

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

SEPTEMBER 8, 2016

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Mr. Rusty Strodtman
Ms. Sara Loe
Mr. Dan Harder
Ms. Tootie Burns
Ms. Joy Rushing
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Brian Toohey
Mr. Michael MacMann**

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Ms. Lee Russell

I) CALL TO ORDER

MR. STRODTMAN: Good evening. I would like to call the September 8 City of Columbia Planning and Zoning Commission to order.

II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. STRODTMAN: Any changes to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir.

III) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. STRODTMAN: You all -- you have received your minutes from August 18th regular meeting. Were there any changes or modifications needed to those regular meeting notes? I see none. Can I have a motion or -- very good.

MS. BURNS: I move to accept those presented -- as presented.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Stanton. Is there going to be a roll call?

MS. LOE: Let's do a roll call.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Secretary. May we have a roll call, please.

MS. LOE: We have eight present; we have a quorum.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. It looks like we have a -- oh, yes. Going to the minutes, the April 18th [sic], we need to make a --

MS. LOE: We moved.

MR. STRODTMAN: We moved. So, now we'll -- thumbs up? Everyone do a thumbs up? Do I see any -- yes.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: Everybody is good on that, so we would approve the minutes.

IV) TABLING REQUEST

MR. STRODTMAN: We have a tabling request.

Case No. 16-86

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Ridgemont Development, LLC (owner), seeking approval to rezone approximately 12.34 acres from R-1 (Single-family Dwelling) to PUD 2.9 (Planned Unit Development maximum of 2.9 du/ac) and approval of a development plan to be known as "Ridgemont Park". The 12.34-acre subject site is located at the east end of Ridgfield Road, lying south of Ridgemont Road. (The applicant requests that this item be tabled to the September 22 Commission meeting.)

MR. STRODTMAN: Staff, do we have any comments?

MR. ZENNER: We do not. You have had provided for you in your packet an email from Crockett Engineering requesting the tabling. They are seeking to continue to resolve some outstanding plan review comments, as well as trying to address some neighborhood-related issues, as well, prior to being prepared to bring the project forward. We are supportive of the request to table.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Staff. It is our normal practice if there's anyone in the audience that came here for this item that would like to speak on it. Obviously, we would suggest that you come back on the September 22 meeting so that we could hear from you at that time during the discussion on that project, but you're also welcome to come tonight if you came specifically for that event. If not, we'll see you on the 22nd. Okay. Can we -- do we have a motion and a second on tabling this case?

MS. BURNS: I move to table Case 16-86, a request by Crockett Engineering on behalf of Ridgemont Development, LLC.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Burns, thank you for that motion. Do we have a second?

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Rushing seconds that motion. We have a motion that has been made and approved -- a second. Can we have a roll call, please.

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Case 16-86.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Stanton, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0

MS. LOE: We have eight approving. Motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe. That item will be carried over to September 22.

Moving on to our first subdivision case.

V) SUBDIVISIONS

Case No. 16-161

A request by EE, LLC (owner) for a one-lot final plat to be known as "Ballews Subdivision Plat 2" and an associated variance to Section 25-43 (Street Widths) of the subdivision regulations. The 1.48-acre subject site is located on the south side of Business Loop 70 and east side of

Seventh Street, and addressed 708 E. Business Loop 70 and 1200 N. Seventh Street.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Chairman, the links on here on not working when we click on the agenda items.

MR. STRODTMAN: Oh. On your -- on your -- has anybody opened up theirs?

MR. MACMANN: I cannot open the links, either.

MS. RUSHING: I couldn't either, but I don't need to.

MR. STRODTMAN: It may not be operator error this time. We'll get started in just a second.

MS. LOE: The website is down now.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you all for your patience.

MR. ZENNER: We're having some internal internet problem, I believe.

MR. SMITH: Try it again.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. ZENNER: We apparently are having an internet issue internally within City Hall this evening. We have one of two options. We can either move forward with the PowerPoint presentations that we have, which summarize, to some extent, the information that you need, while you do not have the full staff report. Or, if you would like, we can make some hard copies for you all this evening, if that is what your preference is.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Do we have -- my preference would be to move forward and continue on. And then if we get on a topic or something that is a little more technical or we need more information, then we can either ask for copies or maybe by then the internet is working.

MR. ZENNER: We will hope or there will be some hard copies coming down, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: So we'll continue on.

