



**Benton County Planning Board
Public Hearing
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**

February 6, 2013

6:00 PM

Benton County Administration Building
215 East Central Avenue

Meeting Minutes

PUBLIC HEARING:

Call to Order: The meeting was convened at 6:00 PM by Planning Board Chair Mark Curtis.

Roll Call: Mark Curtis, Jim Cole, Ken Knight, Starr Leyva, John Pate, Ashley Tucker, and Rick Williams were present.

Persons present in addition to the Board: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Christopher Ryan, Planning Manager Rinky Singh, Planning Coordinator M.J. McGetrick, Planning Assistant Matt Benton, and Administrator of General Services John Sudduth. Eleven members of the public were also present.

Disposition of Minutes: Mr. Cole moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve the January 16, 2013 Planning Board meeting minutes as written. Mr. Ryan moved to amend the disposition of minutes of January 16, 2013, seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion carried 7-0.

General Public Comment: None

Old Business: None

New Business:

A. Camp War Eagle LSD Addition, #13-231, 2280 Camp War Eagle Road Rogers, AR 72756

Represented by: Pete Day, Director, 35 Village Rd Rogers, AR and Rob Whorton, Facility Director, 14199 Camp War Eagle Rd Rogers, AR

Staff Updates: Staff gave a presentation on the project. Staff provided the Planning Board with an updated site plan which included pictures of the cabins and additional information with updates as requested from the previous meeting. At the last meeting, the Applicant was asked to show the proposed increase in traffic to the site and to have the parking areas delineated on the site plan. Both were provided by the Applicant. The Applicant provided proper dimensions to the parking area, including square footage and labels delineating specific use of each parking area. The Applicant also provided updates on traffic flow, represented by blue arrows on the site plan. The Applicant provided a parking table detailing the dimensions and primary use of each parking area. Staff noted the Applicant would need to have handicapped parking. The Applicant was informed it must be paved and striped according to ADA regulations on the site plan. The Applicant requested a waiver from the storm water provision. The waiver stated the addition of the proposed structures would not affect the scope and functionality of the original storm water plan. In regard to Health Department approval, the applicant provided information that the existing wastewater systems could handle the proposed additional campers on-site. Finally, Staff noted the Applicant had clearly delineated the floodplain on the updated site plan.

Staff Recommendations: Staff felt the storm water plan provided by the applicant was adequate, but, in regard to the waiver, recommended a certified engineer provide a statement that the storm water management plans could be modified to adjust to the proposed buildings on-site.

In regard to stipulations, Staff suggested including the following as part of approval: (1) the handicapped parking be labeled on the site plan with dimensions and surface material indicated, (2) the applicant contact the Planning Office if any additional major changes occur to the proposed timelines, and (3) that Standard Conditions apply.

Questions/Comments from the Board: Mr. Knight asked Staff how much more hard surface would be added that would require input from a certified engineer. Ms. McGetrick responded that she was not sure if the plan accommodated extra buildings. She further stated, if the Board was comfortable with the waiver, they should proceed. If not, a letter from an engineer should be obtained stating the sufficiency of the existing plan.

Mr. Pate commented that it's a good policy for an engineer to review the plan.

Response from the Applicant: Mr. Day stated the goal when going through the original process was to detail anything the camp might be planning. He reiterated his plea for a waiver. He stated his goal is to put four (4) buildings under roof before this summer, and he hopes to avoid any delays.

Questions from the Board: Mr. Tucker asked the Applicants if they would be willing to obtain a letter from the engineer as a stipulation before issuing a building permit. Mr. Day responded agreeing to this request.

Public Comment: None

Comments from the Board: Mr. Tucker moved that the Board approve Camp War Eagle as presented with the following four (4) stipulations:

1. Indicate handicapped parking on the site plan
2. Material for parking area be delineated in the site plan
3. The Applicant contacts Staff if any major changes occur to the site plan
4. The Applicant provides a letter from a certified engineer prior to the issuance of a building permit

Vote: A motion was made by Mr. Tucker to approve, seconded by Mr. Cole. The motion passed 7-0.

