

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing July 6, 1993
7:03 p.m. - 9:10 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Vice Chairman Tom Volkmann at 7:03 p.m. in the City County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Vice Chairman Tom Volkmann, Ron Halsey, Stephen Laiche, Jim Anderson, Larry Seese, and Gabe Harbin.

Chairman John Elmer was absent.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner, Planning Supervisor; Dave Thornton, Senior Planner; and Karl Metzner, Senior Planner.

John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney, was also present.

Jacque Brever, of KLB Secretarial Services, was present to record the minutes.

There were 53 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Volkmann announced that the Petitioner has requested that item #71-93, Rezone and Outline Development Plan for Bella Vista Estates be tabled to the next Planning Commission meeting August 3, 1993.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #71-93, Rezone and Outline Development Plan - Bella Vista Estates, I move that we table this item to the next Planning Commission meeting."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Seese.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0. Commissioner Laiche was not present for this vote.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice Chairman Volkmann stated that a correction should be made to the June 1, 1993 Planning Commission minutes. Page ten, item #5-93, should read "May 19, 1993" rather than April 19, 1993.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes of the June 1, 1993 public hearing as amended."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Seese.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR PRE-SCHEDULED VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations, and/or pre-scheduled visitors.

IV. GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION.

1. #72-93 AMENDMENT TO THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - THE RIDGES METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

A request for approval of an amendment to the Final Development Plan to amend the side yard setback requirements for "A" lots.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

REPRESENTATIVE: Karl Metzner

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner gave an overview of the request for approval of an amendment to the Final Development Plan to amend the side yard setback requirements for "A" lots.

Mr. Metzner stated that the Ridges contain A, B, and C lots, and that "A" lots are slightly different because these lots can be developed using common lot lines. A duplex can be built on a single lot or a three- or four-plex can be built using adjacent lots. The setbacks for a single unit are either zero or ten feet, but nothing in between.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Halsey asked approximately how many lots this would affect?

Mr. Metzner replied of the approximately five hundred "A" lots in the Ridges, excluding the multi-family sites, approximately one hundred would meet the new requirements.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #72-93, a request for approval of an amendment to the Final Development Plan to amend the side yard setback requirements for "A" lots, I move that we approve this request."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Seese.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL.

1. #2-93(2) FINAL PLAT & RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION FOR HORIZON PARK EAST

A request for approval of the Final Plat/Plan for Horizon Park East and approval of a right-of-way vacation for a portion of North 15th Street.

PETITIONER: Bob Bray & Wayne Beede

REPRESENTATIVE: Rolland Engineering

LOCATION: G Road & Horizon Drive

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave an overview of the request for approval of the Final Plat/Plan for Horizon Park East and a right-of-way vacation for a portion of North 15th Street. She explained that the proposal is for twenty-three detached units on five acres. The Petitioner responded to the review comments on the preliminary review of several months ago and has redesigned the site. The original proposal had two accesses on to G Road. The Petitioner has reduced that to one access on the existing 15th Street right-of-way. The proposed fourteen feet of right-of-way on their property to be vacated meets City standards.

Ms. Portner stated that the forty foot drainage easement the Petitioner is now proposing is not wide enough to contain the existing drainage features. The side slope along the drainage should be three to one rather than two to one. Restrictions on the use and development of the drainage feature should be noted on the plat. Staff has received verbal confirmation from the Corps of Engineers that the proposed plan will be approved by them under a nationwide permit. Written confirmation will be required prior to recording the plat. Ms. Portner stated that she telephoned the Corps of Engineers today which confirmed that will not be a problem.

Ms. Portner explained that the proposed setbacks on the revised site plan are twenty feet from G Road, 15th Street, Racquet Way and Racquet Court and fifteen feet from the south and west exterior boundary of the subdivision. The proposed exterior setbacks will meet RSF-8 zoning requirements.

The Petitioner is proposing a six-foot concrete stucco wall along G Road. They have submitted details and Ms. Portner stated that it would be a matter that would require Staff review of site distance. She was not certain if the subdivision identification sign would exceed the maximum square feet allowed and asked that it be addressed by the Petitioner.

