

MINUTES FOR THE WEEKLY MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE ON MONDAY,
APRIL 23rd, 2009 AT 3 PM IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM,
BUILDING F.

PARTICIPANTS:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jack Fraley
Mary Jones
Julie Leverenz
Bill Porter
Chris Henderson
Ruth Larson
Rich Krapf
Vaughn Poller
Tom Tingle

NOT PRESENT:

Mark Wenger
George Billups

STAFF PRESENT:

Tammy Rosario, Planning
Allen Murphy, Planning
Jason Purse, Planning
Ellen Cook, Planning
Terry Costello, Planning

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jack Fraley called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Mr. Chris Henderson, Mr. Vaughn Poller, and Ms. Julie Leverenz arrived later in the meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Fraley opened the public comment period.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Fraley recognized Board of Supervisor Mr. Jim Icenhour in attendance.

III. MINUTES

- April 9, 2009 Minutes

Mr. Bill Porter moved to approve the minutes.

Mr. Tom Tingle seconded the motion.

In a unanimous voice vote the minutes were approved. (6-0, Absent: Leverenz, Poller, Wenger, Henderson, Billups).

- April 13, 2009

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that Ms. Leverenz had some corrections to the minutes.

Mr. Fraley stated he does not accept those changes. He did not recall any discussion about adequate acreage for economic development and was unclear on the term “adequate.” Mr. Fraley stated he remembered charts displaying the acreage available.

Mr. Jason Purse stated that he believed Ms. Leverenz was referring to the report done by the Business Climate Task Force (BCTF) with regard to the commercial capacity issue. He stated the report listed the number of acres that they believed was necessary to meet the demand and the number listed in the technical report was the available commercial land in the Primary Service Area (PSA), which was greater than the numbers listed in the BCTF report.

Mr. Fraley was still unsure about using the term adequate.

Mr. Fraley moved to approve the minutes without correction.

Mr. Tingle seconded the motion.

In a unanimous voice vote the minutes were approved. (6-0, Absent: Leverenz, Poller, Wenger, Henderson, Billups).

IV. LAND USE

A. Goals, Strategies and Actions

Ms. Ellen Cook stated that Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic, of Renaissance Planning Group would be making a presentation on Rural Lands.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that as requested by the Committee, Renaissance Planning Group had taken a closer look at the policies concerning Rural Lands. He stated that Renaissance reviewed the current policies, documents, and history of research on the subject, and attempted to develop a framework for understanding and for evaluation relative to the goals, strategies and actions (GSAs) developed by staff. He stated Renaissance reviewed the 2003 Herd Planning Report on Rural Lands and related issues, reviewed consultant work that has been done over the last few years, and compared them to the current draft of the GSAs.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that he suggested concentrating on two key issues. These issues were protecting the rural economy and preserving rural character. Protecting the rural economy is the idea of providing opportunities for rural landowners to realize a viable economic return. Economic return will preserve the character and function of the Rural Lands, and will also help counterbalance the economic pressure that some landowners may be feeling for conversion to residential subdivisions. Mr. Gavrilovic stated it would be important to provide viable alternatives. It would be important to expand the range of land use options if there are revisions to the density permitted for residential development.

Mr. Gavrilovic then discussed several packages of incentives to protect the rural economy. The first set of incentives would be tax incentives. This would include use value assessment, and suggested possibly considering offering greater tax relief, if possible. He also suggested expanding the flexibility in the Agricultural and Forestal District Program, if possible. Another package of incentives was direct funding incentives. Mr. Gavrilovic stated the Purchase of Development Rights Program (PDR) is one of these incentives which the County utilizes. The suggestion was made to continue this program. This would contrast with what was discussed at the last meeting, which is a leasing of developmental rights (LDR). This program could be explored as an economic incentive to defer development for a certain

number of years. Mr. Gavrilovic stated the third set of incentives was marketing incentives. This would help rural landowners market their products, such as providing staffing and programs for landowner assistance in certain rural industries, such as agriculture tourism. Assistance should also be provided with both easement donations and general estate planning. There is a fourth incentive, which is classified as a land based incentive. This would entail a consideration of the Transfer of Development Rights Program (TDR). Mr. Gavrilovic stated that for a long term potential this could expand the range of options to rural landowners.

Mr. Gavrilovic suggested offering incentives to protect the rural character of Rural Lands as a viable working landscape, not just open space. He also noted the need to reduce pressures and impact on existing industries and potential industries that result from residential conversions. He stated the importance of maintaining a firm PSA edge to discourage pressures on residential and commercial development. Mr. Gavrilovic stated the overall idea is reducing the allowable density in rural zoning districts to the level that supports the continued rural industries, and to discourage incompatible residential developments. He stated that twenty or twenty-five acre lot sizes could be a level that would support the emerging farming industries and discourage rural sprawl.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated another set of important policy options would be rural clusters. He stated that these policies would expand the range of options available to landowners to develop these low density cluster lots, yet preserve the majority of the land for compatible rural economic land uses. He stated that, in conjunction with the cluster provision, the Steering Committee should evaluate central well policies, such as loosening the central well requirements for very low density developments, and strengthening the fees and/or requirements required where central wells are mandatory. He also stated a miscellaneous grouping of incentives such as expanding the list of permitted uses in rural districts, such as rural resorts and bed and breakfast establishments. Mr. Gavrilovic also mentioned tightening of the family subdivision requirements, and incentives such as relaxing road standards and approval requirements for very low density developments.

Mr. Rich Krapf asked whether or not the TDR program was an all or nothing situation. He asked if there were examples where certain development rights would be pro-rated.

Ms. Karen Gavrilovic stated that she had researched two localities who had implemented a TDR program. She said Calvert County left no residual development potential in their TDR program, whereas in Montgomery County, one dwelling unit per twenty five acres could be left as a residual unit.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that he was unaware of anything in the Virginia legislation that would preclude this taking place.

Mr. Tingle asked for an example that shows the difference between TDRs, PDRs and the LDRs. He asked how each of these programs dealt with protecting the agricultural and rural character of the property.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that through the PDR program, once the assessment of the development rights are calculated, the landowner would be paid in exchange for a permanent easement that would preclude all development on the property. He stated that the cost through the LDR program would be less because eliminating the entire potential for development does not occur. It would just be a lease over a long period of time that would delay development. Mr. Gavrilovic stated there are no examples of LDR programs in Virginia so he could not give an example. He stated that in a TDR program, the private market would establish what a development right is worth; it would be sold to a party in a receiving area.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated that with all of these programs, the landowner continues to have the ability to farm the land. She stated that all TDR programs are structured differently. She stated that Montgomery County averaged \$4,000 - \$18,000 for a development right, with the highest paid being \$45,000. In Calvert County, the range was \$1,200 - \$7,500 per acre. In this community, a developer who builds one residential unit must purchase five development rights to build in a receiving area. She stated the ranges are as individual as the community and as expensive as the market will bear.

Mr. Tingle clarified that the sending and receiving TDRs are not equal, according to the example given.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated each program is structured very differently.

Mr. Porter asked if people outside the sending and receiving areas could be involved in the TDR program.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated that they would not be involved. In some communities the sending area might be any rural area for example. She did say that most programs set a minimum parcel size in order to participate.

Mr. Tingle asked whether any of the programs already established allowed for other residual use of the property besides agricultural. He asked if all development rights are relinquished with these programs, or are some of the emerging agricultural uses allowed, such as ecotourism and rural lodges, etc.

Ms. Gavrilovic was not sure. She stated most policies refer to maintaining land for agricultural uses. She stated that the current TDR statutes in Virginia allow for the development potential converted to non-residential density as well.

Mr. Porter asked if there was an assumption that the sending areas are stagnant.

Ms. Gavrilovic said the existing zoning would dictate the potential development. Sending areas would not typically be an area where utility line extensions or road improvements would be. She stated the areas adjacent to the PSA are more vulnerable and where there will be the most pressure for conversion.

Mr. Porter asked what areas would be receiving areas.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated receiving areas in the County could be identified based on revitalization or redevelopment potential.

Ms. Mary Jones asked about the down zoning, and what other jurisdictions have done as far as incremental changes or significant changes.

Mr. Gavrilovic did not remember seeing a pattern based on the overall size of the jurisdiction. It is most likely based on objectives relative to farmland preservation and natural resource preservation. He stated that farmland preservation numbers have been fairly large, for example, 20 – 50-acre zoning. He stated that many policies have used the twenty-acre benchmark.

Mr. Porter asked about grandfathering density. He stated he thought he remembered in Montgomery County a down zoning occurred to twenty acre lots, but for TDR purposes, one could sell a TDR right for the density that was allowed before the down zoning.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated that was correct. She stated that in several programs, there was a minimum established for the new base density while still allowing the development rights at the old density.

Mr. Fraley stated that he felt it was important to state how large the receiving areas are. He also discussed the items related to the marketing strategies, specifically the ones referencing assistance to property owners for marketing or other purposes. He asked for staff's response on how this could be achieved.

Ms. Rosario answered that either staff would be doing the work or overseeing the work of others. She stated other localities have rural agricultural officers. This has not been used in James City County.

Mr. Fraley asked about the need or requirement for a rural land specialist on staff. His suggestion is that if the County is serious about Rural Lands, conservation, and rural development, that maybe there needs to be a person dedicated to it.

Mr. Tingle thought it was important to first determine what it is that is trying to be marketed and what the vision was. He felt it important to determine what the options are for alternatives to sprawling residential development in Rural Lands. He felt that many of the incentives presented by Renaissance Planning Group were soft incentives.

Ms. Gavrilovic gave examples in other localities of staff resources and other task forces that concentrated on Rural Lands and Rural Lands development.

Mr. Fraley stated he felt that now is the time to have a staff person dedicated to this.

Ms. Ruth Larson questioned with the current budget situation that maybe this would not be feasible. She asked for examples of ecotourism.

Ms. Gavrilovic answered that ecotourism could be things like farm tours, historic garden tours, winery tours, farmer's markets, and other opportunities for individuals to get cut flowers, fresh produce, antiques, etc.

Mr. Fraley initiated a discussion concerning the PSA. He felt that the PSA is no longer discouraging residential development in Rural Lands, although it does discourage high density development. He feels that some action needs to be taken with regards to design, density, open space, and other considerations for Rural Lands development. Mr. Fraley referenced Hanover County, where the base density in Rural Lands is one unit per twenty acres. He stated that have a cluster policy which is about one unit per six or seven acres, which is allowed in situations where 70% of the parcel is maintained as open space.

Ms. Rosario added that that cluster option in Hanover is a legislative rezoning decision.

Mr. Fraley supports lower densities in Rural Lands, but he would have a problem increasing the acreage to twenty acres. He served on the committee that has studied Rural Lands, and the recommendation that came from that committee was one per twelve acres, along with other options. He felt that any more than twelve that might be proposed will be vigorously opposed by landowners.

Mr. Poller asked if Loudon County saw its agricultural production values increase due to its proximity to a large urban population.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that was a part of it, and also due to demographics of the population.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated that Loudon County had a strategic plan to double their revenues generated by rural land activities.

Mr. Poller asked about the examples of agriculture revenue, for example, those mentioned on the Eastern Shore, whether was this in part due to their size.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that agriculture is a significant part of their economy, as well as the natural resources available to them.

Mr. Tingle stated that as a Committee, if there is a consensus for lower density in Rural Lands, then there needs to be options for the landowners that are in this area. He stated many options have been suggested. He feels that if this is to be successful, and down zoning is a part of it, that there needs to be some creative options for these property owners.

Mr. Porter stated that packages should be offered to property owners.

Ms. Jones questioned the level of specificity.

Mr. Fraley stated this will be discussed when going through the goals, strategies and actions.

Ms. Jones stated that the Comprehensive Plan is a plan for the future. She stated that Mr. Kennedy, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, has initiated discussion about a tourism specialist, and tying that in with the Rural Lands.

Mr. Fraley initiated discussion on the strategies, goals and actions. His first comment was on Action 1.4.3. On item C, he would like to add ridgelines and resource protection area (RPA). He felt the PSA does not match the watershed boundaries, and he felt that including these as a consideration would add greater environmental protection.

Ms. Leverenz would like to add “protecting environmental resources” to the same action.

Mr. Henderson asked if language was needed to promote goals in terms of economic development.

Mr. Fraley answered that it may be, but that economic development was not related to this particular point. He felt that this issue dealt strictly with environmental concerns. He felt that the current PSA line is somewhat arbitrary and political, instead of natural.

Ms. Leverenz felt that the economic development issue was addressed in Action 1.4.3.a and Action 1.4.3.b.

Mr. Henderson’s concern was that the reader may not be able to make that connection.

Ms. Leverenz stated her concern was that if economic development was mentioned, then work force housing and some other items important to the County should be also included.

Mr. Murphy stated that with each Comprehensive Plan update there is an inescapable examination of the PSA. He stated that this occurs for a variety of reasons, one being economic development.

Mr. Tingle suggested incorporating some of the Rural Lands information that Renaissance Planning Group presented in the goals, strategies and actions. He suggested maybe behind Strategy 1.6.

Mr. Fraley suggested staff examine the points made and report back to the Committee where they have incorporated some of these ideas.

Ms. Cook stated staff had coordinated with RPG in drafting the GSAs, noting that the actions covered rural economy and rural character in actions 1.6.1 and 1.6.2 respectively. She stated that staff would be willing to look at incorporating the chart format in the technical report.

Mr. Fraley stated he was uncomfortable with the requirement of 20 - 25 acres under action 1.6.2.1. He suggested instead of setting a number, perhaps placing a general requirement.

Ms. Leverenz stated she was comfortable with the number since it will be going to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. She felt that the County is approaching a crisis situation, and felt the need to take some crisis management steps.

Mr. Krapf agreed especially with all the work that was done with the Rural Lands Technical Committee. He would advocate maybe 15 – 25 acres.

Mr. Poller asked if projections within the PSA with regard to densities had been considered when determining these numbers. He asked if an aggressive TDR program was considered when developing these figures.

Mr. Tingle stated he felt that the Committee needed to be more aggressive with regards to the rural economy if these numbers were to be determined to be part of the update.

Ms. Jones felt that if a number was stated, then the focus would be on the number. She was concerned that the message might be missed as far as rural economic opportunities.

Mr. Fraley felt the Committee was in a position and had enough information to make the decision concerning acreage requirements.

Mr. Krapf felt Ms. Jones' point was valid, in that the message may be missed and the focus might be on the number.

Mr. Henderson did not have an issue with including a number. He felt that there was good information to use the numbers presented.

Mr. Porter asked if there were any discussions concerning TDR programs when the Rural Lands Technical Committee met.

Mr. Fraley stated there was not a discussion like what has taken place with this Committee.

Ms. Rosario stated the enabling legislation was new and the work of the Rural Lands Committee was already under way.

Mr. Porter stated it was important to make the density so that these programs are attractive.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated that Montgomery County did conduct a study that showed that for a family to support themselves with a farm; it would require a minimum of 25 acres. She felt it was important to

note that the study was conducted to determine the economics of their county. Ms. Gavrilovic also stated that the County's policy of adding land to an AFD, the minimum requirement needed is 20 acres. So there is that idea that this is the general area required to maintain an agricultural use and the rural character.

Mr. Fraley stated it might be beneficial to have a similar study done for James City County.

Mr. Tingle felt comfortable removing the 20 – 25 acres under consideration in Action 1.6.2.1.

Ms. Rosario suggesting adding wording to include incentives.

Mr. Murphy asked if the recommendation was to have the density lower than what is currently allowed.

Ms. Leverenz agreed to remove the number, but would like to have stronger language other than "consider." She suggested to have wording added that states, "significantly lower than what is currently allowed."

Mr. Krapf suggested that language be added that this should be paired with the economic incentives mentioned. He wanted to emphasize that the lower density is in combination with economic incentives.

Mr. Fraley initiated a discussion about a position within the County that would deal with the Rural Lands. He does not see this as solely for economic development but see it for other reasons as well.

Mr. Porter suggested the Committee list tasks and what they actually want to accomplish instead of suggesting a position. He felt that the Board of Supervisor and County Administrator could determine whether a person would handle these, or perhaps come up with other alternatives.

Mr. Fraley suggested making a recommendation to add a position.

Mr. Krapf stated he could support some type of preservation officer to concentrate on the Rural Lands. He stated that other things such as specialized farming, open space preservation, and economic development could all be incorporated.

Ms. Rosario stated staff will collaborate with the County Administrator's office to determine some language.

Ms. Jones thought it would be good to get the County Administrator's input.

Mr. Poller asked about compensating landowners with regards to lower densities proposed in the agricultural part of the County. He mentioned the landowners who spoke to the Committee and stated that they found it no longer viable to pursue agriculture. He questioned whether all incentives were reviewed that would entice owners to participate in the PDR type programs. Mr. Poller also expressed his sentiments that this is a very sensitive subject.

Mr. Henderson felt it may be beneficial to provide incentives over what is allowed by-right when development rights are transferred.

Ms. Cook stated that there is the whole package that has been discussed, including economic incentives, some incentives in the form of eased subdivision or zoning requirements, or an option to do a

cluster, etc. She asked if the Committee was looking for other tools other than what was listed in the goals, strategies and actions. She stated staff will start exploring what has been presented. Ms. Cook stated that the status of TDR's is still in discussion because of the detail that is needed.

Mr. Henderson felt the Committee spent a great deal of time discussing incentives for the physical development of the Rural Lands, which in turn is what the County is actually trying to stop.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that with respect to clustering, if it is of a low density it can both maintain farming, and preserve the open space and rural character.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated that whatever TDR program was designed would be unique to the County. It will take some evaluations, research and a study of the market to design this program. She gave an example where bonus densities were allowed to property owners. Ms. Gavrilovic stated these programs were not effective because there was so much density already allowed in the receiving areas. There has to be enough incentive in the receiving zones that the extra bonus is needed. She stated that all the studies recommended that each locality review its individual market, and its sending and receiving zones.

Mr. Tingle suggested removing the word "consider" from Action 1.6.1.2 d.

Mr. Henderson suggested adding a sentence stating to implement a TDR program.

The Committee then discussed the idea, and the different possible ways to word the action, with consideration to the facts that there are changes that will be made at the state level, and there are not a lot of jurisdictions that have experience with these programs in Virginia.

Mr. Fraley suggested making the action item more pro-active.

Mr. Tingle suggested the wording be the same for Action 1.6.1.2 c and 1.6.1.2 d, by including the word "investigate" and remove "consider."

Mr. Henderson stated he objected due to the fact that government was now giving priority in purchasing development rights when there is a private sector solution to this that does not use scarce government resources.

Mr. Tingle envisions Action 1.6.1 having three parts, PDR Programs, LDR Programs and TDR Programs. He would see all of them reading the same, with the LDR and TDR Programs needing further research since they are fairly new.

Mr. Krapf felt that investigating would be the reasonable approach, before making a decision to implement any programs.

Mr. Fraley suggested adding some language that if investigation shows it is beneficial, that the program is implemented.

Ms. Rosario stated staff will look at all these suggestions and come back with additional language.

Mr. Henderson asked why the Committee would not support funding for a LDR Program.

Ms. Gavilovic stated that LDR programs have been in existence longer than PDR Programs, but have not been implemented since the focus has been on PDR Programs. There may need to be more evaluation to determine how to implement such a program.

Mr. Henderson stated he raised the issue because he does not believe that the PDR Program has been as successful as it could have been, and to the extent that other alternatives can be added for property owner, he believes it would be beneficial.

Ms. Rosario believes that the investigation should look at whether the two programs would be complimentary to each other rather than competing with each other.

Ms. Leverenz suggested having the wording “investigate developing and funding.”

B. Development Standards Chart Discussion

Mr. Purse initiated the discussion about development standards for each land use designation. He stated some of the changes under the residential chart included language regarding continuing care retirement centers and timeshares, added examples of environmental protections, and example of housing and workforce benefits. He stated on the commercial chart changes were made that included adding recommended floor area ratio intensities to the different land use designations. Mr. Purse stated that changes to the mixed use section included adding some specific language to the recommended uses and intensities in the general language. This was to provide some better examples of the general standards that the County looks for in the Mixed Use areas in the County.

Ms. Leverenz suggested defining the “very low density development” in the glossary. She suggested adding a number to better help clarify.

Mr. Fraley suggested not including a number.

Ms. Rosario stated that for guidance, staff would rely on the background document that was used in the Comprehensive Plan update. The Renaissance Planning Group report could be the example referenced.

Ms. Leverenz suggested using the language, “significantly less than what is currently allowed” under the recommended density for Rural Lands.

Mr. Tingle suggested having this item refer back to the Zoning Ordinance, and removing the language that specifically spells out “one dwelling unit per three acres”.

Mr. Fraley asked under the section of commercial and industrial, under recommended density, what the term “single structure” meant. He asked how this relates to Prime Outlets Shopping Center.

Mr. Purse answered that Prime Outlets consisted of multiple structures.

Mr. Tingle questioned the Community Commercial examples. He felt the two examples given, Colony Square Shopping Center and Norge Crossing, both exceed 200,000 square feet.

Mr. Purse stated these two examples do exceed the initial 200,000 square feet requirement, but they do not exceed the 200,000 square feet revision that specifically referenced building massing.

Mr. Fraley stated he felt that the Mixed Use descriptions were not as clear as some of the other sections. He would like to see more Economic Opportunity so that everything is not in Mixed Use designations.

Mr. Krapf stated he felt staff's preference was to have the Mixed Use designation remain this way and then provide specific language that applies to each of the individual situations. He asked the consultant what other localities have done with respect to Mixed Use.

Mr. Fraley stated it becomes problematic when applying the Mixed Use ordinance to a Mixed Use application. He stated that many times the Mixed Use ordinance and these designation descriptions are conflicting.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that those who do traffic analyses see much benefit in a Mixed Use designation in terms of reducing trips. He stated VDOT is now encouraging this in some of their policy language. He stated developers like this designation because in an uncertain economic climate it gives them more flexibility. He stated that with regards to unpredictability, it is normally addressed with standards for minimum percentages of commercial or residential.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated that in localities where Mixed Use is used, there are minimum and maximum percentages. She stated that design guidelines could always be added.

Mr. Henderson asked if the concentration was higher on residential than for commercial in reference to square footage allocation.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated in communities similar to James City County, there is typically minimum commercial, 20% and up to 50%.

Ms. Gavrilovic stated it all depends on the market, and what is selling at the time.

Ms. Leverenz felt that there was a basic disconnect between the two descriptions. One speaks to high density/ redevelopment, and the other states to protect and enhance the character of the area. She felt that these two descriptions are not always compatible.

Mr. Henderson stated he did not feel that they were incompatible. He stated he felt it probably was dependent on the case in question. He stated that one thing that could be as an alternative use for Rural Lands is in receiving environmental credits for greater impervious cover within the PSA.

Mr. Fraley stated that he felt open space and mixed use does not necessarily have to be green. Example of this would be gazebos, outdoor cafés and walks, etc. It would probably depend on the type of development.

V. OTHER ITEMS

Ms. Rosario distributed a new schedule. She stated there is a possibility that the next meeting may be cancelled due to the readiness of materials. She also stated that May 4th will be the date the final decisions will be made on the land use cases.

Mr. Fraley asked about the discussion that took place regarding adopting the conceptual plan process. He does not think the County should make the conceptual plan mandatory for small business type developments. He feels that it should be applied to larger projects.

Ms. Rosario stated staff could circulate something to committee members concerning incentives for those who do participate in the conceptual plan process.

Mr. Fraley stated he has new information and dialogue concerning trees and clear cutting. He also mentioned that the James City County Citizens Coalition (J4C) sent the Committee a letter. Mr. Fraley met with two of their members and exchanged viewpoints. He will forward what was discussed to members. This information represents Mr. Fraley's viewpoints and not necessarily the Committee's.

Ms. Leverenz recognized the work that the J4C has done.

VI. AJOURNMENT

Mr. Poller moved for adjournment, with a second from Mr. Krapf.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Mr. Jack Fraley, Chair