

THESE MINUTES ARE SUBJECT TO FORMAL APPROVAL BY THE WYOMING  
PLANNING COMMISSION AT ITS REGULAR MEETING OF AUGUST 18, 2015

PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JULY 21, 2015  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
CITY OF WYOMING, MICHIGAN

MEMBERS PRESENT: Arnoys, Bueche, Goodheart, Hegyi, Micele, Postema, Spencer,  
Weller

MEMBERS ABSENT: Woodruff

STAFF PRESENT: Rynbrandt, Director of Community Services  
Cochran, City Planner  
Lucar, Administrative Aide  
Dooley, Director of Public Works  
Carmody, Chief of Public Safety

Chair Spencer called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Motion by Hegyi, supported by Arnoys, to excuse Woodruff. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of June 16, 2015 were approved as written.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was approved as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA ITEMS

There were no public comments.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

Request to rezone 98.4 acres from ER Estate Residential (66.9 acres), B-2 General Business (9.5 acres), B-1 Local Business (15.7 acres) and RO-1 Restricted Office (6.3 acres) to PUD-1 Low Density Planned Unit Development. The properties are located at 3928-56<sup>th</sup> Street, 3950-56<sup>th</sup> Street, 3952 56<sup>th</sup> Street, 5700 Wilson Avenue, 5850 Wilson Avenue, 5950 Wilson Avenue, 5972 Wilson Avenue, 5988 Wilson Avenue, 6002 Wilson Avenue, 6010 Wilson Avenue, and 6030 Wilson Avenue. (Section 32) (TMGB Wilson, LLC) (Includes Overall Development Plan Approval.)

Cochran described the location, existing land use and current zoning around the area.

Rezoning Synopsis:

The petitioner proposes to rezone 98.4 acres from ER Estate Residential, B-2 General Business and RO-1 Restricted Office to PUD-1 Low Density Planned Unit Development to accommodate a mixed use development. The rezoning covers eleven (11) separate properties, many of which until recently, were not under their control. The rezoning would combine these properties with the adjoining Rivertown Valley Planned Unit Development to create a total PUD area of 211.2 acres to be rebranded as The Reserve at Rivertown. The expanded PUD as proposed would provide 719 residential units including 265 single family lots developed to R-1 standards (10,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size), 154 senior apartments, 188 stacked flats, and 112 townhomes. A commercial area within the PUD of 9.8 acres is also proposed. This rezoning represents an opportunity to comprehensively master plan the largest undeveloped area remaining in Wyoming.

Site History:

The original Rivertown Valley PUD, with associated B-2 General Business and RO-1 Restricted Office zoned areas, was approved in 2001. That PUD was authorized for 168 single family homes, 122 attached condominiums, and 160 rental townhomes. Nile Drive was planned to be the collector street through the development and would connect to both 56<sup>th</sup> Street and Wilson Avenue. The frontage along Wilson Avenue included B-2 General Business zoning with additional RO-1 Restricted Office zoning located behind.

Subsequently, the Rivertown Valley PUD had numerous land ownership, zoning and market changes that significantly impacted the planning and development of the PUD as initially approved. These are summarized chronologically as follows:

Nile Drive – Shortly after adoption of the PUD, it was recognized that the wetlands along Wilson Avenue were more substantial than identified. This resulted in the alignment of Nile Drive with Wilson Avenue moving north. When Wilson Avenue was reconstructed to a four lane boulevard, the street opening and utility connections were constructed to align with this necessary relocation.

Grandville Elementary School Site - In the center of the PUD, the City of Wyoming held ownership of a 15 acre parcel for a future school. The potential for that facility influenced the planned land use surrounding it. When the rezoning of the surrounding property to PUD-1 and RO-1 Restricted Office occurred, that site retained ER Estate Residential zoning. The School District decided to not utilize that property and the City transferred ownership to the petitioner.

In 2007, the petitioner obtained B-1 Local Business zoning (15.7 acres) where Nile Drive is planned to be relocated. That rezoning included part of an adjoining property, part of the townhome area of the Rivertown Valley PUD, and part of the Restricted Office area.