B. H and H Classic LSD-12-226, 12325 Highway 72E., Bentonville, AR

Represented by: Tray Smith, 10889 Northfork Drive Gravette, AR and Hermon Smith 12325 Highway 72 West Bentonville, AR

Staff Updates: Staff gave a presentation on changes made to the updated site plan. Staff noted the Applicant had added additional parking and moved the lights on the corners of the building away from the residential properties. An example of the wall-mounted lighting unit was provided. It was noted that the Applicant updated the grading and landscaping plan. Staff also indicated that the Applicant had included holly bushes to the landscape plan. In addition, the Applicant had been given final approval of the access permit by the Highway Department on December 20th.

Staff felt that the applicant met all the requirements of the County Planning Regulations, but that the Board might want to consider the vegetative buffer. The Applicant had provided two layers of vegetative buffering along the west property line and an additional planting along Highway 72. Staff felt the buffer meets the minimum requirements, but that it could be a few years for the plants to reach maturity. Staff felt the Board

may wish to consider a two (2) to four (4) foot high earthen berm to provide additional buffering while the plants grow.

Staff found no other outstanding issues that needed to be addressed. All public utility service agreements had been provided by the Applicant. The Applicant had sufficiently identified the septic tank and field locations. Staff found all requested materials had been provided. Adjacent property notification had been completed.

Questions from the Board and Staff: Mr. Knight asked if Staff had received any comments from adjacent neighbors regarding the visibility of the existing structure. Ms. McGetrick responded that the adjacent property owner had made comments and that he was present at the meeting.

Mr. Tucker asked if the existing propane was going to remain in its current location. Ms. McGetrick and Mr. Tray Smith both responded that it would.

Mr. Knight asked what size of plants would be installed for buffering. Mr. Tray Smith responded that plants in the three (3) to five (5) gallon range would be installed.

Ms. Leyva asked if the Applicant knew the distance between the installed septic system and the property line where the earthen berm would be placed. Mr. Tray Smith stated that he did not.

Mr. Tucker asked if the proposed berm would be inside the utility easement. Ms. McGetrick responded that the berm would probably have to be outside of the easement, but that further research would be needed.

Mr. Ryan asked if the Applicant would consider a cheaper alternative such as a white cedar. Mr. Tray Smith responded that he chose holly bushes because they match the existing buffer.

Mr. Knight told the Applicants that vegetation would require extensive maintenance. He asked them how they would maintain a vegetative buffer. Mr. Tray Smith responded that an existing buffer was already being successfully maintained.

Response from Applicant: Mr. Smith stated that he didn't want to install a berm and believed the proposed vegetation would provide adequate buffering if given time to mature. Ms. McGetrick noted that as part of the standard conditions, maintenance would be required of vegetative buffers.

Public Comments: Mike Hollingsworth of 12353 Highway 72 West Bentonville, AR appeared for comment with his attorney, Bryan Powell. Mr. Hollingsworth resides on property bordering the applicant's land towards the west. He stated he was for small business, but that he was concerned about the size to which the Applicant has grown. He stated horn honking at gates of the property had become a problem. He wasn't informed about the movement of the propane tank. He stated he didn't feel a vegetative buffer would be adequate. He was also concerned about safety of his six (6) year old daughter. Overall, he would like to see a fence installed along the property line and the propane tank moved.

Board Questions to Mr. Hollingsworth: Mr. Knight asked Mr. Hollingsworth what would make him feel more comfortable with the proposed changes to the site. Mr. Hollingsworth responded that he would like a fence for privacy. He believes bushes won't provide adequate buffering. Mr. Knight asked Mr. Hollingsworth if the propane tanks are a problem. Mr. Hollingsworth responded that the tanks have not been a problem, but trucks filling them have caused noise issues. Mr. Hollingsworth requested that the applicants work with him in addressing these issues.

Mr. Tucker asked Mr. Hollingsworth if the honking occurs frequently. Mr. Hollingsworth stated that the honking does not occur frequently, but that it's loud.

Ms. Layva asked Mr. Hollingsworth if he had any fencing on his side of the property. Mr. Hollingsworth responded that there is a dilapidated barbed-wire fence.

Mr. Pate asked Mr. Smith if there was a safety plan for a propane explosion; however, Mr. Curtis interrupted Mr. Pate stating the questions were for Mr. Hollingsworth, not the Mr. Smith.

