

Development Review Board – Panel B  
Minutes–May 22, 2017 6:30 PM

---

---

**I. Call to Order**

**Chair Shawn O’Neil** called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**II. Chair’s Remarks**

The Conduct of Hearing and Statement of Public Notice were read into the record.

**III. Roll Call**

Present for roll call were: Shawn O’Neil, Richard Martens, Aaron Woods, Samy Nada and Samuel Scull.

Staff present: Jennifer Scola, Daniel Pauly, and Barbara Jacobson

**IV. Citizens’ Input** This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board (DRB) on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

**V. Consent Agenda:**

- A. Approval of minutes of February 27, 2017 meeting

**Shawn O’Neil moved to approve the February 27, 2017 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**VI. Public Hearing:**

- A. **Resolution No. 335. Wilsonville High School Electronic Readerboard: West Linn-Wilsonville School District– Applicant/Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver for conversion of an existing freestanding sign to a digital sign at Wilsonville High School. The subject property is located at 6700 SW Wilsonville Road and is legally described as Tax Lot 100 of Section 13, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Jennifer Scola

Case Files: DB17-0012 Class 3 Sign Permit with waiver

**Chair O’Neil** called the public hearing to order at 6:34 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Dan Pauly, Senior Planner,** reminded the Board about content neutrality. The DRB could not consider who the applicant was or what the sign might say in terms of the review and that needed to be very clear in the record.

**Jennifer Scola, Associate Planner,** announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on Pages 1 and 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Ms. Scola** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the location and history of the high school's readerboard signs, with these key additional comments:

- The existing base for the school's readerboard signs was approved in 1999 under a prior sign review that was obtained on behalf of the first class to go through all four years of high school at Wilsonville High.
  - The first freestanding sign was a 14-ft tall, manual-change readerboard sign that was internally illuminated. Its base was located approximately 10 ft from the property line, which met the City's requirements of a minimum of 2-ft from the hard surface of the right-of-way and no further than 15-ft from the property line. The sign's base was located in the buffer area to the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ), but the original permit deemed the encroachment to be minor and the sign had not been moved since. Its immediate surroundings remain relatively clear in relation to the SROZ itself.
  - A subsequent sign permit approved in 2011 resulted in the sign currently onsite, which provided for an updated manual-change readerboard. The current sign was shorter, 8-ft high, and was a 32-sq ft, the maximum allowed for a sign of this type in this zone.
- The proposed sign would maintain the 32-sq ft area and decreased marginally to 7.5 ft high. The main difference would be that the new sign was an electronic readerboard as opposed to an internally-lit, manually-change sign. She displayed side-by-side photos to compare and contrast the existing and proposed signs.
- The key discussion point was whether the waiver criteria were necessary for the electronic change aspect of the sign. The two types of signs that dealt with such moving or flashing changes were changing image signs and changing copy signs.
  - Changing image signs were outright prohibited by Code, but changing copy signs were allowed as long as they were approved specifically through the waiver process in conjunction with a Class 3 Sign Permit, which the Board was reviewing this evening.
  - The distinction between the signs was also the impetus for Condition of Approval PD 4, which effectively insured the readerboard would maintain its status as a changeable copy sign throughout its life, essentially placing a 15-minute hold time on the copy.
  - Any electronic readerboard sign approved through a waiver must meet two criteria in particular. First, the sign must be equipped with an automatic dimming technology to adjust the sign's brightness to the ambient light conditions. The proposed sign model, designed by Daktronics, did come equipped with a photocell that would adjust the sign to the ambient light conditions; therefore, the sign met the requirement.
    - The second criteria regarded luminance levels. Specifically, the sign could not exceed 5,000 candelas per square meter from sunrise and sunset and 500 candelas per

square meter between sunset and sunrise. According to the manufacturer's specs, this particular sign could not exceed 4,000 nits, the equivalent of one candela per square meter; therefore there would not be an issue with sign exceeding the 5,000 cap between sunrise and sunset.

- For sunset to sunrise, Staff proposed Condition PD 5 to ensure that the Applicant would maintain that 500 candelas per square meter cap at night to avoid any nuisance to surrounding properties.