MR. ZENNER: All right. We would like to introduce then Case No. 16-161. We apologize for the technical difficulty.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. So Case number 16-161 again.

Case 16-161

A request by EE, LLC (owner) for a one-lot final plat to be known as "Ballews Subdivision Plat 2" and an associated variance to Section 25-43 (Street Widths) of the subdivision regulations. The 1.48-acre subject site is located on the south side of Business Loop 70 and east side of Seventh Street, and addressed 708 E. Business Loop 70 and 1200 N. Seventh Street.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends :

- Approval of variance from Section 25-43(1) to allow a six-foot reduction in the required right-of-way to be dedicated along proposed Lot 15A's Business Loop 70 frontage.
- Denial of the variance from Section 25-41(1) to allow a six-foot reduction in the required right-

of-way to be dedicated along proposed Lot 16A's Business Loop 70 frontage.

- Approval of the proposed final plat, subject to a revision being made to increase the right-of-way dedication along proposed Lot 16A from seven feet to thirteen feet.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Do we have any questions for Mr. Zenner?

Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Mr. Zenner, will this trigger any sidewalk considerations? I don't think there are sidewalks currently on these properties.

MR. ZENNER: It would.

MS. BURNS: Okay. For 16 and 15, or just 15?

MR. ZENNER: For both.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: And I was wondering whether the building -- the building can't be moved back -- moved south to accommodate more --

MR. ZENNER: For Boys' and Girls' Club?

MS. RUSHING: Yeah. The -- the new building on 15A, they can't drop that south to allow more right-of-way?

MR. ZENNER: The design of the -- the addition, and John Simon, not our building regulation supervisor John Simon, but John Simon, the architect with Simon Oswald, is here to speak to the design of the building. But what I do know of the building addition is it is to accommodate a full-scale or a full-size basketball facility -- basketball court. And reducing the basketball court by the remaining expansion, which would be seven feet, would result in that basketball facility being less than regulation size, and that is part of what the allocation of the money that has been identified for this particular project is gone toward is to build a full-scale basketball facility inside the addition. So we are not, from a City staff perspective, since this 15A is not on the corner, as concerned, nor do we believe there is any need for any additional right-of-way beyond the common property line of 15A and 16A and, therefore, reducing the right-of-way along 15A is not an issue for us. Design of the building has already been completed and it is ready, basically, to be permitted short of having this platting action taken care of.

MS. RUSHING: This does eliminate the lot line there?

MR. ZENNER: No. What you see here on the graphic in front of you, the dark lines that go north-south and east-west that come through the middle of the property here, these are the two new lot lines that would be created to, in essence, have all of 15A with Boys' and Girls' Club and then 16A being delegated to the -- to the Dairy Queen site itself. Currently, the property line runs along east-west along the backside or the north side of the Boys' and Girls' Town-- Club parcel. And then this parcel is, in essence, a single individual lot that was at one point, it used to run east-west. So it was consolidated and the development that you see today, the Sonic and then the Dairy Queen, were oriented to the Business Loop on what was previously east-west lots.

MS. RUSHING: So there would be no setback requirement between the two buildings on 15A, is

what I'm getting at?

MR. ZENNER: Right. That is correct. There is no -- they will be connected, so they will be considered one building. And if -- under the way that the Code is currently written, if the platting was not brought forward to consolidate the lots for the purposes of just cleaning up the platting situation, the extension of the Boys' and Girls' Club onto the northern portion of what's shown here as Lot 15A, they would have built across the property line, which is still a permitted opportunity to be able to do that, to have it considered legal -- a legal one-lot building. So they could add on to the existing Boys' and Girls' Club facility by just building over the property line and that would be legal under our building code standards. Instead, they have chosen to basically consolidate the lot to make just one parcel for Boys' and Girls' and then basically one parcel for the Dairy Queen. And again, the right-of-way necessity at least six feet, that matches up with -- that matches up with the notch that you see here, and it's difficult to see it here, but there is a notch already that's offset on a portion of the Wilson's lot and that carries out to the lot line that would be here, so that six feet actually drops down, it carries that across, so it's an equal six feet, and then we take an additional seven and basically round the corner on the Dairy Queen lot, so it stair-steps back towards Seventh Street is what the final plat would look like if you choose to deny the requested variance. If you approve the variance, the plat you see here is what would be recorded with just a six-foot addition to the road right-of-way in order to ensure that all of the frontage basically from the east lot line of what is the old Wilson's Nursery site to Seventh Street is at the same depth. Otherwise, if you deny the variance, it steps back on the corner.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any more questions, Ms. Rushing? Is there any other additional questions for staff? I've got a question, Mr. Zenner. You mentioned that no hardship would result from the full right-of-way dedication along the Lot 16A frontage. So would there be any parking loss than what there is today? Because one of your photos, it looked like the radius would take some parking potentially out. I mean --

