

**MESA COUNTY AND GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING
JANUARY 12, 2010 MINUTES
6:00 p.m. to 8:37 p.m.**

The Mesa County and Grand Junction Planning Commission Joint Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Grand Junction Chairman Pro-Tem Ebe Eslami. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Ebe Eslami (Chairman Pro-Tem), Reginald Wall, Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh, Patrick Carlow, Richard Schoenrad, Mark Abbott and Rob Burnett.

In attendance, representing the County Planning Commission, were John Justman (Chairman), Mark Bonella (Vice-Chairman), Christi Flynn, Sam Susuras, Joe Moreng, Pat Bittle and Phillip Jones.

In attendance, representing the City Public Works and Planning Department – Planning Division, were Lisa Cox (Planning Manager), Greg Moberg (Planning Services Supervisor), Brian Rusche (Senior Planner) and Dave Thornton (Principal Planner). Representing Mesa County was Keith Fife (Long Range Planning Division Director).

Also present was Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney).

Lynn Singer was present to record the minutes.

There were 42 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Chairman Pro-Tem Eslami announced that tonight's meeting was a joint meeting between the City of Grand Junction and the Mesa County Planning Commissions to consider taking action on the Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan. He explained that a presentation would be made by staff, followed by opportunity for the public to speak either in favor or in opposition to the plan, after which the public hearing would be closed for comment and the Planning Commissioners would proceed with their deliberation and decisions.

The Chairman further stated that there would be two separate votes whereby the City Planning Commission would vote to make a recommendation to the Grand Junction City Council regarding adoption of the Plan. The City Council is scheduled to hold a public hearing on the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan on February 17, 2010. The County Planning Commission would vote to approve the Plan as an amendment to the Mesa County Master Plan and adopt a resolution to adopt and certify the amendment to the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners. The County Planning Commission would not adopt a resolution during this meeting; however, a resolution would be

considered for approval by the Mesa County Planning Commission on February 25, 2010 after the Grand Junction City Council took final action on the Plan. After consideration of the Plan by both Planning Commissions, the joint business portion of the meeting would be concluded and the City Planning Commission would hold election of officers.

Consent Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Approve the minutes of the October 27 and December 8, 2009 Regular Meetings.

2. James Annexation – Zone of Annexation

Request a recommendation of approval to City Council to zone 1.29 acres from County B-2 to a City C-1 (Light Commercial) zone district.

FILE #: ANX-2009-241
PETITIONER: James Flynn – Fruitvale III, LLC
LOCATION: 514 30 Road
STAFF: Brian Rusche

MOTION: (Grand Junction Commissioner Abbott) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the Consent Agenda as stated.”

Grand Junction Commissioner Wall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

Public Hearing

3. Comprehensive Plan

The Mesa County Planning Commission will consider adoption of the Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan. The Grand Junction City Planning Commission will consider a recommendation for the adoption of the Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan to the Grand Junction City Council.

FILE #: 2009-0294-MP1 and PLN-2009-219
PETITIONER: Mesa County and City of Grand Junction
LOCATION: County and City wide
STAFF: Keith Fife, Mesa County and Dave Thornton, City of Grand Junction

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Dave Thornton, Principal Planner for the City of Grand Junction Public Works and Planning, made a PowerPoint presentation regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan. He distributed several handouts which included a list of changes or corrections which he indicated would be part of the record and the Plan document, a revised ordinance to be reviewed by City Council, and copies of recently received letters from

the public. Mr. Thornton stated that he along with Keith Fife, Mesa County Long Range Planning Division Director, would be making the presentation that evening.

