

TOWN OF CLAYTON

Town Plan Commission

Meeting Minutes

7:00 P.M. – 8:57 P.M. on Wednesday, August 10, 2011

Town Office Meeting Room, 8358 County Road T, Larsen, WI 54947

I. Call to Order:

A. Pledge of Allegiance, Notice Verification, Roll

1. Chairperson Knapinski called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.
2. Pledge of Allegiance recited.
3. Meeting properly posted.
4. Roll

a. Plan Commission Members

Chairperson Knapinski	PRESENT
Commissioner Adler	PRESENT (Arrived at 7:02 p.m.)
Commissioner Brucks	PRESENT
Commissioner Geise	PRESENT
Commissioner Hamblin	PRESENT
Commissioner Haskell	PRESENT
Commissioner VanAirsdale	PRESENT

b. Staff

Administrator Johnston	PRESENT
Treasurer Bowen	PRESENT
Town Engineer Bartz	PRESENT

Commissioner Adler arrived at 7:02 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:

A. Regular Plan Commission Meeting – July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011

**Corrections to minutes:** Spelling Correction -Change “Pacer” to “Paser”

**MOTION:** (Brucks, Haskell) Approve the Regular Plan Commission Meeting minutes of July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011, with corrections.

CARRIED by unanimous voice vote.

III. Open Forum – Non-Agendized Town-related Matters:

A. No open forum matters.

IV. Correspondence:

A. UW Extension – Winnebago County Plan Commissioner Network Meeting on Wednesday, August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011, 6:30p-8:00p, Town of Omro Town Hall, 4205 Rivermoor Road, Omro, WI

B. Winnebago County Zoning Department – Nothing for Town of Clayton August review

V. Business:

A. Discussion/Recommendation: Plan Commission update on a landscaping in a temporary Right-Of-Way (ROW) plan, authorized by the Administration, for 3096 Rose Moon Way in the Plat of Strawberry Estates (Tax ID # 006-1728).

1. This item is on the Commission's Agenda to update the Commission on the Administration's authorization to place private improvements in a temporary Town Right-Of-Way (ROW).
2. Specifically, the landscaping contractor (Springhetti's Landscaping) at 3096 Rose Moon Way in the Plat of Strawberry Estates (Tax ID # 006-1728) has requested authorization to place drainage improvements in the Town's temporary ROW.
3. The western terminus of Rose Moon Way has a cul-de-sac circle that is off-center to the north (see photograph).
4. The property owner has an extensive landscaping plan that extends to the shoulder of the temporary cul-de-sac.
5. To make the storm water management drainage system work with the landscaping plan, the property owner needs to install a series of drain tiles in the temporary ROW for the cul-de-sac and across the western terminus of Rose Moon Way (see drainage plan).
6. The property owner petitioned the Town to allow the installation of the storm drain in the ROW.
7. The Administration authorized the property owner to install the required drainage system in the ROW and across the western terminus of Rose Moon Way.
8. The authorization was granted on the following conditions:
  - a. The design and installation of any storm water management pipe across the western terminus of Rose Moon Way had to be approved by the Town's Engineer.
  - b. The property owner had to acknowledge that the installation of any storm water management pipe across the western terminus of Rose Moon Way was temporary and could be removed by the Town at any time and for any reason.
  - c. The installation of any storm water management pipe and/or landscaping material in the shoulder of the temporary ROW for the western cul-de-sac of Rose Moon Way could not interfere with the Town's plowing activities or the ability of the Town's residents to use the cul-de-sac.
  - d. The installation and maintenance of all of the materials installed as part of the landscaping project were to be paid for by the property owner.
9. The Administration's logic for authorizing the project was based on the temporary cul-de-sac and the permanent landscaping.
10. The project is, for all intended purposes, on what is private property.
11. The cul-de-sac terminus will be removed when Rose Moon Way is extended to the west and what was the cul-de-sac circle will revert to the property owners of record as their front yard.

- The Commissioners had a discussion relative to drainage issues.