By ordinance, PUD's require at least 15% open space of the entire area. Along the southern part of the Rivertown Valley PUD, a large wetland area was developed as a regional storm water detention basin. In 2007, the petitioners requested, and obtained, the City's purchase of the basin's 27.7 acres. This purchase eliminated the ability of the petitioner to include that acreage as part of the PUD open space requirements. That 27.7 acres is currently zoned a combination of PUD-1 and B-2 General Business. As part of this rezoning request, the land zoned B-2 General Business is proposed to be rezoned to PUD-1 to provide zoning consistency. The B-2 zoned land is wetlands and cannot be developed. This 27.7 acres owned by the City may not be used to increase density on the balance of The Reserve at Rivertown PUD.

The petitioners have constructed three phases of Rivertown Valley subdivisions, totaling 131 lots developed to R-1 standards. The proposed expanded PUD would add 134 more lots. Nile Drive has been extended south from 56<sup>th</sup> Street with each phase.

#### Land Use Plan 2020:

The City of Wyoming Land Use Plan 2020 was adopted in 2006. The development of that Plan involved considerable resources, public engagement, and time. Much of this was concentrated on the Wilson Avenue corridor. The resulting determination for the corridor was that the two major commercial areas would surround the Rivertown Crossings Regional Mall and also at the Wilson Avenue interchange with M-6. Land uses along Wilson Avenue between these two bookends would be a combination of multifamily, office and limited retail. Comprehensively designed projects, especially of a larger size, were to be encouraged using the planned unit development approach. The nearby Del-Mar Farms and South Rivertown PUD's are representative of this recommendation.

Specifically to this proposed rezoning, the petitioners have offered an expanded Planned Unit Development that offers mixed use with an overall density of 3.9 units per acre. This complies with the Land Use Plan's recommendation of no more than 4 units per acre. The neighborhood commercial area along Wilson Avenue as shown in the Land Use Plan would be developed as stacked flats within the PUD. The 9.8 acre commercial component of the PUD would be located at the intersection of 56<sup>th</sup> Street and Wilson Avenue. PUDs, exceeding 80 acres, are entitled up to 10 acres of commercial development, to be developed under B-1 Local Business standards. The commercial PUD component at this intersection would be in character with the other commercial zonings at all four corners. The small commercial property at the southeast corner of the intersection is zoned B-1 Local Business, but is not a part of this PUD rezoning proposal. This rezoning borders Byron Township to the south. Byron Township's Future Land Use Plan shows the area north of M-6, and up to this proposed rezoning, to be master planned for a Commercial Planned Unit Development. Currently, a portion of that area has been zoned to B-3 Interchange Business to accommodate a C-Store (gasoline/convenience) business. Their Future Land Use Plan also shows the area along 64<sup>th</sup> Street north of M-6, and the area south of M-6, to be master planned for Mixed Use Planned Unit Developments.

Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing and Housing Needs Assessment 2013:

As a recipient of Federal funds, the City of Wyoming is obligated to faithfully consider and address area housing needs. The City Council adopted Analysis identified that the Wyoming “panhandle” area would be desirable for new rental housing. The Analysis determined that new rental housing would address an unmet demand in the market place. It was also identified that new complexes should fit with the character of the surrounding neighborhoods. The integration of rental units, into a comprehensively designed mixed use development, complies with the recommendations of the Analysis.

Zoning Ordinance Standards:

The following table compares the Ordinance requirements with The Reserve at Rivertown PUD:

<u>Ordinance Required</u>	<u>The Reserve at Rivertown</u>
Maximum 4 units/acre	3.9 units per acre
Minimum 35% R-1 lots (251 lots)	36.8% R-1 lots (265 lots)
15% minimum open space (27.5 acres)	21% open space (38.5 acres) with an adjoining 27.7 acres of City regional basin
Community bldg. w/ pool or tennis courts	Community building (amenities to be determined)

The proposed Reserve at Rivertown PUD complies with the Zoning Ordinance PUD standards.

If the rezoning and Overall Development Plan are approved, detailed site plans or subdivision plans will be required for each phase of construction. These will be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Traffic calming measures, architectural details, floor plans, landscape plans and nature preserve deed restrictions will be considered at that time. The entire development can be adequately served by the existing street and utility infrastructure.

Cochran highlighted how the proposal conforms to the City of Wyoming Sustainability Principles. The proposed Reserve at Rivertown will provide a wide range of quality housing opportunities for residents in Wyoming and will promote social equity. The subsequent construction of the homes, townhomes, flats, senior apartments, and commercial center will provide significant employment. These factors will contribute to the economic strength of the City. The development will preserve significant open space which will help to preserve environmental quality. The proposed rezoning, and Overall Development Plan, conforms with the City of Wyoming Sustainability Principles.