MR. ZENNER: What I -- and I realize what you're saying. And I would -- I don't believe we are asking for the right-of-way. While we were asking for the right-of-way, the improvements would be nonconforming. They would be allowed to remain, and if we were to extend the right-of-way at any point, make any intersection improvements, it would be at that point that the nonconforming parking spaces would be removed since they would be in our public right-of-way at that point. But we are -- to my knowledge, we are not asking for any upgrades to the site to be made as a result of the dedication of the right-of-way. So what exists today would remain until and at such time that we make any additional improvements.

MR. STRODTMAN: So there would be -- I understand that there would be no improvements asked of the applicant as part of the approval of this. But in future, if the City wanted to improve that intersection, then the City would be responsible for constructing that new intersection?

MR. ZENNER: That would be correct. Or if the site were to be redeveloped at any point -- and to Ms. Burns' question -- the Dairy Queen lot will likely not have sidewalk requirements associated with it given the fact that there is no redevelopment occurring on that parcel. But the parcel to the east where we

would be doing the extension of the Boys' and Girls' Club would likely have one because it's new construction along an arterial or a collector.

MR. STRODTMAN: Until such time as it came back to us, and then we would -- then the sidewalks would be in discussion.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. We would complete the entire sidewalk network. And again this is part of the Business Loop CID and part of that overall project, a part of the CID is to try to increase connectivity, which sidewalk improvements, at some point, would likely be being looked at. So we are setting the site up to at least accommodate that at the future.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Any additional questions?

MR. MACMANN: Can I follow up quickly?

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Director Zenner, Boys' and Girls' Club is in the CID?

MR. ZENNER: The parcels that are on the Business Loop are, so the Dairy Queen and then the Dairy Queen would be at some point possibly impacted by the CID's desire for increased connectivity which, if the sidewalk is not installed as a result of redevelopment or as a part of a City project, it may be funded through some CID capital investments that they may make along the corridor.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. All right. That's the clarification. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Our normal practice, even though this is not a public hearing, if there is anybody in the audience that would like to come forward and give us any information that would be relevant to this case, we would welcome that. Mr. Simon? As you come up here, if you would give us your name and address for the recorder, we would appreciate it.

MR. SIMON: My name is John Simon with Simon Associates Architects. 210 Park Avenue is our office location. We're here in conjunction with preparing the documents for the Boys' and Girls' Club and trying to do some housekeeping with respect to these properties and just clean things up primarily. I think the response to the variance request for Lot 16A was in part due to our understanding of the City's traffic engineer's indication that there is no need for the additional right-of-way. No improvements were scheduled that would be impacted as a result of the reduction in right-of-way, and the owner of the property simply would like to retain the additional property, obviously, where possible. I think it's important to represent that to the east, there is significant buildings right on the Business Loop that would preclude widening this roadway for a number of years. At such time as those improvements might be made, it's quite likely that this tract might come into the control of the Boys' and Girls' Club, as well. There's a long-term lease associated with the Dairy Queen operation there. And it would just give us a better opportunity to make a more homogenous configuration for any expansion that they might do in the future relative to this tract of ground. And that's why we thought it was significant to keep those two setback conditions in alignment. The L-shaped configuration of the Boys' and Girls' Club tract is unusual insomuch as we have a front-yard setback off Seventh Street, and then we also have a front-yard setback off of the Business Loop as well. So the building still is going to be back quite a distance from the curb line of the Business Loop and, yes, we are going to install sidewalks as a part of the improvements to that tract. I'd be happy

to answer any questions if I can.

MS. RUSHING: Well, I guess you --

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: -- get to answer my question about -- I'm just looking at what looks to me like where you plan to place your building, and there is space between the new building and the existing building. And so my question was whether you could drop down the new building --

MR SIMON: I think that's --

MS. RUSHING: -- to allow more right-of-way?