**MOTION: NO MOTION**

B. Discussion/Recommendation: Plan Commission update on the County’s developing Farmland Preservation Ordinance.

1. The Administration would like to remind the Plan Commission that the County is in the process of updating its Farmland Preservation Ordinance to comply with the revised State Statues.
2. Because the Town operates under County Zoning, the revised Farmland Preservation Ordinance will apply to the Town.
3. Supervisor Lettau has been the Town’s representative on the County Advisory Committee for the Code revisions.
4. The Plan Commission members each received a copy of the material Supervisor Lettau asked staff to distribute to interested parties in the Town.
5. The County intends to implement the proposed revisions to its Farmland Preservation Ordinance in conjunction with the County Zoning Code update.
6. Staff expects the implementation of the County’s Zoning Code update and Farmland Preservation Ordinance update to become effective on or about February of CY 2012.

- The Commissioners and the Staff discussed the Farmland Preservation Ordinance and the

**Mark Luebke**

3905 County Road II  
Larsen, WI 54947

- Mr. Luebke asked about the local farm land and the Farmland Preservation.
- Mr. Johnston referred him to Supervisor Kay Lettau, the Town’s representative.

**MOTION: NO MOTION**

C. Discussion/Recommendation: Plan Commission review and recommendation on the additional information for the Staff Report prepared for the Plan Commission on a request by Dennis Lehrer and Travis J. Lehrer to improve Lehrer Lane (a private road) to Town standards and then deed Lehrer Lane and the Public Improvements to the Town.

Site Location: Lehrer Lane extends approximately 1,300 feet north from Larsen Road approximately 3,500 feet west of the intersection of Larsen Road and STH “76”.

Applicant: Dennis Lehrer and Travis Lehrer  
8187 Lehrer Lane  
Neenah, WI 54956

Property Owner: Undistinguished ownership of a 66-foot ingress and egress  
easement between the following properties:  
Tax ID #006-0608-01-01  
Tax ID #006-0608-01-02  
Tax ID #006-0608-08-01

Prepared for: Town of Clayton Plan Commission at the request of:  
Dennis Lehrer and Travis Lehrer  
8187 Lehrer Lane  
Neenah, WI 54956

1. Property Status:

- a. The statements on the status of the property are specific to the subject properties.
  - 1) Tax ID #006-0608-01-01
  - 2) Tax ID #006-0608-01-02
  - 3) Tax ID #006-0608-08-01
- b. The subject properties consist of 3 lots of approximately 5 acres each.
- c. The subject properties are in the Neenah School District.
- d. The subject properties are in the Department of Natural Resources Special Well Casing Area.
- e. The subject properties are Officially Mapped with an 80-foot Right-Of-Way (ROW).
- f. The subject properties are currently Zoned A-2 GENERAL FARMING DISTRICT.
- g. The subject properties are shown as Residential One and Two Family on the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Map.
- h. The subject properties are in the City of Neenah’s Extra Territorial Zoning Area.
- i. The subject properties are out of the County’s Floodplain Zoning Area.
- j. The subject properties are not in the County’s Wetland Identifier.
- k. The land division options available to the subject property owners’ area are consistent with the Town’s adopted Land Use Plan.

2. Estimated Costs and Requirements for Public Infrastructure Improvements:

- a. The Administration’s estimated costs for the Public Improvement required to convert Lehrer Lane from a private road to a Public Road under the control of the Town of Clayton are as follows:
  - 1) Approximate length of Public Improvements: 1,300 linear feet
  - 2) Estimated costs of construction for the Public Improvements: \$115.00 per linear foot
  - 3) Estimated Public Improvements Construction costs: \$149,500.00
  - 4) Design Engineering at 10% of the estimated construction costs: \$ 14,950.00