Staff Overview:

Due to the numerous land use and ownership decisions in this area over the last fourteen years, the Rivertown Valley PUD cannot be developed as originally approved. The petitioners have

acquired significant additional property and put forth a proposal that will comprehensively master plan over 200 acres for a mixed use development. If approved, it would be the largest PUD in the City. The proposed rezoning and PUD Plan is compatible with adjoining developments, and complies with the Land Use Plan 2020, the Analysis of Impediments and Housing Needs Assessment 2013, the Zoning Ordinance PUD standards, and the City's Sustainability Principals. The entire development can be adequately served by existing street and utility infrastructure.

City staff held two publicly noticed information meetings regarding this proposal in December 2014, and June 2015. Both meetings were significantly attended by area residents. Also in attendance was the developer. Substantial amendments to the proposal, based to a degree by comments received and voluntarily made by the developer in many regards, occurred between the two meetings.

Planning Commission Action:

The Development Review Team suggested the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the subject rezoning. In a separate motion, the DRT recommended the Planning Commission approve the associated Overall Development Plan, subject to City Council approval of the rezoning.

Goodheart disclosed, as the owner of Pathfinder Engineering, he did work related to this property in the past, as did Bueche as a surveyor for his company. However, they are no longer involved with the development of this project and have no conflict of interest that would prevent them from voting on it. Rynbrandt noted the City Clerk has verified that Commissioners are required by Ordinance to vote when there is no conflict of interest.

Chair Spencer opened the public hearing and explained the procedure to be used. If the majority of the audience present wished to have one representative speak on their behalf for ten minutes, they would stand. The majority of the audience did stand. Steve Troemel, 4232 Limousine Ct., came forward as their citizen representative, and as the representative of Wyoming Citizens for Planned Progress.

Mr. Troemel presented the group's response to the Granger proposal. They were opposed to rezoning of the property at 56<sup>th</sup> and Wilson for the following reasons:

1. Questionable density calculations. They believe the correct density calculation should be 570 total units/98.44 acres, which is a density of 5.8. This exceeds the PUD requirement of 4 units per acre.
2. Incomplete impact assessments. There is incomplete data regarding the traffic study, crime/safety concerns, impacts against city infrastructure, impact on schools and the best long term use of the land.
3. Inaccurate demand assessment. The City's adopted Analysis of Impediments to

Fair Housing and Housing Needs Assessment contains demand estimations that are based on pre-disposed assumptions and national averages, not local data or surveys. The local survey identified in the report resulted in 86% saying they plan on owning a home within the next five years, and 81% saying they wanted to live in the southern portion of the City.

4. Plan does not fit in with surrounding neighborhoods. Del-Mar Farms and South Rivertown PUD's are the surrounding neighborhoods and are dominated by 99% privately owned homes. 95% of the neighborhood residents oppose the plan. The Granger plan proposes four rentals for every one house in the Panhandle area.
5. Actual situation ignored. The population and tax base has increased over the last ten years in the Panhandle area. Single family homes provide nearly three times the positive economic impact compared to rentals.

Pam Brenzing, 5680 Nile Drive, was concerned with increased traffic in the neighborhood and the safety of the children living there. The initial traffic analysis was done based off the December draft plan. No recent data has been provided. Before making a decision, an updated traffic analysis should be provided. She also requested a revised plan be brought forth proposing less rental units. She reviewed the fair housing report and did not see a correlation between that report and this proposed plan.

Gordon Vandermeulen, 4186 Del Mar Village Drive, distributed the Wyoming Citizens for Planned Progress purpose statement and list of reasons The Reserve proposal should be rejected or at least postponed. He encouraged the Commissioners to read it. He felt this many rentals do not conform to the surrounding neighborhood at all. Over time, this could become a Ramblewood southwest. Who is going to represent them as citizens and tax payers if the Commission does not? This proposal will wipe out 100 acres of ER zoning. Where are the high value homes going to be built? People will end up building them in other cities.

