

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
JANUARY 27, 2026

Chair Kingsley called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Kirsten Kingsley, Chair
John Fitzgerald
Jonathan Kubow
Ted Eckhardt

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: Kevin Purdom, JRC Design Build for *1161 N. Hickory Ave.*
John Haran, E&J Builders for *1321 N. Mitchell Ave.*
Charley Schalliol, Site Enhancement Services for *Popeye's*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 16, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 16, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC#25-101 – 1161 N. Hickory Ave.**

Kevin Purdom, representing *JRC Design Build*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a second story addition to an existing single-story home. An existing two-car detached garage will be replaced with a new detached two-car garage in the same location. This project requires review by the Zoning Board of Appeals for encroachment into the required side yard setback. Otherwise, the plans comply with the rest of the R-3 single-family zoning requirements. This project is appearing before the Design Commission due to the proposed full second floor addition on a block where the context is predominantly single-story or one-and-a-half story homes.

Overall, the design of the proposed second floor addition is simple and straight forward. However, considering the surrounding context of smaller-scale single-story homes, the following revisions are recommended to reduce the visual height of the proposed expanded house:

1. A recommendation to reduce the roof pitch of the front gables (similar to the rear elevation) to better fit with the scale of the adjacent homes.
2. A recommendation to hip the sides of the main roof to reduce the overall height of the side walls to better fit with the scale of the adjacent homes.
3. A recommendation to omit the top section of the two-story bay window (above the second story window) which seems unnecessary and adds visual height to the house.
4. Color Scheme. The proposed black & white color scheme will have a bold appearance in this location. An earth tone color scheme is recommended to better fit with the surrounding context which will soften the appearance.
5. North Elevation. A recommendation to add some windows to the new second story to break up the blank wall.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition, with the recommendations given.

Kevin Purdom said this is currently a spec home, but they are working with 2 potential clients that have certain things that they like. They want the verticality of the bump-out to go the full two-stories, but they are not opposed to omitting the top section of the bump-out above the second-story windows. They are open to the suggestion to lower the gable slope and to hip the sides of the main roof, but the two clients they are working with do not want to change the color of the home to earthtone. Two additional windows will also be added in Bedroom 1 on the north elevation on either side of the bed.

Chair Kingsley asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was response from the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Vivian Menzies, 212 W. Fremont Ave. She liked the design being proposed, but felt bad for the neighbors that this is a spec home. She liked the steep roof pitches but questioned if it is fair to do this to the neighbors with their much more modest smaller homes. She appreciated the detached garage.

Keith Moens agreed with the previous resident and said that this is essentially a teardown. Putting an addition on a starter home like this is the same as tearing it down and putting up a mega mansion in a neighborhood that just does not fit. He asked the commissioners to

seriously lean on recommendations 1, 2 & 3 in the Staff report, to bring the scale down to fit somehow, and make the home more affordable for median income buyers.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said it is a nice looking home and Staff's recommendations 1, 2 & 3 will really help the home fit into the neighborhood. He said the colors do not fit in and he recommended the color scheme be changed to better fit the neighborhood. He agreed with adding two windows on the north elevation, and he asked about the color of the front columns, which **Mr. Purdom** said will be all white. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed with all white columns, and said this is a recommendation from him.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked for clarification between the rendering and drawing with regards to the fenestration of the front element; one shows a diagonal element and the other shows vertical boards. **Mr. Purdom** clarified that only one section will be the diagonal element, and the white portion will be white board and batten siding. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt that the diagonal detail looks dated and he preferred something more contemporary. He was okay with the black and white color scheme being proposed, and he liked the tall elements on the home and said that steep roofs are more authentic. He liked the home and had no further comments.

Commissioner Kubow arrived at the meeting and did not comment on the project.