Mr. Keith Fife, (Mesa County) Long Range Planning Division Director, stated that the City and County had jointly adopted the 1996 Growth Plan (City) and the Joint Urban Area Plan (Mesa County) as part of the County-wide Land Use Plan in 1996, a process that began in 1994. Since that time the Plan had been reviewed and updated. In 2007, the City and County began the Grand Junction planning process which takes a look at the next 25 years believing that the area would continue to grow and probably double in population and employment needs by the year 2035. This was based on the historic growth trend over the past 50 years. Mr. Fife said that the public support for the plan was evident throughout the planning process and participants wanted the ability to see this community continue to grow while maintaining their quality of life here. Higher densities, mixed uses, more concentrated land uses with walkable areas in growth centers scattered throughout the valley were envisioned. He added that this planning process kept intact the most recently adopted plans that were in the planning area which were identified as the Clifton Fruitvale Community Plan and the Whitewater Community Plan which are both unincorporated areas.

Mr. Fife stated that there had been over 300 meetings or workshops held with regard to the Comprehensive Plan. The adoption of the Comprehensive Plan would replace the existing Grand Junction Growth Plan and the Mesa County Joint Urban Area Plan as well as sunset some older plans such as the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan and the North Central Valley Plan. Other neighborhood plans within the planning area would continue to be in effect such as the Redlands, Pear Park, Clifton-Fruitvale and Whitewater and H Road Northwest Plans; however, if there were any inconsistencies between the Comprehensive Plan and those neighborhood plans, the Comprehensive Plan would prevail as the most current plan.

The Grand Junction City Council created the following vision statement for the Comprehensive Plan: To become the most livable community west of the Rockies. Some of the attributes to achieve livability included things such as being a fiscally sustainable area, the retention of regional center status, medical regional services, and a healthy lifestyle.

Mr. Fife then discussed the Guiding Principles which reflected the Plan's vision. The goals described the broad desired results of the Plan which would be achieved through public policies and programs so implementation would be an ongoing effort. Highlights of the goals include:

- The implementation of the Comprehensive Plan
- Maintaining the community separators between the communities
- Support ordered and balanced growth throughout the community
- Continuing development of the downtown area
- A broader mix of housing types for all income levels and all age groups
- Preservation of existing buildings and the appropriate re-use of those buildings
- Provide buffers for adjacent uses with different densities or unit types

- Enhancement of the visual appeal of the community
- A well-balanced transportation system which protects natural resources
- Continuing the regional neighborhood and community park programs
- Protection of open space corridors for recreation
- Transportation and environmental purposes
- Place a priority on public facilities and services in the capital improvement programming
- Continue to be a regional provider of goods and services

Mr. Thornton added that the Comprehensive Plan would be implemented through service delivery programs and through public and private land use development and service decisions. City residential zoning decisions would be guided by the blended residential land use categories map. Mr. Thornton said that the blended map was split into three categories of Residential Low (Rural - 5 units per acre density), Residential Medium (4 - 16 units per acre) and a Residential High (greater than 16 units per acre). The concept was such that through the use of blending the various densities within those ranges and using techniques through the zoning and development code, compatibility could be achieved between different housing types within the various areas of the community. Plans need to be implemented consistently over time, however, they need to be able to change as the community changes. Therefore, plan reviews should be undertaken every 3 to 5 years.

Mr. Thornton said that when deciding changes to the Plan, the City had jurisdiction inside the Persigo 201 boundary. The County may, if deemed appropriate, comment on the change prior to adoption. When deciding changes to the Plan outside of the Persigo 201 boundary, the County would have jurisdiction and likewise the City may, if deemed appropriate, comment on a change prior to adoption by the County. He went on to say that there were two ways to amend the Plan – Administrative Changes and Plan Amendments. The Public Works and Planning Director had the authority to make Administrative Changes, such as minor additions or clarifications to the Plan and policies, or to correct errors or grammar. Plan amendments will require review by the Planning Commission with a recommendation to City Council who is the final decision maker.

A Plan amendment would occur prior to a development application for a land use action such as a rezone or a subdivision. A Plan amendment could be requested by a citizen, property owner, City or County official, or City or County staff. According to Mr. Thornton, the City may amend the Comprehensive Plan if the proposed changes were consistent with the goals and policies and at least one of the five approval criteria were met. Mr. Thornton concluded that he believed that the Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan was consistent with the purpose and intent of the Growth Plan, the County-wide Land Use Plan and the Persigo Agreement, and that the review criteria in the land use codes had all been met.