Joyce Garcia, 4121 Del Mar Village Drive, distributed the results of a petition drive conducted by the Wyoming Citizens for Planned Progress. She noted they have 20% of the property owners' signatures who live within the 100 ft. parameter of this project to obtain a supermajority vote by the City Council. 95% of the 465 property owners that were personally contacted were eager to sign the petition as being opposed to the large number of rental units currently proposed.

Clarence Heid, 3539 Yukon Drive, was not happy with the number of apartments proposed. They pay too much in taxes to have this happen.

Steve Petee, 5830 Wilson Avenue, was concerned that if the project goes through, his house will be totally surrounded by apartments. This is all about money for the developer and the City.

Mike Moll, 4266 Del Mar Court, thought the presentation by the City was disingenuous and City staff is not telling the truth. There were two neighborhood meetings held and the most of the people in attendance were opposed to apartments.

Joe Birtles, 4175 Ayrshire Drive, has lived in Wyoming most of his life and saw how years ago residents on DenHertog Avenue opposed Swiss Valley Apartments and they were approved anyway. Those apartments were not maintained and brought down the value of the neighborhood. Ramblewood and the apartments off Prairie Parkway are another good example of properties that have not been maintained.

Mary Connelly, 4487 Penny Lane, has been a real estate appraiser for 20 years, and knows that living next to apartments is not a positive thing when it comes to property values. The apartments will negatively impact the schools and cause additional traffic and crime. Apartments were recently approved at 52<sup>nd</sup> and Wilson. A high-rise apartment complex was also approved in Grandville. They want single family homes and condos built here, with some senior and assisted living.

Chair Spencer closed the public hearing.

Petitioner Jason Granger of the Granger Group, 2221 Health Drive SW, explained they have been involved with the development of this property since 2001. Because of the economic downturn from 2008-2012, and a significant drop in single family home sales, they were forced to look at their original plans differently. They have also been the developer of Metro Health Village since 2003 and their company headquarters are located there. Their goal is to make sure this development has the same type of quality as Metro Health Village. After the informational meeting held in December 2014, they made considerable changes to the plan by removing the major apartment buildings, and instead including two and three-story townhomes. There is a regional detention basin at the south end of the development with wildlife there, and they have added 24 acres to this area for increased green space and walkability. They have included 154 units of senior apartments for residents 55+ years old, similar to the Bayberry Farms PUD. They have also expanded the number of single family homes. After the economic downtown and foreclosure crisis, there has been a shift in how millennials view home ownership. Quality townhomes are another option for the young professionals not looking to invest in a home.

Motion by Hegyi, supported by Micele, to recommend to the City Council denial of the subject rezoning. Discussion followed.

Postema questioned the accuracy of the traffic impact study submitted in December 2014. Public Works Director Bill Dooley explained the draft traffic impact study addresses the impacts of traffic of the overall plan area. As individual site plans are submitted for sections of the overall plan, more detailed traffic analysis will be required. The current traffic counts on Wilson Avenue are approximately 14,000 v.p.d. (vehicles per day) and 56<sup>th</sup> Street is approximately 8,100 v.p.d. Wilson Avenue is currently categorized as a Level A, and if the count increased to 24,000, would be categorized at a Level B. These are both safe traffic levels that function well. It is predicted, based on traffic count averages, that the PUD as proposed would add 5,100 v.p.d. If the development were all single family, it would add 6,900 v.p.d. When the draft traffic impact analysis was submitted in 2014, the City hired consultant Progressive AE to review it. Their findings concluded that the traffic impact study is accurate and reasonable for the overall

development.

Arnoys asked, if the development were all single family, how many homes could fit in this development. Cochran replied approximately 410 single family homes. Arnoys asked the current demand for rentals in Wyoming. Cochran said there has been a recent push by developers for apartments, with the 192 unit apartment complex approved at 52<sup>nd</sup>/Wilson and another 76 apartments proposed at 36<sup>th</sup>/Burlingame, which were denied. Studies show there is a demand for rentals in the greater Grand Rapids region, with 4,000 apartments needed. Vacancy rates are less than 3%. Arnoys mentioned that single family homes may be converted to rentals. Cochran confirmed that this is possible and reviewed how an increase was noted in these regards over the last several years; this being a result of the recession and foreclosure crisis. There has also been a change in culture regarding home ownership.

Hegyí said he was not opposed to this plan containing some rental properties; he was only opposed to the high number proposed. Micele agreed.