MR. SIMON: I think what's confusing in this representation is that's actually the Sonic building on the lot right now.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. SIMON: The Boys' and Girls' Club addition will be contiguous to their existing facility.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. SIMON: So you'll be able to walk from the south face of the existing building all the way to the north face of the new gymnasium.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. SIMON: So this doesn't represent the addition in any respect. Right now, it's just what's existing on that property.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Simon, good evening. The City is engaged in burying utilities through CIP funds on the Loop. Will you coordinate your sidewalk activity with that? Are you going to do it and they're going to dig it up again or what's the plan there -- or do you know?

MR. SIMON: I don't know at this time. I know what the improvements are intended for the CID program there, but, you know, the intent is to install the sidewalks per City standards and there would be that opportunity to install any additional infrastructure --

MR. MACMAN: And you're --

MR. SIMON: -- prior to our construction --

MR. MACMANN: Okay. You're not currently in negotiations or coordination with the City for the activity?

MR. SIMON: We haven't submitted drawings for the project yet, and I suspect if that were to occur, it would be a part of that submittal process where Public Works would come out and say we want to get these infrastructure elements in place, and certainly we would be open to those improvements.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Simon.

MR. SIMON: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like to come forward to speak on this topic? I see none. Thank you. Commissioners, subdivision item. Any comments, discussion? Would anybody like to -- any follow-up questions -- form a motion, discussion on the variances?

MR. STANTON: I tend to agree with staff as to recommendations. I plan to support it in that way.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton. Would you like --

MS. BURNS: I'll make a motion if that's what you're looking for.

MR. STRODTMAN: There we go. Ms. Burns, we would appreciate that motion.

MS. BURNS: In Case No. 16-161, Ballews Subdivision Plat 2, final plat, I'd like to recommend as per staff recommendation as far as the right-of-way approval for Lot 15A and denial for 16A.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Thank you. And was there also approval of the final plat?

MS. BURNS: And approval of the final plat also.

MR. STRODTMAN: As part of the motion. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton seconds that motion. Any comments, questions on the motion?

With that, can we have a roll call, please, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So in Case 16-161.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. LOE: Eight approvals. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe.

VI) PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. 16-170

A request by The Crossing-EPC of Columbia (owner) for approval of a C-P development plan to be known as "Lot 7, Red Oak South Plat No. 1". The 0.75-acre subject site is located on the southeast corner of Grindstone Parkway and Grindstone Plaza Drive.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the C-P development plan and associated Design Parameters, subject to prior approval of a consolidation plat to combine the subject site with the principal church lot which it serves.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Do we have any questions for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Director Zenner, after the replat, this is going to be one piece of property?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct --

MR. MACMANN: I mean --

MR. ZENNER: -- with two zonings on it.

MR. MACMANN: -- with part of this property that's not platted will be C-P?

MR. ZENNER: It is platted. The C-P lot is platted today. We're combining two platted lots. The church lot was platted at the time that they did their most recent expansion, so the entire church boundary has been platted as a legal lot, so we are combining two legal lots together which is considered an administrative action and legal. There is nothing within our regulations that precludes an individual from

being able to join two differently zoned parcels. We generally do not -- we generally frown upon that action. However, given that the ownership is the same in this particular instance and the need to not create an off-premise advertising sign, it is something that we are -- we will allow to occur. Split-zoned property, which is what we would term this as after it's combined as one lot is normally something that is more challenging to track, especially if you're in an area that is intending on being redeveloped. Now, that's one reason why we -- we frown upon combining split-zoned parcels into a single lot. In this particular instance, given that this is for the church, the church's purpose is for being able to put the advertising signage to get way-finding to the road that they've created, we do not see this as really the platting action as an issue, nor the split zoning in the same light as we would if it were some other area.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: So to follow that -- his -- Mr. MacMann's questions, if the church decided that there was a better use for this site than their sign and they decided to sell it, then it would come back, obviously, through to us with the new ownership for a -- to split it off?

MR. ZENNER: We would be resubdividing the property at that point. And to resubdivide the property and have a new development plan on it, that would require a final plat, yes. I would probably tell you that if the church wants to retain the ability to advertise on whatever monument-style sign or whatever signage that they place -- leave on this lot if it's redeveloped, we would probably advise them that they need to retain the ownership of it; otherwise, you can't have your church sign on that property even --

MR. STRODTMAN: And my assumption was that the sign would go away and, you know, they would sell it.

MR. ZENNER: Somebody would be rebuilding it for commercial use.

MR. STRODTMAN: Be developed. And under my assumption or scenario, then the -- would the zoning -- there wouldn't be a little sliver left over of -- you know, of C-P, the lot that they sold off, and then the A-1? I mean, because --

MR. ZENNER: We would --

MR. STRODTMAN: -- you would lose that line. Right? You lose that property line?