**Samy Nada** asked what the difference was between a copy sign and an image sign.

**Ms. Scola** responded the difference had to do with hold times. A changing image sign would change text or images within a 15-minute window. A changing copy sign would keep the same image or text on the screen for a minimum of 15 minutes, which eliminated the constant flashing or scrolling of text.

**Richard Martens** asked if the approval of the waiver would create a precedent that could potentially be troublesome in other situations.

**Ms. Scola** did not believe it would create a problematic precedent, as any other electronic readerboard sign would have to go through the same review process and demonstrate that it met the minimum requirements. The electronic readerboard sign would be the first of its kind in Wilsonville, but any subsequent such signs would have to meet the same criteria and go through the same review process.

**Mr. Nada** asked if why it was called a prohibited sign.

**Ms. Scola** replied that essentially the Prohibited Sign Designation was made to avoid the quick change type of electronic readerboards often seen along major highways or freeways that were really attention grabbing and had a high brightness levels that were pretty distracting. Such signs were prohibited unless they had a hold time to help mitigate the almost aggravating brightness, especially in a residential area.

**Aaron Woods** asked how and from where the data was put on the sign.

**Ms. Scola** responded that could be done remotely. She believed the proposed type/model of sign could be accessed via phone or computer to adjust settings and program different sign messages.

**Mr. Woods** confirmed that a hacker could potentially access the sign and put up something that was not very nice.

**Mr. Martens** stated he had the same concern and wondered how soon it would be before somebody accessed the sign and posted something untoward about the principal.

**Mr. Pauly** reminded the Board was content neutral.

**Chair O'Neil** noted the Board was supposed to look at the application in a content neutral manner. The applicant could be a law firm, Black Bear, AT&T, or anybody. The Board was to consider the sign and what it would do. However, he too was concerned about the next steps because the Board had run into situations when things had been presented, but they had already gone down a road and could not go back. He believed the community might have concerns down the road if some other applicant, whom the Board had to be neutral about, wanted a sign that was a bit different. He posited that no community members were present because they were aware of who the applicant was, even though the Board had to be neutral. If the applicant was someone else, like O'Neil Law, LLC, for example, there would be thousands of people voicing concern because of who the applicant was. Then later, after establishing this precedent, the Board would have to say there was nothing it could do because the Board had already given the green light to so-and-so. He was worried it would be abused, although he did not believe the current applicant would do so. He believed he had a responsibility as a citizen to establish precedent wisely. He asked if Staff could respond to his concerns.

**Mr. Pauly** replied he had helped write the Sign Code many years ago. He noted that this type of application had been anticipated, and he was surprised it had taken this long to come forward. There were specific rules and the Board needed to be aware of the waiver criteria, one of which was the Board had to be content neutral. However, there was a burden on the applicant to show that it would improve both function and aesthetics. He invited Ms. Scola to discuss how the Applicant addressed the functionality and aesthetics of the proposed sign, which were key criteria.

**Ms. Scola** added that in terms of functionality and aesthetics, it seemed the main purpose for this application was student equity. Aesthetically, the proposed sign would be easier to clean than the plastic on the front of the current sign or any other type of manual-changer readerboard sign, which tended to become yellow-tinged over the years due to sunlight and the elements. The new sign would also eliminate the need for students or faculty to have to get on a ladder, regardless of the elements, to change the sign.

**Mr. Nada** said the same reasoning could be used by anyone who wanted to change their sign. He asked if it was okay, why was it not part of the Code.

**Mr. Pauly** replied because the Council at the time wanted to make sure there was an added level of review when these sign applications came forward, not because Council never wanted such signs necessarily.

**Mr. Martens** understood that this kind of electronic sign anywhere in the city would require a waiver at this point.

**Mr. Pauly** replied the only exception was the specific Code provision that allowed fuel price signs to be digital. Content was part of State law, which included what gas stations had to display.

**Barbara Jacobson** agreed the issue was that the proposed sign was the first of its kind and it did need to be content neutral. Everything else being equal, regardless of who the applicant was or the content, the requested waiver did open up that door. The Code language already effectively allowed for a waiver on this particular type of sign, but the DRB could decide that.