Postema favored the design of the PUD plan, but would feel more comfortable with less apartments. He asked, if an association is formed with this PUD, will the existing homeowners have to be part of it and contribute to maintenance of the common areas. Petitioner Granger replied the homeowners were notified at the time of purchase that their property would be part of an association in the future. They plan on building a club house and perhaps a pool, tennis courts, etc. The details will be worked out at a later time. Postema asked the type of senior housing. Mr. Granger said 55+ senior housing for independent living.

Goodheart asked, if the motion to deny passes, would the overall development plan be considered at all. Cochran noted the recommendation would be forwarded to City Council. A solution to the Overall Plan needs to be found. The Commission should provide a clear direction to the petitioner and staff on how they wish the overall development plan to be changed. Goodheart pointed out the original PUD plan approved in 2001 contained apartments. The question is the number of apartments that would be reasonable for this proposed plan.

Weller asked if the school system could handle an increase in students. Cochran responded the Grandville School district has made no comment on the plan. Most school districts lost students during the recession. In 2007 Grandville Schools had 6,070 students and in 2015 the enrollment dropped to 5,676 students, a loss of nearly 400 students. Weller would like to see the apartment density lowered for this development and also more condos to buffer the single family from the apartments. He stated his belief that Granger would ultimately build a high quality development.

Chair Spencer remarked that Grandville School's enrollment has dropped and that is most likely why they did not wish to build another school on this property. Regarding the remarks about City staff misleading the Commission, she knew this not to be the case. She pointed out that mixed use development is planned for this area and they must also consider the property owner's development rights.

Hegyí thought City staff does a fine job in providing them with a neutral view on how a

development fits with planning and zoning laws. He also thought Granger does remarkable work. The only thing he is questioning is the number of rental units. Hegyi asked, if his motion to deny passes, does Granger have the opportunity to make changes to the plan or does he have to start over. Cochran replied the City Council could either approve, deny or send it back to the Planning Commission for further review. Cochran suggested tabling this item if they wish changes to be made to the plan.

Postema asked if they had considered multiple family condos. Mr. Granger replied the condo market has not been the strongest. He would like some direction from the Planning Commission on what would be amenable to continue with the planning process. Rynbrandt recommended tabling this item and giving direction to the petitioner.

Motion by Hegyi, supported by Postema, to table this item to give staff and the petitioner the opportunity to revise the plan to reduce the number of rental units and increase the number of owner-occupied units. Discussion followed.

Postema thought, since 160 apartments were approved in the original PUD plan, they would be hard-pressed to deny them this number with this plan. Mr. Granger noted, since the senior apartments do not seem to be a problem, then there are 300 units in question. This is the average apartment ratio for PUDs. They can be called condos because they are not apartment buildings. They are also not low-income apartments. Short-term gain is not their goal. They are using high-quality building standards that will stand the test of time, such as brick and stone. They also would like to serve a demographic that is changing. Goodheart pointed out the development complies with R-1 standards, and they are meeting the ordinance requirements as to the number of apartments that can be built. Mr. Granger asked if owner-occupied units were a PUD requirement. Cochran responded no.

A vote on the motion carried unanimously.

## AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

Request to rezone 5.1 acres from B-3 Planned Business to B-2 General Business. The property is located at 155 – 28<sup>th</sup> Street SW. (Section 12) (CARite, Inc.)

Cochran, primarily through the staff report, described the location, existing land use and current zoning around the area. The petitioner has optioned this property with the intention of developing an automobile sales/service facility and an attended car wash. Both facilities are allowable by Special Use Approval from the Planning Commission in the B-2 General Business zoning district. As such, they are requesting to rezone this property from B-3 Planned Business to B-2 General Business. If the rezoning is approved the petitioners would then apply for Special Use and Site Plan Approvals from the Planning Commission. If the property is rezoned to B-2 General Business the full range of uses under the Zoning Code would be permissible. The petitioners have voluntarily offered a development agreement to commit solely to the uses proposed. The development agreement would be entered into with the City Council at the time of rezoning. At this time there is no known use for the rear area balance of the property.

Site History:

This property is a remnant from the K-Mart store developed in 1966. That store occupied the overall property for several decades but subsequently closed. An ancillary K-Mart out-building was previously located at the northeast corner of 28<sup>th</sup> Street and Buchanan Avenue. That was used for various commercial businesses until razed several years ago. The K-Mart building was rezoned in 1999 from B-3 Planned Business to I-1 Light Industrial to accommodate its conversion to Richwood Industries.

