

Donovan Smith  
Chairperson  
Melanie Markowicz  
Vice Chair/Secretary

Marcell R. Todd, Jr.  
Director

**City of Detroit**  
**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
208 Coleman A. Young Municipal Center  
Detroit, Michigan 48226  
Phone: (313) 224-6225 Fax: (313) 224-4336  
e-mail: cpc@detroitmi.gov

Kenneth R. Daniels  
David Esparza, AIA, LEED  
Ritchie Harrison  
Gwen Lewis  
Frederick E. Russell, Jr.  
Rachel Udabe

## City Planning Commission Meeting

### MINUTES

February 22, 2024

5:00 P.M.

#### I. Opening

A. Call to Order – Chairperson Donovan Smith called the meeting to order at 5:26 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Attendees: Kenneth Daniels, David Esparza, Ritchie Harrison, Gwen Lewis, Melanie Markowicz, Frederick Russell, Donovan Smith and Rachel Udabe

A quorum was present.

C. Amendments to and approval of agenda

Commissioner Esparza moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Commissioner Udabe. Motion approved.

#### II. Meeting minutes of January 4, 2024

Commissioner Markowicz moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Daniels. Motion approved.

#### III. Public Hearings, Discussions and Presentations

- A. **5:15 PM PUBLIC HEARING** – To consider the request of the New Investment Properties 1, LLC, on behalf of Michigan Central Development, to amend Chapter 50 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, *Zoning*, by amending Article XVII, Section 50-17-44, District Map No. 42 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, to show B5 (Major Business District) zoning classification where an M4 (Intensive Industrial District) zoning classification is currently shown on land generally bounded by Lacombe Dr, 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Bagley Avenue, 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Newark Street, and Vernor Hwy (formerly 16<sup>th</sup> Street), more commonly known as 2001 15<sup>th</sup> Street and 2091 15th Street. **(KJ)** **60 mins**

Present: Kimani Jeffrey, and Eric Fazzini, CPC Staff

Petitioners: Melissa Dittmer, Cornetta Lane-Smith, and Beth Kmetz, Michigan Central

*Commissioner Harrison made this disclosure statement, “I wanted to disclose that I have an immediate family member who is a member of the Ford Motor Company and working as a part of the Michigan Central team, so I’ll be recusing myself and excusing myself from this hearing.”*

*This action was verbally acknowledged by the Michigan Central Team on the record.*

Kimani Jeffrey, CPC Staff, presented via PowerPoint a request to rezone M4 to B5 zoning classification. He showed the existing condition of the Michigan Central Station building and described the current zoning classifications in the area. Also, he made a clear distinction as he displayed the actual two parcels of 2001 15<sup>th</sup> Street and 2091 15<sup>th</sup> Street to be rezoned in this current request.

Mr. Fazzini provided via PowerPoint train station zoning history and a historical zoning background of the Michigan Central site pertaining to the specific land use history, use categories, and use permissions (2005 adopted). He explained details of the 1940 ordinance zoning map 42 of the area (past MH and current M4).

Ms. Melissa Dittmer of Michigan Central (MC), subsidiary of Ford Motor Company, discussed current development plans and its efforts for parking. She displayed an overview of the Michigan Central Properties as Bagley Mobility Hub, the Factory, New lab @ Michigan Central (book depository building), and Michigan Central Station. Ms. Dittmer discussed that Michigan Central is currently supported by the Bagley Mobility Hub with 1200 parking spaces that exist on the southwest greenway. Additionally, Michigan Central is in the process of improving an existing surface parking lot at Michigan Central West which then will have over 300 parking spaces. She explained that they will have over 1500 parking spaces total available. There will be a new hotel, and it will occupy floors in the tower. They are negotiating a hotel operation company. She mentioned that M4 Intensive Industrial zoning classification does not allow for the hotel, yet B5 Business District has that provision. She mentioned that Michigan Central recognizes the neighborhood’s concerns for adequate parking. Further, Ms. Dittmer pointed out that Ford Motor Company also owns many other small properties that may be coming before CPC for future visions and rezonings in the future.