PUBLIC COMMENT

For:

Jeffery Fleming, 2992 North Avenue, stated that he was a professional planner and wanted to speak in favor of the Comprehensive Plan. He thanked the staff for all of the work put into this. He reiterated the goal of the plan – to become the most livable community west of the Rockies. He said that as the area grew, certain burdens were put on the community which may be perceived as negative.

He said that right now the average home had a greater need for a bigger garage than it did for more bedrooms because the family size was shrinking. He added that low density sprawl took an enormous toll on the natural resources of air, water and land. Low density also increased congestion by making the drive further to get to basic necessities and increased risks to children by making them walk further to school and increased infrastructure cost by requiring more water lines, more sewer lines, utilities, streets, and more maintenance.

Taxes and housing costs would also be increased by low density. Mr. Fleming said that the food supply was weakened by putting pressure on farms to be developed and by taking their water supply. Low density created urban sprawl putting pressure on open spaces rather than keeping the city in the city. Low density suburban living was not a sustainable plan according to Mr. Fleming. The comprehensive plan addressed all of those issues in a positive way. By increasing density as proposed homes would be more affordable by having smaller parcels of land. He concluded by stating that he fully supported it and again thanked staff for all the work put into it.

Dan Graham, 3245 Applewood Street, a volunteer board member of the Mesa Land Trust, spoke in reference to the goal pertaining to the community separator program. He spoke on behalf of the Land Trust and stated that they felt that the Planning Commission had done a good job of taking that separator into account and wholeheartedly supported it. He went on to say that the Land Trust had been a cooperater with the City and the County by way of preservation of approximately 58,000 acres of land in Mesa County for the preservation of wildlife habitat, open space and agriculture. This goal was something that really needed to be pursued and fully realized. Additionally, the two separator programs of Palisade and Fruita were mainly being preserved by conservation easements that were donated and purchased through the Land Trust. He said that while working on a lot of plans the hardest part about plans was trying to get them put into effect. He said that they supported the plan and would like to do anything they could to see that the goals were achieved.

Roland Cole, 659 Grandview Drive, said that as a former member of the City Planning Commission and former chairman, he had been involved in this process from the beginning. He encouraged the Commissioners to pass this onto City Council with a favorable recommendation as it would be good. He said that this was probably the most important document that the Commissions would have to act on during their tenure on the Planning Commissions because it set out the direction for this community for the next 25 or so years. The Commissions had the responsibility of following that, of using it for their guide to be able to plan this community and develop this community in an orderly manner. There had been a lot of efforts, a lot of time, a lot of work, and a lot

of scrutiny to get this plan where it ought to be as it was now. He added that a city that was progressive had a good comprehensive plan and urged the Commissions to pass this plan, to recommend it to City Council and believed it was a good plan for the community.

Chairman Pro-tem Eslami stated that the community owed Mr. Cole a lot of debt because of his years of service.

George Callison, 2247 Codels Canyon Drive, stated that he had business interests in the City and also was a board member of the Mesa Land Trust. He spoke in favor of the Comprehensive Plan. He added that this plan was a thoughtful and balanced approach. He specifically addressed the goal of maintaining buffers between communities with agricultural lands mainly through the use of conservation easements that were monitored and maintained by the Mesa Land Trust. He urged the Commissioners to support this plan.

Dick Pennington, 780 23-7/10 Road, Grand Junction, said that he was for the Comprehensive Plan but thought that in the northwest area, the Appleton Plan, that there should be some adjustments there. He disagreed with the proposed density in that particular area. He said that approximately four years ago he was denied for 1 to 2 units per acre and now 4 to 8, 8 to 16 and 16 to 24 units were being proposed. He added that even though all of the utilities were there he had been turned down. He thought that the density in that particular area needed to be lowered considerably. He hoped that the Planning Commissioners would think about the heavy density.