In 2013, the City also considered the rezoning of this subject property to B-2 General Business. That proposal was to accommodate a Speedway C-Store facility that would also provide diesel fuel for large trucks and tractors. That request was denied based on concerns over the negative land use, noise and traffic impacts of such a facility on the intersection and on adjoining properties.

Staff Comments:

1. The City of Wyoming Land Use Plan 2020 was adopted in 2006. It identifies the area on the north side of 28<sup>th</sup> Street and between Buchanan Avenue and Division Avenue as suitable for Mixed Use development. The purpose of the Mixed Use concept is “to transform this area into a walkable and accessible environment that is human scaled and will provide for a highly concentrated mix of compatible and complementary land uses of sufficient intensity to facilitate transit ridership.”

The proposed development is not mixed use, nor will it facilitate transit ridership. However, the proposed development will significantly enhance this corner by providing necessary investment and attractive facilities. The buildings are of modern architecture and will be placed near the street. The bulk of the parking will be behind the buildings. Attractive, and irrigated, 25 foot wide greenbelts would be placed along both street frontages. As such, the developments will enhance the walkability along the 28<sup>th</sup> Street corridor. It is envisioned that as economic vitality grows in this area these large parcels will redevelop into the cohesive and desired plan envisioned within the Land Use Plan.

2. The other three corners of this intersection are zoned B-2 General Business. The proposed rezoning would be identical.
3. The City of Wyoming 2035 Thoroughfare Plan showed a 2009 daily traffic volume of 35,500 trips on 28<sup>th</sup> Street and 12,900 trips on Buchanan Avenue adjoining this property. The volumes are projected to increase by 2035 to 44,100 trips on 28<sup>th</sup> Street and 16,800 trips on Buchanan Avenue. The proposed developments will primarily use existing drives and can be accommodated.

Cochran highlighted how the proposal conforms to the City of Wyoming Sustainability Principles. The proposed rezoning and subsequent development would be beneficial to the long

range community vision for this neglected area. The development would clean a blighted property and will encourage the redevelopment of nearby properties to enhance the overall economic strength of the 28<sup>th</sup> Street corridor. The proposed rezoning and subsequent development conforms to the City of Wyoming Sustainability Principles.

Planning Commission Action:

The Development Review Team suggested the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the rezoning, subject to acceptance of the voluntarily offered development agreement.

Chair Spencer opened the public hearing.

Mr. Patel, owner of the Travelodge at 65 – 28<sup>th</sup> St SW and the Best Western hotel at 2725 Buchanan Ave, expressed his support for this development. This area has been deteriorating and the proposed development will be a welcome addition.

Chair Spencer closed the public hearing.

Petitioner Steve Bailey, who will be a managing partner of this business, noted this is a national chain and a very upscale operation.

Motion by Micele, supported by Hegyi, to recommend to the City Council approval of the rezoning, subject to acceptance of the voluntarily offered development agreement. Discussion followed.

Bueche suggested when they come back for Site Plan Approval that the plan is signed by an engineer and the survey signed and sealed by a surveyor.

Micele asked the number of employees they planned to hire. Petitioner Bailey responded 40 – 50 initially, then around 80 people when they are in full operation. They are also using all local vendors.

Goodheart asked how the site plan will fit into the development agreement. Cochran replied the development agreement, once finalized, will have wording stating they must come back to the Planning Commission for Site Plan and Special Use Approvals.

A vote on the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chair Spencer opened the nominations for the position of Chair. Hegyi nominated Spencer, supported by Arnoys. Spencer accepted the nomination. There were no other nominations and the nominations were closed. The nomination stood and Spencer was elected for the position of Chair.

Chair Spencer opened the nominations for the position of Vice-Chair. Hegyi nominated Postema, supported by Arnoys. Postema accepted the nomination. There were no other nominations and the nominations were closed. The nomination stood and Postema was elected for the position of Vice-Chair.

The election for the position of Secretary was deferred one month since the current Secretary was not in attendance.

### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 P.M.

---

Anthony Woodruff, Secretary  
Wyoming Planning Commission

---

Kimberly S. Lucar, Administrative Aide  
Wyoming Planning Commission