

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

February 24, 1981

The first meeting of the month of February, 1981 was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairperson FLORENCE GRAHAM. The following members were present: FRANK SIMONETTI, JIM PICKENS, TOM PRICE, JANINE RIDER, SUSAN RINKER and REBECCA FRANK.

ALEX CANDELARIA, Planning Staff, DON WARNER, Planning Analyst, BOB BRIGHT, Senior City Planner, and LEILA E. MOSHER, Certified Shorthand Reporter, were also present. There were approximately twenty-five interested citizens in the audience.

SIMONETTI/PICKENS PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 30, 1980.

SIMONETTI/PICKENS PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 27, 1981.

#94-78 EASEMENT VACATION

Petitioner: Richard Sparkmen.
Location: Southwest corner of 12th Street and Winters Avenue.

A request to vacate a 20' railroad easement.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

DEL BEAVER, of Paragon Engineering, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the need for the easement vacation on the Southwest corner of 12th Street and Winters Avenue.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: Does the Staff have any comments?

ALEX CANDELARIA: Staff doesn't have any comments on this.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

RIDER/RINKER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #94-78, EASEMENT VACATION ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF 12TH STREET AND WINTERS AVENUE.

#69-80 NORTHWOOD CONDOMINIUMS - FINAL PLAN AND PLAT

Petitioner: Destination Properties, Inc.
Location: 655 North 12th Street.

Contains 3.5 acres designed for 90 units in a planned residential zone.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

TOM LOGUE, of Paragon Engineering, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the Northwood Condominiums, Final Plan and Plat.

TOM PRICE asked for clarification of Section B of the condominiums and the relationship to the parking areas for people living in that section.

TOM LOGUE outlined the proposed parking areas and how they would be utilized by persons in the condominiums.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

TOM LOGUE: We received the Review Comments from the City Traffic Engineer late this afternoon. We have several options that we would like to propose to the Traffic Engineer, as well as the Utilities Services Department.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

FRANK SIMONETTI: Is there anything in there about fencing, buffering?

JANINE RIDER: We had a conversation about it with the people on the north.

FRANK SIMONETTI: Yes. The people on the north were very upset about it.

DON WARNER: I think they have answered the question.

JIM PICKENS: What are you going to do with RV storage --

TOM LOGUE: We don't have anything on this particular site as far as the RV storage. There is a deed restriction as part of the CC Rules that would prohibit storing a recreational vehicle on site. They would have to make other arrangements to do so.

SIMONETTI/PRICE PASSED 4-3 (RIDER, PICKENS AND RINKER AGAINST) A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #69-80, NORTHWOOD CONDOMINIUMS, FINAL PLAN AND PLAT, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND PRELIMINARY PLAN COMMENTS: THAT THE TRASH PICKUP PROBLEM BE RESOLVED; THAT SOME TYPE OF FENCING OR BUFFERING BE REQUIRED ALONG THE SOUTH PROPERTY LINE, BETWEEN THIS PARCEL AND THE UNITY CHURCH.

JANINE RIDER: Can I suggest that you phrase that differently?

FRANK SIMONETTI: How?

JANINE RIDER: Let them talk to the Unity Church and either make an agreement to buffer or not buffer, as the two owners choose, and if neither one of them want it there I wouldn't see it as a problem.

FRANK SIMONETTI: I am not making it a total requirement. I am throwing it in as an option. I think they should look at it, because I see a problem if they don't.

#8-81 EASEMENT VACATION

Petitioner: Carl Roach.
Location: Lot 20, Horizon Park Plaza.

A request to vacate 5' of a utility easement.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

CARL ROACH appeared as the Petitioner and outlined the proposed easement vacation on Lot 20, Horizon Park Plaza.

ALEX CANDELARIA: It has been reviewed by all reviewing agencies and they have no objections to it, and Staff has no objections to it.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

PICKENS/SIMONETTI PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #8-81, EASEMENT VACATION, LOT 20, HORIZON PARK PLAZA.

#9-81 USE IN H.O. ZONE - LIQUOR LICENSE

Petitioner: Earl Payne.
Location: Mesa Mall #300.

A request for a liquor license at the Hungry Miner Restaurant - Lounge, in a highway oriented zone.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

EARL PAYNE appeared as the Petitioner and outlined the request for Conditional Use for liquor license for the Hungry Miner Restaurant and Lounge, in Mesa Mall.

DON WARNER: It is not really a conditional use. It is in the H O zone. It is just an additional use in the H. O. zone, rather than a conditional use. It can be approved as an addition to the H O zone.

JIM PICKENS: You have your own separate entrance?

EARL PAYNE: We will have two outside entrances and a Mall entrance, as well as corridor supply entrances for supplies.

BOB BRIGHT: No comments. If you would like us to, we can orient you as to where this project is.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

RIDER/FRANK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #9-81, AN ADDITIONAL USE IN THE H. O. ZONE, FOR THE LIQUOR LICENSE FOR THE HUNGRY MINER RESTAURANT - LOUNGE, MESA MALL #300.

#10-81 HOLMES SUBDIVISION (MINOR) - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Charles and Bernita Holmes.

Location: Southwest corner of Orchard Avenue and 28.75 Road.

Contains .35 acres designed for 2 lots in a single family residential zone.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

BILL RYDEN appeared for the Petitioner and presented the Final Plat for Holmes Subdivision (minor).

LOUIE DEROSE appeared and asked for clarification as to what would be placed on the lot.

BILL RYDEN: According to the information given to me by the client, he is going to put a single family residence in there.

DON WARNER: It is single family zoned.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

RIDER/PICKENS PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #10-81, HOLMES SUBDIVISION (MINOR) FINAL PLAT, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND SUBJECT TO AN AGREEMENT BEING REACHED BETWEEN THE CITY ENGINEER AND THE PETITIONER FOR THE AMOUNT OF RIGHT OF WAY ON 28.75 ROAD AND ORCHARD AVENUE, BEFORE THE ITEM IS PRESENTED TO CITY COUNCIL.

#11-81 REZONE R1C TO I-1

Petitioner: Jehovah's Witnesses.
Location: East of 28.5 Road, between Hill Avenue and
Gunnison Avenue.

A request to change from single family residential use to light industrial uses on .56 acres.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

LARRY GOSS appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the reason for the Rezone R1C to I-1.

LARRY GOSS: We are wanting to relocate and in order to do so, why we felt that we had to rezone this particular location, because it would be difficult to sell it as a residential piece of property with the building on it, so we are requesting a rezone for this purpose.

BOB BRIGHT outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: I have severe reservations on having gone out there. I know it is a dreadful hodgepodge, but there are some very nice homes, especially across the street, and I wonder about the residents of that area. The road itself already carries a great amount of traffic, and I personally don't feel that it is a good place for light industrial.

REBECCA FRANK: I just have a problem with a request to change a zoning on a property to help the resale of that property by the Petitioner, and I think the zoning request should come from the buyer and not the seller of the land, and I don't think it is a good reason to rezone the property.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

FRANK/PRICE PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL DENIAL OF #11-81, REZONE R1C TO I-1, BETWEEN HILL AVENUE AND GUNNISON AVENUE, BECAUSE REZONING A PARCEL OF LAND FOR THE SOLE REASON OF RESALE AND TO HELP THE LANDOWNER SELL THIS LAND IS NOT A VALID REASON TO REZONE PROPERTY.

JANINE RIDER: May I make some discussion? It would occur to me that behind your motion might be the idea that that piece of property may be right for rezoning, if someone with the intended use came forth with the idea?

REBECCA FRANK: Precisely.

JANINE RIDER: So that could be a possibility in the future and the idea of rezoning in the future is not out of the question.

REBECCA FRANK: I don't think we should get into rezoning property to help sell the property. If there is a market for that property, then let the buyers come to us.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: Before you go, you have the right to go before the City Council.

#12-81 CONDITIONAL USE - CHURCH BUILDING AND DAY CARE CENTER

Petitioner: Robert McClung.

Location: East of 28 Road, South of the Grand Valley Canal.

A request for a church building and day care center on 4.1 acres in a single family residential zone.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

ROBERT McCLUNG appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the proposed conditional use for a church building and day care center. ROBERT McCLUNG also described the fencing that would be proposed and the traffic study that had been made to determine the number of vehicle trips in and out of the area of the proposed church and day care center area.

ROBERT McCLUNG: We did ask also for a height variance. -- Nobody said anything about that in any of the responses we got, and I am wondering why.

DON WARNER: This height variance wasn't advertised -- I think we have got to bring that height variance back next time, but that will still process it in time for your start of building.

FRANK SIMONETTI: I don't see any problem, but it does have to be advertised.

TOM PRICE: I wanted to ask something about the sign. What type of sign are you going to have?

ROBERT McCLUNG: We haven't got an exact idea in mind. We did say six foot wooden fence. Probably Jim Willis would make it for us; that's his business. It would probably not be lighted, because there is a street light over it.

DON WARNER: That would come under the Sign Code.

DOUG SAWTELL appeared as a property owner in the area of the request and expressed concern over the increase in traffic flow and the alignment of Cindy Ann Road.

DOUG SAWTELL: They are going to put up a privacy fence. I have my reservations about the chain link fence. I don't know what type you are really planning on putting in there, and the maintenance on it. I would kind of prefer a wood privacy fence along that boundary line.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: Can you get an agreement with your neighbor?

ROBERT McCLUNG: Now, then, if we move over to line up with Cindy Ann, Mr. Anderson is going to get mad at us for moving the street light that's in the middle of Cindy Ann.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

JOE AAENG... appeared as a homeowner in the area, stated he also represented NOLA MILLER and DEAN HANNIGAN and stated they were in opposition to the proposal because of the traffic and access problems.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

JIM PICKENS: I am going to make just a couple of observations of my own, not in particular opposition to the proposal, but I live not too distant from the proposed site, and for a short period of time I was coming in from the Clifton area at five, or a little after five, to five-thirty. I would come in on North Avenue, catch 28 Road and go up to Orchard and it was not unusual for me to sit there sometimes five to ten minutes at a stretch before I could make a left hand turn on to Orchard.

Just personally, I really don't know what we would do with this particular piece of ground that would impact the neighborhood less than maybe the Church might. -- I am just making a comment that there is a lot of traffic already at the intersection of 28th and Orchard.

SIMONETTI/RINKER PASSED 5-1 (PICKENS AGAINST) A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CONDITIONAL USE, CHURCH BUILDING AND DAY CARE CENTER, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND THE REALIGNMENT OF CINDY ANN ROAD; THAT THE PETITIONER BE REQUIRED TO PLACE A WOODEN FENCE ALONG THE ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES, TO THE CANAL.

#13-81 DEVELOPMENT IN H. O. AND ZONING OF ANNEXATION IN H. O. - ORCHARD MESA CENTER

Petitioner: Dillon Real Estate.
Location: Between D.5 Road and Hwy. 50, West of 27.75 Road Line.

A request by City Market, Inc., for development in a highway oriented zone, and a request to zone an annexation to H. O.

- a. Consideration of development.
- b. Consideration of zoning of annexation.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

ALEX CANDELARIA: If I may clarify before the Petitioner -- this portion here is H. O. and it is in the City. They have requested this for annexation, as well as for H. O. zoning, and that is the clarification I wanted to make to the Planning Commission.

JOHN SHAW, Victoria Investment Company, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the proposed Development in H. O. and zoning of annexation to H. O., for Orchard Mesa Center.

DON WARNER: What is your treatment going to be of that big ditch on B.5?

JOHN SHAW: We have taken bids to pipe that ditch.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: I don't understand the interior traffic circulation; would you mind running over it?

JOHN SHAW pointed out the traffic circulation pattern to the Commission.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

SIMONETTI/RIDER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #13-81, THE ZONING OF THE ANNEXATION TO H. O. FOR ORCHARD MESA CENTER, DEVELOPMENT IN H. O.

SIMONETTI/RIDER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #13-81, DEVELOPMENT IN H. O., ORCHARD MESA CENTER.

#14-81 RIGHT OF WAY VACATION

Petitioner: D. S. Dykstra.
Location: 2516 Foresight Circle South.

A request to vacate a portion of right of way.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

D. S. DYKSTRA appeared as the Petitioner and outlined the need for the right of way vacation for 2516 Foresight Circle South.

DON WARNER: If you are familiar with it, there is a great expanse of blacktop out in here, which is really not useful for traffic circulation, except to confuse it, and vacation of this area and bringing the curb and gutter out would probably aid the traffic circulation.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

RIDER/RINKER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #14-81, RIGHT OF WAY VACATION, 2516 FORESIGHT CIRCLE SOUTH.

#15-81 EASEMENT VACATION

Petitioner: Discovery 76.
Location: North of Ridge Drive (F.5 Road), East of 27.75 Line.

A request to vacate utility easements that will be relocated.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

JOHN BALLAGH, of Armstrong Engineers, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the need for easement vacation North of Ridge Drive and East of 27.75 Line.

FRANK SIMONETTI: How about that first comment by Mountain Bell, that they want an easement?

JOHN BALLAGH: That easement has been granted on the plat.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

PICKENS/RINKER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #15-81 EASEMENT VACATION, NORTH OF RIDGE DRIVE AND EAST OF 27.75 LINE.

#16-81 INDEPENDENT AVENUE COMMERCIAL PARK (MINOR) - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Trinity Associates.
Location: Between Independent Avenue and Hwy. 6 & 50, West of 25.5 Road Line.

Contains 5.26 acres designed for 2 lots in a heavy commercial zone.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

LUTHER MUSGROVE appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the final plat for Independent Avenue Commercial Park (Minor).

LUTHER MUSGROVE: The Petitioner has agreed to Power of Attorney on Independent Avenue. This submittal is not part of previous submittals on the property. It is a different owner and a new ballgame.

FRANK SIMONETTI: Is the right of way sufficient, or --

LUTHER MUSGROVE: We were asked for an additional three feet and did give that.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: Alex, do you have any comments?

ALEX CANDELARIA: No. That's all the comments that Staff has. I might add that Petitioner has responded to all of the comments that were on the Review Sheet.

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

RIDER/FRANK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #16-81, FINAL PLAT, INDEPENDENT AVENUE COMMERCIAL PARK (MINOR), SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

#17-81 REZONE R1C TO PB AND VICTORIA WEST - PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Carl Vostatek.

Location: Northwest corner of First Street and West Mesa Avenue.

A request to change from single family residential use to planned business use for an office complex on .66 acres.

- a. Consideration of zone.
- b. Consideration of preliminary plan.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

CARL VOSTATEK appeared as the Petitioner and outlined the proposal for a rezone R1C to PB, and the Preliminary Plan for Victoria West.

CARL VOSTATEK: In terms of the other Staff Comments, I just picked this up today -- it hadn't been sent to me -- and I have talked with the Planning Staff. I see no problem with going along with any of the recommended changes that the Planning Staff would require.

I should like to present to you at this time a petition with 26 signatures of residents in that neighborhood who are in favor of this project.

JIM PICKENS: I would like to clarify one other point: The office buildings, I think you were referring to, were not approved by this Commission. We denied the request and we were overturned by City Council, but it was not a recommendation of this Commission that we approve those office buildings in there.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: In the back of your building is the faculty parking lot, and at one o'clock this afternoon I drove out there and talked to the teacher who was on duty, and that is an open campus concept -- the school is growing and that parking lot had about twenty adolescents in it. You couldn't move. And the same with First Street and Mesa. I feel this type of thing is really not compatible with a junior high school.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: And I certainly don't think Victorian architecture is compatible with that junior high, nor do I think Hillcrest Manor is Victorian architecture.

JANINE RIDER: I have a real problem with an area like this, because what do you do with it?

FLORENCE GRAHAM: I don't know why we bothered with the First Street Policy at all, in view of what's happening. I mean, we do it one day and undo it the next.

SUE HAFEY appeared as a property owner in the area and spoke in favor of the project, stating that no-one would want to build a house next to the junior high school because of the problems of the students sitting on lawns, smoking and so forth.

TOM PRICE: You moved in to the neighborhood when that school was still there, right?

SUE HAFEY: Right.

TOM PRICE: You were aware of the situation with the school?

SUE HAFEY: I was not aware the students were like they are.

JANINE RIDER: Carl, I think you probably said this and I missed it. What do you intend to go in the building totally, or what do you anticipate?

CARL VOSTATEK: Professionals, probably Accountants again, as in the other building, or real estate people.

DON WARNER: That would be determined by your approval; if you said offices, there wouldn't be any retail.

ALEX CANDELARIA appeared as a property owner in the area.

ALEX CANDELARIA: I am objecting to this because of the fact that the bulkiness -- it is even bulkier than the junior high, and I would disagree that the junior high is a bad neighbor. They have been a good neighbor to us, and I have no objection to them. As a matter of fact, we have one of them babysit for us and is really highly recommended and real good kids. I have no qualms as far as the junior high is concerned.

My objection is to the stripping along First Street, which will, if the project keeps going on to the south of you -- there is someone waiting in the wings for a Petition for more offices, and further south you have a non-conforming usage, which is Arcieri, and further south you have a conditional use which was approved by the City Council.

To me, these people come in from nine to five and then they go home to their quiet little neighborhoods. We put up with the traffic that occurs at night, and I am sure that everyone that drives along North Avenue and sees the stripping of business, and I am sure those people who abut -- the residences that abut to those uses there have their own little stories as to what does occur at night with these parking lots.

To me, this is residential in character and it should remain residential in character. That would lower my property values because my interest lies here and here. Once this starts building into business you are going to have a limited market as far as I am concerned, because people who are shopping for a house are looking for a house in a residential area; not in a mixed use.

JANINE RIDER: There is another problem, too. The other problem is that I think in any neighborhood you went in to and tried to rezone multi-family, you would have the neighborhood complaining because nobody wants apartments. On the other hand, it is our responsibility to provide that kind of housing in the community for people who need it, and the best place to put it is so the people are close to facilities they need.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: Janine, I think really that was the purpose of our intent in our Policy.

JANINE RIDER: Absolutely.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: How much of that property is occupied by the building?

DON WARNER: 5,650, and the lot is about 24,000, so it is a very small part of the lot that is being occupied by the building.

JIM PICKENS: It seems like any time we address anything on First Street the Franklin Apartments come up as we don't want that type of development in our neighborhood, and I can certainly appreciate that. I don't think I would like it in my neighborhood either, but I think -- I will offer as I have before, that there is a happy medium that we can strike on multi-families, and that being anything from a duplex up to or exceeding the Franklin West Apartments.

From my viewpoint, this does not fit the neighborhood. What can we offer that would be a little bit better? What about a well done duplex, or a well done fourplex, and forget the Franklin West thing?

FLORENCE GRAHAM closed the public hearing.

RIDER/PICKENS PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #17-81, REZONE R1C TO PB FOR VICTORIA WEST, FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. THIS DOES NOT REFLECT THE FIRST STREET CORRIDOR POLICY WHICH WAS PASSED WITHIN THE YEAR BY THE COUNCIL AND THE COMMISSION.
2. THE FACT THAT AN OFFICE BUILDING DOES NOT SEEM TO BE AN APPROPRIATE USE ON THE PROPERTY ABUTTED ON TWO SIDES BY A SCHOOL.

JANINE RIDER: Personally, Carl, I hope you find the great site, because I like the Victorian architecture.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: You are aware you can take this before the City Council?

CARL VOSTATEK: Yes.

#18-81 TEXT AMENDMENT - ZONING ORDINANCES OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

Petitioner: City Staff.

A request to delete Conditional Use 4.9 from the R3 zone - On premises consumption of Liquor or Fermented Mal beverage Licensed premises --- consists of premises licensed under hotel restaurant license, Tavern License, beer and wine license, or fermented malt beverage license for consumption on the premises.

FLORENCE GRAHAM read the request and opened the public hearing.

DON WARNER: This is a housekeeping item. You remember we removed restaurants as a conditional use in R3 and this just had the liquor licenses for restaurants in R3 which was no longer any good, since we removed the restaurants anyway.

SIMONETTI/FRANK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #18-81, TEXT AMENDMENT - ZONING ORDINANCES OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

#20-80 Consider a recommendation to the Grand Junction City Council concerning the recommended "Zoning and Development Code".

FLORENCE GRAHAM: This concerns only the Grand Junction City Planning Commission. Two Members of our Commission cannot vote because they had to be here during the whole process, so the two Members, if you will refrain, please.

SIMONETTI/RIDER PASSED 4-2 (PRICE AND RINKER ABSTAINING)
A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THE ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF
GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE.

The first meeting of the month of February, 1981 was adjourned
at 10:30 p.m.

** ** *