TOWN OF LOUISVILLE, TENNESSEE
LOUISVILLE MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 18, 2025
6:00 P.M.

Present: Kent Vaught – Chairman, Steven Kelley – Vice Chairman/Secretary, Jill Pugh – Mayor, Rick Fuller, Mary Wingo, Fran Hatley, Linda Simmons

Absent: None.

Others Present: Jordan Rockwell – Town Planner, Hailey Russell – Administrative Assistant & 21 citizens.

Chairman Vaught called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

Chairman Vaught welcomed the newest member Linda Simmons to the board.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Vaught presented the minutes from the October 21, 2025 meeting.

MOTION by Fran Hatley to approve the minutes from October 21, 2025 as written. Second by Rick Fuller. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES.**

Reports: Mayor, Building/Codes Official, Administrative

Mayor Pugh announced that the Ring in the Holiday parade is scheduled for next Sunday at 3:00 p.m.

Hailey Russell stated that several points of confusion from recent months needed clarification. She emphasized that, on any Town board, the role of members is to follow the Town's zoning regulations, subdivision regulations, and all applicable state requirements. Decisions should not be based on whether a project is popular or unpopular with citizens, nor on personal preferences. A request must be evaluated solely on whether it complies with Town and state regulations; if the rules allow it, or if the rules prohibit it, those factors alone determine the outcome.

Russell then clarified that the requirement for "substantial differences" to bring an item back applies only to the Board of Zoning Appeals. The Planning Commission has no such requirement unless it chooses to adopt its own rules and procedures. At present, there is no provision within the Planning Commission's regulations addressing such circumstances.

Chairman Vaught asked where this reference originated, and Russell stated it comes from TCA Title 13, Chapter 4, which governs Planning Commissions. She noted that the "substantial difference" requirement appears only under the Board of Zoning Appeals and is not present in Planning Commission statutes or in the Town's zoning ordinances. Mayor Pugh added that the Town's attorney had reviewed this as well.

A discussion followed regarding whether items must automatically return to the agenda if they fail to pass. Vaught expressed concern that, under the current structure, applicants could bring the same request back monthly, and the Commission would be obligated to hear it repeatedly. He suggested that the Town may need to revise its ordinance if state law does not permit limiting rehearing's.
Mayor Pugh clarified that the relevant provision is not state law, but a Town-adopted rule, and the Planning Commission may recommend changes to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Commissioner Wingo noted that the ordinance states the Planning Commission *will* hear matters and does not provide authority to refuse them, while the Board of Zoning Appeals does have such an option. She stated that Tennessee law sets the baseline and cannot be made less restrictive by local government. Rockwell stated that an outside, neutral attorney he consulted had offered a general interpretation inconsistent with the Town's attorney's advice. Wingo recommended that all legal questions be directed to the Town's attorney. Chairman Vaught agreed that the matter should be left to legal experts and noted the discussion provided needed clarity.

Russell continued by addressing comments made at the previous meeting regarding the removal of board members. She clarified that no member was removed because of how they voted. The Planning Commission consists of five citizen members appointed by the Mayor, one Alderman representative, and the Mayor or her designee. The designee may not be another Alderman. She explained that Alderman Loope's term had expired, requiring a new appointment. Additionally, Gwynne Macon and Scott Bassitt chose not to continue serving when their terms ended. Their seats were filled by Fran and Mary, and Linda later replaced Rob, who resigned before the last meeting. These circumstances, she stated, are why the Board's current membership exists as it does today.

Russell also addressed continuing concerns about older plats and subdivisions approved using multiples of 20,000 square feet. She explained that, at the June 3 special-called meeting on development, Alderman Loope stated the Town had never allowed such multiples. That statement was incorrect, and Barry's reference to historical plats was intended to show that similar approvals had been granted in the past.

Because the inaccurate statement had influenced the June 3 decision, Barry was asked by the new Chairman to provide proof, which he tried to present at the September meeting. His intent was solely to correct the record.

<u>Public Input on Agenda Items (5 Minute Limit)</u>

<u>Greg Presnell</u> before beginning his presentation, Presnell distributed a packet of information he had compiled for the Board's review. He then stated that he wished to address several issues regarding lot size, density, and septic capacity related to the proposed development.

