

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- February 5, 1991
7:30 p.m. to 9:35 p.m.**

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Steve Love at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

Steve Love, Chairman	John Elmer	Jim Bittel
Sheilah Renberger	Katie Worrall	Ron Halsey

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner and Karl Metzner.

John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney, Bennett Boeschenstein, Community Development Director, and David Thornton, Planner, were also present.

Bobbie Paulson was present to record the minutes.

There were 10 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 1991 MEETING."

Commissioner Worrall seconded the motion.

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

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

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

III. PUBLIC MEETING

1. #4-91 REVISED FINAL PARKING PLAN

A request for a Revised Final Parking Plan in a Planned Multi-family Residential Zone with a density of 21.4 units per acre (96) units on approximately 4.54 acres to allow 144 parking spaces versus 164 which is required by the Zoning and Development Code and a request to release the elderly use restriction.

PETITIONER: Jay L. Cooke

LOCATION: 3032 North 15th Street

Howard Roberts, Nellie Bechtel Gardens property manager, announced that Mr. Cooke was not present and requested that this item be deferred until later in the evening.

MOTION: Commissioner Elmer made a motion to defer this item until later in the meeting; the motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger. Vote 6-0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

1. #10-91 LANDSCAPING PLAN FOR THE FUOCO MOTOR COMPANY

A request to vary the landscaping requirements for the Fuoco Motor Company located in a Light Commercial (C-1) and a Heavy Commercial (C-2) Zone.

PETITIONER: Jim Fuoco

LOCATION: 2586 Highway 6 & 50

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Fuoco stated that his letter (dated December 27, 1990; addressed to the Planning Department) was self-explanatory.

Chairman Love read the letter aloud:

"Subject: Variance to Zoning and Development Code 5-4-15.

It is our desire to ask for a variance to the above code and section. It is not in good planning to have the required amount of trees as the code requires because of the spill off and floating of so called tree pitch. This substance is devastating to automotive paint and, even though we presently do not have any trees, we have pitch on our new units from Elms across the street.

This problem is not exclusive to the Elms but is common with all types of trees.

The other problem is the critical ground water level that is in our area. In a recent test by salinity control where four test wells were drilled on our property, a water flow at seven feet indicated a continuous flow of fifty gallons/minutes without a drop in volume. This is indicative of the alkali problem that the area has had for years.

To deal with this problem, we have filled our property and raised the ground level slightly above the alkali. To add the deep watering that would be necessary for tree growth would be fool hardy and slow death for trees including pines that would suffer from salt accumulation on the roots.

The area should be able to support some low growing Junipers but I would like to hold off until our grass is visible to see exactly where the optimum placement would be. But the secret will be selective shallow watering so as not to raise the alkali level.

I hope that this information will be supportive of our request."

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner stated that his review comments were based on a discussion he had with Curt Swift of the Tri River Extension Service. Because of Mr. Swift's knowledge in landscaping, he was asked to review this proposal. A letter from Mr. Swift states that the water table at seven feet would not be a problem since tree roots do not normally grow that deep and because there would be no perking up of alkali from that level. The alkali that is there can be mitigated through use of soil additives and watering. Mr. Swift recommended that soil tests be done to determine the exact level of alkali. Based on the level of alkali, he can recommend trees and other plantings that will do well in that soil.

According to Mr. Swift, proper insect control would mitigate a pitch problem with most kinds of trees.

Based on the landscaping requirement, the total needed for this development is 5,030 square feet.

Karl stated that the proposed landscaping plan includes a grassed area along the Highway 6 & 50 right-of-way and a rock area planted with soapweed, yucca and sage. The rock area does not meet the Code's definition of vegetative landscaping.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Fuoco disagreed with Mr. Swift's comments and contended that there would be a pitch problem regardless of the type of tree. He stated that he did not want pitch on his cadillacs. He stated that seven years ago he requested the same type of variance, and the Planning Department agreed that trees and new cars were not compatible. He asked the Commission to take into consideration the 31,000 square feet of swamp area which he acquired from the State Highway Department and raised approximately two to four feet. The State Highway Department will not allow trees to be planted within 35 feet of the asphalt line of the state highway. Mr. Fuoco questioned whether trees would grow at all because of the high level of alkali.

Chairman Love asked what the Code required for landscaping?

Karl replied that the Code required one tree per every 500 square feet or fraction thereof and that 40 percent of the total square footage of the development be planted with shrubs. All areas that qualify as landscaping must be vegetative materials. He reiterated that rock did not qualify as landscaping. Eleven trees are required within the 5,030 square feet required to be landscaped for this development.