Cornetta Lane-Smith described the project’s community engagement, and identified three ways Michigan Central is connecting and updating the community.

1. The Michigan Central Information Center hosts monthly office hours in the Bagley Mobility Hub, and the next dates are March 19 and April 16.
2. The Michigan Central community newsletter is distributed to residents in the surrounding neighborhood. The next release date is May 14, 2024.
3. Michigan Central’s next community meeting will be in May 2024.

Kimani Jeffrey discussed that if the B5 rezoning is approved, the MC developer’s plan will include a hotel, so it will require a special land use hearing with Buildings, Safety Engineering, and Environmental Department (BSEED).

*Public Testimony:*

Richard Noto commented his concerns for insufficient parking in the area, and its effect on the community and businesses. He mentioned his 21-page parking proposal submitted to the City and he is awaiting response.

Sheila Cockrel, President of Train Station Neighbors Block Club, commented support of the rezoning proposal.

Mr. Synder commented his concerns regarding inadequate parking issues. He mentioned the restaurants will suffer if the parking does not become under control, and there is no street parking with the existing plans.

Alex Sprogland commented concerns on removal of bike lanes and transit adjacent assets availability.

*End of Public Testimony*

Kimani Jeffrey stated there have been discussions on this request with the Planning and Development Department (PDD) and a formal report will be included when this matter returns to CPC. This was in response to Commissioner Esparza's questions.

Ms. Dittmer stated that their current parking will sufficiently cover day-to-day operations and visitors. She acknowledged MC has been working with PDD on shared parking studies and possible additional parking facilities to the west of the train station to resolve the general area's parking problem. She explained Michigan Central recognizes they will be a community and global destination, and they desire to support parking for all. This was in response to Commissioner Lewis' questions.

Mr. Jeffrey explained that this development is not a root cause of the area's parking problem. This proposal can park itself in response to Commissioner Lewis' questions.

Ms. Lane-Smith mentioned in community feedback they have received four letters of support from the Corktown Business Association, Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation, Southwest Detroit Business Association, and Train Station Neighbors Block Club. There are concerns from the community about upcoming construction on Michigan Avenue and parking. This was in response to Commissioner Smith.

Commissioner Markowicz suggested to the developers display more clear signage for parking. Also, she suggested PDD, Municipal Parking and CPC Staff seek improved parking solutions for the area.

Kimani Jeffrey stated that PDD will give a Master Plan interpretation, and Staff will have a broader overview of the project and parking in the area. This matter will return at a later date.

Commissioner Smith requested the Municipal Parking department give their ideas and solutions.

- B. 6:15 PM PUBLIC HEARING** – To consider a text amendment that would amend Chapter 50 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, *Zoning*, with request to Animal Husbandry:  
To define animal husbandry and beekeeping as the keeping of certain urban farm animals and domestic honeybees for personal consumption or utilization of agricultural products such as eggs, meat or honey.  
To allow the Buildings, Safety Engineering and Environmental Department to waive

dimensional standards and permitted numbers pursuant to a conditional land use hearing with the review and recommendation of Animal Control, Regulation and Care and the Planning and Development Department; also excluding standards from being appealable to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

To allow animal husbandry and beekeeping exceptions as a principal use by requiring a conditional land use hearing where operated by a municipal agency, 4-H program or by an educational non-profit in selected zoning districts;

To allow animal husbandry and beekeeping as an accessory use in selected zoning districts  
To require licensing for animal husbandry and beekeeping pursuant to Chapter 6 of City Code.

To fix current provisions related to farmers markets and specify zoning districts which they are permitted in.

To specify principal uses that are eligible to permit animal husbandry and beekeeping as an accessory use as well as zoning districts that the activity is permitted in.

To specify requirements for shelter and enclosure spaces for animal husbandry and beekeeping.

To specify setback requirements for animal husbandry and beekeeping.

To specify number limits for animal husbandry and beekeeping.

To require notice to be sent to abutting property owners and occupants.

**(KJ)**

**90 mins**

Present: Kimani Jeffrey, CPC Staff  
Renee V. Wallace, Food Plus Detroit  
Edwina King, Planning and Development Department, Legislative Affairs & Equitable Development Division  
Lori Sowle, General Services Department, Animal Care and Control  
Scott Withington, Detroit Health Department, Environmental Health

Kimani Jeffrey, CPC Staff, presented via PowerPoint and based on CPC report dated February 21, 2024, ordinance text amendments pertaining to animal husbandry. The proposed text amendments will allow citizens to legally keep chickens, ducks and honey bees (current photos shown). During community engagement some opposition was expressed, and the following animals will not be permitted: goats, sheep, pigs, cattle, wasps, hornets, turkeys, and no mass farm production. Mr. Jeffrey relayed that the COVID-19 pandemic showed the possible reality of food scarcity and price inflation. There are approximately 20 cities in Michigan that have similar animal husbandry ordinances. He stated that some Detroit citizens are currently keeping animals. The benefit of passing the ordinance will be to decriminalize some who are being prosecuted or fined for producing their own food in the City.

Ms. Wallace stated that the presented proposed efforts in urban farming and animal husbandry date back to 2013. She explained that people want to provide food with options to buy food at the store or raise it at their homes. Ms. Wallace has connected with stakeholders and organizations, involving city agencies, to develop an ordinance. Ms. Wallace's organization educates interested individuals on the proper processes on humane care and consumption of farm animals, and it addresses issues on the welfare of the animals, animal keepers and neighbors. During community engagement, she mentioned there were meetings with focus groups with supporters and opposers (photos shown). These opposers raised concerns and mentioned they want to be notified of an animal keeping neighbor. For example, a notice is beneficial in awareness, if a neighbor may be allergic to bees. Animal

husbandry promotes neighbor relations. She described via PowerPoint the purpose and goals of the Animal Husbandry Guild.

Mr. Jeffrey presented via PowerPoint a synopsis of the proposed amendments for animal husbandry and beekeeping 50-12-402 permissible zoning districts. He provided an overview of the proposed Chapter 50 and Chapter 6 City Code Regulations and explained six types of accessory uses permitted. (Please refer to the February 21, 2024 CPC Report).

Mr. Jeffrey discussed that pursuant to Chapter 6 of the City Code on animal husbandry and beekeeping sites must be licensed, and the application process and fee will be set by City Council. He explained dimensional standards or setback requirements for an animal keeper. He described a configuration of where a beehive can be located as an accessory with a flyaway barrier. Further, Mr. Jeffrey explained that BSEED will inspect a location’s setbacks, and they will approve or require a special land use hearing, (if out of bounds). The Chapter 6 proposed amendments involve Animal Care and Control Division to show how people are required to keep animals, and proper waste and manure management to avoid attracting pests and rodents. Mr. Jeffrey explained the proposed permitted number of animals allowed as follows:

<b>Animals permitted</b> (residential, schools, educational institutions and sit down restaurants)	<b>Animals permitted</b> (urban farms and gardens)
Ducks/Chickens maximum amount	Ducks/Chickens maximum amount
8	12
Honeybee Hives	Honeybee Hives
2	4

Mr. Jeffrey explained that Chapter 6 proposed amendments provide regulations on compost, tagging (flexible) and health documentation on the animals. There will be no slaughtering on the animal keeping site; it is prohibited. The City may partner with Eastern Market (letter submitted) to provide a multispecies slaughter system and slaughter center. According to the Animal Care and Control Division from years 2020–2023 there were approximately 5,100 citations, but for farm animals there were 34 citations or less than one percent.

Also, Mr. Jeffrey mentioned community engagement meetings, including Council Member Pro Tem James Tate sponsored four meetings. Mr. Jeffrey described CPC’s public hearing notifications of sending out approximately 1300 postal mailings to community groups, and CPC sent electronic notices to 6,000 subscribers of CPC’s email list and utilize the media for news reports.

*Public Testimony*

Bill Hickey commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. He relayed the benefits of bees, honey, and his experience educating students on nature.

Mr. Spradline commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment, and he relayed neighborhood beautification, receiving grants for ducks and enjoyment of greenway.

Victoria commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She enjoys the benefits of food sovereignty, fresh food, bees, educational experience for children and ease

of caring for chickens.

Ms. Peoples commented her opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She expressed her concerns of ordinance enforcement, decriminalizing present animal keepers, odor of chickens, effect on neighbor's backyards for social gatherings and allergies.

April Worden commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. It will be good for the City and its youth.

Antonio, a beekeeper, commented his support for the proposed ordinance amendment. He wants to utilize goats for lawn management fighting invasive species.

Rose Howell commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She mentioned the City's yearly registration fee is high at \$50 and much more than other cities' fee.

Ash Rose commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She mentioned neighbors' ability to sustain and produce food for themselves, opportunities for youth to interact with horses and goats good. She expressed the permit fee should be \$10 a year.

Justin Hisrow commented the benefits of keeping chickens and giving away eggs to neighbors enhances neighbors' relations.

Katy Trudeau, President of Eastern Market partnership, commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. The provision gives Detroit residents opportunities for growing and feeding themselves.

Winona Bynum of Detroit Food Policy Council commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She mentioned her positive experience witnessing it in New York.

Ms. Victoria Lawrence, a farmer, commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She said it increases more nutrient dense food. She desires higher caps and more species especially goats.

Mr. Faulkner commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment.

Robert Thomas commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. He stated beekeeping two hives per home is too restrictive.

Ross Shaw commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. He requested revisions for number of bees per home.

Richard Lawler commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. He mentioned his concerns for impact of the residents, danger and permissibility potential for abuse widespread.

Ms. Landrum, President of United Citizens of Southwest Detroit, commented opposition to proposed ordinance amendment. She provided handouts to CPC. Ms. Landrum expressed concerns with illegal abuse of the law and enforcement with only one officer for each district. She admonished CPC to place this matter on the ballot. Also, she mentioned concerns with roaming roosters, coyotes, garden snakes and a horse, and rat infestation.

Kim Summerville commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment.

Ms. Kathy Brantley commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She requested CPC place this amendment on the ballot.

Ms. Renata Miller, President of Indian Village Association, commented opposition for the proposed ordinance. She submitted handouts and requested placement on the CPC notification list. She shared her concerns about childcare facilities and animal keeping.

Mr. Oriah McClain commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. He expressed concerns with enforcement, other wildlife being attracted to the area and diseases of chickens.

Amy of Michigan Local Food Council commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment.

Otis Mathis III commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. He stated his neighbor has a rooster, and he personally experienced a rooster in his yard. He wants the opportunity to vote on this matter.

Patrice Brown of Detroit Food Policy Council and employee for Eastern Market, commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She mentioned its benefits, food scarcity and health and wellness.

Nicole Lindsey, Detroit Hives organizer and beekeeper, commented on her opposition on beekeeping restrictions of the proposed ordinance amendment. She stated beekeeping is permitted in the state of Michigan. She asked these approximate questions 1. How long is the application process? Beekeeping season is four months. 2. Will beekeeping be permitted on rooftops?

Ms. Yelda commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment, and she relayed a pleasurable experience of receiving eggs from a neighbor's chickens.

Ms. Hoerauf commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She mentioned her experience of 10 years of loud clucking chickens in yards and ducks on her property and flying over fence or roaming freely.

Peter Cross commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment, and he believes it increases neighborhood cohesion.

Timothy Jackson, Detroit Hives organizer and beekeeper, commented his opposition on beekeeping aspect as it is permitted in state of Michigan. He mentioned that his organization has educated 4,000 students on beekeeping.

Sara Feldman commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. It provides resources to community and educate people on raising and taking care of animals.

Suzanne Scolbold commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She provided history on the Michigan Right to Farm Act and urban farming.

Bernice Smith commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment.

Rachel Meeker commented support for the proposed ordinance and this ordinance gives

good justice.

Carmen Geraryson commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She does not want this in her neighborhood and desires it to be a voting matter.

Ms. Murcott commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She is a mother who raises chickens and ducks, and it is rewarding.

Lorreta Cannon commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She mentioned there is no space for animals.

Mr. Keto of Keep Growing Detroit commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. He mentioned people are abiding by proper standards with animals and bees.

Patricia Gatson commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. Farm animals are a no. Homes are close to one another. Smell in yard do not want that. People do not care about citations. She referred to removal of excessive cars.

Ms. Evitriace Cowen commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She mentioned food scarcity is not official. Detroit needs grocery stores in neighbor. Who is there to call for enforcement? She mentioned that there were chickens walking with her and kids at bus stop.

Ms. Ross commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She spoke on the establishment of zoning and zoning keeps the peace.

Ms. Kathleen Delvin commented support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She mentioned the psychological and ecological benefits of animal keeping.

Yolanda McCants, president of a neighborhood organization, commented her displeasure in not being notified of community meetings and no meetings being held in District 3. She mentioned that food at grocery stores get USDA approval. A certain time of year bees will get aggressive.

Amelia Sharp commented on living near Marathon and its fumes and truck traffic. She mentioned it is undesirable to eat an egg grown in her neighborhood due to the pollution.

Betty Gill commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She expressed concerns with noise pollution, odor of the animals and disagreed with 30 feet measurement. Chickens and ducks are not quiet, yet noisy.

Emily Brent commented her support for the proposed ordinance amendment. She farms and grows her own food. She feels food security is important.

Karen Williams commented in opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She expressed her concerns with the smell of animals when it rains, and animal keepers will not clean-up after the animals.

Linda Gatlin commented opposition for the proposed ordinance amendment. She expressed that farm animals belong on farm land. It is better for the animals than being in the metropolitan neighborhood.



*End of Public Testimony*

Mr. Jeffrey agreed to conduct further research on the Michigan Right to Farm repeal, animal keeping's impact on property value, mitigation of the stench of animal keeping and estimation of how many chicken and ducks will be in the City if ordinance passes. This was in response to Commissioner Lewis' questions and requests.

Mr. Jeffrey agreed to conduct further research on animal keeping residents maximum permitted amounts when all residents are owners living in a flat, condominium or two-family unit and fencing requirements. This was in accordance with Commissioner Markowicz's inquiries and concerns.

Commissioner Markowicz formally announced on the record that there were 12 letters received which resulted in 11 in support and one opposed. She noted one support letter had 60 signatures.

Ms. Wallace stated that it is believed there will not be a huge increase in animal keepers if the proposed ordinance passes. She mentioned that individuals participate in the training courses, but very few actually take on animal keeping, due to time and care involved. This was in response to Commissioner Daniels' question.

Scott Withington advised that produced eggs and honey may sell directly to a customer, such as neighbors or through a farmers market, but an indirect sell to a grocery store or restaurant is not permitted. On the other hand, meat cannot be sold without USDA or small meat producers Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) licensure or inspection. This was in response to Commissioner Daniels' questions.

Ms. Sowle stated that Chapter 6 ordinance has different requirements for licensing, i.e., setbacks and other requirements, but registration would be similar to registering a dog. This was in response to Commissioner Udabe's questions.

Commissioner Markowicz suggested considering fencing requirements, so that animals are not wandering in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Lewis requested research on how by-right efforts may dilute or impact the urban experience and what residents should expect in the future as long-term effects of urban farming animal keeping.

Mr. Jeffrey concluded by stating that Staff will conduct more research and return on this matter at a later date.

**IV. Public Comment** – *Public Comment was heard after unfinished business.*

Jill Bostick, group child care provider, expressed her support for the proposed ordinance.

Elizabeth Gonzales, a child care facility owner, commented support for the proposed ordinance. She mentioned child care is important in diverse communities such as Southwest Detroit.

Renata Miller expressed that she would like to receive notification of CPC zoning matters. She mentioned child care in a house is a business, and other child care matters.

Rita Ross commented her displeasure for the ordinance amendments. Also, she relayed her

relative's experience with finding a child care facility and expensive rates.

Patrice Brown commented on child care deserts, food deserts and urban farming.

Rachel Maker commented on animal husbandry and urban agriculture.

## V. Unfinished Business –

- A. The consideration of request to amend the text of the Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 50 of the 2019 Detroit City Code – to update definitions, regulations, and procedures relative to child care facilities for consistency with updated State law and to broaden the opportunities for such facilities on a by-right or conditional basis. (RB, and the Office of Early Learning) (ACTION REQUESTED) 60 mins

Presenter: Rory Bolger, CPC Staff  
Dr. Lisa Sturgess, Office of Early Learning

Dr. Bolger presented via PowerPoint and based on CPC report of February 21, 2024, proposed and revised child care facilities text amendment -Summation Report, including a summary on the options on child care facilities. Dr. Bolger explained the three different kinds of child care facilities, proposed ordinance revisions and the concerns raised to these proposed amendments. He expressed that the most common concern is the permissibility and regulation of group day care homes as a by-right use. He identified and explained child care facilities and which zoning classifications are permissible and prohibited. Dr. Bolger explained Options 1-3 (see February 21, 2024 CPC report) as possible approaches to regulating group day care homes for consideration as follows:

- ❖ Option 1 — To approve or deny the revised text amendment as presented and heard on February 15, 2024.
- ❖ Option 2 — To retain all February 15th definitions and provisions as proposed for Child Care Centers and for Family Day Care Homes but permit Group Day Care Homes only as a Conditional use in the specified zoning districts without the revision for spacing.
- ❖ Option 3 — To retain all February 15th definitions and provisions as proposed for Child Care Centers and for Family Day Care Homes but to specify Group Day Care Homes as a “Conditional/By-right” use.

Dr. Sturgess presented via PowerPoint responses to commissioners questions and concerns from the previous week's meeting. She described that the State is currently ready to handle an influx of child care programs. It has two key programs namely: 1) State of Michigan Child Care Licensing System (CCHIRP). 2) The State has a budget for improving the timeliness of child care facility inspections. This includes the addition of 30 new licensing consultants to assist in licensure.

Additionally, Dr. Sturgess explained that currently there are 10 family child care programs and two group homes that are in the queue to become licensed group homes. She displayed maps describing the seat gaps and child care desert areas. All seven districts have a gap, but especially in 3, 6 and 7, where over 4,000 children need child care. Also, she addressed CPC's concerns about children's safety and described her conversation with a State licensing consultant monitoring Detroit. Dr. Sturgess described that the State consultants fingerprint any person in the provider's home. If there is a registered sex offender in the vicinity, they create a crisis intervention plan that manages safety, i.e., restrictions on walking around in

the neighborhood or playing in fenced yard. Also, a crisis prevention plan for stray dogs in the area for safety. Dr. Sturgess discussed the alternative to not having anywhere for child care that some people move out of the City, use a trustworthy neighbor or family member. On the other hand, families may leave the children with boyfriends, siblings or left alone. Therefore, a City offering child care in neighborhoods is the best options for families. She mentioned that they received more than 100 signatures on their petition in support. She mentioned the potential to expand child care facilities as she is aware of a group of 30 that are waiting for the outcome of this CPC hearing to move to a group home.

**Commissioner Russell motioned to accept Staff’s recommendation for Option 1 seconded by Commissioner Udabe.**

**2 yays (Russell, & Udabe) —6 nays (Daniels, Esparza, Harrison, Lewis, Markowicz, Smith)**

**Motion Failed.**

**Commissioner Esparza motioned to reconsider the previous action, seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Motion Approved.**

**Commissioner Harrison motioned to accept Staff’s suggestion of Option 3, seconded by Commissioner Markowicz.**

**6 yays (Daniels, Harrison, Lewis, Markowicz, Smith & Udabe) —2 nays (Esparza & Russell)**

**Motion Approved.**

**VI. New Business** – There was no new business.

**VII. Committee Reports** – This agenda item discussion was tabled until the next meeting.

**Commissioner Lewis motioned to schedule committee meeting to March 27, 2024 at 3:30 p.m. seconded by Commissioner Harrison. Motion Approved.**

**VIII. Staff Report** – There was no Staff Report.

**IX. Member Report** – There were no Member Reports.

**X. Communications** – There were no Communications.

**XI. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:44 p.m.