Chair Kingsley said it is a nicely designed home and she liked that the existing home is being saved and re-used. She agreed with Staff's recommendations to bring down the edges of the home to minimize the impact on the immediate neighbors, by clipping some of the ceilings or lowering the second-floor eave height. She also agreed with the suggestion to change the color scheme, and she suggested cream and dark bronze, which better respects the neighborhood than the black and white being proposed. She further agreed that the center portion bay should be reduced in height, and that the diagonal board material be reconsidered; there are a lot of different materials currently being proposed on the home.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 1161 N. HICKORY AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 1/12/26, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT TO REDUCE THE ROOF PITCH OF THE FRONT GABLES TO BETTER FIT WITH THE SCALE OF THE ADJACENT HOMES.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO HIP THE SIDES OF THE MAIN ROOF TO REDUCE THE OVERALL HEIGHT OF THE SIDE WALLS TO BETTER FIT WITH THE SCALE OF THE ADJACENT HOMES.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO OMIT THE TOP SECTION OF THE TWO-STORY BAY WINDOW (ABOVE THE SECOND-STORY WINDOW) TO MINIMIZE THE VISUAL HEIGHT OF THE HOME.
4. A REQUIREMENT TO ADD 2 WINDOWS ON THE NORTH ELEVATION, AS STATED BY THE PETITIONER TONIGHT.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE 2 COLUMNS ON THE FRONT PORCH BE ALL WHITE.
6. A RECOMMENDATION FOR THE TRIM IN THE BAY WINDOWS TO MATCH THE DRAWINGS INSTEAD OF AS SHOWN IN THE RENDERING.
7. A RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE THE COLOR SCHEME TO BE OFF-WHITE/CREAM WITH DARK BRONZE WINDOWS.

8. A RECOMMENDATION TO LOWER THE BASE OF THE COLUMNS ON THE FRONT PORCH.
9. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.
10. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

ECKHARDT, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KUBOW, ABSTAIN; KINGSLEY, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC#25-103 – 1321 N. Mitchell Ave.**

John Haran, representing *E&J Builders*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story home and detached garage to build a new two-story home with an attached two-car garage. This project complies with the R-3 zoning requirements. The subject property is located on a street with a mix of single-story, split-level, and two-story houses. The existing homes have a mix of both attached and detached garages. The existing homes on the block are all relatively aligned with an approximate 25-foot front setback. The proposed new house is shown with a 29-foot front setback. It is recommended that the front setback be changed to 25-feet to align with the other homes on the block. Additionally, there is an existing parkway tree that is required to be protected and preserved. The parkway tree needs to be shown on the Site Plan and coordinated with the new driveway to maintain a minimum 8-feet of clearance.

Overall, the proposed design looks nice, but the Design Commission should evaluate the scale and character against the surrounding context. Ideally, a different roof design without the steep gables and a hipped main roof would fit better with the adjacent homes. **Mr. Hautzinger** presented a schematic sketch prepared by Staff to show how the proposed design could look with a lower pitched hipped roof. Also, the proposed exterior color scheme should be evaluated which includes a light “Cobblestone” siding paired with black trim that has a relatively bold appearance. A darker siding color, such as tan or brown, should be considered to tone down the contrast with the black trim.

Similar versions of this design have been previously reviewed by the Design Commission, at which time the style of the garage door was required to be changed to better fit with the architectural style of the house. A chevron style garage door is recommended to coordinate with the chevron pattern in the bay windows.

Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the proposed design and consider the comments and suggestions from Staff.

John Haran said he has a client interested in buying this new home, based on a similar home that he built in a different neighborhood. Although he likes the colors and the brick on the new home, he is open to changing the colors and changing the garage door, as well as moving the home forward as suggested by Staff. He preferred to keep the gables as proposed, which are similar to a home across the street.

Chair Kingsley asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from those in the audience.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said it is a nice home and he liked the twin gables on the front elevation, which are steep, and he felt the tallness of the home goes with the style of home. He did not care for the revised design suggested by Staff showing the clipped gables.

Commissioner Kubow said the new home is beautiful and well done architecturally, but the verticality of the home and the material palette are severe for this location, and the home will stick out compared to the surrounding homes. He agreed with the recommendations from Staff, and said that there has to be some big changes made to make the new home fit in with the context of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Fitzgerald liked the colors and design of the new home, and he appreciated that the home is well designed on all four sides. He agreed that the garage door style does not go with the home, and he liked Staff's suggested revision for the roof design, which gives it more of a modern or horizontal look to the home. He liked that the revised roof design looks unique but not strange, and it looks more custom. He was in favor of Staff's suggestion. However, with the revised roof design, he felt the garage doors and the front door could remain as proposed.

Chair Kingsley said this is a large home that is nicely designed, but it does not take into consideration the adjacent homes on either side. The first-floor ceiling height is 10-feet, which increases the eave height above the garage, and the second-floor ceiling height goes up to 11-feet in the bedrooms with tray ceilings. These ceiling heights affect the neighbors, and the heights in general should be lowered, and the eaves brought down to look more contextual with the surrounding homes. She liked the horizontal style of the front door, she loved the brick selection, which goes well with the neighborhood, and that cobblestone siding is being used instead of something stark white. However, she felt the black color was just too much. There are black eaves, black soffits, black gable tips, a metal roof, and two vertical elements; the home is almost all black and it will be a different home in this community. She suggested going a little farther with some of Staff's recommendations, and remove some bulk out of the home as well.

Commissioner Eckhardt reviewed the context of home styles on this street and said the neighborhood is changing, and he saw no problem with the two-story home being proposed here. While he supports the idea of Staff's suggested roof design, he questioned some of the details and whether it keeps the integral elements of the original tall design. Even if the homes on either side were similar to the other surrounding homes, the new home is still big. He agreed that the style of garage doors should be changed, but the front door is okay as shown. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked the petitioner how he felt about clipping the roof.

Mr. Haran said he preferred not to clip the roof; however, he was okay with reducing the pitch of the gables and doing a short clip on the sides. He really likes the new home as proposed and felt that it works well here. There are bigger homes on this street, and a newer large home across the street with gables. This area is in transition, and he built 3 new homes nearby. He was okay with changing the garage doors and the exterior colors.

Chair Kingsley said a two-story home in this location is a bit easier for her because there is a split-level home next to it, and the surrounding homes consist of split-level, second-story additions, and a new large home. However, she felt this new home is bigger and a little glaring next to the surrounding homes. She reiterated that she liked the brick, but the color scheme should be more earthtone.

Commissioner Kubow said he could support a motion that includes a requirement to revise the roof design to be more respectable to the neighbors, and that Staff review the changes or bring the revisions back to the commissioners; and a requirement to evaluate the proposed color scheme, also to be reviewed by Staff or brought back to the commissioners for another review.

Commissioner Eckhardt said the petitioner previously offered to change the gable pitches but still likes the gable ends. He agreed with the petitioner about the gable ends and said they are beautiful elements of the home. This is a classic home and he was unsure if squashing the roof down would take away the turn-of-the century charm of the current proposed design. He felt there were a lot of elements of the design that need to be evaluated,

and he questioned if the project should come back to the commissioners instead of the petitioner working with Staff. **Mr. Hautzinger** welcomed the opportunity to work with the petitioner and his Architect to address the concerns raised tonight. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said he was okay with allowing Staff to review any changes, and **Chair Kingsley** agreed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 1321 N. MITCHELL AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 12/19/25, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER WORK WITH STAFF TO CHANGE THE ROOF DESIGN TO BE MORE IN CONTEXT WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD.**
- 2. A REQUIREMENT TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSED COLOR SCHEME TO BE MORE IN CONTEXT WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD.**
- 3. A RECOMMENDATION TO LOOK AT THE FLOOR-TO-FLOOR HEIGHT AND THE GARAGE HEIGHT, TO HELP REDUCE THE SCALE OF THE HOME.**
- 4. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.**

**KUBOW, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

ITEM 3. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC#25-091 – Popeye’s – 7 W. Dundee Rd.**

Charley Schallioli, representing *Site Enhancement Services*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The existing Popeye’s restaurant located at 7 W. Dundee Road is proposing to replace their existing conventional printed drive-through menu boards with new fully electronic menu boards along their existing drive-through lane. There are two existing identical menu boards which are each 52.66 sf. The proposed new electronic menu boards will be installed in the same location as existing. The proposed electronic pre-sell menu board will be 7.64 sf, and the main electronic menu board will be 22.61 sf. One existing speaker bollard will remain.

The sign variation requests are as follows:

1. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-208.b, to allow a 22.61 sf fully digital drive-through menu board, where fully electronic menu board signage is not allowed.
2. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-208.c, to allow a 7.64 sf fully digital drive-through pre-sell menu board, where fully electronic pre-sell menu board signage is not allowed.

The petitioner has submitted a letter addressing the sign variation criteria, which in summary outlines the need for fully electronic menu boards for efficiency, safety, order accuracy, and to improve communication with their customers. They feel that the electronic menu boards will be easier to read, and they are becoming the new industry standard.