Ms. Portner stated that staff recommends approval, subject to all review agency comments and technical details being satisfactorily addressed prior to recording the plat. She advised that there would be two motions required of the Planning Commission, a final decision on the Final Plat/Plan and a recommendation to City Council for the proposed right-of-way vacation.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jim West, who is the contractor and project manager for the proposed subdivision, stated that he would like to have the option of zero lot setbacks on six lots, four on the north side of Racquet Way (lots 4, 5, 6, & 7) and lots 18 & 19. Mr. West further explained that a closed community with high control on the construction standards is proposed. The subdivision would be closed off from G Road by a proposed six-foot concrete wall reinforced with steel and finished to give a stucco look. The only open portion of the wall would be at the 15th Street entrance. The subdivision identification sign would be approximately at a forty-five degree angle and would read "Horizon Park East". He stated that he was not sure of the size but had no problem meeting the maximum requirement.

The proposed drainage would require a great deal of grading due to the rolling topography. On the issue of the three to one slope, Mr. West proposed using a tier retaining wall. The proposed wall is similar to the system that is used by the Bookcliff Country Club, which is a vertical system. The wall would extend up three feet (lower retaining wall), with a walking path at this level, then the wall would continue to extend an additional two feet (upper retaining wall). Mr. West stated that he had worked on this over the weekend and had only one copy of the plan to present to the Planning Commission. He presented the retaining wall plans to staff and the Planning Commission.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked if this would change the nature of the drainage issue and Staff recommendations?

Ms. Portner responded that staff would be willing to review other options.

Mr. West explained that all the utilities come off of G Road. The subdivision would be connected to the existing Ute water system and the sewer line would be heading west through the subdivision easements.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Anderson asked Ms. Portner if staff had any problem with the proposed zero lot lines?

Ms. Portner responded that in the original review, staff assumed the Petitioner was doing some zero lot line configurations and there would not be a problem with these, provided they are attached units.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked Ms. Portner if the proposed drainage easement would be wide enough?

Ms. Portner replied that she had roughly scaled it at sixty feet at a two to one slope. It would need to be wider for a three to one slope.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #2-93(2), a request for approval of the Final Plat/Plan for Horizon Park East, I recommend that we approve this subject to review agency comments and discussion that occurred here tonight, particularly the widening of the drainage in relation to the drawing and with the condition that Staff can review the drainage situation."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #2-93(2), a request for approval of a right-of-way vacation, I recommend that we forward this to City Council, with a recommendation for approval."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Harbin.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

2. **#25-93 REZONE & FINAL PLAT/PLAN - V.O.A. ELDERLY HOUSING**
A request to change the zoning of a property from B-2 & P (Neighborhood Business and Parking) to PR-43.8 (planned Residential with a density of 43.8 units per acre) and approval of a final plan/plat. This item was tabled at the April 6, May 4, and June 1, 1993 Planning Commission meetings.
PETITIONER: Volunteers of America, Inc.
REPRESENTATIVE: Lantz-Boggio Architects, Inc.
LOCATION: NW corner of 1st Street and Independent Avenue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner stated that the Petitioner requested that this item be tabled one last time because the Petitioner has purchased the required land but did not submit the revised site plan in time for this

meeting. He stated that the Petitioner has purchased enough land to meet all the parking requirements. Mr. Metzner stated that he advised the Petitioner to submit a revised site plan at least two weeks prior to the next Planning Commission meeting.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #25-93, I move that this item be tabled to the August 3rd meeting."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

3. #43-93 REZONE, ALLEY VACATION AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - TWO RIVERS TOWER

A request to change the zoning of a property from B-3 (Retail Business) and C-2 (Heavy Commercial) to PB (Planned Business), vacation of an alley and, approval of an Outline Development Plan for Two Rivers Tower.

PETITIONER: ADL Development

REPRESENTATIVE: Lee H. Talbot

LOCATION: South side of the 200 Block of Main and the north side of the 200 Block of Colorado

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave an overview of the request and stated that the proposal is consistent with the Downtown Development Strategy, to provide for the redevelopment of properties at levels of density appropriate for downtown. The Petitioner is requesting a rezone to allow for a height variation from the existing B-3 and C-2 Zones. She explained that the Planned Zone category is the most appropriate zoning in order to meet the intent of the policy, which is not to adversely affect the health or safety of the downtown community in the area of height setbacks in mixed uses. Ms. Portner stated that this project meets the rezone criteria.

Ms. Portner added that the Petitioner has provided market information indicating a shortage of office space in downtown Grand Junction. The leasing of office space at \$10 to \$12 per square foot would satisfy the criteria as well as meet the demand for this type of shortage.

