission policy on notifying people in the area of the public hearing. She stated the Commission should take that into consideration in making its decision.

Ms. Garino asked for further clarification on whose responsibility it is to recognize withdrawals. Mr. Martin stated that withdrawals should be directed to the person gathering the signatures and they should be certified or notarized. Ms. Garino stated the signatures for withdrawal were already certified. Ms. Garino asked whether the petitions for withdrawal were notarized. Mr. Ramey stated that both the petitions for the proposal and the petitions for withdrawal were notarized. Mr. Martin asked Mr. Omgig whether the petitions he received were notarized. Mr. Omgig indicated that some of them were and some of them were not notarized. Mr. Martin stated that if the proposing agent receives a notarized petition of withdrawal, that meets all petition requirements. It is valid notice to Mr. Omgig that the signatures are withdrawn. Mr. Martin concluded that was done well before official submittal.

Mr. Wojtkowski stated that there appeared to be two issues. The first is the certification issue. The second is when did the process begin. Mr. Wojtkowski stated it was Mr. Martin's opinion that the signatures can not be withdrawn once the process begins. He stated the Commission essentially has redefined the start of the process to be when the proposing agent comes before the Commission to obtain a date for a public hearing. That should be the date after which signatures can not be withdrawn. Mr. Saulsberry asked when that occurred. Mr. Wojtkowski stated the first time Mr. Omgig requested a date for a hearing was November 17.

Ms. Garino stated that the official submittal date was December 22. She stated that the proposing agent indicated at the November 17 meeting that he was not submitting the proposal at that time. She stated the proposing agent has not met the requirements of the law and the Commission can not act.

Mr. Saulsberry asked Mr. Martin when he believed the official submittal occurred. Mr. Martin stated he believed it to be December 22. Until it is submitted to the Commission, the proposing agent has total and complete control over the proposal. The time begins to run on the date when the proposal is submitted and review begins. Mr. Saulsberry asked Mr. Martin whether Mr. Omgig had the signatures on the November 17 date. Mr. Martin indicated his belief that they did have the signatures.

Ms. Gerhardt asked whether it was correct that Mr. Omgig received on December 13 notarized signatures withdrawing their names from the petition. She asked whether it was within the time frame for withdrawing signatures. Mr. Martin indicated until the proposal is submitted to the Commission the proposing agent is free to collect additional signatures, as in this case. There was nothing done by the Commission to prevent gathering additional signatures.

Mr. Geldbach stated that he supported the position of the attorney on the withdrawal of signatures. He stated the withdrawal of signatures is an indication of the desire of the people.

Ms. Garino stated her belief that the official submittal was December 22. To think it was any date earlier means the Commission has exceeded its thirty day requirement for review under the statute.

Mr. Saulsberry expressed concern that the absence of rules defining the method and timing for the withdrawal of signatures may mean the Commission is bound to recognize the original petition.

Mr. Martin reviewed the facts, indicating that Mr. Omvig received notarized copies of the withdrawal, which places him on notice of the fact signatures were being withdrawn. Mr. Martin stated the common law issue is that of fairness. Both parties should have an opportunity to add or withdraw signatures up to a certain point in time. After that the petitions should stand on their own. It was Mr. Martin's view that December 22, official submittal, was that point in time when signatures could no longer be added or withdrawn.

Mr. Wojtkowski stated there is a difference between starting the process and filing the proposal. Mr. Wojtkowski took exception to the earlier public comment by Mr. Leavitt which he believed threatened the Commission members with legal action if they approved the proposal.

Mr. Youngblood made a motion to move the previous question. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wojtkowski. Roll Call: Ayes: Wojtkowski, Youngblood Nays: Garino, Geldbach, Gerhardt, Merritt, Middelkamp, Saulsberry, Wingron *The motion failed.*

Ms. Garino asked whether December 22 was the date when the petition and proposal was submitted to and on file with the Commission. Mr. Martin indicated that December 22 was the date when the clock started and until then Mr. Omvig had the opportunity to collect sufficient signatures for his petition. Ms. Gerhardt asked what was submitted on November 17. Mr. Martin stated what was submitted was a draft and Mr. Omvig stated it was not a submittal.

Ms. Garino asked of Mr. Martin whether his written opinion on this matter had changed any. Mr. Martin indicated that it did not change. The copies of the petitions submitted to Mr. Omvig were notarized.

Roll Call: Ayes: Garino, Geldbach, Gerhardt, Merritt, Middelkamp, Wingron Nays: Saulsberry, Wojtkowski, Youngblood *The motion passed.*

G. Summary of Decision re: BC9806 - Carman-Dougherty Ferry - City of Manchester

A motion was made by Ms. Wingron to approve the Summary of Decision BC9806 regarding Carman-Dougherty Ferry. Ms. Garino asked for clarification regarding the financial information on page 6. Mr. Ramey indicated it was a negative number and what was printed is correct.

Roll Call: Ayes: Garino, Geldbach, Gerhardt, Merritt, Middelkamp, Saulsberry, Wingron Nays: Wojtkowski, Youngblood *The motion passed.*

H. Discussion re: Budget Fiscal Year 1999

Mr. Middelkamp indicated the budget committee has yet to meet; however, the Commission is facing a deadline to preserve its right to file a lawsuit against the county regarding the budget. Mr. Middelkamp

stated it was not his first choice of action.

Ms. Garino made a motion to proceed with filing a lawsuit in relationship to the funding of the 1999 budget. Ms. Gerhardt seconded the motion. Mr. Youngblood asked what the theory would be in filing such an action. Ms. Garino indicated the action by the county not to properly fund the Commission could be viewed as an interference on the independence of the Commission. Mr. Saulsberry asked whether the Commission should consider going into an executive session to discuss the matter. Mr. Ramey responded it was not on the agenda.

Mr. Middelkamp reviewed the three approaches the Commission has considered, the first to work on a budget, which is the role of the budget committee. The second, it to meet with the county to determine whether more funding can be made available. The third is filing a lawsuit. The Commission is faced with a thirty day time limit within which to file a suit. Mr. Saulsberry proposed an amendment to the motion that the action is being taken to preserve the Commission's rights under the law, but what the Commission is looking to do is sit down with the county regarding difficulties with the budget. Ms. Garino stated she would accept the amendment. As the second, Ms. Gerhardt stated she would accept the amendment.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked what would be the impact of the revised budget allocation. To date no one has demonstrated to him what resources would be affected by the budget cut. Mr. Middelkamp stated that it is up to the Commission to determine what to cut. Ms. Garino indicated that the budget prepared by the Commission and submitted was not out of line.

Mr. Saulsberry asked what was the schedule for the Budget Committee and who is on the committee. Mr. Middelkamp indicated it was Mr. Wojtkowski, Ms. Gerhardt, Mr. Frager and Mr. Saulsberry. The Committee talked about meeting on February 2.

Roll Call: Ayes: Garino, Geldbach, Gerhardt, Merritt, Middelkamp, Wingron Nays: Wojtkowski, Youngblood Abstain: Saulsberry *The motion passed.*

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Youngblood made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Wingron seconded the motion. Voice vote: Ayes - All Nays - None. *The motion passed.*

This being a memorandum of the activities at this meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Carl E. Ramey
Executive Director

Approved: February 2, 1999