MR. ZENNER: -- we would -- you will lose the property line that divides the A-1 and the C-1 -- or the C-P through the administrative combination plat. We would probably, if you came back to resubdivide the property, we would require the property to be divided where the original lot line was. There would be no harm in, however, not having that property line overlapping in some nature. We would probably see no reason for that, and I would imagine the church would not, either. Why would they want a piece of C-P that they could do nothing with?

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. Right.

MR. ZENNER: And the sign's location is what the sign's location is. It's out on the corner. Now, this particular tract of land just in general is an extremely challenging tract of land to develop partially because of the environment features that are up along its Grindstone Road or Grindstone Parkway frontage with some stream buffer and some other environmental features that are on the front portion that you see in the hatched-in area, so it makes it a challenging site for development. This was -- it was a

remnant parcel that could have a very small building on it, but I -- and obviously, with the church acquiring the property, the small building could still be there. It could be a bookstore of some nature or something, but, likely, it would serve no value. It would serve value only to somebody that wanted to build a small retail business or some other business permitted. And the signage, if it's more important for the church to have way-finding is probably going to overshadow the need to sell the property for other purposes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. Any additional questions of Mr. Zenner? I see none. We'll go ahead and open up the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: And anyone that would like to come forward to speak on this matter, please do. Just please give us your name and address.

MR. SHY: Chairman and Commission, my name is Ron Shy, and I live at 5600 South Highway KK. To answer your question a little bit about the sign, I think it's the idea of the church purchasing this lot and putting the signage there is because there is a traffic light there, and that is going to be a very good situation for people to come to the church and exit the church. So this is very straightforward. I do have the director of development here with me, Mr. Bayte, if you have any questions for the church particulars, but as far as a technical part of this, I'd be glad to try to answer any questions you might have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions of Mr. Shy? I see none, so thank you, sir.

MR. SHY: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. Would anyone else like to come forward and speak on this matter? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing on this case.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any discussion?

MS. BURNS: I'll make a motion at this time --

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Burns? Yes. Yes.

MS. BURNS: I'll make a motion at this time for the Case No. 16-170, Lot 7, Red Oak South Plat No. 1. It's a development plan. It's a request by The Crossing-EPC of Columbia, they're the owner, for approval of a C-P development plan to be known as Lot 7, Red Oak South Plat No. 1. It's a .75-acre subject site and it's located on the southeast corner of Grindstone Parkway and Grindstone Plaza Drive.

MS. RUSHING: Subject to filing of the plat?

MS. BURNS: Subject to filing of the plat.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Mr. Stanton seconds. We have a motion that has been made and seconded. Is there any questions or comments on this motion? I see none. May we have a roll call, Ms. Secretary?

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries

8-0.

MS. LOE: We have eight votes for, zero against. Motion carries. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe.

Case No. 16-171

A request by Cole & Associates, Inc. (applicant) for approval of a major amendment to an O-P (Planned Office District) development plan to be known as "Mainstreet Health & Wellness Suites". The 11.24-acre subject site is located on the north side of Berrywood Avenue, approximately 400 feet east of Portland Street.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the revised O-P development plan and associated Statement of Intent and Design Parameters.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Are there any questions of Mr. Zenner? I see none. We'll go ahead and open up the public hearing portion of this matter.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: If anybody would like to come forward and speak on this, please do.

MR. KLINGL: Good morning -- or good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. For the record, my name is Michael Klingl. I'm a development director with Mainstreet. Our offices are located at 14390 Clay Terrace Boulevard in Carmel, Illinois. I didn't want to necessarily add to any of the technical issues brought forth in the staff report, but we are here to answer any questions that you may have further. Instead, I want to use my time to identify or introduce Mainstreet to you and our mission and what -- a little bit -- add a little more clarity to what we're planning on doing with the property. Mainstreet was founded in 2002. Our primary mission to transform lives. We do that by developing what we believe is the youngest and best-designed post-acute care facilities in the system today. Our company was built on always challenging the status quo, always asking why not. Our CEO, Zeke Turner, when he started in this industry out of -- coming out of finance and properties management realm in Wall Street, started to acquire nursing homes, the nursing homes that we know of today. And right away, the mission was formed there because he asked why can't they be better than they are currently. Most of the stock out there today is anywhere from 25 to 40 years old. Obviously, many changes, many improvements have been made throughout the industry, and while some of those facilities choose to continue to upgrade their properties, a lot of them are not configured in a manner in which they can offer what the properties that we are developing offer. So from that standpoint, we are transforming lives through the way healthcare is being delivered today. We feel that the better people feel about their surroundings and the care that they are receiving, and the manner they're receiving, and the conditions that they're receiving it in, is only going to help them to get better quicker, and that is the whole purpose for our facility. As the director said, we are a post-acute care facility. This is short-term and short-term only, not that people want to stay longer,

