

Excerpts
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
DECEMBER 21, 2017

Case No. 18-18

A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (agent) on behalf of Last Enterprises, LLC (owner), seeking approval to rezone 7.66 acres of undeveloped land from PD (Planned District) to IG (Industrial District.) The subject site is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road, between Vandiver and Highway 63. Concurrent requests for a revised preliminary (Case #18-35) and revised final (Case #18-17) plat accompany this request.

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a Staff report, please?

(Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department.

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning requests to IG.)

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer.

Commissioners, questions for Staff?

I see none.

Thank you, sir.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: We'll go ahead and open this. This is a public hearing, so we'll open it up to the public. Just ask for your name and address.

MR. FARNEN: Thank you. And good evening again. My name is still Mark Farnen, 103 East Branham, Columbia, Missouri. I am appearing on behalf of Last Enterprises, who is the applicant. This is part 2 of our request tonight.

This is the part that asks for rezoning. And as Staff has indicated, this was part of an old planned district. And as we discussed for about two years here at meetings frequently, one of the intents of the new code was to try and move away from planned district zoning and into more defined and more stable zoning classifications. This is one of the first of those moves to try and accomplish that very goal.

Staff supports this request, and we believe that it takes advantage of a lot of the things that were intended when that code was adopted; that it takes advantage of the existing road and infrastructure network that surrounds it on all sides. These are major collectors, state highways, and it's a perfect place to have a business or set of businesses that need access to that roadway system without running that traffic through neighborhoods or other undesirable areas.

We believe that allows for the reasonable use of a parcel that has remained unused under the previous planning and zoning designation. And we know that we frequently talked about stale lands, and this is a way to make that fresh again.

We believe that it makes administration of this parcel cleaner and more straightforward by

converting to standard zoning designation.

We do not think that it will have significant impact to the neighbors or the existing road infrastructure and traffic patterns in this area. And after this is developed there will be more trees there than there are now. We believe that this meets those goals.

We also understand that there are questions about floodplain and that -- and that there will continue to be discussion, but those were the rules that we were given when we submitted. Just like we have the new zoning code.

So we would ask you for your support on what we believe is a very real and reasonable request to rezone this from a PD designation to IG.

And we would [accept](#) your questions and enjoy them. And we have the same set of engineers available to answer the more technical questions that we would pose -- or that you would pose.

So with that, that's it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Farnen.

Commissioners, any questions -- Commissioners, any questions for the speaker?

Sorry, Mr. Farnen. No questions.

MR. FARNEN: Happy solstice. And I'm looking forward to this holiday.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir.

Anyone else to come forward this evening to speak with us? We would welcome this chance if you would like to come forward.

MS. DUNN: My name is Lucinda Dunn. I live at 4401 Mexico Gravel Road, which is just east of the roundabout there where it meets Mexico Gravel on the other side of kind of the open area there.

I want to go on record in opposition to the rezoning of the 7.66 acres located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Vandiver and Mexico Gravel Road from planned district to industrial district.

My husband and I have lived just east of Mexico Gravel Road roundabout for twenty-one years and I travel the road adjacent to the property in question on a daily basis. I have the following primary concerns with this plan.

First of all, I feel that it's likely to have a negative impact on the property value and the desirability of our home and neighborhood with industrial development in such close proximity. It would be within about a quarter of a mile of my home.

Secondly, rezoning of this plat could lead to further rezoning in the area to industrial. I understand that there is a floodplain area that's unlikely or less likely to be developed in the near future, but there is land, you know, on the -- on the other side and -- and on the other side of the highway. I don't want to live in the middle of an industrial district. And I think any one of you would agree you wouldn't want to be put in that position either.

I'm concerned about increased traffic in the area. And this area has already experienced a great increase in traffic over the time that we've lived there, and especially in the last ten years there's -- there have been a lot of housing developments on farther out Mexico Gravel Road to the east. I believe there's also going to be a large apartment complex over across from Menard's soon.

There's just a lot of traffic in that area and people use those corridors to go to work.

Sometimes I have to wait for twenty or thirty cars to go by before I can pull out of my driveway in the morning. And I don't think this will help any.

In addition, I'm concerned about increased truck and commercial vehicle traffic in the area, which can create dangerous conditions when you're driving. Sometimes I'm sure you guys have had the experience the truck stops to be able to maneuver into a position to do their business, but it happens all the time on Mexico Gravel farther on down towards Paris Road and I don't want to see that happening any more than it already is.

I'm concerned about especially the negative impact on nature and the natural aesthetics in the area, which as you know is adjacent to Hinkson Creek. There is a walking trail up Headway along the east side of that piece of Mexico -- of Vandiver there that runs between the roundabouts. I walk that trail. I enjoy the -- kind of the open spaces there. I enjoy being able to be right near the creek and hear the water running in the spring. And I'm concerned with industrial development right there. It's going to take away the entire feeling of the natural spaces there. I don't think it will have a positive impact on the creek area either.

I respectfully request that this case not be approved and that real consideration be given to the best interests of the local residents. I know that everybody wants to make money and everybody wants to have an opportunity for business, but I -- I would like you to remember that people live there and it impacts us every day; not -- not just once making a decision about this plan, but it impacts us every day moving forward.

I also feel that the timing of this case has made it difficult for the local residents to be aware and active in giving their input in this case because the public hearing sign did not go up until last Friday. And this meeting is only six days later. And it's the week of Christmas.

So I've tried to spread the word among the neighbors, but I will say this: It's a very difficult time to get people out of their homes and get people active to express their thoughts.

So I respectfully request that you will not approve this request for rezoning.

And I'm more than happy to answer any questions you may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Good evening.

MS. DUNN: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Let's play devil's advocate. What would you do with the property? If it was in your possession what would you like to see there?

MS. DUNN: Originally it was part of a planned development for retail spaces. I would like to see that original plan go forward. I know there hasn't been a lot of interest or -- in the years since that planned development was conceived; however, I think with the addition of additional residential in the area, with that, I think it's more than a 300-unit apartment development going in across from Menard's, I think there will be a lot of need for additional retail like places to eat. I don't think that would be a problem.

I think something that is more conducive to, you know, not bringing down the value of our

properties. I don't think retail would do that the way industrial would.

MR. STRODTMAN: So just so you understand, ma'am, also retail would be a much heavier density, so the traffic I think of that nature would be much more intense with retail.

MS. DUNN: I understand.

MR. STRODTMAN: So you understand that.

MS. DUNN: We certainly will keep our ears open to what plans might be, but I don't think retail would have the negative effect that -- that industrial would.

MR. STRODTMAN: Miss Burns.

MS. BURNS: You said the sign went up six days ago or -- when were you aware of this, Miss Dunn?

MS. DUNN: I noticed the sign -- I don't know if I noticed it the first day. I noticed it over the weekend, I know.

MS. BURNS: Were you aware of this development plan prior to the sign going up?

MS. DUNN: I was not. I mean, I -- like probably the rest of you I'm busy. It's Christmas time. I have a job. And I don't watch -- I don't even take the paper. So I don't watch what's happening in the paper.

When I called and I talked to Mr. Palmer about it he said the sign went up on Friday. He explained that, you know, there are minimum requirements for actually notifying people. He said, I believe, that you only need to notify people if they're within two hundred feet.

Well, as you can see, there aren't a lot of residents literally within two hundred feet. So there's not very -- there aren't very many people to notify.

And, you know, I saw the sign. I called I believe on Tuesday to get information. So I found out on Tuesday and I started to kind of -- to spread the information around with the neighbors. But like I said, it's the week of Christmas. People are busy. I'm supposed to be making caramels tonight, but I'm here.

So, again, I, you know, I just hope that you will deny the rezoning and -- and consider if you lived a quarter mile away what would you want there. And I mean, if you want to know what I want there, I mean, I would be glad to think about it, but I know it's not this.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am. Any additional questions, Commissioners?

Thank you, Mrs. Dunn.

MS. ERTZ: My name is Laura Ertz. I live at 3504 Mexico Gravel, which is just west of the roundabout. We bought our home in 2000. We retired here. And it was a quiet little kind of off the beaten path area. It was residential. It was I understand maybe what they call a feeder road, but now since the roundabout and on the many subdivisions that are just east of us, my road is like going out onto Stadium. We back out onto Mexico Gravel and I thank God most days if it's the time people are going to work or coming home that I have a chance to get out.

There also in the -- between Henleys, East and West Henley, there's a number -- quite a number of children there that live there and that takes the city school bus or the city busses to school. And the traffic at this point is very much of a concern for us.

The other thing that is a concern is I really believe that turning this plat into industrial is going to adversely affect all of our property values. And this is certainly a concern for anyone. I believe, as Mrs. Dunn said, that it also will open that door for other industrial.

I am recommending from a homeowner's perspective that this not be approved. I, too, could see and can certainly live with small, of the smaller retail as we were told what was the plan at the previous people that were going to develop this area.

But I would -- we are seeing now with the additional impact with the apartments there by Menard's we have doctors' offices, we have a church that's very, very close that are really non-invasive. And I would hope that this doesn't continue. It -- it just isolates us more and more and causes concern with the money that we have chosen to build into Columbia. It's nothing like a business probably would, but I think being known for a good residential place to live and to where to retire is very important. And I respectfully ask your consideration to oppose this.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am. Would you spell your last name, please?

MS. ERTZ: Yes. It's E-r-t-z as in zebra.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

Commissioners, any questions for Mrs. Ertz?

I see none. Thank you, ma'am, for coming.

MS. ERTZ: Thank you.

MR. KEMBLE: Again, I'm Nile Kemble. I live at 3000 East Henley, which is west of the plat that's being discussed.

I am the President of the Mexico Gravel Neighborhood Association. Unfortunately, I couldn't get more of the neighbors out tonight. As it's been said, it's the week before Christmas and they're all busy wrapping presents and all that fun stuff that's Christmas related.

However, those that I have talked to are opposed to this rezoning. As was mentioned by our first speaker, that plot has sat empty for several years since Curtis McDonald tried to make Centerstate go.

As was mentioned by Miss Dunn, the new apartment buildings, they're going to go in, I think might be an opportunity to leave this as a planned district. The folks that are going to live in those apartments are going to want restaurants, stores in the area that they can shop without having to drive long distances. I just think that's a better use of that land.

Going back to the discharge. As an environmentalist, I'm a fisheries biologist by trade, I have concern that -- that we didn't really discuss or get an answer as to whether the discharge is going into the creek or into the city sewer line. If it's going into the creek, with an industrial zone I've got a lot of concern about what may end up in that creek and affect the biod in that -- in that eco system.

I just -- one by one this -- this original plan has been picked apart, and what once was probably going to be very nice for the neighbors in the area, it's just slowly going backwards for us.

And I recommend that you guys oppose this, too.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir.

Commissioners, any questions for this speaker?

Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Why did you wear a Nebraska jacket?

MR. KEMBLE: I grew up in Lincoln. It's -- it's -- blood is thicker than -- you know.

MR. STANTON: This is Tiger country.

MR. KEMBLE: I understand that. I've got kids that cheer for them and -- and it's been a great place to raise my children, so...

MR. STANTON: Okay. So same question. You would -- what would you rather -- if you owned this property. Put yourself in the other -- the other boat -- shoes.

MR. KEMBLE: As Miss Dunn said, I think when we get to the apartment complex that is being built, it's going to be young professionals. I think that area would be -- may -- say it may not. I won't say it's going to, but I think it would be a great place to put, you know, a little bar, a little restaurant, something that those folks could come and relax after work.

There's going to be shopping needs. Menard's has a lot of fun stuff, but it doesn't meet all your daily requirements like groceries and stuff and other things. But I would like to see, if that's going to go through, which it is, I would like to see that plot of land given a chance to develop more in that direction.

I also have concern, as it's been previously said, that if we do IG on this, based on what I read it's possible, that other plots of land in this area are going to end up in the same boat.

So I would like to see it go to small retail type shops and stuff.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners, of this speaker?

I see none. Thank you, Mr. Kemble.

MR. KRIETE: My name is Matthew Kriete with Engineering Surveys and Services. Offices at 1113 Fay Street. Again, the civil engineer for the project.

Address a couple of questions. I think there was some comments regarding traffic. In terms of the intended use of this property and the -- and the traffic generation, based on ITE generation rates you're looking at peak hour turning rates out of this develop -- out of some of these driveways of fifteen vehicles, two vehicles, one vehicle. These are very low intensity uses. Versus a restaurant that's going to be creating hundreds of additional trips during that same period of time, or a retail building that will be doing the same.

And for the last -- I don't recall exactly when this was rezoned, but for -- or when Vandiver was completely built, but it's been sitting ready for development as retail, as a restaurant use. And during that time period we had two restaurants across the highway go out of business.

I can't speak to the market, it's not what I do, but I think we've seen some evidence of how they -- those uses have not been able to survive up there. And there's continued empty space across the way.

From a storm water management perspective we have some pretty intensive requirements in -- in Columbia that have to be vetted. And, you know, the concerns at Hinkson Creek is going to be addressed. And that's within our ordinance. That's within our regulations. You know, it's going to be -- it's going to be dealt with.

And I'm from a -- the new UDC standpoint, a lot has changed from what this original zoning was from the CP. And I -- I think there's a lot to argue that the protections that are in place for the neighbors are actually more intensive under the new UDC than they would have been under the CP zoning. And with -- with these uses and, you know, calling it industrial, these, you know, these aren't what you would consider your heavy industrial type uses. Those would require another approval. You know. These are more warehouses. These are distribution. These are, again, fairly un-intensive uses. And with each of those uses the neighborhood protection standard provide more requirements for screening, and buffering, and, you know, what -- how exactly this is going to be developed.

And as a reminder in terms of if the market changes, if there is a demand for those type of uses, you know, the IG district remains -- that remains a viable use in those -- in those districts -- or in that district. Excuse me.

With that, I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm waiting for an answer, and maybe I fell asleep or something.

MR. KRIETE: Okay.

MR. STANTON: What are the intended use, unless it's some proprietary information that you don't want to disclose, but in general what are you planning to put there?

MR. KRIETE: Well, I think I -- as I -- as I described there's a traffic generation report that I provided to Staff. And I -- I don't know if that made it in your packet. I didn't see that it did.

But we -- we classify this under -- under what was classified as light industrial. And that's -- that's the allowed use. I mean, we can't really get into heavy industrial in this. So that would be things like warehouse or distribution. Things of that nature. Maybe some kind of like light research. Very light manufacturing type facilities. You know. Everything in a building. Kind of get into all the standards.

You know. You're looking at what you're going to have is basically large buildings spaces, some large roofed areas. You know. You're not going to see outdoor storage. You're not going to see things of that nature. So you'll -- you'll have some parking. You're going to have some loading areas. You know. You're correct, you'll have some trucks coming through there to service the facilities.

But, you know, it's not like something -- you know -- I'm not picking on anyone in particular, but 3M or Quaker, you know, the industries we're used to out on Paris Road. It's not anything nearly that kind of intensity.

MR. STRODTMAN: I have a question. Mr. Kriete, you or either Mr. Farnen mentioned earlier about landscaping and how that's -- the trees. Can you speak to that a little bit?

MR. KRIETE: Well, I liked his comment, because as it stands today there isn't a tree on that property. And when we're done -- the landscaping requirements in the UDC are very intensive. I don't think we've had a chance to really see the intensiveness of it, but I've -- I've had landscape architects, some other architects tell me the -- the tight -- how tightly spaced the trees are required. It's so tight that the trees won't really be able to grow to their full potential.

You know, you're looking at once you get your street trees and then your landscape buffer

trees you're looking at separations of, you know, ten to fifteen feet on some large shade trees. And these -- these are trees that could have thirty, forty foot drip lines in their maturity. So you're going to see a lot in here. And buffering is going to be required on all four sides to buffer the roadway with those trees.

So it's going to look different than it does today. It's going to look a lot -- a lot -- well, there's going to be a lot more landscaping. I mean, today it's just basically a fescue field that gets mowed on occasion. So...

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you -- or continue that.

Any additional questions, Commissioners, of Mr. Kriete?

I see none. Thank you, sir.

MR. KRIETE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like to come forward?

I see none. I'll go ahead and close this public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Questions? Comments? Discussion?

We have Christmas gifts to wrap, so no discussion.

You know, I -- you know. I was going to make a few comments. You know, I think, you know, we obviously haven't seen the plan to see what it's going to be, but, you know, I visualize that this location is going to be utilizing those roundabouts to access 63 for probably most of the time. I don't see them going maybe east on Mexico Gravel, unless maybe they're going to go Battle or, you know, maybe that direction. I don't really see that being a very logical direction. I think it's maybe a little bit of Mexico Gravel to the west to get over to Paris or, you know, Range Line. But Again, I think that 63 is why that type of use would go there.

So, you know, all of that land to the east is agricultural in the floodplain. It's not going to be developed. There's a lot of buffer to the east.

To the west, you know, we've got 63, and most of it's developed immediately to the west.

North is, you know, that's a different scenario, but that's a different day.

I -- I plan on supporting it. You know. We obviously know that with our storm water and different ordinances we'll take care of the water. There's not going to be any hazards going into the Hinkson Creek. We know that this is light industrial. It's not your smokestack, your smelters. It's -- you know. It's going to be some buildings with some work going on inside of the buildings and very little on the outside, except for a parking lot and cars.

I think the landscaping would be a huge improvement. Would be some -- a little more complimentary to the east side.

You know. Being in the retail business I can see why it's not. That's a tough area. I don't think it's ever going to be a strong retail destination area. Part of me hopes that just because of selfishly. My retail is elsewhere, but **retail** is hard up there. And I don't see even those apartments getting much better.

Miss Loe?

MS. LOE: I have a couple of extra questions for Staff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, ma'am. Go ahead.

MS. LOE: I am looking at the CATSO plan and at the zoning plan. I don't know if we can pull those up at all, but on the CATSO plan it does show that that Vandiver spur connecting down to Clark. I was wondering if you would just comment on when -- if that's planned? What kind of development we are hoping to see [along](#) that. What changes that could bring. Because that would obviously bring some different pressure to that parcel.

MR. TEDDY: Yes, it is on the plan and --

MS. LOE: Clark -- Clark would be down. So basically from right now it's the bus depot for STA, but just east of Home Depot connecting up through it looks to that roundabout?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. In transportation planning it's desirable to have more local roads parallel to freeways that interconnect interchanges. And that was the thought there.

That being said, the recent discussions of that link is that it would be a long way off.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. TEDDY: And there's general awareness of a great deal of environmental sensitivity that's playing into that as well as other priorities that basically the city has as a partner in CATSO. So I could not give you an estimate of when.

I believe there's been some preliminary studies done. I have seen drawings not -- not lately, but ten years ago I know there were some preliminary schemes done, but I think for the time being that that project's for the back burner.

MS. LOE: Okay. The zoning map, any chance of pulling that up?

I'm looking at the zoning -- the IG zoning in that area. Really seems to be [along](#) the Paris Road corridor. And this does look like we have a PD corridor running up that 63.

So I was just curious if we can take a look at that and maybe evaluate how this might change. It looks like there was a plan for the PD zoning coming up [along](#) 63 there.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'm going to guess a lot of that was Centerstate. I think Centerstate was a very large development, Miss Loe, that probably brought that PD to the majority of that.

MS. LOE: All right. So I am looking at the darker gray, which is the IG zoning. And it does give Paris Road a certain feel just based on the comments that got brought up looking at the neighborhood in context and what maybe was planned for it.

MR. STRODTMAN: I would argue you've got -- you've got Highway 63 right there in the middle. And to me that -- that's not Paris Road.

MS. LOE: So to Staff: Do you see all that light gray turning to IG or -- I mean, this would be a switch. And it does feel like we're maybe beginning to change that.

Do we remember what the intent was with all of that PD going up [along](#) there? If we anticipated the neighborhoods coming in and supporting that?

MR. TEDDY: I'll just comment. I think the light gray is -- really is meant to represent diverse land uses because that was the original idea of Centerstate. I don't think there's any Staff that completely abandoned that. There's obvious changes since the original concept of Centerstate for those of you that have been around long enough to remember what that was proposed to be.

But there's a good mix of land uses there. And my view of this particular request is it's that

condition of being surrounded by roadway that's really driving the idea of industrial. I don't think it's the beginning of a large IG district. I think it's the particular condition of this. It's an oblong piece. It's going to display well to the freeway, but it's got roads on all four sides. So it will be good accessibility and -- for maybe a service oriented business that's quasi industrial in nature. It's probably a good location. It would work for retail, too, but I don't know how strong the retail market is.

MS. LOE: But just one final question. It was pointed out to us that the trail system does come right by there? Is that correct?

MR. PALMER: I believe actually in that location that's a city sidewalk.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. PALMER: It is adjacent to the -- to the Hinkson Creek, but it's widened out there. As I stated, the C -- well, it's not on the CIP plan yet. Future intentions are to widen Vandiver to four lanes adjacent to this property. And so the sidewalks are set wide enough so that that can happen without tearing those up and moving them.

MS. LOE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Additional questions, Commissioners, of Staff?

Comments? Motion?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I just want to thank Planner Smith for digging that up for us.

MR. STRODTMAN: Icebreaker.

MR. MACMANN: Whoever dug that up.

MR. STRODTMAN: Miss Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: For the -- for the purposes of a vote, I am going to make a motion to, in the case of 18-18, Centerstate plat 14 rezoning, approve the requested rezoning.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Russell.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second was Miss Rushing. Commissioners, we have a motion that has been made by Mrs. Russell for Case 18-18 and received its proper second from Miss Rushing.

Do we have any additional comments or discussion needed on this motion?

I see none.

Mrs. Secretary, when you are ready for a roll call.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval. Voting Yes: Mr. Harder, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Ms. Loe, Ms. Burns. Voting No: Mr. MacMann. Motion carries 7-1.

MS. BURNS: 7 to 1. Motion Carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Burns.

And for those in the audience this evening, you will have -- you can have the opportunity if you so choose to speak at City Council. Our recommendation is not final. We have no authority. We just have an approval process to forward it to our -- to City Council with our recommendation. So you will

have the opportunity so you have a chance to get your neighbors if they so desire to speak. It's not over. So don't think that just because you didn't get your answer tonight that you're look for, you still have an opportunity to go to the decision-makers who's the City Council. So watch the paper and/or other locations.

Yes, Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: I would like to also add: The new -- the new code does have a lot of buffering between the residential and industrial. So as citizens and neighbors I would definitely hold the developer's feet to the fire and make sure they do at least what they're supposed to do and stay active in the process along the way.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stanton.

Yes? Mr. Palmer?

MR. PALMER: Just wanted to make an announcement that the -- the vote for that at Council right now would be scheduled for February 5th.

MR. STRODTMAN: So February 5th I would mark on your calendars for anyone that would like to attend the related case at City Council. Thank you, Mr. Palmer.

Moving on, we'll move on to Case 18-5. At this time I would ask any Commissioner who has had any ex-parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 18-5 please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us.

Thank you, Commissioners.