Presnell stated that he wished to address several issues regarding lot size, density, and septic capacity related to the proposed development. He noted that the plans list the property size as 5.407 acres, referencing a survey by Hindes Surveying Company. However, both the deed and the Tennessee Property Viewer list the property as 5.12 acres. Presnell stated he could not locate any documentation supporting the larger acreage figure.

He explained that depending on which version of the density requirements applies—either the previous 30-20-20 standard or the newly adopted 30-30-30 standard—the acreage required for the proposal would differ. Under 30-30-30, the development would require 7.58 acres; under 30-20-20, it would require 5.28 acres. He stated that, at 5.12 acres, the property does not meet either density requirement. Presnell then asked whether the current proposal should be considered a new submittal, given that the original request was denied and that concept approvals are valid for three years only if they pass.

Presnell next addressed the septic system information. He stated that the plans depict a 1.5-acre "common development" drip system area; however, the recorded plat for the business park shows individual septic system areas for each property. Each parcel has a separately permitted system with an associated maximum gallons-per-day capacity, as indicated on the plat. According to soil ratings provided, soil absorption values in the area are rated at 60, which is near the poor end of the State's scale (10 being good and 75 being poor).

He referenced signed documentation from Patrick O'Hara showing that one of the first lots could only accommodate 150 gallons per day and only in a specific location. Another multi-tenant building site could only handle 140 gallons per day under its separate system. Presnell explained that plans show 11 units tying into a pump system on one of the lots, but that the maximum daily flow permitted for that parcel would not support the load shown. He further noted that one of the lots does not have a septic permit on file at all.

Presnell stated that, based on the evidence he reviewed, the proposal does not have a functioning or approved common development septic plan, nor does it meet density requirements. He also referenced a September 2025 engineering letter that raised concerns about septic system efficiencies and maintenance responsibilities. He said the letter indicated uncertainty about whether deficiencies had been resolved, and that the County had stated it would not assume maintenance responsibility for such a system. Presnell concluded that each property has separate septic permits and separate systems with defined maximum capacities, and that the proposal does not meet the required density or septic criteria.

The five-minute limit expired.
MOTION by Wingo to allow Presnell to finish his comments. Second by Chairman Vaught. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES.**
Presnell then completed the remainder of his remarks, as summarized above.

Chairman Vaught thanked Presnell for the information and stated that the Planning Commission's role is to review and approve site design, not environmental permitting. Septic system approval falls under County and State authority. He noted that although the issues raised may indicate challenges for the applicant, the Commission would not issue a permit until the appropriate agencies had approved the septic system. He clarified that there is a distinction between Planning Commission approval of design and the environmental approvals required before development can proceed.

<u>Anna Gibson</u> asked whether Patrick O'Hara was still serving as Chairman of the Design Review Committee and stated that if so, she intended to read an ethics complaint she had written. Commissioner Wingo asked whether the complaint had already been submitted; Gibson responded that she had submitted it, but it had not been formally acknowledged, so she would proceed to read it aloud.

Gibson cited Municipal Code §§ 1-601 and 1-608, stating that these provisions prohibit an official or employee from using municipal time, facilities, equipment, or supplies for personal gain, and prohibit the use of one's official position to secure privileges or exemptions not authorized by law, charter, or ordinance.

She stated that there is no law requiring the Planning Commission to rehear an item, nor a law prohibiting it, but that the code indicates a law must exist to authorize such repeated hearings. Gibson expressed concern that the PUD proposal for 3021 Louisville Road (Bryson-Patrick PUD), submitted by Patrick O'Hara, had been heard multiple times despite being denied.

Gibson summarized her ethics complaint as follows:

- On June 3, 2025, O'Hara presented personal development plans for 3021 Louisville Road. The Planning Commission denied the request.

- On June 8, O’Hara appealed the decision to the BMA, though Gibson stated she believed no rule permits such an appeal.
- On July 8, the BMA upheld the Planning Commission’s denial.
- Despite this, O’Hara returned with the same proposal multiple times, which Gibson stated was not authorized by ordinance and constituted a special privilege.
- She stated she confirmed with Town Planner Rockwell that no rule exists explicitly allowing resubmission.