**Chair O'Neil** asked if the Board approves the proposed waiver and someone came in at a later date, asking the same thing with the same explanation as to why they needed it, and the DRB at that time denied the application, could that future applicant not cite tonight's original decision as precedent that it had been done for one applicant and as such trigger potential litigation.

**Ms. Jacobson** confirmed it could trigger potential litigation, and it would be incumbent upon that future DRB to explain why they denied it in their findings or decision; however, the reason could not have anything to do with content or the applicant.

**Samuel Scull** asked in the guidelines that were a function of the waiver, if someone in the future were to come in under the same premise, would the DRB determine whether the brightness, content, size, or height would be okay.

**Ms. Jacobson** clarified not the content, but brightness, size, and structure.

**Mr. Scull** asked if the 5,000 to 500 candelas would be controlled by a manual switch or automatically adjusted based on the amount of natural light.

**Ms. Scola** replied the calibration to the ambient lighting would be done by an automatic sensor in the sign. Setting it to the specific level after sunset would have to be done manually.

**Mr. Scull** asked who had control of the content.

**Ms. Scola** believed the school itself would have control over the content.

**Chair O'Neil** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Dan Schumaker, Principal, Wilsonville High School** introduced Kristin Rott, who had done most of the work on the proposal, and Eric Moya, who had a lot of contact throughout the application process.

**Kristin Rott, Leadership Class Teacher, Wilsonville High School**, stated that she and Eric Moya represented the 4As at Wilsonville High School. Nearly every day, or at least once per week, the Leadership Class would go out and change the letters on the manual display to support one of the four events at the school. Because it was manual display, the number of

events that could actual be represented was very limited, so there was a constant dialogue to decide what events could actually be displayed on each side of the readerboard. Equity amongst all school programs had led them to want an electronic readerboard, which could display up to 16 different panels so everyone's voice was on the board and represented. As a Leadership teacher, she would be responsible for content oversight. The main office would also have control and students would need approval to update the sign regularly.

**Eric Moya, Senior Student, Wilsonville High School**, added an electronic readerboard would be especially helpful in the winter when it rained. Currently, students had to go out in inclement weather, and next to thorn bushes, to manually change all the letters. It was a bit unsafe; however, they still managed to do it weekly. He reiterated that the class had to choose from many activities, including football, basketball, and academic events, and decide which events would go on the readerboard. The school would love to have a whole bunch of activities on the board so everybody in Wilsonville knew what was happening at the school on a daily basis. The school was very active and wanted people to come help support its events because it meant a lot to the football players and other students. He believed it would be a great addition to the school.

**Mr. Schumaker** noted the high school was unique as an applicant, relative to a car dealership or an attorney, due to how much of the community the school reached and represented, including several different subgroups within the school, which was why it was very common in rural and urban areas to find electronic readerboard signs at schools.

**Chair O'Neil** thanked the Applicants for their excellent testimony. He wanted to look at the content of the sign but was instructed that he could not, which meant that before he made a decision, he wanted to hear what the Applicant needed this particular sign for that would be unique to the school so if another applicant asked for the same waiver in the future, he could tell that applicant why this waiver was approved for the school. In his opinion, every reason stated thus far for needing the new sign would be the same reasons given by any future applicants seeking the same waiver. If the Applicant could say that they had very complicated computations or something complex that goes into the sign that would be far more calculated in need than a grocery store or other entity that might want an electronic readerboard sign, he could hang his hat on that. He was looking for the Applicant to show him that their need was a unique need that would trigger the waiver.

**Mr. Schumaker** added that as a school, Wilsonville High School was typically the place where people would go in the event of a disaster. They constantly practiced scenarios and were told by the sheriff's office and City of Wilsonville Police that in an event, people might be told to go there. Some of the school's need to put information on the sign was different in nature than one would find in retail.