Ms. Portner stated that the proposed alley vacation does meet the requirements set forth in Section 8-3 of the Zoning and Development Code, provided that the plat is recorded indicating the area will be maintained as a utility easement, in addition to the north access of the alley being dedicated to public access so the alley will not dead end in the middle of the block.

Ms. Portner stated that parking is an issue in that three hundred parking spaces, which includes fifty-nine spaces for the retail portion and two hundred forty-one spaces for the office portion,

would be required. Because the proposed project has insufficient parking, the Petitioner must secure additional parking within five hundred feet of the project.

Ms. Portner added that the access onto Main Street must be a one-way entrance to limit the amount of traffic going out onto Main Street. All traffic exiting the alley must leave via 3rd Street, 2nd Street, or Colorado Avenue.

She explained that the height of the proposed structure will have a ninety-five percent increase in the maximum height allowed. The Planned Business Zone would allow an increase in the height. Ms. Portner added that the proposed seventy-eight feet high building is consistent with other buildings in downtown Grand Junction.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) That a contract is secured with the DDA and the City for the property prior to the City Council hearing on the submittal.
- 2) That it is shown how the required three hundred parking spaces can be accommodated on-site prior to the City Council hearing on the submittal.
- 3) That all other review agency comments must be addressed at the time of Final Plan submittal.

Staff recommends approval of the alley vacation with the condition that it not be effective until a certificate of occupancy is issued for the building.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Lee Talbot stated that this project will produce \$3,000,000 in wages and \$230,000 in sales tax revenues and \$3,000,000 in tax increment, as well as stimulate growth for downtown Grand Junction. The materials for the first floor landscape will be consistent with the nearby landscaping.

Mr. Talbot addressed the issue of parking, stating that the Petitioner will be happy to work that out with staff.

Mr. Talbot was concerned with the restriction that the alley vacation not becoming final until the Certificate of Occupancy is issued. Mr. Talbot stated that the owner would not have a project until he is finished and such a restriction may cause problems with the financing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against the proposal. However, Ms. Shari Raso, the

owner of the Enterprise Building, asked Mr. Talbot to explain what would be needed for parking on the west side of her building?

Mr. Talbot responded that there is currently sixteen feet west of the Raso Building that is not being utilized and another twenty-five feet to the west, that has been set aside which will not be part of the design. He added that there are no plans to build on this space.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Laiche asked if the proposal included tearing the buildings down on Colorado between 2nd and 3rd Streets?

Mr. Talbot answered in the affirmative that there were a couple of buildings that would need to be demolished to accommodate the parking structure.

Commissioner Laiche asked if the only building that was to remain intact would be the Enterprise Building?

Mr. Talbot responded negatively, stating that the shop on the southeast corner would remain.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked if the restriction on the alley vacation would be a problem?

Mr. Talbot answered that the lender may be hesitant to respond positively to the request.

Commissioner Laiche asked Ms. Portner where the alley was located?

Ms. Portner answered that it is an east-west alley that runs between Main and Colorado and added that it may not be recognizable as an alley as it is an open area.

Commissioner Laiche asked if anyone was using the alley?

Ms. Portner responded that it is being used, but it is an open area that is not well-defined.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the problem with not vacating the alley until the Certificate of Occupancy has been issued was a problem that can be worked out?

Ms. Portner answered that the suggestion came from the City Attorney's office so she would let Mr. Shaver respond.

Assistant City Attorney John Shaver responded that he could be flexible in working out an agreement with the Petitioner regarding the timing of the proposed vacation.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked if it was possible to have a rededication agreement of some kind to resolve the situation?

Mr. Shaver responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Talbot responded that would be fine with him as well.

Commissioner Halsey expressed his concern over the height restrictions and gave the example of the discussions last year over the rationale behind the forty foot restrictions, emphasizing the importance of the restrictions at the west end of Main Street. He stated that there would be a dramatic effect on the view of Glade Park and the Colorado National Monument, which could impact downtown adversely. Commissioner Halsey agreed that the site needs to be developed; however, the height restriction for downtown was initially mandated in response to citizen concerns over the Valley Federal Building.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked what the height of the Valley Federal Building was?

Commissioner Anderson responded that it is ten stories which is approximately 150 feet.

Mr. Talbot responded in defense of the proposal, stating that he thinks it is consistent with the development for downtown Grand Junction and not inconsistent with adjacent properties and would present less of a blockade than what is anticipated.

Commissioner Laiche asked if the Enterprise Building is more than 40 feet high?