Gibson asserted that permitting repeated resubmissions undermines the governing body’s final authority and utilizes excessive municipal resources for O’Hara’s personal gain. She further stated that while not explicitly an ethics violation, she felt it inappropriate that O’Hara did not disclose his role as Chairman of the Design Review Commission when presenting to the public.

Gibson also stated she found O’Hara’s actions deceptive, referencing his June 26 appeal letter asserting that the Ed Cloud properties had been approved. She explained that O’Hara had presented evidence to the BMA indicating the opposite. She noted that he repeatedly referenced an approval letter during the meeting, yet the permit letter stated that the Design Review Commission approved the development—and that O’Hara himself, as Chairman, was the person who signed the approval despite having no authority to do so.

Gibson stated she believed O’Hara was attempting to conceal that he had signed the approval, which she felt was inappropriate given his understanding of the applicable rules and laws.

With remaining time, Gibson added several additional comments:

- She stated that personal opinions should not be used in evaluating proposals and expressed concern that a commissioner had previously indicated support for a project based on personal preference rather than compliance.
- She suggested that O’Hara had no standing to sue the City, as he is not the property owner and would not incur hardship.
- She stated that if the Commission approved the proposal, community members could also pursue legal action, noting that past Commission decisions had been overturned through legal challenge.
- She expressed concern about the timing of certain actions following a previous vote and questioned consistency in how density rules were applied, noting that density codes were established roughly 20 years ago.

Gibson concluded her remarks at that point.

Cliff Gibson stated that while many people talk about the Town "moving forward," it does not take much to recognize that something feels wrong. He said that past mistakes need to be acknowledged rather than covered up and that the Town should move forward with truth and honesty, even if that results in a lawsuit. He emphasized that citizens and officials alike want the same thing—to move forward honestly and transparently.

Chairman Vaught thanked the speakers for their public comments. He stated that, out of respect for Mayor Jill, he wished to clarify that, while serving as just the Mayor, she had every right to speak publicly about strategic planning initiatives and projects she supported as beneficial to the Town. He noted that once she became a member of the Planning Commission, her role changed, as she is now required to vote as part of the Commission. He explained that any prior expressions of enthusiasm for this or other projects were made in her capacity as Mayor, and that, as a commissioner, she is now bound to operate within the regulations and procedures that govern the Commission's actions.

New Business

a. Discussion on the Process and Duties of the Louisville Planning Commission

Commissioner Wingo stated that recent emails and internal decisions raised serious concerns about compliance with Tennessee law and Town ordinances. She explained that a revised site plan submitted on September 3 was improperly withheld from the Planning Commission after the Chair and Town Planner decided on September 8 not to place it on the agenda—an action she said violated state law, local ordinance, and the Town's contract with the East Tennessee Development District, which grants the Town Planner no decision-making authority. Wingo noted that Tennessee law requires submittals to be scheduled within 30 days; however, the plan was not placed on the September 16 agenda or offered the special-called meeting the applicant requested for October 2, despite the Town Attorney advising that the applicant must be given that option. Instead, the matter was not heard until October 21, outside the statutory timeframe, and some Commissioners abstained due to lack of information.

Wingo emphasized that only the Planning Commission has authority over submittals and that any revised plan must return to the Commission. She stated that repeated refusals to hear the plan created a pattern of decisions made outside the Commission's authority, without the knowledge of most members, damaging public trust and giving the appearance of incompetence or disregard for the law. She further noted that the Town Planner's actions exceeded the advisory role defined by contract. Wingo concluded by moving to recommend removal of Chairman Kent Vaught from the Planning Commission and removal of Jordan Rockwell as Town Planner.

Commissioner Simmons asked whether Vaught and Rockwell would be allowed to speak before a decision; after learning a second was required, she seconded the motion to open discussion.

Mayor Pugh expressed concern that the Commission had not followed its own attorney's guidance and stressed the importance of relying on the Town's designated legal counsel. Rockwell maintained that the attorney's advice had been followed; the Mayor disagreed, noting that the applicant had requested a special-called meeting that was not granted.

Chairman Vaught responded to Wingo's statements, noting that he appreciated the effort she had put into her analysis, especially given that she had only been on the Planning Commission for approximately 90 days. However, he stated that he disagreed with her conclusions. He stated that he relied on the Town Planner's interpretation, was unaware of ordinance requirements regarding revised plans, and believed the Commission satisfied legal obligations by responding to the submittal within 30 days. He said the Town Attorney later confirmed the plan could be heard either at a special-called meeting or at the next regular meeting, and he chose the latter.

Rockwell questioned why legal arguments were being debated, stating the Planning Commission should rely on the Town Attorney and that accusations of breaking the law were inappropriate. The discussion grew tense between Wingo and Rockwell until Chairman Vaught halted the exchange, stating discussion had been sufficient.

Before the vote, Commissioner Hatley said she believed mistakes were made and found Wingo's research credible, but did not believe any actions were intentional. Commissioner Kelley also stated nothing was intentional and questioned whether a special-called meeting would have changed the outcome; Russell acknowledged delays in distributing information were due to her being out of town and that timing might have differed under a special meeting.

Mayor Pugh reiterated that the Commission must follow the Town Attorney's guidance. Rockwell again asserted they had; the Mayor disagreed. Wingo sought clarification on whether the attorney had told Vaught he could decline the October 2 meeting request. Vaught stated the attorney told him the Town had the option of either meeting format and that he preferred the regular meeting.

Commissioner Simmons raised concerns about an email indicating a decision by the Chair and Planner not to rehear the plan. Rockwell responded that the Chair and staff typically prepare the agenda and that the revisions were minor and previously voted on. He acknowledged the attorney later instructed that it be reheard and noted that it has now come before the Commission multiple times. He strongly disagreed with the accusation that he or the Chair violated the law.

With further discussion becoming unproductive, Chairman Vaught ended debate and moved to a vote on Wingo's motion.

MOTION by Mary Wingo to recommend to the Mayor the removal of Kent Vaught and Jordan Rockwell from the planning commission. Second by Linda Simmons. ROLL CALL VOTE: Vaught – No, Kelley – No, Pugh – Abstain, Fuller – No, Wingo – Yes, Hatley – Abstain, Simmons – Abstain. **MOTION FAILED.**

b. Request for Approval on the Subdivision of the Lunsford Estate Property

Town Planner Rockwell presented the request for approval of the subdivision of the Lunsford Estate property. He stated that the proposal is a simple subdivision of an existing 1.4-acre lot into two lots. He noted that each lot meets the Town's minimum requirements of 30,000 square feet in area and 50 feet of road frontage. He acknowledged that the existing residence currently encroaches into the building setback line, but stated this is an existing condition and not created by the subdivision. Based on his review, Rockwell recommended approval of the plat.

MOTION by Kelley to approve the subdivision of the Lunsford Estate Property. Second by Fuller. VOTE: Aye: Vaught, Kelley, Pugh, Fuller, Wingo, Simmons. ABSTAIN: Hatley. **MOTION PASSES**.

c. Discussion for Long Range Planning

Town Planner Rockwell led a discussion on long-range planning and noted that Commissioner Wingo had previously mentioned the idea of developing a comprehensive master plan. He stated that the Commissioners had received a packet from his organization outlining various types of planning documents, along with descriptions of each. While cost estimates were originally included, they were removed to avoid premature disclosure, though he could provide approximate figures if requested.

Rockwell explained that while the East Tennessee Development District has the capacity to assist with some of these plans, the information provided was primarily for the Commission's consideration. If the Town wished to move forward with updating its land use plan, developing a comprehensive master plan, or pursuing other strategic planning efforts, he recommended forming a long-range planning subcommittee to guide the process.

He stated that the Town could choose to have ETDD help prepare the plan or could hire a private consultant, and that his office could help facilitate either approach. Rockwell concluded that pursuing a larger planning effort would help the Town establish a clearer long-term vision to support future decision-making.

Chairman Vaught asked whether Commissioners wished to review the long-range planning materials provided by Rockwell and revisit the discussion at the next meeting, and the Commission agreed.

d. **Discussion to Recommend to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen the Updated Zoning Ordinance**

Chairman Vaught presented the ordinance that had been distributed to the Commission at the previous meeting for review. Russell outlined several revisions requested by members of the BMA, and the Commission reviewed those updates.

MOTION by Hatley to recommend to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen the updated zoning ordinance. Second by Kelley. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES.**

Old Business

a. **Site Plan Approval for the Development at The Cove at Lackey Creek**

Patrick O'Hara, developer for The Cove at Lackey Creek, addressed the Commission. He noted that he and his team had appeared before the Commission several times and wished to respond to comments made earlier in the meeting. O'Hara acknowledged that he serves as Chairman of the Design Review Commission but stated that the DRC has not met since August 2024 and that its authority is limited to design elements such as colors and materials—not density, use, or site design. He rejected the suggestion that he had received any special treatment.

O'Hara disputed comments regarding the property's acreage, asserting that the tract totals 5.69 acres, including a 0.5-acre portion across the road that he stated is considered contiguous under state law. He noted that Sterling Engineering prepared and confirmed the density calculations and stated he has never sought a variance. He expressed his belief that there has been an organized effort to prevent the project from moving forward.

O'Hara stated that he had never before needed to bring an attorney to a meeting in his 37 years in commercial construction but felt it necessary due to ethical concerns raised by recent discussions. He further stated that, based on Commissioner Wingo's earlier presentation, he believes some members of the Commission have violated the Tennessee Sunshine Law through communications outside of public meetings.

O'Hara referenced his attorney's prior presentation, stating that the design and density meet applicable standards and that the project was originally submitted under the Town's former 30,000/20,000 density interpretation in place prior to recent ordinance amendments.

Regarding wastewater, O'Hara acknowledged prior concerns but explained that the development includes a wastewater treatment system required by the Commission and already approved. He noted that recent statewide inspections identified deficiencies in many systems, including his, and that he has installed a flow meter and hired specialized contractors to correct them by the December deadline. He stated the system is now functioning properly and confirmed it has adequate capacity for the 11 additional dwellings, with expansion capacity for future commercial development on Topside Business Park Drive.

O’Hara denied rumors that he had offered money or attempted to negotiate privately with Mayor Pugh or any Town officials, stating those claims are untrue. He then turned the presentation over to his attorney, Melanie Davis.

Attorney Melanie Davis addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. She stated that the property consists of a single 5.69-acre tract as confirmed by Sterling Engineering. Although the state road crosses the property, she explained that the right-of-way is an easement and does not divide the property into separate tracts. She suggested that earlier calculations may have mistakenly evaluated only one side of the road.

Davis explained that her client holds an option to purchase the land, with the purchase contingent upon receiving the requested approvals, which she stated provides full legal standing. She further noted that the application vested under the Town’s prior 30,000/20,000 density standard because it was submitted before the BMA adopted amendments. Under state law, rights vest at the time of application.

Davis asserted that the proposal meets all applicable criteria under the former standard and must be approved if compliant, regardless of public opinion. She argued that the project satisfies those standards and noted that such approval would also mitigate legal concerns raised by earlier procedural issues.

Town Planner Rockwell stated that his position remained unchanged from the prior meeting. He reiterated his opinion that the proposal does not meet the letter of the law because it fails to satisfy the minimum requirement of ten lots at 30,000 square feet each (10 × 30,000 = 300,000 square feet, or approx. 6.8 acres). He also stated that the 30,000/20,000 density standard applies only to multifamily projects—defined in Town code as three dwellings in one building—and that the applicant’s proposal consists of single-family structures. Septic considerations, he noted, fall under the Health Department’s jurisdiction.

O’Hara responded that Town subdivisions historically have been reviewed using the 30,000/20,000/20,000 standard and that multiple plats confirm this interpretation, consistent with his attorney’s prior presentation.

Commissioner Wingo asked whether the existing wastewater system has capacity for the 11 new dwellings and noted that TDEC would not issue an expanded permit until the property is acquired. O’Hara affirmed the available capacity and described potential future system expansion.

Mayor Pugh clarified that TDEC approval is required for a building permit and is not the responsibility of the Planning Commission.

Citizen Greg Presnell stated that TDEC informed him the only permits on file are for existing individual septic systems with capacities of 140 and 30 gallons per day, and that no permit application for a treatment system has been filed. He reiterated that the property consists of a 5.12-acre tract plus a separate 0.57-acre piece divided by a state right-of-way, which he argued should not be counted as one contiguous tract. Even under the 30,000/20,000 standard, he stated the acreage is insufficient.

Citizen Anna Gibson argued that the proposal does not meet minimum site plan requirements and that if all standards were met the applicant would not still be appearing before the Commission. She asserted that the 30,000/20,000 discussion was being misapplied and reiterated prior ethics concerns.

Chairman Vaught instructed Gibson to remain on topic.

Commissioner Simmons expressed difficulty determining what meets legal requirements. Vaught noted that the applicant's attorney represents only the applicant. Simmons stated she was trying to determine how to vote. Vaught replied that the Town Planner provides guidance, while Commissioner Wingo emphasized Commissioners must also review the ordinances themselves.

Commissioner Hatley acknowledged the complexity of conflicting information and stated that the Commission must still make a decision. Vaught stated he relies heavily on staff and building officials because he is not an attorney.

Attorney Davis clarified again that roads do not divide property and that the tract remains 5.69 acres. She argued that Section 30-20-20 requires a site totaling ten times the minimum lot size in the district; at the time of application, R-1 minimum lot size was 20,000 square feet, and the applicant meets that requirement.

Commissioner Wingo reviewed density calculations under that interpretation, stating that the project would require 5.28 acres and that the applicant's 5.4-acre plan (or 5.69 acres including the contiguous section) meets that threshold.

Presnell reiterated that the State owns the right-of-way; Simmons countered that the State owns only the easement.

Commissioner Fuller asked Rockwell to restate his interpretation. Rockwell repeated that the ordinance requires ten times 30,000 square feet and that the project does not meet that standard.

Wingo responded that the ordinance in place at the time required only the first dwelling to meet 30,000 square feet, with additional units at 20,000 square feet. Mayor Pugh noted that the subdivision regulations set the minimum PUD size at 4.5 acres under Appendix 3. Rockwell replied that when two regulations conflict, the more restrictive applies.

MOTION by Hatley to approve the site plan for The Cove at Lackey Creek.
Second by Wingo. ROLL CALL VOTE: Vaught – No, Kelley – No, Pugh – Yes, Fuller – No, Wingo – Yes, Hatley – Yes, Simmons – Yes. **MOTION PASSES.**

b. Continued Discussion on Planned Unit Development (PUD) Regulation Changes

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

Public Comment Not on Agenda Items

Citizen Anna Gibson stated that, based on her review of Robert's Rules of Order as adopted by the BMA, the Chair is responsible for preparing the agenda for meetings. She said she wanted to clarify for the Commission that, under those rules, the Chair determines what appears on the agenda, which she felt underscored how important that role is.

Russell clarified that, while the Chair does have final authority over the agenda, that authority does not extend to mandatory items. She explained that if a site plan, subdivision of property, or similar required application is submitted, the Chair cannot refuse to place it on the agenda. She noted that the Chair's discretion applies primarily to optional discussion items, which may be deferred to a later meeting.

Carrie Dougherty asked whether the Commission believed that the property on Louisville Road was currently under contract. Several members responded that, to their understanding, it was not under contract unless and until the proposal before the Commission was approved.

Dougherty stated that, according to MLS records, the property was shown as under contract on February 19 but returned to active status the day of, or the day after, Anna Gibson submitted her ethics complaint regarding O'Hara's role on the Design Review Commission. She stated that she found this timing suspicious and expressed concern about the applicant's claims of acting ethically.

Vera Henry addressed the Commission, stating that as a long-time community member she appreciated the challenges the Planning Commission faces at each meeting. She thanked Commissioner Wingo for her diligence, integrity, and research, and emphasized the importance of ethical decision-making, communication, and investigation as the Town continues to grow.

Henry noted that she has lived in the area for more than 50 years and has seen significant progress over time. She expressed optimism about the Town's future and stated that, with thoughtful planning, growth can support a safe and vibrant community. She commented that the Town's consideration of planned unit developments reflects positive forward movement and that Louisville has land suitable for a range of uses, including commercial, residential, and recreational.

Henry stated that she did not believe any member of the Commission would act maliciously but acknowledged that everyone makes mistakes and can learn from them. She encouraged continued education and understanding of Town policies and government structure. She closed by expressing pride in her community and gratitude to the Commission for its work and patience.

Adjournment

MOTION by Kelley to adjourn the meeting. Second by Fuller. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES**. The meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

____
Kent Vaught, Chairman

____
Steven Kelley, Secretary