Mr. Knight asked Mr. Hollingsworth what height of fence he would like. Mr. Hollingsworth responded that a fence would need to be at least six (6) foot in height. Ms. McGetrick stated a six (6) foot fence would work.

Response from the Applicant: Mr. Tray Smith provided additional information to the Board. His main objection to the fence idea was the long-term maintenance that would be required. He felt shrubbery would be more expensive, but also believed it would look better and that it's better for the environment. He provided pictures to the Board showing the deterioration of the wooden fences resulting in maintenance every 10 years. He stated even a treated fence would deteriorate rapidly and look bad. He showed another picture of what he proposed in a vegetative fence. He proposed putting plants in a buffer in a four (4) foot spacing for better coverage. He admitted wood fences provide immediate screening, but reiterated maintenance issues. He stated he wants the property to look nice.

Questions/Comments from the Board: Mr. Curtis stated he also believed green fences are a better solution. He is not a fan of berms like Mr. Tucker. Mr. Tray Smith changed the discussion back to the issue of the trucks. In regard to the horn honking, he wasn't sure if the honking is a DOT requirement. He only received 31 trucks in the last 70 days and did not believe there would be an increase in truck traffic because he would be still using the same vendors.

Mr. Knight remarked that maintaining the proposed vegetative buffer would come at a significant cost in time and money. He was not sure if it would be more economical than installing a fence. He raised the question of what is the cost of goodwill to maintain a good relationship with the neighbors.

Mr. Williams asked how the elevation changes between the two properties. He also asked what was the status of the propane. Ms. McGetrick replied that the elevation is fairly flat between the properties. Mr. Tray Smith noted the propane is an independent business and not owned by him. He noted the propane tank had been empty for three years.

Mr. Knight stated that he didn't believe exploding propane would be an issue to be addressed. Mr. Cole asked the applicants when the propane tank was last moved and who requested the move. Mr. Hermon Smith responded that the tanks were moved back in 2000 at the State's request.

Mr. Tucker asked what the buffering ordinance said regarding fencing as being an adequate buffer. Ms. McGetrick stated she felt the vegetative buffering would be adequate without the berm. She stated the berm was suggested initially for increased height. Mr. Ryan noted the ordinances don't go into detail regarding the walls used for buffering.

Mr. Curtis asked if there would be a double line of vegetation for the buffering. Mr. Tray Smith responded the buffer would be a double line that would grow into a single row. Mr. Curtis asked if the vegetation offered by the Applicants would provide adequate buffering as it grew. He stated a berm would not be adequate in reducing sound and light pollution.

Mr. Tucker noted that he did not see the need for a berm either, due to potential complications with the septic field.

Mr. Knight stated the Board could back off the fence issue since a barrier is being added where one didn't exist previously. He noted that at least in a couple of years an adequate barrier would exist.

Vote: Ms. Leyva moved to approve the project with the stipulation that standard conditions apply and that the Applicant consult with Staff regarding any additional development to be proposed to the site. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cole. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Curtis recommended the Applicant get in touch with Staff regarding the plantings. Staff promised to provide a copy of the standard conditions, so that the Applicant would be aware of the maintenance requirements.

The Public Hearing was closed at 6:56 PM.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Call to Order: 6:56 PM

Old Business: None

New Business:

A. Wolfe Boat Works – LSD Addition, #13-237, 14101 E. HWY 12, Rogers, AR

Represented by: Jeff Wolfe, 8899 East Brown Road Lowell, AR and Pat Wolfe 16576 Ivy Lane Rogers, AR

Comments from the Applicants: Mr. Wolfe proposed additional parking area for his business. The lack of parking has become a burden as his business has grown. A piece of property behind the business was purchased for this expansion. He stated that he would like to expand his existing building an additional 1800 sq. ft and that there would be new construction on the new property. Ms. Wolfe added that the new parking would be used for boats that are currently in front of Highway 12 to get them out of view, plus some new parking for employees.

Comments from Staff: Staff gave a presentation on the property and the proposed changes. The property is located at 14101 E Highway 12 Rogers, AR and includes three separate parcels totaling 3.3 acres. It is bordered to the west and south by residential areas. The proposal is a revision of the original site plan. These revisions include:

- The addition of a new parcel (15-16069-000) fronting on Stoner Lane
- Maintaining existing access from Stoner Lane
- A 1800 sq. ft. building addition to expand the boat repair use
- Twelve (12) new parking spaces on-site, including one (1) accessible space and a reconfiguration of existing parking
- A 100-foot privacy fence and additional 100-foot chain link fence along the access from Stoner Lane

Staff noted that the original site plan was approved in 2005 with the following features:

- The overall site included two parcels provided (15-16067-000 and 15-16068-000).
- Development was approved on parcel 15-16068-000. The other parcel was left undeveloped.