Ms. Raso answered that it is less than 40 feet in height.

Commissioner Laiche asked if the proposed building would only use one half the space between Main and Colorado?

Mr. Talbot replied that it would.

Kent Webster, who is an attorney and former tenant of the Valley Federal Building, stated that office space is needed in Grand Junction. Mr. Webster stated that he was concerned about the imposition of parking requirements on builders.

Vice Chairman Volkmann stated that he did not share Commissioner Halsey's view of the height issue. He did not think the height would pose the type of problem that Commissioner Halsey feared. Commissioner Volkmann added that there would be many more cases such as this and he

would be fearful of stifling the potential for growth by too strictly enforcing the 40 foot height restriction.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #43-93, Rezone and ODP, for the structure to be located in the 200 Block of Main Street and the 200 Block of Colorado and the land in between, I move that we forward this to City Council with a recommendation for approval, subject to all of the review agency comments."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laiche.

A vote was called, and the motion was passed by a vote of 5-1 with all but Commissioner Halsey approving.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #43-93, the alley vacation, I recommend that we forward this to City Council with a recommendation for approval, and that the details be worked out between the City Attorney's Office and the developer, regarding that vacation."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Seese.

Commissioner Laiche asked Commissioner Anderson if his intent was that the Planning Commission forward this request to City Council with the recommendation for approval with the intent that the stipulations of the alley vacation not impede the developer's ability to obtain financing?

Commissioner Anderson replied affirmatively.

A vote was called, and the motion was passed by a vote of 5-1 with all but Commissioner Halsey approving.

4. #75-93 DRAINAGE FEES

A request for establishing an option whereby developers of projects of a certain size can, with approval of Public Works, pay a drainage fee in lieu of providing a drainage report and on-site facilities.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

REPRESENTATIVE: Gerald Williams

STAFF PRESENTATION

Don Newton, City Engineer, gave an overview of the request for establishing an option whereby developers of projects may, with approval of his department, pay a drainage fee in lieu of providing

a drainage report and on-site facilities.

Mr. Newton explained that the current drainage policy pertains to prevention of an increase in runoff which requires a comparison of surface runoff characteristics for developed and undeveloped conditions. In order to incorporate this concept, Mr. Newton stated the proposed drainage fee should be revised so that the fee equation in paragraph (5) allows for varying pre-development conditions.

Mr. Newton explained there is a problem with the smaller construction sites in that the on-site drainage facilities often interfere with layout, grading, aesthetics, and maintenance costs. He proposed that funds used for drainage studies and on-site facilities would be better utilized if they were placed into a drainage fund which would be used to construct major conveyance and detention facilities.

Mr. Newton added that in order to meet the criteria, the site must have public streets or have other drainage conveyance facilities which are adequate to provide for collection and conveyance of the site runoff, and be located such that drainage from the proposed development together with flows from upstream of the development site are released in a manner which does not adversely affect downstream properties. The Public Works Department would then make the determination if the drainage fee option could be implemented. Upon written approval of the Public Works Department, the developer would then be given the option of paying the drainage fee in lieu of providing the drainage report and constructing detention facilities on-site.

Payment of the drainage fee would constitute compliance with the City drainage requirements. The drainage fee would be calculated with two variables: 1) the area in acres, and 2) the runoff coefficient, with the new variable depending only on the increase in runoff, to reflect existing as well as proposed conditions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Anderson stated he was concerned that in order for this to work, everyone ought to be assessed equally to keep the equity and not allow for the variance. He stated he was referring to paragraphs two and three of a letter sent by Ciavonne and Associates.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked if his concern was that it may affect the value of properties.

Commissioner Anderson replied in the affirmative.

Vice Chairman Volkmann posed the question to Mr. Newton.

Mr. Newton replied that in some instances it may be better to allow drainage to go directly into an outfall facility rather than to retain it on-site. He added that if the development is not increasing runoff there would be no fee, which is the same as the existing policy. If a development resulted in a change from pervious to impervious surfaces, the equation would result in a proportionate fee. Because of directional storm possibilities, Mr Newton added that he did not think there should be a waiver of the fees due to the location of a proposed development.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked if this provided for the payment of the fee regardless of where they are?

Mr. Newton replied that it does, and added that it provides the option to pay the fee or construct the on-site facilities.

Commissioner Anderson asked if there were many of these five acre or less sites?

Ms. Portner answered that Staff is still seeing a lot of these sites that are being redeveloped and added to by paving or enlarging their building.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked if the fee is less than the actual cost?

Mr. Newton replied it typically would be.

Vice Chairman Volkmann asked why the figure used in the calculation was changed from the point five power to the point seven power in the coefficient?

Mr. Newton stated the exponent was changed in conjunction with other changes in the equation so that the resulting fee would remain consistent with estimated actual costs of providing the alternative drainage report and facilities.

MOTION: (Commissioner Laiche) "Mr. Chairman, on item #75-93, I recommend that we forward to City Council with recommendation for approval for the ordinance which would allow the developer, when permitted by City Staff, the option of either paying the fee or preparing a report and providing facilities."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Seese.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**5. #77-93 MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY AND PLAN
A request to adopt the Metropolitan Planning Organization Multi-modal Study and**

Plan as an appendage to the transportation element of the Comprehensive plan, to be used as an advisory document for the City in making future decisions regarding transportation and capital improvement projects.

PETITIONERS: City of Grand Junction / Metropolitan Planning Organization

**REPRESENTATIVES: Dave Thornton, City of Grand Junction
Bennett Boeschstein, Mesa County**

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bennett Boeschstein gave an overview of the proposed Multi-Modal Transportation Plan to be adopted as an appendage to the transportation element of the Comprehensive plan and to be used as an advisory document for the City.

Mr. Boeschstein explained that the twenty year plan was designed for pedestrian, bicycle, and multi-modal transportation and included considerations for the physically disabled. It does not include automobile transportation plans. He explained that the purpose of the plan is to respond to new federal transportation legislation known as the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). The state of Colorado is presently requiring counties and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations to follow the legislation.

Mr. Boeschstein explained the laws of ISTEA emphasize comprehensive planning, and transportation planning which considers environmental considerations, as well as social and economic factors. The purpose of the plan is to develop viable areas in communities by binding them together with pedestrian and bicycle networks. He gave the example of the Riverfront Trail and mentioned a proposed network linking Clifton with Grand Junction.

Mr. Boeschstein stated that his organization had done studies and found the greatest benefit from this would be bicycling students from the elementary to the college level. He presented a slide presentation and explained the present problems that need to be addressed.

Mr. Boeschstein also explained the benefits for the surrounding communities and gave examples such as the path from a cul-de-sac of one subdivision through the neighboring subdivision that enables about two hundred school children to safely get to school. There is one bicycle underpass in Grand Junction and he added that it is in disrepair. This proposal would address this issue. Mr. Boeschstein concluded with the example of the success of the Tabeguache Trail.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jerry Mutzer, 3411 Northridge Drive, came forward to speak for the proposal. He stated that his family frequently enjoyed walks on canal banks and were recently forbidden to do so. He explained that he did understand liability concerns but he would like to see the proposal approved so that his family may resume their outings. Mr. Mutzer gave an example of some of the negative impacts of the present alternatives stating that his daughter had witnessed a man in a passing vehicle throw a

beer bottle at a cyclist on the street, which severely injured the man. He also gave the example of the success of the Highline Canal in Denver as a positive benefit for the citizens of Grand Junction.

George Cordoba, who lives on West 15th Street, came forward to speak in favor of the proposal. He stated that he is a member of a bicycle club that has logged more than one million miles. Mr. Cordoba's club provides bicycle programs for all phases of the activity. He felt the proposal would be of great benefit to the citizens of Grand Junction and added that he envisioned the Tabeguache to Moab trails being expanded to reach Denver.

Peter Russier, 1520 North 7th Street, came forward to speak in favor of the proposal. He stated that he worked at St. Mary's Family Practice and the previously mentioned man who was hit with the beer bottle is a colleague of his who required 170 stitches for his injuries. Mr. Russier explained that he is a member of an organization called Headstrong West which purchases bicycle helmets and distributes them at a low cost to promote bicycle safety. Headstrong West provides programs that include bicycle rodeos and safety programs. He explained that deaths from bicycle related accidents have increased from last year and he would like to see the plan implemented for these reasons.

There were no public comments against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #77-93, I move that we forward this to City Council for perusal, with a recommendation for adoption."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Halsey.

A vote was called, and the motion was passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0. Commissioner Laiche was not present for the vote.

VI. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey was selected to be the liaison to City Council for the month of July and will attend the July 21st meeting. None of the Commissioners were available to attend the July 7th City Council meeting.

VII. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no nonscheduled citizens and/or visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.