**Chair O'Neil** asked if the school was a designated spot for people to seek shelter during a cataclysmic event.

**Mr. Schumaker** replied it was like that, though he did not believe the language specifically used the word shelter, instead he believed it was considered a designated place where people would be asked to go due to a combination of location and familiarity. The language would have to be double-checked to see exactly what was stated. However, similarly, the school did a lot of training at the school monthly, as well as more often than every month. They had a required earthquake drill just that morning. In the event of disasters, it would be pretty hard to get out to a readerboard and put something up. The school needed to notify the community as to whether people were on or off the property.

**Mr. Nada** asked if the board would work without power.

**Ms. Rott** responded it was underground, so there should be no issues with power. She also understood the sign was wireless connected, but she was uncertain about those details.

**Chair O'Neil** asked if there was backup power.

**Mr. Schumaker** responded he was not sure there was backup power. Wilsonville High School had a generator, as did all schools in Wilsonville. However, he was unsure if the generator that would power the lights in the building would go to the sign.

**Mr. Nada** asked if the Code had any restrictions on font size. He had seen signs with very tiny font which caused people to slow down to read it. He noted that with LED, about any font size could be used.

**Mr. Pauly** replied there was no restriction in the Code, but he would encourage that the sign be readable. Mr. Nada made a good point. The Board had often talked about font size on highway signs and highway safety. Even when discussing how large to make signs, the maximum allowance, one of the considerations talked about was would the sign be big enough that the text would legible, which increased safety.

**Mr. Woods** asked how many characters and lines could be put on the proposed sign.

**Ms. Rott** replied three different lines could be filled and the 16 different panels could be changed every 15 minutes. The font was much larger on the electronic readerboard than on the manual display board. The proposed sign would hold 13 letters on each of the three lines.

**Ms. Scola** confirmed that the specs on the application also stated it was 13 characters.

**Chair O'Neil** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application. Seeing none, he confirmed there were no further questions from the Board and closed the public hearing at 7:03 pm.

**Richard Martens moved to approve Resolution No. 335 and the Staff report as presented.**  
**Aaron Woods seconded the motion.**

**Chair O'Neil** stated he had already discussed his opinion, and he did not expect this until Mr. Pauly instructed and reminded him that the Board had to be applicant neutral. He had a problem with the current application right now. He wanted to see some information that would make the current application unique from any future applicant. For example, if the school was a designated disaster area, it would be good to know if the sign was capable of sending warning notices out. He was looking for some other uniqueness the sign would offer the community versus another applicant. As a member of the Board, he believed he had an obligation to consider the citizens that did not bother coming this evening to speak because they had looked at the proposal from a more narrow perspective, who the applicant was, and everyone supported the schools. Yet he was charged, as all Board members were, to consider the precedent nature of the application.

**Mr. Martens** stated he had raised the question about precedent, and as the Board had discussed the application and as he thought about it, he had a hard time envisioning a circumstance where the Board might wish it could decline a similar application. If a sign was otherwise permitted, and the sign met the size criteria, etc., the fact that the content of the sign changes from time to time might be a public benefit. For example, if Safeway wanted display that bananas were on sale, which might not be as important as directing citizens to a disaster location, but it was important to those wanting cheap bananas. If Blackberries wanted to announce that biscuits and gravy were on the menu, some people might want to know that. If an entity could otherwise have a sign and put content on it, the fact that it was fixed or changed from time to time, to him, would be immaterial.

**Mr. O'Neil** asked about the potential of having an electronic sign in Villebois or Frog Pond at some point.

**Mr. Pauly** replied there were schools in both locations.

**Mr. O'Neil** stated he would not have an issue if it was the Black Bear or a local food store. Even though the Board had to be applicant neutral, he could see Mr. Martens' point because they would generally be in an area that would not be an issue. He was looking at precedent and concerned that residents with specific concerns might come in later to ask why all these signs were up, and the Board would have to apologize and say a precedent had already been established.

**Mr. Nada** agreed, stating it would set a precedent and make it hard to refuse others with a similar request. The Board should be content and applicant neutral, but he believed it should be part of the Code without a waiver, because as it was currently, he would have no reason to say no, other than due to the location perhaps, since he would not know what the content was.

**Mr. Pauly** responded the Board could regulate time, place, and manner.



**Mr. Nada** noted location could be controlled by Code, too. For example, the signs could be permitted in certain zones only. He reiterated his concern that it would be difficult to refuse future application requests for similar signs.