- Access was provided from Highway 12
- A 6000 square foot building for boat repairs
- Five (5) total parking spaces on site, including one (1) accessible van space
- A screened storage area closer to the building

Staff noted the proposed site plan differed substantially from the previously approved site plan and that the revisions were not accurate in the Applicant's description. Staff provided photos of these differences taken during the January 30th site visit. Some of these differences include:

- Expansion of the boat storage areas to the west and south which are now closer to the residential areas. The approved plan showed the screened storage areas next to the building
- A landscaped setback was shown along the east side of the storage area, which no longer exists
- Three (3) parking spaces were approved close to the north building wall where a concrete walkway currently exists. Dimensions of the existing sidewalks need to be included on the site plan
- The clean out area was not shown and was replaced by parking spaces. Landscaping along the west wall was noted during the site visit. It was suggested that the parking could be relocated to protect the landscaping setback and clean out
- Parking circulation was restricted to the north of the septic tank; however, traffic circulation and storage currently exists on all sides of the building and over the existing tank
- The Applicant did not confirm the proposed new use of the acquired parcel

In regard to the setback, Staff noted the proposed building addition did comply with the requirement. Since the overall property comprises of three (3) parcels, side setbacks are required to be shown along the outside edges or the applicant could consolidate the three (3) parcels. In addition, the proposed angled parking is within the 10-foot setback requirement. Staff noted the Board may wish to request the applicant remove the parking and maintain the setback consistent with the approved site plan.

Staff stated the proposal, which includes 12 spaces, spaces does comply with the parking requirements. Staff, however, noted changes in parking and circulation on-site. The proposed plan allows traffic over the septic tank and lateral fields.

Staff noted the septic location did not match the information provided by the Health Department. Staff stated the applicant would need to verify the location and modify traffic circulation and storage areas.

Staff stated that access to the building from the parking areas should be labeled on the plan. Staff noted that the approved accessible space did not exist on-site per the site visit on January 30th. It is required that a paved accessible area with proper signage be provided as shown on the approved and proposed site plans.

Staff noted that no information was provided regarding on-site lighting. Wall-mounted lights, however, were noted during the site visit on the west, south, and east walls. The Applicant is required to show existing and proposed lighting on the site plan, including type and intensity.

Staff noted during the January 30th site visit that the entire property up to the original property limits was dedicated to boat storage, which is a substantial change from the original approved plan and must be included as a revision for review by the Board. The site plan needs to identify existing conditions, which include an internal drive leading to the south storage area. The expansion of the storage area towards the existing residential areas also requires adequate buffering.

Staff was concerned with the expansion of the boat storage area toward the residential area to the south and Highway 12. The proposed plan shows a 'quiet zone' to the west, which doesn't provide proper screening

during the fall/winter months as noted during the site visit. Furthermore, Staff noted the Applicant did not have ownership of the property designated as the so-called 'quiet zone.'

Staff noted that the applicant is proposing a 100-foot privacy fence for the access on Stoner Lane. Staff stated the Applicant needs to identify the type, height, and material of the fence. In addition, existing residential units need to be shown on-site to determine the adequacy of the proposed fence.

Staff noted that the existing access from Highway 12 needs to be identified on the site plan, including access apron surface materials. The proposed access on Stoner Lane should be justified. Staff noted that a similar request from Dollar General was denied in the past. Staff also mentioned that according to the Road Department the existing driveway does not have a permit and must be abandoned. For the Board to approve the access on Stoner Lane, Staff noted that a driveway permit would be required and the access would have to be paved to the satisfaction of the Benton County Road Department.

Regarding site surfaces and drainage, the applicant provided an Engineer's Certificate noting that "the increase in flow by the addition of 1800 sq. ft. is 0.165 cubic feet per second and with the short path to the lake can be considered pre-peak flow; therefore no Stormwater detention pond is being submitted." However, Staff noted that the Board may want to review the impact of existing/proposed site conditions.