- 5) Construction Engineering Costs at 10% of the estimated construction costs: \$ 14,950.00
  - 6) Total estimate Public Improvements construction costs: \$179,400.00
  - 7) Estimated Public Improvements costs per linear foot of frontage: \$ 69.00 per linear foot of frontage owned
3. Absent a Board-approved Special Assessment Policy/Ordinance for the assessment of Policy Infrastructure Improvements, the Administration’s recommendation for assessing the costs per linear foot of frontage owned by the individual would be:
- a. Schmidt: Tax ID #006-0608 Deferred until the property owner makes use of the Public Improvement (“use” to be defined with the Special Assessment Documents).
  - b. Cocherl: Tax ID #006-0608-01 Deferred until the property owner makes use of the Public Improvement (“use” to be defined with the Special Assessment Documents).
  - c. Keberlein: Tax ID #006-0604 There would be no Special Assessments on this property.
  - d. Lehrer, Travis: Tax ID #006-0608-01-02 Escrow payment held by the Town as a requirement of a Public Infrastructure Improvement Agreement.
  - e. Lehrer, Dennis: Tax ID #006-0608-01-01 Escrow payment held by the Town as a requirement of a Public Infrastructure Improvement Agreement.
  - f. The estimates used are based on the Administration’s experience and consultation with the Town Engineers.
  - g. Prior to the start of any expenditures, the Applicant would be required to sign a Public Improvements Agreement with the Town that outlined the estimated costs and the Applicant’s liabilities and responsibilities under the Agreement (see model agreement) (Plan Commission members each received a copy.)
  - h. The Town Board would need to approve any financial agreements or conditions outlined in the Public Improvements Agreement.
4. The Town Board recently approved the Town’s revised Minimum Road Design Standards Policy.
- a. Any Public Improvements to Lehrer Lane would be required to meet the Town’s new Policy standards and to be constructed within the 66-foot ingress and egress easement dedicated on CSM No. 3252. (Plan Commission members each received a copy of CSM No. 3252.)
5. As part of the Public Improvement project, the ingress and egress easement would become a public ROW.
6. Development Options Available to the Petitioner Under the County’s Zoning Code:

- a. Under Wisconsin Statutes, Chapter 236 (Plan Commission members each received a copy) the Applicants can either Plat their property or have a Certified Survey Map prepared that divides their property (Lot 2 and 3 of CSM No. 3252) (Plan Commission members each received a copy).
7. Under the present County Zoning Code of Ordinances, it is the Administration's contention that the Applicants can subdivide their property in the following manner:
  - a. The Applicants' properties would be required to be rezoned to one of the following County Zoning Districts:
    - 1) R-1 Rural Residential District (see attached Code Section).
    - 2) R-5 Planned Residential District (see attached Code Section).
    - 3) Plan Commission members each received a copy of the Code Section.
8. Lot and Access:
  - a. Under R-1 (Rural Residential District) the Applicants can create lots with a minimum of 34,000 square feet of area, and a minimum of 200 feet of Public Access frontage.
    - 1) Based on the attached survey, it appears that the Applicant's could legally create a total of 6 lots from their existing properties (see attached copy of the County Zoning Code Section).
    - 2) Plan Commission members received a copy of the survey and the County Zoning Code Section.
  - b. Using the Town's existing Access Ordinance, any subdivision of the Applicants' properties would be in R1 (Rural Residential District) and therefore considered a neighborhood (subdivision) road not subject to the 600-foot minimum driveway separation.
  - c. Under R-5 (Planned Residential District), any subdivision of the Applicants' properties would be on a private road and therefore exempt from the Town's Access Ordinance.
  - d. Under R-5 (Planned Residential District), the Applicants can create lots with essentially the same minimum of 34,000 square feet of area, and a minimum of 200 feet of frontage.
    - 1) However, these lots could use a private road.
    - 2) Based on the attached survey, it appears that the Applicants could legally create a total of 6 lots from their existing properties (see attached copy of the County Zoning Code Section). (Plan Commission members each received a copy of the survey and the County Zoning Code Section.)
  - e. The Administration's main issue with the R-5 option is the use of a private road.
    - 1) The Town's Comprehensive Plan and Official Map show Lehrer Lane becoming a Public Road with the intent of connecting to Westfield Ridge.
    - 2) The R-5 option would, for all intensive purposes, eliminate the option of any Public Infrastructure connectivity for development north of Lehrer Lane (see attached copy of the Town's Official Map). (Plan Commission members each received a copy of the Town's Official Map.)
  - f. Compatibility with the Town's Comprehensive Plan:

- 1) The options available to the Applicants under both the R-1 and R-5 Zoning Districts are compatible with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map.
  - 2) Additionally, both options have been used by the Town for development on land divided by a Certified Survey Map in the past few years.
9. Additional Information Requested by the Plan Commission:
- a. The Plan Commission has requested that staff research the following additional information relating to questions asked by the Plan Commission. Please be advised that the Town Administrator is neither a Licensed Engineer nor a Licensed Attorney and that the answers listed below are given only from the prospective of a Municipal Administrator:
  - b. Storm water management provisions: The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) NR 151 rules require the following:
    - 1) Per NR151.23, transportation projects disturbing more than 1 acre of land are required to develop a narrative plan addressing Erosion Control practices that will be implemented during construction.
    - 2) Per NR151 24(1)(d), Minor Highway Reconstructions are exempt from the post-construction performance standard; i.e., TSS reduction and peak runoff shaving after the construction portion of the project.
      - a) "Minor reconstruction" is defined as limited to 1.5 miles of total length reconstruction and does not exceed 100' in width of roadway widening, and also does not include replacement of a vegetated drainage system with a non-vegetated drainage system.
    - 3) Per State Statutes 340.01(22), "Highway" means all public ways and thoroughfares.
      - a) It does not include private roads or driveways.
    - 4) The Lehrer Lane project is approximately 1,300 feet in length and, therefore, does not meet the requirements for Storm Water Management Plans under the DNR's NR 151 rules.
      - a) If the project is approved, Town staff will conduct a Storm Water Management review to determine how storm water will flow on the site prepared before and after construction.
      - b) Based on the proposed review, staff will use best management practices in order to try to improve the extant conditions for the property owners on the project site.
  - c. Tree and Lot Line considerations:
    - 1) The trees and fencing placed in the easement by Mr. Cocherl technically violate the customary rules for ingress and egress easements; the only use for the easement should be for the vehicular travel surface and the related storm water management facilities.
    - 2) However, it would be reasonable to move the fence and trees out of the easement as part of the project.
  - d. Legal options relating to the ingress and egress easement on Lot 1 of Certified Survey Map (CSM) 3252:
    - 1) The main issues with the ingress and egress easement over Lot 1 of CSM 3252 would relate to the improvement of the travel surface to

- a Town standard and the dedication of the easement to the Town as a Public Right Of Way (ROW).
- 2) The Town has few options relative to this process.
  - 3) The best option is for the property owners to agree to the dedication and to equitably share the costs of improving the road to Town Standards, the Town has many options to facilitate this process.
  - 4) The Administration has always advised the Governing Body to encourage the parties to seek compromise and to only exercise its authority for public health and safety reasons.
- e. Additional Option for ingress and egress from Mr. Keberlein's Property:
- 1) Given the site layout for Mr. Keberlein's property, there are few options for access to the site.
  - 2) Specifically, the site was developed with access by means of an ingress and egress easement from the south.
  - 3) In order to change that access pattern, the site would need to be re-configured.
  - 4) This option would carry a significant expense to Mr. Keberlein.
- f. Options for assessing the costs of the project:
- 1) As stated by the Administration in earlier information to the Commission, absent a Town Board approved Special Assessment Policy, options for the resolution of this issue are the purview of the Town Board.
  - 2) The Administration can only speculate on how the Board would approach the issue.
  - 3) The Administration's advice relative to the Special Assessment process would be to heed the State Statutes relative to the issue and maintain equity and uniformity when Special Assessing any project to the benefitted property owners.
- g. Funding Options available to the Town:
- 1) Absent a Policy, the Town Board has any number of options relative to who pays and how the project is paid for.
  - 2) The Board could require that the petitioners pay for the project outright or it could have the Town pay for the project out of general funds.
  - 3) The reality is that the Board is likely to offer the Petitioners a middle path where they front the costs of the project and recover their investment over time.
- h. Estimated 10-year maintenance costs of the proposed road:
- 1) A properly constructed, paved, rural cross section road should have a substructure life expectancy of approximately 50 to 75 years.
  - 2) A properly maintained pavement course should have a life expectancy of approximately 20 to 25 years.
  - 3) Based on allocating the full burden costs of the Town's CY 2011 Public Works Budget on a per mile basis, the estimated annual costs of maintaining an improved Lehrer Lane would be:
    - a) The full burden costs of the Town's Public Works Department are \$461,268.11.
    - b) Based on the Town's PACER Reports the Town has approximately 75 lane miles of Road.

- c) Based on the above-referenced numbers, the Town's estimated maintenance costs per linear mile of road are \$6,150.24.
- d) The Town's estimated maintenance costs per linear foot of road are \$1.15.
- e) The estimated annual cost of maintaining the 1,300 feet of Lehrer Lane is \$1,495.00.
- f) The estimated 10-year costs for maintaining the 1,300 feet of Lehrer Lane is \$14,950.00.
- g) Please be advised that the methodology used to calculate the estimated costs of maintaining a fully-improved 1,300-foot Lehrer Lane will overstate the estimated annual maintenance costs and, by extension, the 10-year estimated maintenance costs.
- h) Additionally, please be advised that at the Town's current mill rate (\$2.50), a home assessed at \$200,000.00 for land and improvements will generate \$500.00 in Municipal Property Taxes.
- i. Definition of the term "Use":
  - 1) Absent a Town Board Special Assessment Policy, the Board has the option of defining the term "Use".
  - 2) In most cases, when referring to Special Assessments, the term "Use" is used to define when Deferred Special Assessments are due and payable.
  - 3) The use trigger is, in most cases, the division and/or sale of a property with Deferred Special Assessments.
  - 4) The Town Board has the option of using the sale, the division, a point in time, a specific date, or one of any other triggers on properties with deferred Special Assessments.
- j. Consideration and Precedent:
  - 1) The Town Board has not approved any project on Lehrer Lane.
  - 2) The Board received a petition from the owners of 51% of the frontage on the private road known as Lehrer Lane.
  - 3) Following existing Town Ordinances, it referred the Petition to the Plan Commission to prepare a report on the Petitioner's infrastructure improvement request and recommendation to the Town Board on the proposed project.
  - 4) The only other private road that has been converted to a Public ROW in the recent past was Lois Lane.
  - 5) The owners of the private road paid to improve the road to Town Standards and then deeded the ROW to the Town.
  - 6) The Administration was not able to determine an exact date for the project.
- k. Impact of the Proposed Project on Zoning and Lot size:
  - 1) Staff has contacted the County's Planning Department to determine how it would interpret the County's Ordinances relative to this issue.
  - 2) The County could take the following positions:

- a) The County could allow the ROW/Easement to be included in the lot acreage as they have done for the easement alone and there would be no significant impact on the properties.
- b) The County could disallow the ROW in the lot size calculations.
  - i. This would result in Lot 1 and Lot 2 of CSM 3252 being considered nonconforming.
  - ii. As a result of the non-conformity, agricultural buildings would become a Conditional Use.
- c) The County could require that the nonconforming lots be rezoned to R-1 (Rural Residential District) or R-2 (Suburban Residential District).
  - i. Neither of the proposed rezoning options should change the valuation of the properties.

- The Commissioners had a discussion regarding Lehrer Lane.
- Commissioner Haskell asked Mr. Travis Lehrer his intentions for wanting Lehrer Lane paved.

**Travis Lehrer**

8156 Lehrer Lane  
Neenah, WI 54956

- Mr. Lehrer expressed his and Mr. Dennis Lehrer's intentions for wanting Lehrer Lane paved.
- The Commissioners continued to discuss in more detail the information as referenced above in the Staff Report.

**Dave Keberlein**

3237 Fondotto Drive  
Neenah, WI 54956

- Mr. Keberlein asked for clarification of the issues regarding the potential sale of lots if the property were to be subdivided.
- The Commissioners continued the discussion in regards to the impact of the potential decrease in the acreage for Lot 1.

10. **MOTION:** (Adler, VanAirsdale) MOTION to recommend approval to the Town Board to proceed with the project engineering and development of Lehrer Lane moving it from a private road to a public road with the following three conditions: (1) there is no cost to Town for the engineering and the installation of the road, (2) Mr. Cocherl is compensated for his loss of property and (3) that a reasonable amount is included in the development cost for movement of items such as fences and trees from his [Mr. Cocherl] east property line.

CARRIED by a 6-1 voice vote – Chairperson Knapinski voted NO

**Dennis Lehrer**

8187 Lehrer Lane  
Neenah, WI 54956

- Mr. Lehrer commented on the third condition of the motion.

**Travis Lehrer**

8156 Lehrer Lane  
Neenah, WI 54956

- Mr. Lehrer commented on the second condition of the motion.

**Mark Cocherl**

8143 Lehrer Lane  
Neenah, WI 54956

- Mr. Cocherl commented on the second condition of the motion.

11. **AMENDMENT TO MOTION:** (Adler, VanAirdale) MOTION to potentially delete the third item (the repair of the east property line would be the responsibility of Mr. Cocherl).