**Mr. Martens** stated the 32 sq ft was the maximum size of a sign and it could only be placed in certain designated areas. If the sign was there, and permitted to be there, the fact that it provided more information was positive, not negative.

**Mr. Woods** commented he could see both sides. He understood it was not part of the Code, per the City's decision some time ago, but maybe it was time to reconsider that. He agreed if the Board would be setting a precedent it approved the subject sign application. He questioned whether setting a precedent was that bad, adding that was something the Board would have to weigh out. There would not be signs everywhere, and the size was pretty good. The only concern he had was the setting of the precedent, and the fact that it was not in the Code. He believed, however, that in the spirit of what the Applicant wanted to do, the benefit outweighed any negative that could come from the Board approving the request.

**Mr. Nada** asked whether the current manual sign had required a waiver.

**Mr. Pauly** replied it does.

**Mr. Nada** responded that the only issue appeared to be that it was electronic.

**Mr. Martens** said in other words, the school could send someone out every 15 minutes to change the current sign, which was exactly what the proposal was requesting.

**Mr. Nada** asked if the Wilsonville's Code was a common code that other cities adopted. Were there any risks of having something like this or did the current Code need a waiver.

**Mr. Pauly** responded he was not aware of another city that required a 15-minute hold time; that was relatively unique. The idea regarding the brightness was to keep it similar to what would otherwise be seen in a backlit sign.

**Mr. Nada** asked what the reasoning was for adding the waiver requirement to the Code.

**Mr. Pauly** responded at the time, lighting and sign technology was changing quickly and City Council did not know what they would be faced with in the future. Also, the City puts a high value on public involvement and, knowing that those signs could potentially be something of great public interest, provided that venue for a thorough public discussion of the benefits in terms of function and aesthetics over nuisance concerns. The waiver criteria pitted the benefits of function and aesthetics against any potential nuisances.

**Mr. Martens** commented a few years ago a huge electronic billboard sign was placed on Hwy 26, before Hillsboro that was blazing and changing at night. He could understand that a sign

like that would be very distracting; however, that was not what the Board was dealing with here. He liked that the condition imposed a limit on the brightness and that City Code imposed a limit on sign size.

**Mr. Scull** said the question was if the Board was setting precedent on the size, function, and content, were they stepping out of bounds or setting a good lower-limit precedent. Did the benefit outweigh the argument?

**Chair O'Neil** believed that was a good point, but asked if Staff had specifically advertised on the invitation that this was a precedent-making decision, or was just the standard little sign used to inform the public of an upcoming hearing about the sign? As an adjudicated body, the fundamental problem was making sure everybody had a right to be heard. If the City was not providing enough information to know how important the decision was, and the public believed the Board was simply approving a sign for the high school, then he had a concern. If it was another business, he could see the public lining up, but if it was a school, and the Board was supposed to be applicant-neutral, he could understand no one came tonight.

**Mr. Pauly** added that by nature, the regulation of signs was complaint driven with the public calling for Code enforcement if they did not like the message of a lawn sign, for example, which was something Staff had to juggle as well. He understood this was a bit different than a lawn sign, but point was that it was hard to separate the content from the sign, but that was what the law required and it was always going to be a tricky situation. He offered to read the title of the public notice, which did not talk about precedence, but did make clear there was a waiver, a conversion to a digital sign, and a minimum hold time. He believed the City had made its best effort to provide accurate information about what was before the body.

**Mr. Martens** understood that if the Board approved this waiver, it certainly would not prevent City Council from adopting far stricter standards into the Code at a subsequent time.

**Chair O'Neil** responded that until that happened, it was the DRB's obligation to enforce what it had, and he understood some Board members disagreed. He also did not like the fact that the particular applicant, which he had to be neutral on, was the applicant that was presented tonight, but he believed the Board had an obligation, as citizens were not properly represented, because, in his opinion, the notice was not properly presented to the community to identify what type of sign was being introduced for the first time to the community. With no disrespect to the Staff, he understood their reasoning, but he did not think it was sufficient.