Staff noted that the Benton County Health Department approved the application for a septic system on-site on February 10, 2005. Since the proposal does not include additional restroom or plumbing provisions, further review is not warranted.

Staff noted Rogers Water supplies on-site water according to the Applicant. In addition, Staff confirmed electricity is provided by Carroll Electric and propane by Roper Propane.

Staff received letter dated November 12, 2012, from the Beaver Lake Fire Department confirming coverage. The Benton County Fire Marshall Mike Trollinger, however, requires the installation of a Knox Box for the gated access driveways.

Applicant confirmed Deffenbuagh Industries would provide solid waste disposal.

Staff is awaiting comment from Emergency Management. The applicant, however, noted the storage of 6-55 gallon oil waste containers, Ten (10) gallons of solvent, and 110 gallons of waste oil on-site.

Staff remarked that Applicant has been delinquent on taxes since 2010.

Staff concluded their presentation by reiterating the outstanding issues which must be addressed before a comprehensive review. These include:

- Substantial expansion of the boat storage
- Loss of approved landscaped setbacks along the east property line
- Revisions to the approved location of parking and its impact on site services, such as septic, clean out, and existing landscape features
- Substantial revisions to the parking circulation
- Revisions to the approved paved area

On the site plan, Staff also reminded the Applicant of outstanding deficiencies including:

- Identifying the three (3) parcels on-site and showing the required setbacks, or in the alternative, consolidating the parcels
- Identifying adjacent property lines and property owner information
- Identifying all existing site conditions and features
- Verifying the existing septic system
- Identifying all site lighting
- Redesigning the parking area for compliance with the setback requirements
- Buffering residential areas. Staff expects buffer measures to be on-site
- Verifying hours of operation and any potential increase in on-site customers
- Justifying access from Stoner Lane
- Confirming proposed use of the newly acquired parcel

Staff concluded that the proposed site plan differed substantially from the approved plan, beyond the scope of the revisions noted by the Applicant. Furthermore, it was noted a number of site plan deficiencies remained, therefore, it is required that the applicant address these issues prior to a comprehensive review. It was also Staff's opinion that the application was not ready for a Public Hearing.

Questions/Comments from the Board: Mr. Curtis noted the site plan that was approved in 2005 was never carried out. He reminded the Applicants that the purpose of the review was to prepare them for when the matter goes in front of the public. Mr. Wolfe responded the elevation change would make it impossible to park or drive on the septic system. He the argued previously approved parking was not working due to this extreme change, thus requiring the revision. Mr. Curtis asked him how accurate the septic tank location was on the site plan. Mr. Wolfe responded that there was a clean out on the far southwest corner of the building, and the elevation change would make driving impossible. He said the leach lines ran down along the tree line next to the ravine. He stated the location of the septic was chosen because he knew he would have to drive around the existing building to access both sides. Mr. Curtis asked if the location of the septic tank on the revised site plan was accurate at all. Mr. Wolfe responded that it was not, stating that there appeared to be a discrepancy in the drawing. Mr. Curtis noted that the directional arrows on the revised site plan give the appearance that traffic flow occurs over the septic system. Mr. Wolfe responded he would need to get with the engineer, but knew the septic location was not where the flow arrows were located.

Mr. Knight commented that an updated site plan would clear up the outstanding issues. Mr. Wolfe responded he didn't realize he was not compliant regarding the lighting. Ms. Wolfe stated she was never told by the engineer that the buffers were inadequate and that she didn't come to the meetings personally. Mr. Knight reminded Ms. Wolfe that the engineer would not be the one to make a decision on the buffers. He told the Mr. Wolfe and Ms. Wolfe that addressing these issues would clear up 99 percent of the issues.

Mr. Curtis asked the applicants what they wanted to do with the second lot and if it would be used for boat parking. Ms. Wolfe stated the driveway off Stoner Lane was not used by customers. She stated employees would use the field when the parking area was backed up. She stated permission to use the access was given by the former owner, Darrow Garner. She stated the access was never intended to be used as a customer driveway.

