

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 13, 2001 MINUTES
7:05 P.M. to 9:35 P.M.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:05 P.M. by Chairman John Elmer. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were John Elmer (Chairman), Dr. Paul Dibble, Terri Binder, William Putnam, and Nick Prinster. James Nall and Vicki Boutilier were absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Kristen Ashbeck (Senior Planner), Dave Thornton (Principal Planner), Bill Nebeker (Senior Planner), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Joe Carter (Associate Planner) and Lisa Gerstenberger (Senior Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney), Eric Hahn and Rick Dorris (Development Engineers).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 23 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the January 16 public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes as written."

Commissioner Dibble seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Items pulled from the evening's agenda included: CUP-2000-235 (Conditional Use Permit - Cruisers Bar), VR-2000-238 (Vacation of Right-of-Way - The Legends) and ANX-2001-011 (Annexation/Preliminary Plan - Traver Annexation/Westland Subdivision).

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Placed on the Consent Agenda were items ANX-2001-012 (Zone of Annexation - Moore Annexation), CUP-2001-008 (Conditional Use Permit - Harris Vet Clinic Pole Barn), VAR-2001-007 (Variance - Holiday Inn Height Waiver), and FP-2001-010 (Final Plat - Grand Vista Filing 1). No objection or concerns were raised by either citizens or Planning Commissioners; however, the following comments were entered into the record as requested by Tyler Casebier, representative for D & K Construction, on VAR-2001-007 (Variance - Holiday Inn Height Waiver). Mr. Casebier said that he had been working with City staff on the type and location of access into the property.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the Consent Agenda as prepared."

Commissioner Prinster seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

IV. FULL PUBLIC HEARING

PP-2000-234 PRELIMINARY PLAT/CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—GRAND MESA CENTER A request for approval of a Preliminary Plat for six lots and a Conditional Use Permit for a 197,394 square-foot shopping center in a C-2 (Heavy Commercial) zone district.

Petitioner: AIG Baker, David Bearden
Location: 2464 Highway 6 & 50
Representative: Jim Langford

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Randall Naccari, representing the petitioner, initiated a PowerPoint presentation. Benefits to the City, he said, included local infrastructure improvements (traffic and drainage), aesthetic improvements along the Highway 6 & 50 corridor, the creation of new jobs, improved quality of life for the community and increased tax revenues.

David Bearden continued with the presentation, saying that the proposal complied with the new Code's Big Box standards. The site's location was outlined on an aerial photo. The Site Plan denoted proposed lot and building layouts, retention pond locations, access points, parking configurations, internal/external circulation patterns and intersection/signal locations, pad sites, bus stop locations, a pedestrian plaza area etc. Mr. Bearden said that the frontage road in front of the property would be reconfigured behind Lots 2 through 5 off of Highway 6 & 50 and dedicated to the City. Pedestrian access had been accommodated along the entire frontage road and up the main access from the highway through the site to the north and across to the eastern "wing" of the development. Pedestrian access was also provided along the lower anchor of the east wing to 25 Road. A breezeway between the two wings had been provided, connecting to a sidewalk which would carry pedestrian traffic up to West Mesa Court.

Mr. Naccari presented other visuals including elevation drawings, drawing enlargements of Building Anchors A, B, C, D, E and F, the Corner Shops area, and Mini's A and B. He submitted samples of materials proposed, which included coppertone and bronze prefinished metal roofing materials, split face CMU with cultured stone, and EIFS earthtone stucco. Mr. Naccari said that the design theme would be maintained on the rear facade of the main building; however, he asked for Planning Commission flexibility on selection of design materials for the rear of the buildings. "Street print" would be used to provide decorative paving for sidewalks and landscaping areas in the front (photos shown).

Mr. Naccari said that he and other representatives were in agreement with all staff conditions.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dibble asked for further elaboration on landscaping plans for the pedestrian walkways. Mr. Bearden said that new Code requirements would be followed to the letter; however, landscaping specifics had not yet been addressed. Referencing the Site Plan, he noted the locations of areas to be landscaped. Berming would be added along the north retention pond, with tree plantings along West Mesa Court.

Commissioner Putnam asked about plans for Lot 6 along 25 Road. Mr. Bearden said that no tenant had yet expressed an interest in that particular lot; however, outlying lots were generally targeted for sit-down restaurants.

Commissioner Binder asked if sidewalk would be provided on both sides of the primary entrance from Highway 6 & 50. Mr. Bearden noted all sidewalk locations which included a sidewalk only on the east side.

Commissioner Dibble asked if separate walkways would be provided for pedestrians from parking areas. Mr. Bearden said that nothing other than what was proposed had been planned.

Commissioner Prinster asked if HVAC units, generally located on building roofs, would be hidden from view, to which Mr. Bearden responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Putnam remarked that irrigation would be required for all plantings. Mr. Bearden said that irrigation was outlined as a Code requirement and would be provided.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker outlined the proposal as contained in the February 13, 2001 Staff Review. The petitioner had also asked for approval of a sign package, which included an off-premise sign at Highway 6 & 50 and the entrance road. He noted that public works staff had approved a design exception to the TEDS manual to allow intersection signalization at the site's proposed entrance even though it didn't meet spacing requirements; a CDOT access permit had been obtained. John Shaver confirmed that the Public Works Director had the authority to approve design exceptions.

Rick Dorris said that while CDOT standards called for mile spacing between signal lights, there are signals at both 24 ½ and 25 Roads, a half-mile apart. The proposed entrance into the Grand Mesa Shopping Center was located approximately equidistance between the two roads. CDOT was currently undertaking a corridor access study along Highway 6 & 50 from 24 Road to the First Street/Grand Avenue intersection. Projections were that all intersections along the corridor would "fail" within the next 20 years. This could necessitate 6-laning Highway 6 & 50 and closing off the various access points along current frontage roads. On an overhead visual he noted portions of the frontage road slated for closure, the reconfiguration of which would accommodate the Quikrete site and other developments. At some point, he predicted that the shopping center's intersection would provide the only frontage road access from Highway 6 & 50 between 24 ½ and 25 Roads. Since progression would be compromised, CDOT had issued its permit with conditions. The City had agreed to a two-lane frontage road and sidewalk on only one side provided the petitioner analyze the need for turn lanes at their outparcel locations and at all other intersection points. If left-turn lanes were needed, the petitioner would be responsible for constructing them. An analysis was undertaken and results determined that left-turn lanes were unnecessary. Mr. Dorris said that potential turning conflicts with vehicles towing boats and other large vehicles along the western frontage road section would be mitigated with the extension of curb return radii. Details were currently under discussion and would constitute a modification from the commercial road section.

Mr. Dorris referenced a 50-foot public ingress/egress easement split-centered on the property's lot line to serve two lots to the east (locations noted). Pointing out the location of the Quikrete plant, he said that discussions had included extending West Mesa Court over to the plant; however, because the plant had access to the existing frontage road via an easement across the property next to Shiners Car Wash and since the City's extension of West Mesa Court may not be legally defensible, the decision was made not to extend the cul-de-sac. Mr. Dorris said that Quikrete could always buy additional ingress/egress off of Industrial Boulevard, which would, in turn, route traffic to either 24 ½ or 25 Roads.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked why staff had required only a driveway out to 25 Road versus a public road. Mr. Dorris said that the petitioner determined that construction of a public road would result in a reduced parking area, and the City was interested primarily in just providing public ingress/egress across the property. Public right-of-way wasn't deemed essential since sufficient public access had already been provided.

Chairman Elmer asked if staff expected traffic conflicts arising from locating the parking directly adjacent to the driveway, to which Mr. Dorris responded negatively.

Commissioner Binder asked for clarification on the proposed east-west frontage road connections and the current highway/frontage road accesses. Mr. Dorris pointed out the two frontage road access points which would be closed or reconfigured concurrent with the project's development. He said that other highway/frontage road access points would be closed eventually, depending on CDOT plans for highway widening. He noted that the current frontage road would eventually dead-end at 25 Road; however, the new alignment would provide a 25 Road connection further to the north. Commissioner Binder expressed concern that there could potentially be a large volume of traffic traveling along the newly designed frontage road from 25 Road if that were the only way to access businesses located along the highway. Mr. Dorris said that while a valid concern, he expected most of the traffic to be traveling along the highway and accessing the frontage road via the newly proposed intersection.

Commissioner Binder wondered if traffic flows would be impacted along the frontage road from 25 Road by development of Lot 6. Mr. Dorris said that if traffic projections from any use proposed for the outlot warranted additional mitigation based on Site Plan review, additional traffic studies could be required at that time.

Commissioner Prinster asked if West Mesa Court would be widened and improved, to which Mr. Dorris replied affirmatively but adjacent to this site only. When asked if sidewalk would surround the court and if a truck access would be provided to the rear of the main building, Mr. Dorris again replied affirmatively. Mr. Dorris confirmed that delivery trucks (*e.g.*, semi's and single-axle units) would most likely utilize West Mesa Court.

Commissioner Prinster asked if sufficient space was available behind anchor buildings between the building itself and parking areas to allow for semi truck deliveries. Mr. Dorris said that while he had not personally reviewed that aspect of the site's design, he presumed the petitioner's design engineer had made the appropriate calculations.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION (continued)

Mr. Nebeker continued with his presentation by mentioning a letter of opposition received from Quikrete; he deferred further discussion of it. He continued by saying that staff was looking for Planning Commission guidance on Big Box standards restricting delivery, loading, and trash removal times and soundproofing (section 4.3.M.4.f). Since this particular project was surrounded by commercial area rather than adjacent to residential zoning, he said that "it could be argued" that these standards aren't applicable. Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat, Conditional Use Permit, sign package, and waiver of standard street section, with the conditions outlined in Exhibit A (attached to the February 13, 2001 Staff Review). In addition, the following conditions were added:

1. The applicant shall have flexibility in providing different materials along the rear facades than those shown on the submitted elevation drawings, subject to staff review and approval, as long as the materials comply with the Big Box standards and provide the same look as the drawings.

2. Numerical amounts of signage for individual storefronts shall be adjusted at Final Plan approval to reflect the actual linear frontage of the buildings.

Mr. Nebeker said that the proposal was also subject to the sign package as outlined in Exhibit B (attached to the February 13, 2001 Staff Review).

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer commented that the legal advertisement listed the total square footage of the shopping center as 197,000 square feet, whereas the Staff Review denoted 205,000 square feet. Mr. Nebeker pointed out a preexisting pad site which had not been included in the total square footage calculation. In addition, one of the anchor buildings was somewhat larger than had been initially depicted. Chairman Elmer asked if there was flexibility inherent to the proposal that allowed deviation in the overall square footage of buildings. Mr. Nebeker did not expect that much deviation would be possible given setbacks, parking requirements, etc. If the Planning Commission so chose, the petitioner could be locked into a maximum amount of square footage. Mr. Shaver suggested as a preferred option that, it be denoted as a "not to exceed" amount. Mr. Nebeker said that there was insufficient space for Anchors A and F to extend beyond their current footprints so likely only very minor variation could occur.

Chairman Elmer understood that the petitioner had provided more parking than required by the Code. Mr. Beardon confirmed that parking requirements had been exceeded.

Commissioner Binder asked for clarification on the proposed placement of the pylon sign, which was given. Mr. Nebeker confirmed that the storefronts would also have signage on them. When asked about lighting, Mr. Nebeker said that it would be similar to what had been required for the Redlands Marketplace, incorporating shielded covers.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Walid Boumatar (67 – 25 ½ Road, Grand Junction), co-owner of property directly adjacent and to the north of the subject parcel, expressed support for the project. He suggested that a land swap (property locations noted) might be the perfect remedy to Quikrete's access and be a win-win proposition for himself as well as the petitioner.

Larry Beckner (1241 Gunnison Avenue, Grand Junction), attorney representing the L.J. Pavetti family, owners of the largest portion of the subject property, said that the Pavettis' had been very concerned that any project developed on their land reflect quality. The current project, they felt, succeeded.

Sid Squirrell (4339 Racquet Court, Grand Junction) felt the site to be an excellent location for the shopping center. A quality development, he maintained, one that would be a real asset to the community. He said that the owners of Quikrete and other properties had been contacted on several occasions in an attempt to purchase those properties; however, no settlement could be reached.

Greg Schaefer (3845 Horizon Drive, Grand Junction) thought that the petitioner's design team had done a fantastic job with the project and thought it deserved Planning Commission approval.

AGAINST:

Pat Edwards (1204 North 7th Street, Grand Junction) said that he and Quikrete's plant manager were both in attendance. With regard to staff's reference of Quikrete's having access along the frontage road below the retention pond, he said that this access did not extend to the Quikrete property. Noting that plans

were already underway to relocate the business and redevelop the property, once redevelopment occurred, Mr. Edwards said that the 6.22-acre property would effectively be left without an access. Mr. Squirrell's offers to purchase the property, he said, didn't even meet fair market value. Thus, Mr. Squirrell's suggestion that every attempt had been made to include this property was inaccurate. The owners of Quikrete recognized that their present location was inappropriate; however, relocation costs required proceeds from at least a fair market value sale. Barring that, at the very least, the Quikrete property should be given access into the property via the extension of West Mesa Court. Mr. Edwards requested denial of the request and said that if the West Mesa Court extension was not offered, any approval of the request would be appealed.

Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Edwards to show on the aerial photo where access was currently being derived. Mr. Edwards said that while not visible on available maps, a 20-foot access strip into the Quikrete site was located between the Shiners Car Wash and Lube Center and the Valley Plaza, servicing both Quikrete and an adjacent boat repair business. Mr. Shaver asked if the current development would alter this current access in any way. Mr. Edwards said that based on Mr. Dorris's testimony, closure of current highway/frontage road accesses would occur concurrent with development of the shopping center. Thus, any redevelopment of the Quikrete property to include a change in use would result in landlocking the property, since access to the frontage road would then be denied. If no access could be secured from West Mesa Court, Mr. Edwards said that the only option left to Quikrete's owners were to stay in their present location.

Mr. Shaver asked if Quikrete's owners had legal access across the property to the west of the West Mesa Court? Mr. Edwards responded negatively. Mr. Edwards said he thought it was typical to require the developer of any major scale project to provide alternate access(es) to surrounding properties impacted by such development. He'd understood that the access had originally been discussed but was not required.

Chairman Elmer said that although direct access to the highway via the frontage road may be lost, there would be no loss of access from the Quikrete site to the frontage road. Mr. Edwards emphasized that the request for denial was based upon his perceived right of access from West Mesa Court. He also stressed the owner's willingness to be cooperative and relocate the business if fair market value for the property were offered.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Bearden reiterated that the frontage road would continue along Highway 6 & 50 and be routed through the subject property. Quikrete's current access would still exist; the only change may be in the eventual closure of the many hazardous highway/frontage road intersections.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer referenced the driveway located to the east and asked if traffic counts were acceptable. David Hook, Hook Transportation Engineering, anticipated that the majority of traffic would use the signaled intersection, with minimal traffic using the eastern 25 Road access.

Commissioner Dibble asked if other western property accesses to the frontage road would be retained. Mr. Dorris noted the various accesses linking the highway with the frontage road. One access in front of Dale Broom's would be closed, with the other reconfigured as the signalized intersection. There was a highway/frontage road access located in front of Big O Tires that was not slated for immediate closure. The entrance to Quikrete on the west side of the Shiners Car Wash and Lube would not be eliminated and the site would still retain access to the frontage road. He reiterated that eventually all highway/frontage road accesses would be closed; however, the timing was unknown and contingent upon CDOT's corridor

access study. Frontage road reconfigurations were deemed necessary to provide for a safe, signalized intersection.

Commissioner Prinster asked if CDOT could require closure of the highway/frontage road accesses independent of the current development, to which Mr. Dorris replied affirmatively. Commissioner Prinster said that pending outcome of the CDOT study, there was another highway/frontage road access available in front of the Valley Plaza that Quikrete and other businesses could use.

Chairman Elmer said that Quikrete would always have some access to the frontage road to the new signalized intersection.

Commissioner Binder asked if all the businesses along the frontage road would eventually be required to use the frontage road/signalized intersection exclusively for access. Mr. Dorris said there would be access to 25 Road via the frontage road and to 24 ½ Road via the frontage road and Valley Plaza parking lot.

Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Dorris if he knew of any City- or CDOT-sponsored work plan currently in place to undertake the highway/frontage road access closures or highway widening mentioned previously. Mr. Dorris replied negatively. He said that such improvements had not been included in either State or City budgets.

Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Dorris if he knew of any City- or CDOT-sponsored study that supported as an eventuality what he testified to. Mr. Dorris answered that there were no completed studies to say that; CDOT's corridor access study had only just begun, with the developers from both this project and Rimrock financially contributing to that study. He thought that CDOT's study would be looking at accesses and street widening, but he couldn't say for certain. Completion was expected in approximately 6-8 months, with CDOT's Notice to Proceed expected to be issued prior to the study's completion.

Chairman Elmer asked if cul-de-sac length standards would be exceeded if the West Mesa Court extension were to occur. While unsure of the length, Mr. Dorris speculated that emergency service access would not be compromised.

Chairman Elmer observed that a public street from West Mesa Court through the Quikrete property out to the frontage road probably didn't make sense based on the limited gain. Mr. Dorris said that Quikrete's owners did not control enough property to make that a viable option. Further, because any benefit received by extending West Mesa Court was so limited, the City could not justify expending the funds to do so as a public improvement.

Mr. Shaver said that he advised the staff regarding West Mesa Court using a four-part analysis to determine whether extension of West Mesa Court would be required, and if required, whether it would be legally defensible. The analysis included determining if the Quikrete property would be landlocked or otherwise had a legally perfected access across the GMC property. It was determined that legal and sufficient access did exist presently for the use currently there. Secondly, to determine if a legal easement or right existed across the northern portion of the Grand Mesa Center property. Since there was none of record, there was no legal basis to believe that an extension was required. Thirdly, the Major Street Plan was considered to determine whether any expectation of an extension existed for Quikrete property owners, of which none was found. And finally, the Dolan analysis to determine if the exaction of the property from the developer was somehow proportional to the impact being created. It was determined that the site's development did not necessitate a need for the exaction of an extension of West Mesa Court.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer said that the City typically relied on street plans or determined public need when considering street extensions. Since Quikrete currently had access and since the proposed development provided for a number of additional accesses, extension of West Mesa Court did not seem feasible from a public policy standpoint.

Commissioner Putnam said that the City would not deny access to any business located along the highway.

Chairman Elmer said that traffic improvements proposed with the current development would help alleviate some very hazardous conditions currently existing along the highway.

Commissioner Binder concurred, saying safety would be greatly improved. She agreed that the development would be an aesthetic improvement to the corridor in addition to providing a benefit to the community.

Chairman Elmer recommended deleting the condition limiting delivery, loading, and trash removal times (which also included soundproofing requirements) since it didn't seem applicable. Commissioners Prinster, Binder and Putnam agreed.

Commissioner Dibble corrected staff's reference to the delivery limitation condition, saying that the section should be correctly referenced as 4.3.M.6.f instead of 4.3.M.4.f.

Chairman Elmer felt that the petitioner's interpretation of Big Box standards and design details concerning the west side of Anchor A and the rear portions of the property, represented a reasonable compromise.

Commissioner Dibble agreed that the development would be a welcome addition to the City.

Commissioner Prinster expressed support for design flexibility as proposed by the petitioner's representatives. He felt that shifting signage allowance to the building instead of pole signs for the pad sites was also commendable. With regard to access to the Quikrete site, the proposed development did not in any way affect Quikrete's access. Its present access would be retained, intact, until and only if CDOT determined that something else would be required.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, on item PP-2000-234, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plat and Conditional Use Permit for the Grand Mesa Center with the conditions listed and addended by the planning department with the adjustments in the Code citation and to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council for the waiver of the standard street section."

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion.

Chairman Elmer asked that the phrase "with the adjustments in the Code citation" be rephrased to read "with the recommendation of deleting section 4.3.M.6.f."

Chairman Elmer also suggested deleting "addended by the planning department" and substituting in its place, "...in Exhibit A as amended by staff..."

With regard to the limitation on square footage, Mr. Chairman commented that testimony suggested that parking requirements, setbacks, etc. would sufficiently limit any expansion of the main building. Mr. Shaver said a reference stating "...with the square footage not to exceed 205,000" would be appropriate.

Chairman Elmer felt that no limitation was necessary; Commissioner Prinster wondered if all references to square footage should be deleted. A brief discussion ensued, with the result being to exclude references to square footage from the motion.

Commissioner Dibble agreed to amend his motion accordingly, to read:

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, on item PP-2000-234, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plat and Conditional Use Permit for the Grand Mesa Center with the conditions listed in Exhibit A as amended by staff, with the recommendation of deleting section 4.3.M.6.f, and to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council for the waiver of the standard street section."

Commissioner Binder seconded the amended motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

A brief recess was called at 9:05 P.M. The public hearing reconvened at 9:12 P.M.

TAC-2001-01.01 TEXT AMENDMENT—AMENDING THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE TO ADD A SECTION ON INSTITUTIONAL AND CIVIC FACILITY MASTER PLANS
A request to amend the Zoning and Development Code, adding Section 2.20—Institutional and Civic Facility Master Plans, to create a review process for such plans.

Petitioner: Kathy Portner

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner reviewed the proposal, saying that the text amendment would provide a public review process for master plans where currently none existed. Ms. Portner said that such a process would have been helpful with regard to the recently adopted St. Mary's Master Plan and Mesa College Master Plan. The amendment could also require a master plan if an institutional or civic facility were proposed which would be completed in multiple phases and which exceeded 100,000 square feet in one or more buildings. Review criteria and application/review procedures were also outlined as contained in the February 7, 2001 Staff Review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

DISCUSSION

General discussion ensued over the type of facilities which might be required to supply a Master Plan (e.g., recreation centers, large combination school projects, convention centers, etc.). There was discussion of whether the State would recognize the City's requirement in the event that a State-owned project, falling within the Section's parameters, were to be proposed.

Commissioner Putnam wondered if the public notification requirement in the proposed amendment was sufficiently specific. Ms. Portner said that the Code defined where notices were to be published.

With currently adopted Master Plans, if revisions were requested, they would be subject to the provisions of the new text amendment; however, Ms. Portner said that both St. Mary's and Mesa College had provided Master Plans for review and consideration.

Chairman Elmer said that in instances where the initial Master Plan was approved, the subsequent project must be in conformance. Shouldn't this be mentioned as a text amendment criterion? Ms. Portner suggested including the criterion under paragraph F, Validity. After the first sentence, add the sentence, "Future projects submitted under the Master Plan have to be in general conformance." Mr. Shaver concurred with and offered this proposed verbiage and its placement within paragraph F.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) "Mr. Chairman, on item TAC-2001-01.01, I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of approval, including the amendment to paragraph F [to read, 'Future projects submitted under the Master Plan have to be in general conformance.']"

Commissioner Putnam seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 P.M.