**Mr. Nada** asked if the Board could condition that the City change the Code as part of tonight's decision.

**Ms. Jacobson** responded the Board could make a recommendation to Staff that Council consider revising the Code, but the Board could not make it a condition that the Code be changed; that would have to be voted on by the City Council.

**Mr. Pauly** added that when this came up in the Code review process, electronic readerboard signs were already in this Code section, so it was not changed, but it functioned much the same as if it were in another Code section.

**Mr. Nada** believed it was a good change; there was no need for an applicant to go through that process. He added that perhaps it was not in the Code because it was new at the time.

**Mr. Pauly** agreed, noting that digital signage technology was still changing.

**The motion passed 4 to 1 with Shawn O'Neil opposed**

**Chair O'Neil** read the rules of appeal into the record.

#### **VII. Board Member Communications**

- A. Results of the March 13, 2017 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Recent City Council Action Minutes

**Dan Pauly, Senior Planner**, noted the materials distributed to the Board, adding that Mr. Heberlein was elected as DRB Panel B-A Chair. He invited feedback on whether the City Council action minutes were helpful to the Board and provided beneficial information.

**Mr. Woods** said he liked the format of the action minutes because the content was available to reference as opposed to just asking questions and potentially forgetting the responses.

#### **VIII. Staff Communications**

**Dan Pauly, Senior Planner**, updated the Board on some previously approved projects, noting that Black Bear was now open, houses would soon be constructed in the 14-lot subdivision, and construction of Advance Road near the new school was completed. He noted the school had approached Staff about having a readerboard sign similar to tonight's application. Also, the library had received grant funds to potentially install a similar sign as well. He noted the library was a cooling center for the public on hot days and could advertise that to the community on the sign.

**Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney** reminded it was not content neutral if the Board had to read the sign to decide if it was content neutral according to the latest Supreme Court case, so the Board could not even look at what it said. She clarified that the designation of the building structure being in a specific location no longer matter, citing a fairly new court case in Arizona.

**Mr. Martens** asked if there was a restriction or some line that could not be crossed as to content on any sign.

**Ms. Jacobson** replied that it used to be reasonable time, place, and manner; however, now it was a strict scrutiny test, so that no pornography would be allowed, for example. She agreed

Oregon and California had more liberal constitutions than the Federal constitution. Content could not be considered in the decision on whether to allow a sign; however, if a sign had content that fell under the category of clearly obscene, it could be taken down.

**Mr. Pauly** confirmed that the sign of a retail business could have content unrelated to what the business sold, for example, Black Bear's sign could advertise Safeway. Political content was also allowed. He agreed it would be hard to judge on content, because it could be changed.

**Mr. Nada** said it would mostly come down to the applicant from whom the Board could anticipate the purpose of the sign.

**Mr. Woods** noted that graphic characters, representations, holograms, etc. were available now. He explained he had asked about who would be controlling the sign's content because he was concerned that a high school student might play a prank and put something crazy on the sign.

**Chair O'Neil** reiterated that he was stubborn about wanting everyone to have the opportunity to attend these Board meetings. He understood the City had complied with the rules, but he was frustrated at the thought that maybe somebody would have attended the meeting had they realized it was less about whom the applicant was and more about the sign itself. He praised Staff, and especially the City Attorney for assisting in City Council unanimously passing a motion for inclusivity for the community. He believed it took a lot of bravery, and guts, and work. Since Ms. Jacobson did not brag about herself and was humble, he wanted to take the time to say she had done a lot of great work on behalf of the many citizens that had asked for it, and the City delivered.

**Mr. Nada** thanked Chair O'Neil for all of the time and effort he had put into it.

**Ms. Jacobson** noted that the citizens really made the difference, as there had been an overwhelming show of support. Also, she had been informed by the City's Public Affairs Official that Woodburn was crafting a resolution based on Wilsonville's, so it was great to be spreading that message.

**Chair O'Neil** stated that he was very proud of the community. In attending many City Council meetings over the years, the audience tended to be the same type of audience, but as the resolution had moved forward, the audience was more diverse and had more participants than he had seen before.

## **IX. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for  
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant