

MINUTES SEASIDE PLANNING COMMISSION
December 4, 2018

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Chris Hoth called the regular meeting of the Seaside Planning Commission to Order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ATTENDANCE: Commissioners present: Chair Chris Hoth, Vice Chair David Posalski, Bill Carpenter, Lou Neubecker, and Teri Carpenter, Staff Present: Debbie Kenyon, Administrative Assistant, Kevin Cupples, Planning Director,

PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES, EX PARTE CONTACTS & CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Chair Hoth stated it is standard procedure for the members of the Commission to visit the sites to be dealt with at these meetings. He then asked if any of the Commissioners wished to declare an ex parte contact or conflict of interest. There was no response.

Chair Hoth asked if there was anyone present who felt the Commission lacked the authority to hear any of the items on the agenda. There was no response.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 16, 2018 approved as submitted.

AGENDA:

PUBLIC HEARING REQUIREMENTS:

The following public hearing statements were read by Chair Hoth:

1. The applicable substantive criteria for the hearing items are listed in the staff report(s) prepared for this hearing.
2. Testimony and evidence shall be directed toward the substantive criteria listed in the staff report(s) or other criteria in the plan or land use regulation, which you believe applies to the decision.
3. Failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals on that issue.
4. The applicant will testify first, then any opposition will testify, and then the applicant will be given time for rebuttal.

PUBLIC HEARING:

- A.** 18-081VRD is a conditional use request by Tiffany Hemsley for a four (4) bedroom Vacation Rental Dwelling Permit with a maximum occupancy of not more than ten (10) people, regardless of age. The property is located at 2132 Beach Dr. (T6-R10-S28BA-TL1400) and it is zoned High Density Residential (R-3).

Kevin Cupples, City Planning Director, presented a staff report, reviewing the request, decision criteria findings, conditions and conclusions.

Chair Hoth asked if there was anyone who would like to offer testimony in favor of the request. Tiffany Hemsley, 654 Burlond Ct, Folsom, CA. Ms. Hemsley stated that she grew up here in Oregon. Tiffany's family had a beach house here in Seaside and she wants to carry on the tradition.

Chair Hoth asked if there was anyone else who would like to offer testimony in favor of the request. There was no response.

Chair Hoth asked if there was anyone who would like to offer testimony in opposition. There was no response.

Chair Hoth indicated the issue was opened for Commission discussion. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated that looking at the picture and the parking space and yard space area, the drawing looks different than the actual photo. It looks like almost the entire yard is asphalt. Mr. Cupples stated that the whole front yard area is gravel and asphalt. In the conditions of approval it says they're going to have to revise

their parking map to recognize just the area that is currently paved; and provide some kind of separator between the asphalt and the gravel. And then they're going to have to come in and provide some form of landscaping in that first 15 foot setback area. Vice Chair Posalski asked if they knew what they were going to put in the gravel area to prevent people from parking there. Ms. Hemsley stated not yet. Mr. Cupples stated that they indicated that they were wondering whether or not railroad ties were acceptable or not? Ms. Hemsley stated they would like to put railroad ties along that area so that people don't park in the yard. Chair Hoth stated that it was his understanding that the barrier will be in place before they can begin renting, but the landscaping can be done at a later date is that correct? Ms. Hemsley stated yes. Commissioner Bill Carpenter asked if there were any roll over customers that are coming. Ms. Hemsley stated no. Chair Hoth stated that the staff report says for the final recommendation they will conditionally approve a maximum occupancy of 10, which he's assuming are the first of 10 adults. Only if the fourth bedroom is approved, but the fourth bedroom isn't approved yet. So how do we approve it as a 10 person occupancy if that's not approved yet? Mr. Cupples stated they would only be getting the nine occupancy until such time as that bedroom is available and it may never become available, but in order to say that it's approved and then follow the condition and that condition actually says, they'll only be licensed for nine up until such time as a fourth bedroom becomes available. Chair Hoth stated we're just approving up to 10 if the conditions are correct. Vice Chair Posalski asked Ms. Hemsley if she was okay with those recommended solutions. Ms. Hemsley stated that she was okay with all of them except for one and that's the back fence. She reached out to the neighbor who wrote the letter recently and they've been going back and forth. She flew in today and was planning on meeting with him the following day. He lives on the north side of the property. The fence that he's complaining about is on the west side. She thinks it's important that she reached out to the owner to make sure they're okay with it, to see what they want to do, and come to an agreement with them. Vice Chair Posalski stated he thinks the issue is people traveling through the yard from elsewhere, which will be a problem regardless of who owns the property over there. Vice Chair Posalski asked if she was not wanting to change the fence or do something different. Ms. Hemsley stated that she was okay with anything they want to do, a tall fence would be fine, if they want to take it out, she's okay with that too. She just wanted to make the point that he's not that property owner. Vice Chair Posalski asked Mr. Cupples if that would be a condition of approval regarding the fence be put in to prevent people from walking over there. Mr. Cupples stated that's essentially what you're saying is that it's got to have a higher fence so people are discouraged from stepping over it or hopping over it or doing whatever they're doing. They are in fact trespassing onto a different neighbor's property. As a result they walk right past his property, even though they're on the other person's property. That's the problem he identified. Chair Hoth stated that a taller fence must be installed along the backyard area in order to discourage trespass onto the neighboring property as a means of taking a shortcut to the beach.

At the end of the Commissioners discussion, Chair Hoth closed the public hearing and Vice Chair Posalski made a motion to approve the conditional use under the guidelines that staff has presented. Commissioner Neubecker seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

B. 18-068HOZ is a Highway Overlay Zone request by Main & Main Capital Group to build an 18,000 sq. ft. retail building at 825 Avenue N (T6-R10-S21DD-TL200, 500 and 10316). The subject property is zoned General Commercial (C-3). Although the primary access will be from Avenue N, the applicant plans to utilize the undeveloped portions of S Irvine and Avenue O in conjunction with the proposed development of the surrounding property.

Kevin Cupples, City Planning Director, presented a staff report, reviewing the request, decision criteria findings, conditions and conclusions. Mr. Cupples stated what he tried to do is update the original staff report to provide some follow up. By editing the report he tried to make it a little easier to understand what was being kept in and what was being added. He knows the applicant representatives are here and so he'll be interested to hear what they have to say.

Chair Hoth asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of the request. Craig Bull with Main & Main Capital, 6600 Pedro, Colony, Texas stated they were at the meeting seeking approval to build a Grocery Outlet here in town. I have a letter here from Grocery Outlet explaining their interest in this project. He opened with thanking the committee for taking the time to consider the project. We were very excited about the prospect of opening a store to better serve the community by providing fresh, high-quality branded products. We typically have over 4,500 skews with grocery, deli, produce, frozen

food, beer, wine, fresh meat, general merchandise and health and beauty care. Under our unique business model, our independent operators are independent, small businesses who live in the community, manage the store, hire locally, and select the merchandise customized to the community. The key attribute to our independent operator model is commitment to the community involvement, participating in and sponsoring events around the local community and become an integral part of the community. This particular location is great for a Grocery Outlet bargain market as it is specifically zoned for our use and provides an opportunity to build a brand new building, maximizing our ability to serve the community and hire from within the community. They feel it will also provide a vibrant new building Seaside can be proud of. We have intimately been involved in the process behind the scenes with Main & Main, the developer and future landlord for this location. They have kept us up to date on the project details including the various hearings, city meetings and traffic concerns. There was an understanding that the Oregon Department of Transportation would fund the highway widening along Highway 101, which impacted the approach to the property. We understand now that ODOT will not be funding this anytime soon. We understand all planning commission members have expressed desire for the project to proceed, but there are personal concerns over traffic. We want to take the time to write a letter for the record, on the appeal requiring the landlord developer to fix the intersection. This would ultimately be a vote against Grocery Outlet as we would not be able to construct the store with the additional infrastructure burdens. Such cost would be passed onto Grocery Outlet as its independent operator. The letter is from the VP of real estate, from Grocery Outlet.