Chairman Love asked what the landscaping requirements were seven years ago?

Karl replied that he was unsure. The new landscaping requirements were adopted approximately four years ago.

Commissioner Elmer asked what the total proposed square feet of landscaping was?

Karl replied that the proposal included 31,059 square feet of grassed area in the public right-of-way, 10,000 square feet labeled as the natural gravel and rock planted with soapweed, yucca, and sage, and another 1,600 square feet grassed area in the northwest corner of the development.

Editor's Note: Although Mr. Fuoco is proposing a total of 32,659 square feet in grass and another 10,000 square feet with natural gravel and rock planted with soapweed, yucca, and sage, it does not meet the landscaping requirements of our Zoning & Development Code. The landscaping requirements for this development are 5,030 square feet of landscaped area, which includes eleven trees and 2,012 square feet planted with shrubs. Of the total square footage required, it must be plantings and vegetative ground covers.

Mr. Fuoco pointed out that his engineer made a mistake on the landscape plan; the piece labeled as natural rock will be grassed with a sprinkling system.

Commissioner Elmer asked Mr. Fuoco what he intended to do with the area between the Mitsubishi and the Honda showroom?

Mr. Fuoco stated that this area will be used for vehicle display.

When asked if the entire lot will be covered with asphalt, Mr. Fuoco replied that the only area that will not be asphalt is the storage parking area in the northeast corner. He added that the above ground fuel tanks, located in the northeast corner, must be removed by 1993.

Commissioner Elmer asked if a dwarf tree species would qualify as part of the landscape requirements?

Karl replied that so long as the minimum planting size is met, which is based on the caliper of a tree's trunk, it would qualify.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Love felt that the information presented from staff and the petitioner was conflicting and did not feel comfortable in making a decision because of this.

Commissioner Elmer stated that Mr. Swift's comments indicated that he could not make any recommendations of plant species without knowing the salinity of the soils. Commissioner Elmer suggested that the petitioner do additional research and obtain a professional opinion that states his case. If there is a dwarf species or a juniper that is tolerant and will not create a pitch problem then the intent of the Code should be followed to discourage developments that are predominately asphalt.

Commissioner Bittel asked if the trees had to be located along the highway or if there was any place they could be located that would not affect the vehicles?

Karl replied that staff works with each individual project to determine where trees can be located depending on the particular needs of the site plan i.e. circulation, parking, etc.

Mr. Fuoco stated that the only possible place to plant trees would be in the northeast corner where the gas tanks are located.

Commissioner Bittel asked if there was a possibility that Highway 6 & 50 would be widened?

Mr. Fuoco replied that he purchased his access for \$57,000. He will build an accel/decel lane at the entrance to the Fuoco Motor Company. If the highway was widened to four lanes, it would eliminate the accel/decel lanes.

Commissioner Bittel pointed out that if the road was widened, it would also eliminate some of the 31,000 square feet of landscaping along the highway.

Commissioner Worrall asked if a precedent has been set with other car lots?

Karl replied that he did not recall any and added that these requests do not come up very often.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the County was involved with the Ford Dealership on the Highway?

Bennett Boeschstein replied that the County required landscaping around the showrooms as a trade off for landscaping along the highway.

Chairman Love asked if Salinity Control is a State or Federal entity?

Mr. Fuoco replied that it is federal.

Chairman Love suggested that Salinity Control and Tri River Extension get together to come up with a compromise.

Mr. Fuoco requested that the Commission make a decision. He stated that it would be a shame to plant a \$100 tree and have it die three years later.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jan Smeltzer, 114 Mira Monte Road, asked if more native type plants could be used for landscaping i.e. soapweed and yucca plants.

Karl reiterated that any kind of vegetation is eligible. Mr. Swift recommended looking at some xeriscaping ideas, i.e. plants that would use minimal amounts of water.

Commissioner Elmer stated that he would be willing to defer the item if Mr. Fuoco would be willing to consult with a professional landscaper. He added that so long as the intent of the Code is met, he would be willing to omit the tree requirement.

Mr. Fuoco requested that the Commission make a decision and he would live with it.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER BITTEL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-91, A REQUEST TO VARY THE LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE FUOCO MOTOR COMPANY LOCATED AT 2586 HIGHWAY 6 & 50, I MOVE THAT WE RECOMMEND DENIAL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON - THE REQUEST FOR VARIANCE HAS NOT MET THE INTENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT CODE."