Overall, Staff does not object to the use of fully electronic menu boards since they allow for easier menu updates and they are generally smaller than conventional menu boards. Similar fully electronic menu board sign variations have been previously approved in Arlington Heights for McDonald’s, Burger King, and Dunkin’.

The electronic menu boards are required to comply with the operational standards set forth in Chapter 30, Section 30-705(h), which states that the electronic signs will display static images only (without scrolling, fading, flashing, animation, video, or sound), auto-dimming photocell technology to control brightness to .3 footcandles maximum above ambient lighting conditions, no off-premises advertising, and only permitted to be illuminated during the hours that the business is open. The petitioner has provided manufacturer documentation confirming auto-dimming functionality to control the brightness, and they have stated that there will be no animation or motion on the displays.

Staff recommends approval to the Village Board for the sign variation requests for *Popeye’s* at 7 W. Dundee Road, with a condition that the use of the electronic displays shall comply with all operational standards for electronic signs as set forth in Chapter 30, Section 30-705.h, which includes static displays only (no scrolling, fading, flashing, animation, video, or sound), auto-dimming photocell technology to control brightness to .3 footcandles maximum above ambient lighting conditions, no off-premises advertising, and only permitted to be illuminated during the hours that the business is open.

The petitioner had no comments at this time.

The commissioners were all in support of the sign variation requests and had no comments.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATIONS FOR *POPEYE'S* LOCATED AT 7 W. DUNDEE ROAD:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-208.B, TO ALLOW A 22.61 SF FULLY DIGITAL DRIVE-THROUGH MENU BOARD, WHERE FULLY ELECTRONIC MENU BOARD SIGNAGE IS NOT ALLOWED.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-208.C, TO ALLOW A 7.64 SF FULLY DIGITAL DRIVE-THROUGH PRE-SELL MENU BOARD, WHERE FULLY ELECTRONIC PRE-SELL MENU BOARD SIGNAGE IS NOT ALLOWED.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE SITE PLAN, ELECTRONIC MENU BOARD DRAWINGS AND MANUFACTURER SPECIFICATIONS RECEIVED ON 11/11/25, FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. USE OF THE ELECTRONIC DISPLAYS SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL OPERATIONAL STANDARDS FOR ELECTRONIC SIGNS AS SET FORTH IN CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-705.H, WHICH INCLUDES STATIC DISPLAYS ONLY (NO SCROLLING, FADING, FLASHING, ANIMATION, VIDEO, OR SOUND), AUTO-DIMMING PHOTOCCELL TECHNOLOGY TO CONTROL BRIGHTNESS TO .3 FOOTCANDLES MAXIMUM ABOVE AMBIENT LIGHTING CONDITIONS, NO OFF-PREMISES ADVERTISING, AND ONLY PERMITTED TO BE ILLUMINATED DURING THE HOURS THAT THE BUSINESS IS OPEN.
2. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

KUBOW, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Hautzinger said he will contact the petitioner with the Village Board date for final review and approval of the sign variations.

ITEM 4. OTHER BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. Hautzinger reported that he and Chair Kingsley recently discussed the matter of reviewing and possibly updating the Design Guidelines. As a result of that conversation, he wanted to take this opportunity for a quick refresh of the Design Commission's Powers, Duties and Responsibilities as outlined in Section 6-501 of the Municipal Code, of which he provided a brief overview noting all of the references to the Design Guidelines and that it does state to periodically review and update the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Hautzinger also clarified that there are two sets of Design Guidelines, Single-Family and Commercial, and he provided a brief overview of both documents. He acknowledged that the graphics of the Commercial Design Guidelines look dated, but he noted that the content is quite good and comprehensive. He acknowledged that they could benefit from a graphic update with more current photos and examples.

In regards to timing, **Mr. Hautzinger** reported that the Downtown Master Plan, which outlines the goals of development in the Downtown, is being updated this year. Additionally, the Historic Preservation Task Force is another study beginning this year. Both of these items are Strategic Priorities of the Village Board, and since the outcome of these studies may impact the Design Guidelines, the Planning Department is recommending holding off on updating the Design Guidelines until these studies are completed to allow a thoughtful update of the Design Guidelines.

The Design Commissioners appreciated the overview and update.

Public Comment

There was none.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:00 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.