Penny Heuscher, 330 Mountain View Court, stated that she appreciated the advanced planning efforts made by the City. She said that one way the town could be made more sustainable was by reducing the need to drive a long way for services. She noticed that there were more industrial sites located on the plan which she felt was encouraging. Ms. Heuscher also stated that placing Industrial zoning on the river bank was antiquated and conflicted with goals regarding transitioning and enhancement of visual appeal. She next pointed out that the City Planning Commission received testimony on the industrial zoning along the river bank and reiterated that if industrial zoning was put in the flood plain and along the river bank then more dykes would be needed. She noted that the area had a higher and better purpose and in reality should be incorporated into park land with wetland preserve.

Steven Kesler, 2329 Meridian Court, Grand Junction, acknowledged that this plan had been going on for more than two years and had been put together by a whole lot of people from all sides involved in the community. He said that he was extremely pleased to be a part of this. He said that he could not imagine a plan that would make everyone happy as there were too many diverging views. He said that everyone needed to be willing and able to plan for growth. Mr. Kesler reminded the Commissions that there had been an enormous amount of work that had gone into the plan and appreciated the Commissions' understanding of the variables that had gone into it.

Bennett Boeschstein, a professional planner, thanked the Commissions for the Comprehensive Plan and commended both Planning Commissions as well as the City Council and Board of County Commissioners. He reinforced the idea of village centers as he believed they were great concepts as mixed use areas, close to residential areas and were great sustainable areas. Next he discussed neighborhood centers which he believed reduced the need for long-term, long automobile trips, provided services close to where people lived and worked. He did not believe that the trail master plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, needed to be redone. Mr. Boeschstein wanted to see the implementation of the green waterfront concept along the Colorado and Gunnison Rivers. He identified appropriate uses within the green waterfront concept as trails, parks, open space and wildlife sanctuaries and should not include industrial uses and only those commercial uses which enhanced the riverfront as places where people could enjoy the river such as riverfront restaurants, cafés, and museums, among others. He next addressed the South Downtown Plan zoning which encouraged live-work environments and would appreciate having more population to help support the Botanical Gardens and use of the riverfront parks. He also discussed implementation tools regarding the support for agriculture, conservation easement programs, and continued support of cooperative planning areas and transfer of development rights. He would also like the inclusion of recognition of historic neighborhoods. Lastly he pointed out that in the plan there was a map he identified as being Figure 78 on page 91 which depicted an incorrect placement of a line.

Janice Shepherd, 2310 Cyprus Court, applauded the high density idea. She was concerned about the ease of rezoning because of adjacent parcels because of the domino effect that it could have. She thought a more thorough review on any rezoning needed to be done. She addressed the bicycle paths and how difficult it was to ride a bike east-west in the City and would like to have a more concrete vision of the paths. She also thought the plan needed to take into account aggressive ATVers who needed to be fenced out of any green space within the City and the surrounding communities. Lastly, she said that she would like to see a long-range plan where a broader green belt would be developed and reiterated that it was important that the flood plain stay green.

Dave Cale, 2692 Continental Drive, thanked the Planning Commissions for all of their work and having a vision. He also spoke with regard to the riverfront and hoped that they would reconsider the industrial zoned plat on the riverfront. He pleaded that they consider taking off the industrial zoning off the riverfront.

Janet Magoon, 2752 Cheyenne Drive, read a letter she had submitted. She said that the proposed future land use map still designated an aberrant and isolated parcel of industrial zoning amidst the parks and riparian habitat along the river. She said that it did not make any sense. She stated that she believed the purpose of zoning was adopted and enacted to segregate uses that were thought to be incompatible and should be used to prevent new development from conflicting with neighboring uses and to preserve the character of the community. She said that you could not have high intensity next to parks and pointed out the goals that the subject parcel conflicted with

such as transitioning and enhanced visual appeal, protection of air, water and natural resources and protection of parks.

(Mesa County) Vice-Chairman Bonella reiterated that they had asked the public not to repeat testimony.

Mac Cunningham stated that the Planning Commissions would in fact be the deciders of land use and the devil was in the details. He referenced the Persigo Agreement which was great in intent but not adhered to. He said that both of the boards had an opportunity to make a clear statement to the City Council and County Commissioners relative to areas of concern. His specific concern was that the map was a guidance document. Specifically, that the existing zoning on which many property owners in this valley acquired property or had owned property under the current language have no assurance that their density would be respected. There was a great probability in some areas of the city that down zoning would occur. He further stated that the future needed to be planned for and assurances should be provided to existing property owners that their rights as established would be protected. Mr. Cunningham requested that whatever the final adoption was that there be strong wording that there would be no down zoning to occur within this plan.

Bob Engelke, 2111 Yellowstone Road, stated that he had many objections to parts of the plan but it was better than where we were and hoped that the Commissions would go forward with it.

Terry Lorentzen, 2910 El Toro Road, spoke in favor of the plan. He said that it was important to see some increased density because there was a demand for housing with increased density. Some of the benefits of increased density included allowing infrastructure to be used to its full capacity. He encouraged the commissions to adopt the proposals and believed that being able to use adjacent property made good common sense that would allow a change in the zoning. This would be a method to get that done in some sort of expeditious way.

Against:

Steve Voytilla, 2099 Desert Hill Road, said that some consideration needed to be given to the people who have lived here their entire lives. He disagreed with some of the comments made regarding foreclosure rates and stated that there were more foreclosures in the \$200,000 to \$300,000 price range. He said that he did not see a need for the Blended map.

A brief recess was taken from 7:46 to 7:53.

QUESTIONS

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Abbott asked for an explanation of the process regarding a property currently zoned Rural and then discovering their neighbor would be putting five homes on the acre next door and also raised the issue of the appeal process. Mr. Thornton said that currently in order to determine whether a rezone was

appropriate, one would have to first go through a Growth Plan amendment, work through the public process, have a neighborhood meeting, and talk strictly regarding the Growth Plan. Then, if successful, the applicant would come back to request a rezone and again have to go back to the public. As proposed, one could request a rezone using the Blended map if the rezone request fell within an appropriate density range. It would still, however, be considered in a public hearing and have to meet all of the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the vision of the community. He stated that they were looking at ways to create more housing and different types of housing for all of the various life stages.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Abbott asked who would be in charge of approving the change. Mr. Thornton said that there would be a recommendation by the Planning Commission and then it would go on to City Council.

(Mesa County) Vice-Chairman Bonella asked about people on the opposite end with County RSF-4 zoning as an example within a blended area and would the City look more favorably at that? He stated that he was worried that it would become too politicized. Mr. Thornton said that, as stated on the proposed Blended map, generally future development should be at a density equal to or greater than the allowed density of the applicable County zone district. However this was not guaranteed. There may be land use issues such as topography that physically constrained development that would suggest a lower density might be more appropriate than what the Mesa County zoning would permit.

(Mesa County) Vice-Chairman Bonella raised a question regarding the criteria and stated that he did not see anything where it showed that only one of the criteria needed to be met. Mr. Thornton said that it was addressed with the “and/or” language after each criterion. Vice-Chairman Bonella said that he would like to see that it said one of the following must be met as he read this as all five criteria had to be met. (Grand Junction) Commissioner Wall agreed that it should be more specific.

Jamie Beard, Assistant City Attorney, addressed the Commissioners concern by stating that as long as the word “or” was in the language that legally she was comfortable that it could be one, or more, criteria. She said that the language could be changed for clarification, however, technically the current language did address the stated concern.

DISCUSSION

(Mesa County) Chairman Justman said that he had been asked to enter into the record a petition that was given to the City of Fruita which contained approximately 500 signatures. It pertained to having the City of Fruita remove their post-mapped plan of its proposed trails outside incorporated City limits which included trails along ditch banks, canals, drainages, washes and any other private or public right-of-way. He said that the signatories to that petition were opposed to that and entered the petition into the record.

