EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY JULY 3, 2014, 7:30 P.M.
BEAR CREEK TOWNSHIP HALL
373 DIVISION RD
PETOSKEY, MI 49770

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Eby, Dan Plasencia, Kelly Alexander, James Scott, Bert Notestine, David Laughbaum, Tom Urman, Steve Neal

MEMBERS ABSENT: Shawn Wonnacott

STAFF: Tammy Doernenburg, Monica Linehan

I Call to Order and Attendance
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Chairman Eby. All members were present except Wonnacott.

II Minutes of June 5, 2014
Alexander made a motion supported by Plasencia to approve the minutes of the June 5, 2014 meeting. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote of the members present.

III Cases

1. Case #28C-83 MKB Holdings, LLC, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-Outdoor display; Site Plan Amendment; PUD-1-removal, 4722 US 131 Hwy, Section 30, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A two-part request by MKB Holdings LLC at 4772 US 131 Hwy, Section 30, Bear Creek Township for 1) a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review (Amendment) to allow for outdoor display and modification of the site plan, and 2) to remove the Planned Unit Development-1 (PUD-1) overlay. The request is per Sections 1001-4, 2102 and Article XVII of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is tax parcel 24-01-19-30-400-011 and is zoned B-2 General Business with a PUD-1 overlay.

Packet Information: No new information

Case #28D-83 was heard before this case was addressed. After hearing Case #28D-83, Ben Borish, applicant, officially withdrew this request.

2. Case #28D-83 MKB Holdings, LLC, MODIFIED REQUEST-PUD-1 OVERLAY AMENDMENT-Outdoor display & SITE PLAN AMENDMENT-Commercial access to Gruler Rd, 4722 US 131 Hwy, Section 30, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A modified request by MKB Holdings LLC at 4772 US 131 Hwy, Section 30, Bear Creek Township for amendment to the Planned Unit Development overlay to allow for outdoor display and modification of the site plan to include commercial access onto Gruler Road. The request is per Article XVII of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is tax parcel 24-01-19-30-400-011 and is zoned B-2 General Business with a PUD-1 overlay. A public site visit will be conducted at the site by the Planning Commission at 5:30PM on June 25, 2014.

Packet Items: revised PUD-1 Master Plan/Site Plan, photos regarding drainage, Bear Creek Township Planning Commission meeting draft minutes, revised staff report

Doernenburg explained that this is a modified request of Case #28C-83 which was heard two months ago. There has been a revised plan submitted. The parcel is zoned B-2 and FF with a PUD-1 overlay.
The aerial showing existing conditions was displayed. There have been some drainage concerns brought up from a neighbor and the drainage flow and site photos in the spring were shown detailing the issues. The current site plan was shown as approved in August 2007 along with the originally submitted plan from two months ago. The applicant originally wanted to remove the PUD but has agreed to amend the PUD. The request is to allow outdoor display and storage and commercial access to Gruler Road. This case was re-advertised. Graphics of proposed access, outdoor display and screening with evergreen trees were shown. The revised site plan was displayed. The proposed outdoor display will be on the south side of the drive, at one location and will be outlined with boulders. The parking for boats, trailers and hoists was reduced from 121 spaces to 78 spaces. The Bear Creek Township Planning Commission recommended approval on condition that additional trees be planted at both locations and that a drainage plan be required. The Township Board agreed with the approval but also asked for an as-built drainage plan to be submitted within one year. There is to be a sign facing into the property near the proposed Gruler Road access warning of pedestrians using the road. The trees along the west property line and US 131/Gruler Road intersection will remain. The outdoor display area will be grass only (at ground level), changed from the previous raised display. The sign will remain at the current size although the wording may change. There are specific summertime and wintertime storage areas designated on the plan. Additional screening near overhead power line was requested by the township and the applicant has agreed to install that as well. A revised staff report with the township conditions added to the draft motion was distributed.

Ben Borisch, applicant, stated that the suggestion for another row of trees was brought up at the site visit. This allows for more screening from US 131. He pointed out the area near the power line where trees will be added. The boats will be displayed from April 1-November 1.

Alexander asked about the screening; will it all be done with trees? Doernenburg stated that they will be 8-10' tall evergreens. Plasencia asked if the screening near the power lines will need to be cut for maintenance. Borisch stated that they are 15' away from the lines.

Eby opened the floor for public comment.

Jack Jones stated that the area that was all gravel is now blacktop and he feels that a drainage plan should be done with a retention pond if necessary. He showed on the aerial where all of the standing and running water to his property was this year. There is standing water 200' from Gruler Road. This water runs through the valley to his property. Jones stated that it has never been this bad in the 70 years he's been there. He asked that a drainage plan be required. He stated that he is also opposed to the commercial drive onto Gruler. He understands that the Road Commission requires the paved drive but he wouldn't be opposed to dirt.

Joe Hoffman, Bear Creek Township, stated that anyone that was on the site walk saw that the new blacktop sheets water towards the Jones' property. Bear Creek Township doesn't want the as-built drainage plan to be missed; this is very important. If the commercial drive is there onto Gruler Road, it adds to their ability to utilize the public boat launch for commercial use. This will be an issue that the township will have to deal with.

Eric Brown, neighbor to the west of this development, asked about the proposed off-season storage. Will it be behind and up against the building. Borisch stated that it would be more against the trees than the building but would be behind the building in the proposed parking spaces.

Neal asked when the blacktop was put in. Borisch stated that it was put in last summer. The water-flow issue was brought up at the last meeting and they are getting an engineer to review this. The
Gruler Road access was requested for safety. He noted that they have met with their crew and if they do use that launch, they make sure that there are two people there so that the truck can be moved when someone else needs to use the launch. They are not the only ones that use this commercially.

Urman added that the applicant has also agreed to dust-control and this is identified on the plan.

Urman motioned to approve Case #28D-83, MKB Holdings LLC, Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development-1 amendment and site plan amendment at 4772 US 131 S, tax parcel #24-01-19-30-400-011, Section 30, T34N-R5W, Bear Creek Township. Approval is based on the facts presented in the case, the use is a Special Use in the B-1 zoning district, and the township planning commission and township board recommended approval. The approval allows for the added uses of outdoor display of new boats and all other site conditions and stipulations as shown on the Amendment No. 2 to the PUD-1 Master Plan dated 6/24/14. Approval is on condition that 1) Four additional trees be added to the screen along US-131 and that the trees be in staggered rows - planted by October 15, 2014; 2) Four additional 8' to 10' trees be planted near the power line easement by October 15, 2014; 3) An engineered drainage plan must be provided and an as-built plan must be provided within 12 months which meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance; 4) The display area is for boats on trailers and will be displayed from April 1 to November 1 only. The motion was seconded by Notestine and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Notestine, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Plasencia, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Wonnacott.

Doernenburg reminded the applicant that the final review of the PUD will be made by the Emmet County Board of Commissioners at their meetings of July 15, 2014 and July 17, 2014.

3. **Case #1E-75**  
   Circuit Controls Corporation, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-1 (Mixed Use), Preliminary, Final, & SITE PLAN REVIEW, 2277 Harbor-Petoskey Rd, Section 27, Bear Creek Township

**Legal Notice:** A request by Circuit Controls Corporation at 2277 Harbor-Petoskey Road for a Mixed-Use Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development-1 (PUD-1) overlay and Site Plan Review for expansion of the existing PUD-1 for a factory addition, parking and an accessory building. The property includes tax parcels 24-01-16-27-201-012 - zoned I-1 Light Industrial with a PUD-1 overlay, 24-01-16-27-201-002 (2401 Harbor-Petoskey Rd), 003, 004 (2357 Harbor-Petoskey Rd) zoned R-2B General Residential with a Preliminary PUD-1 overlay and 24-01-16-27-200-002 & 004 zoned R-2B General Residential. The request includes a modification to the PUD-1 perimeter setback standards and the parking space width standards. The request is per Article XVII of the Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant requested postponement. This case will be heard at the next regularly scheduled meeting, August 7, 2014.

4. **Case #6-14**  
   Terrance Carolan, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Cabin tourist lodging facility, 4495 N Larks Lake Rd, Section 7, Center Township

**Legal Notice:** A request by Terrance Carolan for Mary Carolan for Site Plan Review for a tourist lodging/cabin court business at 4495 N Larks Lake Road in Section 7 of Center Township. The property is tax parcel number 24-04-09-07-400-003 and is zoned B-1 Local Tourist Business. The request is per Section 900-7 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Packet information:** Revised site plan  
**Passed out at meeting or emailed:** Emailed letter from Gerald Fohrman, question list from Carrie Ketterer.

Doernenburg explained that this is the second month of review for this case. The property is zoned B-1 Local Tourist Business. The property is mostly wooded as shown on the aerial photo. The request is for a cabin tourist lodging facility. The township has recommended approval on the condition that there is warning of the pond on the neighboring property. The original and the revised site plans were
shown. The commercial drive access is now shown on the plan. There are designated parking spaces to be marked with logs and a screened dumpster location shown on the plan as well. The footpath and bridge over the stream/drainage area are marked pedestrian only. The fire department signed their approval on this site plan requiring that a fire lane be provided on the site. The parking area is to remain natural. Well and septic approval will be sought from the Health Department. Twelve parking spaces are required and twelve are shown. The proposal will include eight sleeping cabins and a common building for restrooms and showers. Doernenburg reported that there have been letters of opposition emailed since the last meeting. An emailed letter from Gerald Fohrman was passed around. Another emailed letter with a list of questions was submitted and the author was to provide copies of that tonight. In response to one of the concerns brought up, Doernenburg showed the regulated wetlands map from the DEQ. This property does not show up as a regulated wetland. The Health Department regulates the septic system and this permit would be required prior to a building permit being issued. Doernenburg stated that she would suggest that a condition be placed that the common building is built before or at the same time as any of the other cabins so that there are facilities for guests. The zoning map was shown. Cabins are shown on the site plan as 100-200sf and photos of cabin concepts were shown.

Terry Carolan, applicant, stated that the site went to tax sale by the state at some point as likely contaminated. His daughter bought the property and had the underground fuel tanks removed. One was leaking. The site was cleaned up. She is committed to doing something good with this site. The two letters of opposition state otherwise. Carolan stated that she wants to enhance the area and accommodate those who want to enjoy it. She is a seasoned manager of properties and knows what she's doing. This request is to see where everything stands before they continue with the permitting process. After it is done, they will have pulled at least eight permits including the campground permit from the state. This is a permitted use on the site.

Alexander asked if the cabins have restroom facilities. Carolan stated that they would have just the common building facilities. Camp Petosega does this as does the Petoskey state park. There would be one male and one female bathroom and shower facilities. The common building would also be an area in which a few couples could come together and be able to stay in their own cabins yet eat together in the common area. There will be electricity to the cabins but no water or septic. Water pumps would be on the site. Carolan explained that she is targeting kayakers, hikers and the like. The list of potential issues that the neighbor has sent in are exactly what his daughter doesn't want this to be. It is to be a quiet location to enjoy the natural area. Some of the issues brought up should be resolved with the revised plan.

Plasencia stated that there are no dimensions on the plan or on the parking spaces. Carolan stated that it is a scaled drawing. The ordinance is specific on parking space size requirements. Neal asked about the capacity of the cabins. Carolan stated that two people would be planned for. Perhaps a child as well. Notestine asked if someone will be living on or near the site. Carolan stated that they would not. Plasencia asked if the ordinance has a minimum size for this type of use for the cabins. Doernenburg stated that the 720sf minimum square footage is only for a permanent dwelling and doesn't apply to cabins. Urman asked if the bathhouse would have a minimum size requirement. Doernenburg stated that this would be regulated more by the building code. It would not be allowed to be any larger than what is shown on the site plan or they would have to come back if the sizes were to be increased. Notestine stated that the Health Department will determine number of bathrooms. Carolan stated that he has shown the plan to the Health Department and their requirement was 100gal capacity per cabin. Carolan stated that it would be larger than that as he doesn't feel that is acceptable for the use. There was a comment regarding the request for the drainage plan requirement to be waived. Carolan explained that after the tanks were pulled and the site cleaned up there was a 80x120x15’ hole dug, all
of the soil was removed, and pure sand was put back in. There was about 16,000 yards of sand put into the site. There is no question that the drainage will work. Alexander asked about water testing. Carolan stated that there were 8-10 monitoring wells and the test reports from the engineering firms all have come back good. She took a marginal and potentially dangerous site and wants to do this to enhance the area. Plasencia asked about the 5’ fence. Will it be chain link? Carolan stated that it could be but they’d like to have plantings to grow around it. Plasencia asked about the warning signs that were discussed for the pond; these aren’t mentioned on the plan. Eby added that the pond is an attractive nuisance and perhaps a board fence that would completely screen the pond would be a better idea. Carolan stated that they have no issues with putting up signage. Carolan noted that in reality, the pond is more visible from the road than from this property. You can be at the pond in about 15 steps from the road. Plasencia asked if it is deep. Carolan stated that he doesn't think so; it has been almost dry at times. Laughbaum asked if the occupancy would be limited on the cabins. Carolan stated that it would be limited based on sleeping accommodations. Three would be the limit. Laughbaum asked if they would be allowed extra tents or campers pulled on the sites. This could be a potential issue. Carolan stated that they are early in the process yet; all of these questions and regulations will come up on the campground permit/requirements through the DEQ.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Carrie Ketterer was the one that had emailed the list of questions (attached). She lives just north of the property. She read through each of the questions on the list. Many of the questions were addressed with the revised plan and others were for other departments such as the Health Department or DEQ. She stated that she is concerned with the size of the septic; it seems inadequate for the use. Ketterer commented that this is a different type of neighborhood now than commercial that it was years ago. One of the questions was in regards to an on-site manager. She stated that she is very concerned and that most campgrounds have a host to take care of things. Ketterer asked some additional questions as well including whether dogs will be permitted, where ambulance access will be (addressed on revised plan), if the septic was far enough from the pond (Health Dept), and who's liable if someone drowns in the 10’ deep pond on the neighboring site. She also added that cell phones don't work there, how would emergency services be contacted?

Janet Sislak stated that she thinks that this is a great idea but a bad place to do it. It doesn't make sense to put eight cabins on a 1.5ac parcel on the corner. This is a residential area and there are a lot of nice houses in the area. She is opposed to this project. It should be on a larger parcel. There are a lot of cars very close to an intersection, should have a large parking lot. The buildings are very cute but she feels that it is a bad application for this small piece of property. The parcel is very wet and buggy.

Eby stated that if this parcel was in a FF zone it would have a minimum acreage requirement. Because it is B-1, it does not. Sislak asked about licensing. Eby explained that this is done through the state. If they don't give their permission, it can't be done. Sislak added that she agrees that a camp host should be on site. There used to be issues when people camped without permission at Larks Lake. It seems that if there is to be a campground, there should be someone there to police it. Can a land-line phone be required since cell service isn't available there?

Plasencia asked about the township review and recommendation. Doernenburg explained that they wanted the neighbors notified but that we were unable to do so because of the Zoning Enabling Act notification procedures. This is a principal use permitted in the B-1 Zoning District. The warning signs for the pond were requested in their recommendation as well. Plasencia stated that in order to have the proper maneuvering area, the parking would have to be setback from the road right-of-way 50', would this be verified? Doernenburg stated that it would be verified on site. Notestine asked if
we can require an on-site manager. Doernenburg stated that we are regulating the land use. Notestine stated that the Health Department and DEQ would be the ones to determine if the property is too wet for the use. Urman noted that for the most part, plans that are submitted are engineered plans rather than hand drawn. It protects both parties. Scott noted that the logs shown for parking are not 50' from the road right-of-way as shown. Doernenburg stated that they could be 48' from the right-of-way because the ordinance allows a 2' overhang. Scott stated that he doesn't have any issues with the general layout of the site but it seems a bit small for the use. This isn't in our review process though, it will be determined by the state under the campground permitting process. Plasencia stated that Camp Petosega has separate regulations on how many tents, campers, etc. can fit onto a site. Scott stated that there isn't room for trailers here. Would the county get a copy of the campground permit? Doernenburg stated that we should but we could put this as a condition as well. Urman asked if the gravel surface on the fire lane will be looked at to see if it can withstand the weight of the fire trucks; if the ground is wet, they may sink. Doernenburg stated that the fire chief signed off on this plan. Carolan added that the land isn't wet, there is a runoff area on the north and east side and both areas have been taken care of with ditches and culverts. Mr. Bricker knew the property and would have said something if there was an issue. Carolan stated that you won't get your feet wet on 95% of this property. Eby stated that he would like to see a 6' board fence mainly to screen the pond. Laughbaum asked if this would be for the full length of the property. At some point it is the pond owner's responsibility to keep people off of his property not everyone else's.

Sislak asked if the fence is to go all around the property. Eby stated that it would just be at the south end of the property. Plasencia stated that it is a lot of expense for a fence when you can still go around the end. A wire fence would deter people from going onto the property. Eby stated that it would but wouldn't buffer sound like a board fence would. Scott stated that an advantage here is that they are in enclosed cabins instead of tents as far as sound goes.

Laughbaum stated that when the store was there they'd stop in there quite often. There was a youth club across the street. It would be nice to have something in there again. Some form of this project ought to work if they can get their permits in order. Urman asked if the fence materials need to be specified. Eby stated that the applicant wants to screen this naturally with plantings. Laughbaum stated that a wire fence would last a long time whereas a board fence may not. Natural screening with a wire fence may be better. Urman stated that a woven black wire fence with slat inserts could be required and then the trees can be grown over it.

Plasencia motioned to approve Case #6-14, Terrance Carolan for Mary Carolan, Site Plan Review - Tourist Lodging Facility/Cabin Court at 4495 N Larks Lake Road located within Section 7, Center Township, as identified on the Site Plan dated June 19, 2014 for the following reasons: based on the facts presented in the case, the use is a Principal Use Permitted in the B-1 Zoning District, the parking meets the standards of the Ordinance, the township recommended approval, and the Site Plan meets the standards of Section 2405, and that the drainage requirements are waived based on the site conditions and on condition that no trespassing/warning signs be installed to warn of the pond on the neighboring property, a copy of the approve DEQ campground permit be provided to Planning & Zoning, a 5' fence be installed along the south 200' of the property made of wood or similar material, and that the common building be built before occupancy of any of the cabins. The motion was seconded by Notestine and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Notestine, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Plasencia, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Wonnacott.
5. Case #9-14  Cherry Capital Connection LLC for Glen Jones Living Trust, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-Internet tower, 14277 Mackinaw Hwy, Section 24, Wawatam Township

Legal Notice: A request by Cherry Capital Connection LLC for Glen Jones Living Trust for a Special Use Permit for an internet tower on property located at 14277 Mackinaw Hwy, Section 24, Wawatam Township. The property is zoned R-2B General Residential and is tax parcel number 24-15-03-24-400-005. The request is to erect a 100' high guyed tower for internet reception per Section 2102-2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Info: Request/Location map, tax parcel map, application, certificate of trust (owner authorization), site plan review checklist, impact statement, elevation graphics, site plan, staff report

Doernenburg presented this case. The parcel is located on the west side of Mackinaw Hwy. A restaurant and parking lot exist on the parcel. Adjacent uses are vacant land or commercial property. The property to the north is a hotel that isn't open currently. Across the street is a storage building in the Village of Mackinaw City. The proposal is for a 100' internet tower. The proposed tower meets the 100% fall zone standard from all property lines and the guy wires and anchors meet setback requirements. A township recommendation has not been received as they meet next week. Photos of the site were shown as well as the site plan. This request is a special use in this district.

Bruce Vaughn, applicant, stated that this has not been done in the desired sequence. They had in mind a design for a 50' tower. As this was being constructed, they were negotiating with the village and preparing to move their existing equipment from the water tower as they were refurbishing it. Vaughn stated that they were then informed that the Village was not interested in their services which they had been trading for lease space on the water tower. Because they were then left with no alternatives and no way to service their Mackinaw City and Mackinac Island customers, they added 40' to the tower on this parcel to complete the network. Vaughn stated that he immediately notified Doernenburg who told him what the process was to seek approval for the higher tower and he submitted his paperwork for the Planning Commission review.

Alexander asked why they are not going back on the water tower? Vaughn stated that the Village was not interested in renewing the lease. Alexander stated that he had a conversation with Adam Smith (from the village) who stated that it was Cherry Capital's choice not to go back up on the water tower; they didn't boot anyone off of it. Vaughn stated that information was not conveyed to them. Alexander noted that everyone else is going back up on the water tower that was there before except them. Plasencia stated that the ordinance requires co-location efforts. If this is a fact, they should try to re-install on the water tower. Plasencia asked if there are other towers that he could explore in the area as well. Doernenburg stated that she is unsure of co-location possibilities but there are other tall structures in the area. Alexander noted that the township has not seen this case yet. Urman stated that it doesn't sound like everything has been explored. Plasencia stated that we would need documentation that they were refused co-location. Laughbaum noted that it may be too expensive. Alexander stated that he was told that the contracts for those on the water tower are open to the public.

Alexander motioned, seconded by Neal, to defer this case until the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting, scheduled for August 7, 2014, to allow the applicant to explore co-location possibilities and to allow the township the opportunity to hear this case at their meeting. The motion passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Notestine, Scott,Laughbaum, Urman, Plasencia, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Wonnacott.

Scott noted that he doesn't think that you can see the tower very well. There is a 90' tower there now, 100' has been requested. Vaughn was asked whether 90' is what he needs or 100'. Vaughn stated that the extra 10' would be beneficial to them.
IV Public Comment: Terry Carolan thanked the board for their review. He asked about the fencing requirement and was concerned that the 5' fence required would violate the fence standards (in the front yard). Doernenburg noted that there is a fence policy that only allows 4' in the front yard. Eby stated that if a modification to meet the fence standards is needed for a portion, Doernenburg as Zoning Administrator could make those changes as a minor modification to the site plan.

V Other Business:

- **Vice-Chairperson:** Since Paul Desy left, we do not have a vice-chair. After discussion, Notestine made a motion to nominate Urman as vice-chairperson. The motion was seconded by Plasencia and passed by unanimous voice vote of the members present.
- **Case #11-14, Little Traverse Township, Zoning Coordinating Committee, Rezoning a parcel from FF-1 to B-2:** Doernenburg explained that this is not consistent with their Master Plan but is consistent with surrounding uses. The original request was to rezone the entire parcel but the recommendation of the Planning Commission is to create a transition zone and rezone part of the property along West Conway Rd to B-1 and B-2 for the north part of the property. Scott motioned, Alexander seconded, to authorize the Chair to sign the memo to the township. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the members present.
- **Case #12-14, West Traverse Township, Zoning Coordinating Committee, Text Amendment:** Doernenburg explained that the text amendment is to correct a discrepancy of oversight in the current text regarding rear-yard setback standards in C-1 zoning district. Plasencia motioned, Alexander seconded, to authorize the Chair to sign the memo to the township. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the members present.
- **Master Plan Review:** Doernenburg noted that the changes to the Master Plan had been emailed. These included date changes in the implementation table, changes to the zoning plan that added R-2B as being compatible with mixed use and business zoning, added wineries and vineyards, and a section on invasive species. Doernenburg stated that she is going to look into changing the wording in the section regarding dairy farms acknowledging that they are very limited in the county. Eby has informed her that there are only three farms now and two may be getting out of the business soon. The full Master Plan will be compiled for the next meeting.
- **Zoning Ordinance, Internet Tower Discussion:** In order to allow further review and potentially to have representatives from the northern townships come to a meeting, this discussion was postponed.
- **Enforcement Report:** Distributed with some limited discussion.
- **Resolution of appreciation for Paul Desy:** Alexander motioned, Neal seconded, to authorize the Chair to sign the resolution and certificate of appreciation for Paul Desy. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the members present.
- **Zoning Ordinance:** A hard copy of the draft ordinance was distributed to the members present. There was no discussion at this meeting.

VI Adjournment

There being no other business, and no additional public comment, Eby called the meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m. The next meeting will be held on August 7, 2014 at the Emmet County Courthouse Commissioner's boardroom at 7:30 PM.