Commissioner Worrall seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Fuoco formally appealed to City Council.

Editor's Note: Mr. Fuoco withdrew his appeal the following morning, February 6, 1991.

V. PUBLIC MEETING

1. #4-91 REVISED FINAL PARKING PLAN

A request for a Revised Final Parking Plan in a Planned Multi-family Residential Zone with a density of 21.4 units per acre (96) units on approximately 4.54 acres to allow 144 parking spaces versus 164 which is required by the Zoning and Development Code and a request to release the elderly use restriction.

PETITIONER: Jay L. Cooke

LOCATION: 3032 North 15th Street

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jay L. Cooke briefly outlined the proposal for a revised final parking plan. The corporation Mr. Cooke is involved with bought Nellie Bechtel Gardens from Mesa County in November of 1990. He felt that it was unreasonable and unnecessary to require the addition of the total parking spaces required for the reasons that were categorized in the project narrative. If the required parking were built it would destroy a large amount of the existing landscaping. The intent of the Code is to have adequate parking. He stated that there are other apartment buildings in Grand Junction that do not meet the parking requirements.

There are 84 one-bedroom and 12 two-bedroom apartments in this complex. The Code makes no variation between two-bedroom and one-bedroom apartments. He suggested that the majority of tenants who rent one-bedroom apartments would only have one automobile. Provisions would be made to restrict anyone from storing R.V.'s, extra cars, and trailers on the premises.

He reiterated that a large part of the landscaping would have to be destroyed to comply with the Code. He added that a total of 148 parking spaces can be provided.

QUESTIONS

When asked which other apartment buildings did not comply with the parking requirements, Mr. Cooke replied that both the Northwood and Bookcliff apartment buildings did not meet Code requirements.

Commissioner Elmer stated that there may not be a parking problem now, but by changing the lifestyle and mix of people who live there the parking needs could change. He added that whether the apartments are one-bedroom or two there still may be one to three vehicles per family.

Mr. Cooke contended that because most of the apartments are one-bedroom less parking would be needed than if they were all two-bedroom apartments. He added that the proposed parking is within 10 percent of what is required.

Commissioner Bittel suggested limiting a portion of the one-bedroom apartments to one car.

Mr. Cooke stated that the majority of people who live at Nellie Bechtel do not have cars. The complex is 80% occupied, and the parking lot is never full.

Commissioner Halsey stated that currently the parking is indicative of the elderly population living there; if the population changed it could dramatically change the parking situation.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave a brief presentation and history of the project. Nellie Bechtel Garden Apartments were originally built in the early 1980's by Mesa County strictly for elderly housing. There are 136 spaces existing according to a site plan drawn in 1990. Parking requirements for multi-family dwelling units with five units or more per building are 1 1/2 spaces per unit plus one space per every five spaces for RV's and/or visitor parking. Therefore the parking requirements for the existing 96 units is 173 spaces. The Code does not differentiate between the number of bedrooms in the units. Because of inadequate parking, the use was restricted to elderly housing.

In 1988 when Mesa County attempted to sell Nellie Bechtel Gardens, one of the potential purchasers proposed to decrease the number of units by combining the units in order to meet the parking requirement. The total number of units were going to be decreased to a density of 12.3 units per acre as opposed to the 21.4 units per acre which exists now.

In 1989 the purchaser's plans changed and they requested to rezone the property to the existing density of Planned Residential 21.4 units per acre to allow the 96 units to remain.

In May of 1989, a revised plan showing 28 additional parking spaces was reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. A total of 164 spaces, if provided, would remove the elderly restriction.

The current owners are requesting that the elderly restriction be removed with the allocation of a total of 144 parking spaces. Mr. Cooke stated tonight that an additional four spaces can be provided. The Planning Department's recommendation is based on the Code which is to require the original 164 spaces that were approved in order to lift the elderly restriction. However, if Planning Commission chooses to approve this request, staff requests the following conditions: 1) R.V.'s or other vehicles used for storage not be allowed to park on site, 2) the one-bedroom units remain as such, and 3) if parking does become a problem, additional parking spaces as shown on the approved site plan will be provided by the petitioner. Whichever site plan is approved and the plat for the property needs to be recorded.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Cooke stated that this development has historically been elderly housing. He stated that it would not make sense to rent to young couples or single guys because it would drive the older tenants out. Mr. Cooke stated that they had to leave money on the table with the mortgage company until this was squared away. The mortgage company is uncomfortable with the restriction, otherwise there would not be a problem.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Bittel asked if the required parking was built, would the remaining landscaping meet the Code requirements?