CARRIED by unanimous voice vote

12. **AMENDMENT TO MOTION:** (Haskell, Hamblin) Motion to include with the first condition of the original motion that the Lehrer's would escrow the entire amount for the project.

**MOTION FAILED**

- D. Discussion/Action: Plan Commission review and direction to staff relative to using area Stormwater Utility Ordinances as a basis for creating a draft Stormwater Utility Ordinance for the Town of Clayton.

1. The Plan Commission members each received a copy of a Draft Storm Water Utility Ordinance for the Town of Clayton.
2. Please be advised that the Draft Ordinance is modeled almost verbatim on the Town of Neenah's Storm Water Utility Ordinance.
3. The Administration is not implying that the Draft is the ideal document; however, it does allow the Plan Commission to see what is involved in the process and what type of calculations are needed to implement a Storm Water Utility.
4. The Administration is looking for input from the Plan Commission relative to the possible uses of the funds raised by a Storm Water Utility Ordinance and the methodology the Town Engineer should use to arrive at equitable funding levels.
5. The Administration would recommend that funds raised by a Storm Water Utility Fee be used to increase the Town's maintenance and reconstruction activities on its existing Storm Water Management Facilities.
6. The use of Utility Funds would be prioritized to fix existing and identified storm water management problems, to offset the costs of storm water management construction on the Town's Capital reconstruction projects, for long-range storm water management planning activities, and for implementing the projects identified by the Town's long-range planning activities.
7. The main benefit of this project to the Town is in creating a Storm Water Utility with a minimum fee that can be used to increase the funding for the storm water management functions of the Town's Capital Projects and to plan for and correct the Town's storm water management issues.

- The Commissioners discussed the potential of having a Storm Water Utility Ordinance.

**MOTION:** (VanAirdale, Geise) MOTION to recommend the approval by the Town Board for acceptance of this document as written.

CARRIED by 6-1 voice vote. Hamblin voted NO

E. Discussion/Action: Plan Commission review of proposed changes to the Town's Sub-division Ordinances and Policies (Conservation by Design Subdivision Plat Options).

1. The Plan Commission indicated that it would like to consider the option of having alternatives to conventional plats in the Town's Subdivision Ordinance.
2. The Plan Commission members each received a Draft copy of a Conservation Subdivision Ordinance for the Town of Clayton.
3. The document was created by consolidating elements from both the Town of Greenville and the Village of Suamico Conservation Ordinances.
4. A Conservation Ordinance could be implemented as an element of the Town Subdivision Ordinance or as a standalone Ordinance under County Zoning.
  - a. If implemented under County Zoning, the subject property would be required to have a specific County Zoning (i.e., R-5, Planned Residential District) Classification.
5. Implementation under County Zoning would represent a significant hurdle but could be accomplished with cooperation by all parties involved in the process.
6. Please be advised the Administration would like the Commission's comments and direction relative to the Draft Conservation Ordinance.
7. The Administration is looking for direction relative to the green space ratios and potential density bonus numbers included in the Draft Ordinance.
8. Additionally, the Administration would like direction on Minimum Lot sizes, and how they are calculated.
9. At the Commission's direction, staff will work to edit the Draft Conservation Ordinance for the Commission to approve prior to inserting it into the Town's existing Subdivision Ordinance.

- The Commissioners discussed the potential changes of the Town's Subdivision Ordinance to include Conservation by Design Subdivision Plat Options.

**MOTION: (Adler, Hamblin)** MOTION to approve the draft for the Conservation by Design Subdivision Plat Options to be added to the Town's current Subdivision Ordinance and to direct staff to move forward in creating a site plan ordinance for residential zones with a rural residential development checklist.

CARRIED by unanimous voice vote.

VI. Upcoming Meeting Attendance

- A. Site visit to Lehrer Lane in August – Commission decided a site visit was not necessary
- B. UW Extension – Winnebago County Plan Commissioner Network Meeting on Wednesday, August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011, 6:30p-8:00p, Town of Omro Town Hall, 4205 Rivermoor Road, Omro, WI

VII. Adjournment – 8:57 P.M.

**MOTION:** (Brucks, Adler) MOTION to adjourn.

CARRIED by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tori Bowen, Town Treasurer