Mike Ard (17790 Southwest Dodson Drive, Sherwood, Oregon) has spoken a number of times to several of you about this project over the last couple of months. You're well aware that the traffic study was completed, believing that we were going to have a turn lane in place and that now the turn lane is not happening due to financial considerations from ODOT.

There's a problem with that statement though. The problem is as Mr. Cupples has acknowledged that a requirement to install the southbound left turn lane would be disproportionate to the impact of the development and therefore it is prohibited under federal law and since you cannot follow the direct instructions of ODOT in requiring the left turn lane, the question becomes, can the development move forward? Last time he talked about safety and focused on that because he does think that safety is a critical factor. The basic gist of it is that there have been some crashes that have occurred along that segment of the highway through the City of Seaside. They haven't been particularly bad crashes and the crash rates haven't been particularly high and we don't believe that there's a significant safety risk that's associated with the lack of a turn lane that's there. So what this really comes down to is a question of operations and policy. Your highway overlay district does require you to examine new developments in and through the lens of whether it would create operational or safety problems that need to be addressed. What he'd like to point out tonight is the results of the operational analysis specifically with respect to that intersection at Highway 101 and Avenue N, and those appearing on page 17 of the traffic impact study and where it shows under 20 background plus site trips, conditions they projected for the pm peak hour level of service E with a volume capacity ratio of 0.30. ODOT's standard for the highway is that we're allowed to use up to 90 percent of the capacity of an intersection. We are not using 90 percent of the capacity, so the operational analysis shows that without that turn lane we are meeting the standard. We agree with ODOT that providing a center left turn lane would be beneficial.

We do quibble with the idea that it is essential. He want to read something very briefly from ODOT analysis procedures manual, and this is with respect to turn lanes. It says, turn lane criteria for proposed left or right turn lanes at un-signalized intersections and private approach roads must meet the installation required material contained in the highway design manual. What it means is that the lengths of tapers, the way that striping is done, the lane widths, everything associated with that turn lane pocket has to be done up to standards. ODOT's estimate for the cost of the corridor improvements was \$10M and trying to extend that turn lane he's guessing is going to be in the neighborhood of \$3M if we tried to do it according to highway design manual standards at the south end. That's the burden that goes well beyond what Grocery Outlet can handle. It goes on to say, meeting the criteria does not require a turn lane to be installed. He thinks that's a critical point to make tonight. Satisfying warrants for a turn lane means you can consider installing the turn lane, but it does not mandate that you must install the turn lane.

As ODOT considered their letter they did not take into account the requirements of proportionality under the Nolan and Dolan tests, and they made a recommendation that you do something that you're barred from doing under federal law. We believe that you can approve this project because it meets the

operational standards as shown in the report, even without that turn lane and that's what we're requesting tonight.

Chair Hoth asked if there was anyone else would like to speak in favor of the project. A gentleman in the audience stated that he was in-between, but has a different point of view. Jeff Hayes with Sunset Empire Transportation District, 900 Marine Drive, Astoria, Oregon was the speaker and pointed to a copy of a letter that his Commissioners submitted for this meeting. They wanted to share their concerns. While they're not opposed to economic development, the impact needed to be considered for the surrounding areas. The problem that we experience is bus delays on the highway, especially during the summer months when our on-time performance down here in the South County is considerably less than it is the rest of the year. We also experienced the same type of impacts up in the Warrenton area too. We get some bottlenecks coming off the Youngs Bay Bridge. We just want to make sure that you take that into consideration and the board is recommending that the condition of approval for a left hand turn lane be put on the applicant. If you have any questions, he'll be happy to answer.

Chair Hoth asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak in opposition. There was no response. Chair Hoth asked the applicant if they would like to respond.

Mr. Ard stated that he thinks he's repeating himself at this point. Obviously the installation with the turn lane, it doesn't pass the proportionality test that's required under Dolan, so that really can't be required. In terms of the on time bus performance his understanding is that the major bottleneck that's affecting the progression of traffic in the summer months through the city is the signal lighted intersections as opposed to the two lane cross section that is borne out by our analysis that shows that it's not at capacity. He's heard anecdotally from members of the commission that there are questions about the existing conditions as they relate to the signal south of the project site as you are heading out of town. So his expectation is that with the completion of the center turn lane, you're still going to have congestion in the city associated with the bottlenecks that are affecting the flow of traffic through there. They agree that the center turn lane would be nice to have; he just doesn't believe that it can be done at this time and doesn't want to be held to a requirement that it had to be installed before they can proceed.

Chair Hoth closed the public hearing and turned it over to the commissioners. Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated that the conclusions to criteria number two is that it talks about the turn lane and money. He would like to add to the text that until ODOT funding is available for the turn lane, and if ODOT approves a right turn in, right turn out of the Avenue N, with a curb barrier to prevent left turn lanes, and lanes into Avenue N could be added. We talked about that earlier or at one of the previous meetings. Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated that if you're coming from the south, you can turn into Avenue N making a right turn in, if you're leaving Avenue N, you have to make a right turn out because if a curb could be put in there to prevent a left turn from the southbound traffic, turning into Avenue N, it would allow flow through that section. An example of that would be at 11th street and Highway101; it's a right turn in and a right turn out.

Chair Hoth stated the Commissioner Bill Carpenter is proposing to add that as an action. Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated that if we could put that into the conclusion criteria to say that this is a possibility. Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated that he's not sure ODOT would go along with it. Commissioner Bill Carpenter asked a question, "If we approved this and say without the lane they could proceed," what could ODOT do to us? Could they stop us from doing this? Mr. Cupples stated that he doesn't know that he can answer that. Chair Hoth asked if there is specifically not a precedent for something like that or you're not sure. Mr. Cupples stated, based on the criteria for a highway overlays and the results from the traffic impact analysis, he knows Mike has kind of minced words with how that is compelling or not compelling. It is recommended and it was recommended that you make it a condition of approval. Mr. Cupples stated he has kind of sidestepped that in saying he doesn't know if the city could come up with funding to do that. He doesn't know if the applicant can come up with funding to do that or if ODOT finds money and they can roll it into their project. Mr. Cupples was not compelling the applicant to do it. He was really saying that it needed to be done in order to meet the overlay zone, and to meet the purpose statements in the overlay zone review. Without that, then he doesn't think they're doing it. He thinks what Commissioner Bill Carpenter is suggesting is a potential solution and saying yes, you can go ahead and do that if you put in a right in/right out and a barrier to prevent in-turning traffic. He doesn't know what ODOT would say to that, but they would have to approve anything that was being done in the roadway. So if that's added in that's a different approach.

Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated that he knows that a lot of the business to the new market would be locals and after people have gone through there a couple of times they would find their way around. Vice Chair Posalski asked if Avenue N and Avenue P would be the access points to the property from Jackson. Mr. Cupples stated the problem with that is you're really using someone else's parking lot to access their property. You'd be running through the parking lot in front of Coast Hardware. Vice Chair Posalski stated that he was looking more Jackson Street and come in on the back side. Mr. Cupples stated that with the improvement down the end of their development then yes, it's possible they could come down Jackson. They would most likely come in on the Avenue M and take Jackson and get to the property. Vice Chair Posalski asked about Avenue P and what it looks like where it runs up to the property. Mr. Cupples stated it's a gravel road. Vice Chair Posalski stated he wonders if they're looking at improving the extension of one of the roads, if they have three entrances, then maybe Avenue N limitation isn't as big of a detriment to them as it seems now that it may be less expensive than the \$3M that ODOT wants.

Mr. Cupples stated that is something they could look at. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated somebody suggested that the Coast Hardware parking lot is part of the city or was it road at one time. Mr. Cupples stated there could have been a platted street through there, but if so, it's long been vacated. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated she likes the idea but how would this affect other businesses in the area for people getting in and out of this business. She is excited about it coming in so she's wrestling with the transportation issues. Chair Hoth stated that we've already continued this, so we're kind of at the point now where we'd like to make some decisions.

Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated if we approve this, what then happens if we go along and say with all of the conditions that you have outlined in your report, and go ahead and approve it for these conditions. What then happens? Mr. Cupples stated that if you do approve this with what's in the report as it stands right now with or without what you suggested that would be the decision and the applicants would have an opportunity to appeal that decision to city council. ODOT has the same right to appeal that decision as does the transportation district. Regardless of what decision you make, it's an appealable action. That's the unfortunate part of, or maybe it's fortunate, part of land use in Oregon as your actions can always be challenged.

Vice Chair Posalski stated that they put a couple of suggestions out there for the applicant. He thinks we can approve it with the conditions that we have in there and if they want to change their application and come back with a different approach to it then he thinks we can go that way. He doesn't think we should approve it with suggestions that they're not either interested in or not able to move on anyway. He thinks it puts it back into their court by just approving it with conditions. If they don't like it, they can do an appeal or make changes to their proposal.

Mr. Cupples stated what he is saying is the turn lane needs to be in before they put the demands on the roadway that they're proposing. If they came in and said, look, we're going to build a grocery outlet warehouse building that's going to generate eight trips a day then we wouldn't have an argument. It's the generation of the volume of traffic that they're talking about and that's what's identified in the traffic impact analysis. It's the volume that they're generating. It's not the building, it's the use within the building. Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated it's the issue of hindering the southbound traffic at Highway 101 and Avenue N. Mr. Cupples stated that's his primary concern. Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated that he has offered a solution that would have prevented that from happening and that is where he would like to see it put in as a condition if we approve it.

Mr. Cupples stated that we got it right in the top part of that. It's not really even naming it as a separate condition. You're saying that it is a condition that would have to be provided. And there again, that would still be open to, are they doing it, or are we doing it? Is ODOT doing it? It's not directly compelling them to do it. The only way to fight it out if ODOT is against this is to put it in there. And we can see if they object. Vice Chair Posalski stated that the process on that, would be if we put that in there, they would move forward on their project and ODOT would get a copy of what was proposed and then ODOT could come back and say, no, we don't like that idea either. Chair Hoth stated then ODOT could just say we wouldn't authorize the barrier in the highway. That could stop it. Vice Chair Posalski stated his biggest question is more just about process and are we putting the cart before horse and adding that in there or is it a better position to take what has been recommended and then they can they can handle where they to go from there to try and get around the requirement for the left hand turn lane. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated that another issue is if you do put up a barrier or suggest it, then there's going to

be other business owners who might not be happy about that. Not just the State. Mr. Cupples stated it would still be the State who would ultimately hold the card of saying you can or you can't.

Vice Chair Posalski asked Mr. Cupples what does he think is the proper process or direction to go on? Mr. Cupples stated that he thinks what Commissioner Bill Carpenter is suggesting is a potential workable solution.

At the end of the Commissioners discussion, Commissioner Bill Carpenter made a motion to approve to 18-068HOZ with the conditions outlined in the staff report and modified by the condition of putting a right turn in and a right turn out option. Vice Chair Posalski seconded and the motion was carried unanimously the motion was carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE ADMINISTRATION: Vice Chair Posalski stated the planning commissioners that were at the training the other night heard how site visits are declared ex parte contacts and that's very different from what we do. He wasn't sure if there were any other things from that meeting that might change how they run their meetings. Mr. Cupples stated that after that training, he noticed the last set of minutes didn't exactly follow the script that Chair Hoth follows. That really wasn't reflected accurately in the way the minutes were being done. We've been following the same format for some time and that doesn't exactly follow the script that was provided. Now we have Chris stating that it's standard practice for the planning commission to visit the sites. If you want staff to change the script and say each of the commissioners may have visited the site or whatever he can do that. He thinks putting it under the procedures and ex parte contact heading covers the issue and plainly states it's standard practice for the commissioners to visit the sites. There's an assumption that you've done it and it's been declared as a standard practice.

The one thing that he thought was critical was if you do a site visit and during the hearing you want to identify something that you specifically saw when you were on site, make sure that you say that because you're, basically declaring something that you saw that maybe someone else didn't see. He had one planning commissioner who always rode his bike past sites and he would do a drive-by and he would see stuff from his bike that everyone else didn't see because they were still in their car. It could be risky when you get on site because someone can stop and start talking to you and that is when you want to say, wait, this needs to be during the hearing, not one on one with me right now. He thinks that actually covers the issue if you want staff to make it a little more clear or plain and say it in Chris's opening remark, the sites will be visited and if there's any other ex parte contacts, we could say you're acknowledging that now.

Chair Hoth stated that's kind of how we've done it in the past or at least he has. He figured if you go to the site and there's nobody there, he's just looking at the site. He's not having contact with anybody, but if he met a person and he informed them he's just on a site visit, he's not declaring to be a contact. He's just saying he met the person. Vice Chair Posalski stated the logic that they used was, it was information that you got that was outside of the public hearing and so that was the reasoning that they declared it as an ex parte contact because it wasn't part of the hearing. So that was the logic that they used on it. He thinks we're fine with what we do. It was the one thing that really jumped out at him that was very different than the way we do it. And so that's why he wanted to have a discussion.

Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated when she goes by the sites she would like to see drawings and schematics of the property, it makes things a lot clearer. Chair Hoth stated that it hasn't been a problem up to now, has it? It just hasn't been an issue as long as you're not talking to people. You're going to say if there was something discussed and make that statement. Vice Chair Posalski stated that he is fine with how it is. He just noticed that it was very different than the way we do it and so he thought it was worth a discussion.

Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated that she was just thinking on the last item, the parking lot is all pretty much asphalt. They were talking about separations, she has seen people do separations with very simple things, logs and sometimes logs that have been recently moved and stuff like that. Could there be a list of acceptable separations that you could say, now it's got to be curbing or it's got to be railroad ties. But they'd have to be big enough so they're not easily moved around. Mr. Cupples stated there could be a list of what would be acceptable, if they put fencing along the parking or if they put in poles and chains. Chair Hoth stated that we'd have to come up with so many things to cover this, we just need it to prevent somebody from parking where they shouldn't. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated they need things that are more permanent, something that's not easily moved.

Mr. Cupples stated we did have one individual who wanted to use the blocked off area when they were in town but block off that area when the property is being rented. That was one where they were going to design it so that they could take it down when they were using the property and not have it down when it was being rented. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated it would have to be designed in such a way that people renting wouldn't just be able to move the barrier themselves. Mr. Cupples stated in this case they'd have to cut a chain in order to do it because it was being padlocked. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated that if people want a vacation rental the owners must also follow the rules of the vacation rental not just the renters.

Vice Chair Posalski stated that it's interesting that with a VRD when it's used as personal use, it doesn't have the same limitations on the property as when it's a VRD. If it's supposed to be 50 percent as a VRD so there is a permanence for that home, shouldn't those limitations apply at all times. Mr. Cupples stated that it could be done that way. It just wasn't. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated that the VRD thing just kind of exploded in the last few years. She doesn't think they saw it going in the direction that it is and it's just kind of overwhelming. Then you get down to that thing where they get to do it. How come I don't get to do it? They have, theirs, but I don't have mine. Chair Hoth stated that's why it's a conditional use sometimes and it's up to the planning commission to be more careful in the crafting of the conditions that they would find acceptable.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION/STAFF: Chair Hoth stated the issue right now is the status of new members. Mr. Cupples stated the he spoke to one person today who indicated they had applied and there may be another one. He was indicating he thought there might be another person. So we may have two potential candidates. The city council meeting is next Monday and then they won't meet on Christmas Eve because they decided they would have a hard time getting a quorum for that meeting. Then the Commission's first meeting in January is going to take place on the eighth. Not the first because that's New Year's. Commissioner Teri Carpenter stated that she will not be able to attend that meeting. Commissioner Lou Neubecker stated that he is flying in at 2:00pm and there may be delays at the airport so don't count on him being able to make it. Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated that he will not be able to make it on the eighth either. Vice Chair Posalski stated that he may not be there either. Mr. Cupples stated that if we know that's going to be a problematic date, do you want to look at a holding the meeting the following week which would normally be a work session. Commissioner Bill Carpenter stated that he could be there on the 15th. Vice Chair Posalski stated the he could be there on the 15th. Commissioner Lou Neubecker will not be able to make it on the 15th.

ADJOURNMENT: Adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Chris Hoth, Chairperson

Debbie Kenyon, Admin. Assistant