Kathy explained that the landscaping is based on a planned zone. When the 28 additional spaces were approved, the landscaping was taken into consideration. If this proposal were a straight zone, the landscaping would be sufficient.

Commissioner Bittel asked that if this request were approved with the condition that the petitioner provide additional parking if it is needed, who will make that determination and what kind of enforcement would be taken?

Kathy replied that it would be really difficult to enforce. If there were complaints that people were parking their cars along 15th Street or if cars were blocking the loop through Nellie Bechtel so that fire trucks could not get through, the City would attempt to take some action.

John Shaver stated that if this is approved, it is approval of a final parking plan. He suggested that either the Commission approve the parking as it is being proposed by the petitioner and lift the restriction, or follow the recommendation made by staff and the previous Planning Commission decision that the elderly housing restriction be maintained until the 164 space parking plan is complied with.

Commissioner Halsey asked what the definition of elderly is?

Mr. Shaver stated that the State of Colorado and the Federal Fair Housing Act refer to various ages. There are many various triggers depending upon the nature of the occupancy and percentages of occupancy. The petitioner is responsible to ensure that he is in compliance with both the State and the Federal Fair Housing Act.

Commissioner Bittel asked the petitioner if he could add any parking spaces along the east end?

Mr. Cooke replied that it would be possible to add approximately eight spaces. He suggested that the Planning Commission approve his request with the condition that if the lack of parking becomes apparent, the sheds at the east end would have to be removed and an additional eight spaces provided; and that this approval be revoked in the event the petitioner did not comply.

Mr. Shaver stated that such a condition is possible, but counseled against it because it raised constitutional issues regarding the taking of property and enforcement issues. He reiterated that if this condition were placed upon the approval, it would not be a final plan.

Mr. Cooke stated that what Mr. Shaver suggests is the taking of property against someone's will. Mr. Cooke stated that this would not be the case; as a grantor, he would be waiving a hearing.

Mr. Shaver stated that the actual enforcement of an agreement such as this is another issue. Mr. Cooke says here tonight that if parking becomes a problem he will provide additional spaces; however, when the City determines that parking is a problem and requests that these buildings be removed a conceivable scenario is that Mr. Cooke would say "make me". This situation is one in which the City does not and should not want to be involved in.

Mr. Cooke felt that a judge could enforce this agreement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Robert Stokes, 626 27 1/4 Road, felt that the tenants of Nellie Bechtel Gardens have been excellent neighbors. He stated that he has not noticed any parking problems as it currently exists. He

was concerned that his property value would decrease if the age requirement were eliminated.

Bill Styers, 3011 North 15th Street, stated that he has lived there for four years. He concurred with Mr. Stokes, that the tenants of Nellie Bechtel were wonderful neighbors but was concerned about his property value if the elderly restriction were removed.

Larry Carver, with the Calvary Bible Church, concurred with Mr. Stokes's and Mr. Styer's comments.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Bittel asked Mr. Cooke if parking became a problem, would he be willing to remove the landscaping and build the additional parking?

Mr. Cooke replied affirmatively; he suggested that parking be added along the east end so that the landscaping was not destroyed. If this is an agreement, then the local district court could have injunction powers to enforce this agreement. If we were in violation of this agreement, the court could ensure that if parking became a problem the condition would be fulfilled.

Commissioner Bittel asked for clarification; would you be willing to provide the total number of parking spaces required?

Mr. Cooke replied that if necessary they would provide 164 spaces.

Mr. Shaver stated that there would still be an enforcement issue. The Planning Commission has made a previous accommodation; that previous accommodation stands and there have been no circumstances demonstrated by the petitioner to vary from that previous decision.

Mr. Cooke stated that the difference between then and now is when we physically tried to do it, we realized how detrimental it would be to the property.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #4-91, A REQUEST FOR A REVISED FINAL PARKING PLAN AT 3032 NORTH 15TH STREET TO ALLOW 144 PARKING SPACES VERSUS 164 WHICH IS REQUIRED BY THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, I MOVE THAT WE DENY THIS REQUEST FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: (1) PREVIOUS MOTIONS HAVE BEEN CLEAR ON THE PARKING VARIANCE BEING TIED TO THE ELDERLY RESTRICTION (2) LIFTING ELDERLY RESTRICTION INVITES MORE CARS AND FUTURE PROBLEMS (3) AN EXCEPTION TO THE CODE HAS ALREADY BEEN MADE FROM 173 SPACES TO 164 SPACES."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Bittel opposing.

Mr. Cooke formally appealed to City Council.

Commissioner Elmer excused himself from the meeting.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

1. #1-91 PATTERSON PARK WEST ZONE OF ANNEXATION

A request to zone Patterson Park west to Planned Commercial (PC) on approximately 8.9 acres.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

LOCATION: Northwest corner of Patterson and 25 Roads.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner gave a brief overview of the proposed zone of annexation. Patterson Park West annexation is located at the northwest corner of Patterson and 25 Road. When property is annexed, a city zone is placed on it. The proposed zoning is Planned Commercial (PC) which is consistent with the adjacent zoning to the west. The area east of Patterson Park West is zoned Planned Industrial (PI), and the area south is zoned Heavy Commercial Zone (C-2). The area north of Patterson Park West is still in the county.

There are two existing developments in this annexation which are the Diamond Shamrock Station and the Sleeping-N-Aire Mattress Factory Outlet both of which are consistent with uses allowed in commercial zones. The site plans that were approved at the time they were built would be approved as the development plans for those two parcels. The third parcel which is undeveloped will require a final plan approval at such time development is proposed. The uses, in lieu of a specific plan, would be those uses listed under the C-1 and C-2 zones in the Use Zone Matrix in the Zoning & Development Code.

Chairman Love asked for clarification of the review comments made by the City Attorney.

Mr. Shaver presumed that the City Attorney was requesting that the list of allowed uses be more specific rather than allowing those generally accepted in certain zones.

Karl added that in the future a list of specific uses would be made. The proposal is a planned zone without a plan, but both the 25 Road and Patterson Road Corridor Guidelines recommend planned zones in this area in order to control development along Patterson Road.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

MOTION: "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #1-91, A REQUEST TO ZONE PATTERSON PARK WEST LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF PATTERSON AND 25 ROADS TO PLANNED COMMERCIAL, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Worrall.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

2. **#2-91 PAINTED BOWL ZONE OF ANNEXATION**
A request to zone Painted Bowl to Public Zone (PZ) on approximately 120 acres.
PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction
LOCATION: Monument Road, approximately 1.5 miles southwest of South Redlands Road.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl briefly outlined the proposed zone of annexation. Painted Bowl, located at the east entrance of the Monument, was annexed in the City late last year. Painted Bowl is approximately 120 acres of vacant land with no particular plans for development at this time. A trail head is located on this property for a mountain bike trail that goes up into the BLM area. The property is owned by the City of Grand Junction; therefore, a Public Zone seemed most appropriate which is basically an identifier of the ownership.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jan Smeltzer, 114 Mira Monte Road,* stated that she wondered what would happen with the land and added that it sounded as though nothing at this point. She asked if motorized vehicles were allowed in this area?

Bennett Boeschenstein replied that a management plan is being developed that will limit the motorized vehicle areas between Little Park Road and Monument Road to one particular trail.

Ms. Smeltzer was concerned because many people drive vehicles all over out there. She said that last Spring herself and a friend spent 7 1/2 hours picking up 36 bags of trash. She said that she read in the paper that the museum was going to have a cleanup on Earth Day, but no one else showed up. Then she tried to get someone to pick up the bags of trash but ended up doing that herself too. She asked what steps would be made to keep motorized vehicles out?

Bennett replied that a management plan was supposed to be developed for the BLM property leased by the Museum. Since Mike Perry left, he was not sure whether they would be continuing the process. Plans were to fence the trail head so that motorized vehicles could not go further than a certain point. In addition to that signs would be posted.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER HALSEY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-91, A REQUEST TO ZONE PAINTED BOWL LOCATED AT MONUMENT ROAD, APPROXIMATELY 1.5 MILES SOUTHWEST OF SOUTH REDLANDS ROAD TO PUBLIC ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

3. #5-91 TEXT AMENDMENTS 1991
A request to amend Section 5-4-1.D. of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code.
PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl stated that the proposed text amendment is to clarify a requirement the City has had for at least ten years for improvement of perimeter streets on developments to half-street standards. The City Attorney felt that the current language in the Code was not specific enough.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER WORRALL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #5-91, A REQUEST TO AMEND SECTION 5-4-1.D. OF THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

VII. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Chairman Love welcomed Bennett Boeschstein to the Community Development Department staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.