(Mesa County) Chairman Justman agreed that density should be at a density equal to or greater than the allowed density of the applicable County zoning district. He would like to have that language part of the record.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Susuras said that he had been involved with the Comprehensive Plan since Day 1 and stated that it was a good plan that would be good for the City. He complimented both City and County staff and everyone involved in putting the Plan together. He thought that it was well done. He mentioned a statement that the Comprehensive Plan was and must be flexible and that transitions must be accommodated – gradually moving from where we were today to where we want to be. He also mentioned that the Plan stated that Plan reviews would be done every 3 to 5 years but may be considered more or less often as necessary to reflect changes in community goals and needs. He further stated that Mesa County considered the Comprehensive Plan an advisory document to the County and future development should be at a density equal to or greater than the allowed density of the applicable County zoning district. He believed that statement was very general. He said that he would vote for it and thought it was a great plan.

(Mesa County) Vice-Chairman Bonella said that he was 4th generation resident and Mesa County was pretty unique. He said that he was all for the riverfront and believed that with the right plan and right design, everyone could get along. He said that his biggest concern was that if you pick on one piece of industrial, what would be next. He added that it's part of the community and created jobs, and part of what makes a community a complete community. He thought that it was a good plan overall.

(Mesa County) Chairman Justman agreed with Vice-Chairman Bonella.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Wall concurred. He said that he liked the Plan because it was flexible, the market would help determine how the City would grow, and it helped the planning process become more transparent and would save people money.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Abbott said that he too would support the Plan. The decisions made would not be set in stone and would not be solely decided by staff. He thought it was a good plan that should be supported.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Bittle stated that she was also in support of the Plan. She liked that amendments could be initiated by property owners, City or County officials or staff.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh reminded everyone that this plan worked well for both the city and county which was a great undertaking. It built a lot of efficiencies with the types of housing, consolidating, services, and infrastructure.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Jones stated that he did not think it appropriate that property owners could lose their rights based on what their current zoning was. With respect to industrial, he understood the concerns regarding the riverfront.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Moreng thought the Plan was a wonderful vision for the future by addressing a lot of the needs especially regarding housing, recreation, transportation and commended the people who worked on it. He concluded that he was in favor of it.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Flynn said that she was in favor of it and agreed with previous comments. She said that she understood the need to save the farm ground but thought it was a good plan and was in favor of it.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Eslami said that he was also in favor of this Plan as it was flexible.

MOTION: (Commissioner Abbott) “Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2009-219, Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan, I propose that we forward to the City Council our recommendation of approval.”

(Mesa County) Chairman Justman reminded everyone that the Mesa County Planning Commission was just voting on it tonight, and if passed, a resolution would not be signed until after City Council’s final approval. (Mesa County) Vice-Chairman Bonella asked if City Council changed the Plan would it then come back to Planning Commission for re-approval? Keith Fife said that it was being approved as is; however, if the City and County don’t agree, then there could be two plans which he considered to be highly unlikely.

Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Susuras) “Mr. Chairman, on item 2009-0294-MP1, Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan, I propose that we adopt the Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan as an amendment to the Master Plan and adopt a resolution Number MCPC-2010-01, adopting and certifying the amendment to the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners in accordance with section 30-28-108 of the Colorado Revised Statutes and is also with the appropriate additional corrections as outlined by the staff, as modified.”

Commissioner Moreng seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

Upon motion by Vice-Chairman Bonella and second by Commissioner Flynn, the joint public hearing was adjourned.

A short recess was taken.

The Planning Commission hearing was called to order by Chairman Pro-Tem Eslami.

General Discussion/Other Business

Election of Officers:

Commissioner Carlow nominated Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Abbott seconded the nomination.

Commissioner Schoenradt nominated Commissioner Abbott as Vice-Chairman. A vote was called and Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh was elected Vice-Chairman with 5 votes.

Commissioner Carlow nominated Commissioner Wall to serve as Chairman of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Schoenradt seconded the nomination. A vote was called and Commissioner Wall was elected Chairman (7-0).

With no objection and no further business, the public hearing was adjourned at 8:37 p.m.