

**ANN ARBOR CHARTER TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
MINUTES OF MEETING – MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 2024
TOWNSHIP OFFICES, 3792 PONTIAC TRAIL, ANN ARBOR MI**

I. CALL TO ORDER, ESTABLISH QUORUM

Supervisor O’Connell called the Ann Arbor Charter Township Board of Trustees meeting to order at 7:30 pm on January 22, 2024.

Present: Supervisor Diane O’Connell
Clerk Rena Basch
Treasurer Carlene Colvin-Garcia
Trustee John Allison
Trustee Michael Moran
Trustee Kristine Olsson
Trustee Rodney Smith

Absent: None

Also Present: Township Attorney Gabis, Bodman PLC
Fire Chief Nicholai
Building Official and Zoning Administrator Pace
Utilities Director Judkins
Township Planner Elmiger, Carlisle Wortman

II. APPROVAL OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting December 18, 2023.

MOTION by Basch, support by Olsson, to approve the December 18, 2023 regular meeting minutes as submitted.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

B. Special Meeting Open Session January 3, 2024

MOTION by Olsson, support by Smith, to approve the January 3, 2023 special meeting open session minutes as submitted.

Motion passed by voice vote .

C. Special Meeting Closed Session January 3, 2024

MOTION by Allison, support by Moran, to approve the January 3, 2023 special meeting closed session minutes as submitted.

Motion passed by voice vote 6-0-1 (Colvin-Garcia abstained).

III. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Ed Ridha, 2675 Englave Drive, addressed agenda item V.D., regarding standards for home occupations. Mr. Ridha's property was located in the Huron River Heights Subdivision, a neighborhood that has 3 governing sets of rules and 3 electrical grids. Regarding agenda item V.D., apparently one section of the neighborhood will have new rules; others will not. He understood that a lot of work had been put into the ordinance change, but the results and how those results were reached had not been communicated to the neighbors. Mr. Ridha and his neighbors did not think they needed new rules. The proposed changes did not seem to be congruent with the neighborhood; the neighbors would like continuity with what was already there.

In response to questions, Mr. Ridha said:

- He was addressing the proposed change in regulating accessory structures, and what the structures could be used for. Many in the neighborhood had home offices and people were interested as to whether they could put an office in an accessory structure.
- When Mr. Ridha referenced 3 grids, he was speaking of 3 different neighborhoods, each of which was serviced by a different grid. The deed restrictions for the 3 neighborhoods were also different. He and his neighbors were comfortable with the current regulations and did not see the need to make any changes.

In response, the Board pointed out that the ordinance would apply to the entire Township, and the 3 neighborhoods referenced by Mr. Ridha were all located within the Township. The ordinance itself would not change anything to do with neighborhood's deed restrictions. The Planning Commission had been working on this ordinance for about 2 years; looking at the minutes of those meetings would give context.

IV. APPROVE THE AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION by Allison, support by Moran, to approve the agenda and consent agenda as submitted.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- A. Claims Listing**
- B. Appoint Jeffrey Souza to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a term ending July 1, 2026.**
- C. Barry Lonik hourly pay increase to \$110 per hour for project work (\$5 increase), \$70/hour baseline (\$10 increase, first time ever), monitoring, no change.**
- D. Accept the Code Enforcement Officer's Annual Report**
- E. Accept Farmland Consultant Barry Lonik's Report**
- F. Accept the Building Department Annual Report**
- G. Accept the Personnel Committee Memo**

V. ANNEXATIONS, ORDINANCES, ZONING, RESOLUTIONS

A. US 23 Reconstruction – Michigan Department of Transportation

Members of the project team present this evening included:

Jason Pittman, MDOT, Project Manager, University Region, Cost and Scheduling Engineer

Mike Davis, Jr., MDOT, Senior University Region Planner

Rob Leppala, Project Manager, Bergmann

Barbara Arens, C2G

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Pittman described the project scope:

- Project study area: US-23 from 1-94/US-23 interchange area north to east M-14/US-23 interchange area in the City of Ann Arbor, Pittsfield Township, and Ann Arbor Township in Washtenaw County.
- Currently they were in the Environmental Assessment part of the project. Following the Assessment they would move into Development Studies, and Road and Bridge Design.
- Additionally the team was working on the two ongoing linkage studies in the area:
 - M-17 Washtenaw Ave PEL
 - M-14 Barton Drive Interchange PEL Study
- The project schedule showed the project would be finished 2027-2029.
- After overviewing the public engagement schedule, Mr. Pittman reviewed the Purpose and Goals for this project:
 - Safe operations for all users along and crossing the corridor.
 - Address safety and peak hour congestion along the corridor and at key interchanges.
 - Embrace the Michigan Department of Transportation's Moving Michigan Toward Zero Deaths initiative.
 - Create aesthetically pleasing infrastructure and landscape elements, with community input, to complement the communities.
 - Provide an adaptive series of solutions to meet changing mobility needs, including use of transit and existing park and ride lot.
 - Embrace the *Ann Arbor Moving Together Toward Vision Zero Comprehensive Transportation Plan*.
 - Offer multiple opportunities for input from agencies, stakeholders, the communities, and the public in selection of a preferred alternative.
- The project will address the following needs for the US-23 corridor:
 - Update aging infrastructure of roadways and bridges that were constructed in the early 1960s.
 - Modernize antiquated geometric elements of US-23.
 - Reduce traffic congestion due to the 80,000 vehicles on a typical weekday.
- Mr. Pittman overviewed the factors that went into the Environmental Assessment, including the *Natural Environment, Community Impacts, and Cultural Impacts*.

In response to questions about flooding in this area, and whether flooding mitigation could be accomplished simultaneously with this project, Mr. Leppala said that they had met with Washtenaw County Water Resources, who also had a request to look at the interchange to see if there were opportunities to increase water storage.

- The presentation showed traffic volumes from 2009 to 2023, as well as projections to 2046, based on SEMCOG demand models.
- Passenger data was provided as to where vehicles (both southbound and northbound) on US-23 are headed, and how many vehicles simply “go through”.

Northbound US-23 traffic, north of I-94:

- 37% of the traffic constitute through trips to NB US-23 and EB M-14
- 24% travel to WB Washtenaw (M-17)
- 18% travel toward Ypsilanti
- Trips to City of Ann Arbor = 38%
- Trips to Ann Arbor Township = 7%
- Trips to outside of City of Ann Arbor = 62%

Southbound US-23, south of M-14:

- 48% of the traffic constitute through trips to SB US-23 and I-94
- 21% travel to WB Plymouth Road
- High weaving movements along SB US-23 between M-14 and Plymouth Road causes congestion, especially in the morning
- Trips to City of Ann Arbor = 29%
- Trips to Ann Arbor Township = 14%
- Trips to outside of Ann Arbor = 71%

The Board thought this information would be useful to the Climate Resilience Committee, especially as the Committee was seeking information relative to how much greenhouse emissions in the Township were from pass-through traffic at the US-23 corridor. It would be very helpful to know what percentage of the traffic was local traffic; the project team will try to provide this data.

Mr. Leppala discussed 4 Project Alternatives:

- Reconstructing existing roads (no build): maintains existing lanes – two lanes in each direction.
- Add a general purpose lane: adds third general purpose lane along NB/SB US-23 from I-94 to M-14.
- Add High-occupancy vehicle (HOV) Lane: Adds third lane along US-23 from I-94 to M-14, designated as an HOV lane during peak hours for vehicles with more than 1 person, busses, police, emergency vehicles, and motorcycles.
- Flex Lane: Adds median flex lane as additional lane to increase capacity during peak hours.

MDOT was also looking at alternatives relative to the Interchanges with US-23:

- No build. Reconstruct instead.
- Partial cloverleaf.
- Diverging diamond.

- Single point urban interchange.

Trustee Moran pointed out the single point urban interchange could result in more standing traffic, increasing discharge pollution at the site. Why wasn't a roundabout considered?

Ms. Arens explained that in this location, because of space constraints there was no option for doing roundabouts. Even though right now the interchange schematics were conceptual, initial reports show that the DDA and SPUI will both be improvements to the existing congestion.

Using evaluation criteria will hopefully result in the preferred alternative providing for:

- Mobility, operations & safety
- Community access & circulation
- Social & economic goals
- Environmental goals
- Best cost alternatives

Non-motorized connection evaluation

- US-23 over East Huron River Drive
- Geddes Rd over US-23
- Earhart Rd over US-23
- Plymouth Rd over US-23

Potential grant opportunities to close the funding gap:

- MDOT Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
- RAISE Grant (Urban)
- INFRA (Nationally Significant Multimodal Freight & Highway Projects Program)
- Mega Grant Program

Next steps will include:

- Existing conditions have been analyzed.
- Now it is time to look at the 4 alternatives and look at proposed conditions and determination of impacts. One or more of the alternatives might actually decrease noise.
- Will report back in the spring.

The Board discussed with the MDOT team the issues of noise and whether noise can be mitigated concurrent with the road improvements being made.

A Public Open House is scheduled for Thursday, Feb. 1, Noon-2pm and 4-8pm at Washtenaw Community College, Morris Lawrence Building.

In response to questions about the potential changes to the Barton Hills ramps at US 23, Mr. Davis said the report had been finalized and was on the MDOT website. They were committed to implementing the remaining road safety audit proposals before talking

further about any potential closure. Earliest work has been moved out from 2024 to 2026. Conversations were ongoing with State Senators and Representatives to find funding for the long term alternative. MDOT will also study solutions to the Main Street issues that have come out in conversation regarding the Barton Hills ramps.

The Board strongly emphasized the need for improvement at the Plymouth Road/US23 intersection, especially in terms of improving non-motorized traffic safety (pedestrian/bicycle). The MDOT development team agreed that this intersection was high-priority in terms of needing this type of improvement. However, that work was not yet budgeted. Various funding sources were being sought, and matching funds from local municipalities might be part of the mix.

B. Approve the Resolution on Poverty Exemption Policy and Guidelines – Assessor Haley

Assessor Haley explained that the 2024 Poverty Exemption Policy and Guidelines were based on what Board members voted for the prior year for the 2023 resolution, relative to the poverty exemption policy that applies to qualified low income individuals who own homesteads in Ann Arbor Charter Township. Applicants that meet the income and asset qualifications will have the taxable value reduced by 90% of the current year. Poverty exemptions are granted for one year only, and property owners must apply every year in order to receive each exemption.

The Township had approval from the State Tax Commission for the 90% exemption. This approval did not have to be requested from the State every year.

Assessor Haley explained that the Board could include a line in the Resolution that the policy would be updated with the most recent federal guidelines every year, and a yearly resolution would also not be needed.

After discussion, the Board decided to keep the annual review and resolution process as it is.

MOTION by OLSSON , support by ALLISON, to approve ANN ARBOR CHARTER TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES RESOLUTION ON POVERTY EXEMPTION POLICY AND GUIDELINES, JANUARY 22, 2024, as submitted.

Roll call vote:

Ayes - Smith, Moran, Allison, Olsson, Basch, O'Connell, Colvin-Garcia. Nays – None.

Motion passed 7-0.

Supervisor O'Connell asked that since there was a member of the public present who was interested in Item D, that Item D be heard next.

Motion by Allison, support by Olsson, to hear items D and E before item C.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

D. Ordinance Amendments, Zoning Code Section 74-2, “definitions” and 74-9, “Home occupation,” regarding standards for home occupations.

Referencing the January 16, 2024 Carlisle Wortman memorandum, and based on comments provided by the Township Board at previous meetings, Township Planner Elmiger outlined changes made in the draft Home Occupations ordinance language, specifically regarding:

- Replacing the word “nuisance” with “impacts,” or “negative impacts.”
- Revised and shortened *Purpose of Regulations*.
- Revised reference to “parking” to state that parking must be provided on site.
- Revised statements regarding sales of products to customers visiting the site to allow incidental sales of products in relation to the home occupation.
- Sign ordinance prohibits signs for a home occupation.
- Per the Township Attorney’s recommendation, the prohibition regarding assembly of groups was deleted.
- Included list of districts where home occupations are allowed and what types of buildings they are allowed in. Home occupations as an accessory use are allowed in all residential zoning districts. Category B home occupations are only allowed in a single-family or two-family dwelling/attached accessory structure.

Board Discussion:

- The Board discussed the use of the words “customary,” “incidental,” and “secondary,” as they related to a home occupation. For any accessory use in a residential district, the use needs to be “typical” – one that is typically associated with a residential use, and that is nothing out of the ordinary. The use has to be incidental, which means it is not the principal use. Secondary is similar in meaning to incidental.

After discussion, the consensus of the Board was to use the term “subordinate” instead of “secondary.”

- The Board discussed the requirement for Category B uses to have parking on site, which did not allow street parking for employees or customers. Wouldn’t this increase impervious surface, since people might have to add pavement in order to provide the required parking?

Category B uses require a certain balancing act. The uses should not change the nature of the neighborhood from residential to commercial, including taking residential street parking for a commercial use.

For instance, Fleming Creek subdivision had limited street parking and the driveways can only accommodate 2 cars, making Category B uses difficult within the subdivision.

Category B uses required certain standards for parking. If the parking is not available, that homeowner cannot have a Category B use in the home/accessory structure. A Category B use, like a special land use, is not appropriate everywhere.

- Category B uses would only be allowed in single-family residential and duplex homes, or in an attached structure. Category B uses are not allowed in a detached structure.

Trustee Olsson thought this regulation was not flexible and could have unintended consequences.

Township Planner Elmiger said that with their recommendations, the Planning Commission wanted to make sure residential areas stay residential.

Trustee Allison said this limitation of keeping Category B uses to attached accessory structures was tied to the fact that the new ordinance language would allow a substantial increase in the number of accessory buildings, and the new ordinance was substantially increasing what residents can do with their properties.

The Board discussed several types of uses. A horse stable with riding lessons would not be subject to the home occupation ordinance, since a stable was already a special land use. However, a painter might want to keep paint fumes out of his home and do his creative work in a small separate building; this might constitute a Category B use.

Township Planner Elmiger said that typically home occupations have been in the home. Allowing Category B home occupations to be primarily in an attached accessory structure was a significant change. The Planning Commission wanted to start with a conservative, incremental change that would require permitting by the Township.

Trustee Smith brought up the incident in his own home when, during the pandemic, a family member used their house for telecommuting for 8 months. To Trustee Smith, this was normal family behavior in an extraordinary time, but would not be allowed under the new ordinance, which said that non occupants of the dwelling may not commute to the dwelling for a Category A home occupation on site.

City Planner Elmiger said that the main idea of a home occupation is to allow the home occupants to do something in addition to just living in the building. To allow non-occupants to rent rooms to run a business out of the home, for instance, would violate the spirit of the ordinance. She noted that the existing home occupation ordinance has the same language.

Trustee Smith was concerned that the ordinance eliminated flexibility in terms of normal ways families function.

- The Board offered minor technical edits to the draft language, including deleting the word “telework.”
- The Board suggested that the examples given in the Carlisle Wortman memorandum relative to incidental sales be included in the ordinance.
- “Retail sales” either needs to be eliminated, or better explained as something different than “incidental sales.” (See sub.par. 12 on page 6 of the draft ordinance.)
- Township Planner Elmiger suggested adding clarifying language that “retail sales” does not include incidental sales such as a sheet music purchase from a piano instructor.

- The language should be clarified relative to pre-existing legal non-conforming uses. The ordinance should not give the impression that the changes will somehow now permit illegal uses which were illegal at the time the ordinance is adopted.
- Supervisor O'Connell summarized the suggested changes so far:
 - Get rid of some terms like *telework*.
 - Use "subordinate" instead of "secondary."
 - Add a description/example of incidental sales on page 4.
 - Include grammatical and clarifying edits suggested by the Board on page 5.
 - Clarify sub.par. 12 on page 6, related to retail sales vs. incidental sales.
 - Keep language consistent between definitions and the ordinance standards relative to incidental and subordinate uses
- Trustee Moran thought sub.par.(e) on page 7 was ambiguous; Township Planner Elmiger will provide language that will clarify and tighten up that paragraph.

MOTION by Smith, support by Colvin-Garcia, to table Ordinance Amendments, Zoning Code Section 74-2, "definitions" and 74-9, "home occupation," so that the Township Planner can incorporate comments from tonight's discussion in the draft language.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

E. Ordinance Amendments
Zoning Code Section 74-426, "Requirements, scope, uses, exceptions," and 74-461 through 74-463, "Schedule of Use Regulations," regarding accessory structures.

Referencing her January 16, 2024 memorandum, Township Planner Elmiger introduced this item, highlighting the following:

- All the language for "storage buildings" is being replaced with new language for "accessory buildings." The entire section 74-13 will be deleted and reserved for new language at some point in the future.

The Board suggested also removing the word "residential" from the phrase "residential accessory buildings."

- On p. 2 of the draft ordinance, Chapter 74, Art. IV, Div. 1, Section 426 (d), last line, was amended to read *In all districts, accessory buildings may not be used for dwelling purposes.* This language was simply clarifying language as the ordinance already prohibited this use.
- On p. 3, b. 3. referenced zoning districts that were clustered under type (rural residential district, suburban residential district, and urban residential district). This was consistent with other ordinance language that did similar clustering.
- Bottom of p. 3 to top of p. 4, total square footage of an accessory building on a lot of two acres or less is restricted to 1000sf.
- The memorandum provided a table: *Community Comparison of Accessory Residential Structures – Maximum Size*.
- The new language proposed 10% of lot size or up to 10,000sf for maximum size of an accessory structure.

The Board discussed the various restrictions for maximum size as that related to ground floor area. The natural limitations of GFA will serve to limit the size of most accessory structures, and the maximum allowed size of the accessory structure will depend on the size of the house. However, several trustees felt the calculation formulas will likely be confusing to residents.

Planner Elmiger suggested including a worksheet template to make the formulas simpler to understand and use.

In response to earlier public comment by Mr. Ridha, Trustee Allison emphasized that a neighborhood's deed restrictions are not impacted by the proposed changes. The Township does not enforce the deed restrictions, which are an agreement between neighbors.

Someone could follow the Township ordinances and still violate the deed restrictions; it would be up to the homeowners' association to enforce in that case. On the other hand, if the deed restrictions allowed something more than the ordinance allowed (rare), the ordinance would prevail.

Trustee Moran said he was still troubled by the proposed ordinance, in terms of what it allows relative to the size and location of accessory structures, especially in how the allowed locations relate to the setbacks. He was opposed to allowing any construction in the setback.

Township Planner Elmiger said in the instance of allowing construction in the setback, the language was carried over from existing language as it related to a 200sf storage building. The allowance only applied to the construction being at the 15' line, with the structure moving back 1 foot for every extra foot in height.

Building Official and Zoning Administrator Pace said that a 100sf shed was often placed in a far rear corner, tucked up against the property line. Anything over 100sf must meet setback requirements. No accessory structure can extend beyond the front of the primary residence.

MOTION by Smith, support by Moran, to table Ordinance Amendments, Zoning Code Section 74-426, "Requirements, scope, uses, exceptions," and 74-461 through 74-463, "Schedule of Use Regulations," regarding accessory structures, in order to allow the Township Planner to clarify and incorporate language as discussed this evening.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

C. Ordinance Amendments to Zoning Code Section 74-592 Mineral Mining

Township Attorney Gabis explained that the amendments to Zoning Code Section 74-592 Mineral Mining were recommended by the Planning Commission, including:

- Subsection (a): Two additional elements required under Michigan law: 1) the applicant has demonstrated there are valuable natural resources on the property, and 2) there is a need for those natural resources. The burden of showing this information is on the applicant and not on the Township.
- Subsection (a)(7): An additional element was added relative to the *no very serious consequences* analysis, that the "impact on other natural resources such as wetlands,

lakes, watercourses, aquifers, natural habitats, and similar environmental resources” be considered.

- Subsection (c)(18) specifically addresses dewatering operations for extraction, and prohibits dewatering unless certain exceptions are met, including a.) A comprehensive hydrogeologic study showing no adverse impacts, b.) An aquifer monitoring plan satisfactory to the Township, and c) The Conditional Use Permit specifically stating that if monitoring shows any indication of adverse impact to water resources, as determined by the Township, dewatering operations shall immediately cease.

The above modifications have been discussed and vetted by the Township’s planning consultant and legal counsel, and are before the Board tonight for consideration.

Trustee Allison said there was an active public hearing when this matter was heard by the Planning Commission. While commenters were appreciative of the ordinance amendment, they had also done research into other municipal ordinances that addressed mineral mining operations and had made specific suggestions in this regard. Commenters were also concerned about traffic and trucking issues, which has been a significant nuisance to the neighbors. Per resident research, at least one township had an annual review of the CUP, to make sure compliance was ongoing.

Supervisor O’Connell said Township counsel was following up on these comments.

MOTION by SMITH, support by ALLISON, that the Ann Arbor Charter Township Board of Trustees adopt the Planning Commission recommendations for amendments to Zoning Code Section 74-592 Mineral Mining.

Roll call vote:

Ayes – Smith, Moran, Allison, Olsson, Basch, O’Connell, Colvin-Garcia. Nays – None.

Motion carried 7-0.

F. Second reading of Ordinance Amendment, Code Section 14-139, “International Property Maintenance Code,” Collection of Fees.

There were no changes since the first reading of this ordinance amendment.

MOTION by Basch, support by Olsson, that the Ann Arbor Charter Township Board of Trustees adopt on second reading Ordinance Amendment, Code Section 14-139, “International Property Maintenance Code,” Collection of Fees.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

G. Fence – Gate Ordinance Revision - Discussion postponed.

VI. REPORTS, DISCUSSIONS

A. Supervisor’s Report – O’Connell

- 1) Lt. Robinson retirement; John Cratsenburg will take her place.
- 2) Update on Warren Road culvert. Original cost quoted at \$60K; new estimated cost now \$400K. ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds have been committed based on the lesser price. Road Commission representatives, and perhaps EGLE (Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy) representatives, will attend the next BOT meeting to explain this discrepancy.
- 3) The Township is putting together a packet of materials regarding how to request a SAD (Special Assessment District) to hand to residents who are interested. Two residents have approached the Township seeking this information.
- 4) The County's Road Foreman Mike Mastie has requested the Township provide a list of prioritized roads that need work, so that he can provide initial estimates.
- 5) Supervisor O'Connell attended Washtenaw County Supervisors Meeting; State Senators and Representatives and US Representative Dingle were in attendance. O'Connell added to list of issues discussed ground water protection, and adding more resources for mapping hydrogeology in the state. Other issues discussed included regional issues relative to wastewater treatment, solar power, and fire protection.

Trustee Moran asked if the Township had gotten a quote on the ParPlan without Private Property Use Restriction. Clerk Basch said this quote was received; the reduction was minimal – less than \$3,000.

Trustee Moran noted that the Newman property – which according to the Ordinance Enforcement Report may be up for sale – owed the Township significant debt; perhaps a lien should be sought.

Trustee Allison noted that based on the most recent numbers from Mid Michigan Materials, using a linear projection it will be at least 10 months before water levels reach stabilization. However, per Township consultant Dr. Wright, the trend will be asymptotic and therefore it will be much longer than 10 months before the levels are back to normal.

B. Clerk's Report - Basch

Clerk's report is in the Board packets.

Election Commission met tonight just prior to this meeting.

C. Treasurer's Report – Colvin-Garcia

- Latest figures for ending 2023 balances have been provided.
- Tax collection ongoing.
- 2030 District announcement that EGLE has expanded grant funding for community energy management; webinar scheduled for the end of this week.
- Property tax rate will reflect the raise to the 5% cap.
- Washtenaw County Treasurers Association met January 16.

D. Planning Commission Report – January 11, 2024 – Allison

Trustee Allison reviewed the January 11, 2024 Planning Commission draft minutes.

E. Committee Reports

1) Farmland Open Space and Preservation Board Report
Meeting next week.

2) Utility Committee - Report in packets.

3) Climate Resilience Committee
Still working on climate report.

4) Zoning Board of Appeals - No meeting.

5) Public Safety Committee - No meeting.

6) Roads Committee - Discussed above.

F. Utilities Department Report - Report in packets.

G. Public Safety Report

1) Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department
Report in packets.

2) Fire Department – Chief Mark Nicholai
Chief Nicholai reviewed the December 2023 written report. Department has hired 7 paid-on-call firefighters, bringing the total to 25; three of the new hires are licensed for EMT basics, one is a certified firefighter.

H. Building Department Report
Report is in the packets.

VII. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

VIII. NON-AGENDA ITEMS

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

X. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Basch, support by Olsson, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:47pm.