Mr. Knight stated that even employees using access off Stoner Lane as a driveway would create a major issue due to the outcome of the Dollar General project. Mr. Wolfe stated he was okay if the Stoner Lane access couldn't be used as an employee driveway. He stated he still wanted to fence around the vicinity to make it look nice. He stated he planned on landscaping and pulling the fences back. He stated he believed that Darrow Garner of Prairie Creek Development consolidated the parcels.

Ms. Singh noted that Staff's records didn't show that the parcels were consolidated. She noted they still appeared under Wolfe Management, LLC under three parcel numbers. Mr. Wolfe responded he believed that it was set up as a subdivision under Wolfe Management.

Mr. Ryan commented that it sounded like the applicants were surprised and taken aback by the number of issues. He invited them to the Planning Office to clear up any questions. Ms Wolfe responded by requesting a comprehensive list of all outstanding issues. Staff provided a copy of the Planner's Report that included the requested details.

Mr. Cole asked the Applicants if they wanted access off Stoner Lane. Mr. Wolfe responded that he would. Mr Cole stated he would have a problem with that, given the denied request from Dollar General. Mr. Cole noted the residents would not likely to respond well to the access.

Mr. Curtis commented the probability of increased traffic by the applicant's employees would likely be nil, unlike what would have been for Dollar General.

Mr. Knight told the Applicants all outstanding issues should be discussed with Staff and to let them come back with an update.

Ms. Wolfe commented that boats are not stored on-site, but that they are just waiting to be repaired.

Mr. Curtis asked the applicants if they had security concerns for putting up the lights. Mr. Wolfe said that security reasons were the reasons the lights were put up. He noted, however, that there had not been any security issues. He stated letters were received from the neighbors regarding the lights. Ms. Wolfe noted the wattage of the bulbs had already been lowered to satisfy neighbors.

Ms. McGetrick told the Applicants that their engineer said he would provide receipts regarding notification to the neighbors. Mr. Wolfe responded that they were notified and that the receipts would be provided to Staff.

Mr. Knight asked the Applicants if they would be ready for public comment in two weeks. Mr. Ryan stated that it would be possible, but if not, the hearing can still be held followed by a second session.

Comments ended at 7:37 PM. The project was set for Public Hearing on Feb 20, 2013.

STAFF UPDATES:

Matthew Benton introduced as the new Planning Assistant.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

Cell Tower Regulation in Benton County

Presented by: Donna Mayhue, citizen, Sulphur Springs

Donna Mayhue appeared in front of the Board to share her personal thoughts on telecommunication towers. She stated her goals were to change the Board's opinions regarding these towers and to hopefully change regulations regarding their placement. Ms. Mayhue has been a registered nurse for 30 years in Arkansas. Ms. Mayhue and her husband own 150 acres with 25 head of buffalo in the Sulphur Springs area. About ten days prior to the meeting, she had noticed construction work on a neighbor's farm. She learned from her neighbor that he was constructing a telecommunication tower. Electromagnetic pollution was her main concern. She discussed studies she had found on the effects of this radiation on humans and cattle. She

noted that one study found cattle under cell towers to have several health and behavioral issues. As a small-scale bison farmer, she stated she cannot afford squeeze chutes, so she has to be careful about fencing. Her neighbor gets upset when her bison enter his fields, so potential behavioral problems are a concern. She also noted that she works at a pediatric intensive unit and was aware that developing bodies have thinner brain structure and are thus more susceptible to health problems. Ms. Mayhue requested that the Board be proactive about the placement of these towers because of their alleged potential to reduce agricultural production. She suggested the Board study radiation patterns to determine the safe distances and to coordinate cell phone coverage in Arkansas. She offered to provide research to the Board and Staff on the topic. She concluded by stating she was horrified that her neighbors could come to the rural part of America and reduce the reproductive health of her animals for profit.

Questions from the Board: Mr. Knight asked if the cell phone towers in Benton County and were they approved by the Board. Ms. McGetrick responded that they were in the county, but they were administratively approved. She noted that there is a certain height requirement under which they can be approved.

Mr. Knight told Ms. Mayhue he appreciated what she said and agrees further research is needed. He said, however, he believed cattle would have to be directly under the towers to be affected and that high-tension lines were more of a concern. Ms. Mayhue responded that the question was not evidence because the research confirmed her theories. Mr. Knight responded that there may be an issue, but in court, proof would be needed.

No further comments were made by the Board.

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 PM.