but the minimum -- or I'm sorry -- the average stay is going to be somewhere between ten and fifteen days. These are folks that are coming off of knee surgery, hip surgery, heart attacks where the hospital will not allow them to -- I shouldn't say the hospital -- the insurance companies will not allow them to stay in the hospital any longer to receive that level of care because they've deemed them not -- not needing that level of care, so they need to find someplace else because they can't go home and start living their lives again without getting their bearings more done, their acuity, their dexterity, their -- sometimes there's speech issues that they have to work through in order to be able to go back home again. So we will be offering the post-acute care at our facilities. Mainstreet is the largest developer for post-acute care facilities in the system today. We have more than twenty-five properties already developed and operating with an additional thirteen more that we looking to go under construction this year -- I'm sorry -- that are currently under construction right now that are not open yet with another ten -- roughly ten properties that will be going under construction before the end of the year. That is the model for next year, there's going to be another fifteen to twenty as far as the way we're looking at it. We are a substantial player in the market and we are currently developing in nine states. I believe that from a standpoint of what we've done or what we're proposing on this property, we've done right by the property itself. It is a fully-wooded site, as you can see by the panoramic. We have tried to make our footprint as small as possible and preserve as much wooded area as possible, so by doing so, I think we've done right by the property, the community, for bring this service -- needed service to the community, and then to our neighbors adjacent. We've had two meetings with neighbors. One was an elected meeting where we invited neighbors and sent out invitations for them to come out and ask and inquire about what our property is going to be, and that happened a couple months ago. And then about a month ago, prior, leading up to this meeting here, we met in the lobby with several interested residents and went through what we were proposing to do again. Seemed to be support from the neighborhood. We addressed as many concerns as we heard, although there weren't very many, and we continue to put our best foot forward from a standpoint of, if there are additional concerns, we would like to address them. So, with that, if there's any questions that you have technically, I do have my civil engineer here, as well as my development consultant, so we're -- we're here for additional questions if you have any.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Is there any questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Hi, how are you?

MR. KLINGL: How are you doing?

MR. MACMANN: I'm great. Will you -- do you anticipate doing post-hospital procedures in this facility?

MR. KLINGL: Not necessarily, no. This is not sub-acute. This is going to be post-acute, so there is not necessarily going to be any procedures being done. There will be doctors that will visit -- be revisiting from the hospitals to see their patients, possibly on a daily basis, but there's not going to be any kind of hospital care.

MR. MACMANN: All right. What -- how many beds does this facility have?

MR. KLINGL: Seventy beds.

MR. MACMANN: And number of employees --

MR. KLINGL: Roughly, about --

MR. MACMANN: -- ish?

MR. KLINGL: -- 100 to 120 is generally what gets --

MR. MACMANN: And on a given shift level, how many folks are there?

MR. KLINGL: You're going to probably see some of the largest shift in the morning, somewhere probably between 35 and 40, maybe 45. Similarly, the same number in the afternoon, and then, of course, over the evening time --

MR. MACMANN: Not that many in the evening.

MR. KLINGL: -- it'll more of a skeleton staff. And that's primarily the same kind of nursing employees will be there. It'll be the administrative staff and, obviously, the kitchen staff that won't be onsite any longer.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions? I have a couple. Will -- will Mainstreet -- Mainstreet is the name of the company. Correct?

MR. KLINGL: Yes, it is.

MR. STRODTMAN: Who will manage the facility?

MR. KLINGL: We -- we party with third-party operators, and currently the operator that's slated to partner with us on this is Aduro.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. And you have other facilities with Aduro?

MR. KLINGL: We do.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Are you in other locations in Missouri? You mentioned, I think, nine states.

MR. KLINGL: This is the first location in Missouri. We are looking at three other locations currently, but we are in the neighboring state of Kansas where we've got seven facilities, two of which are still under construction. The other five are already operating.

MR. STRODTMAN: Do you manage any of your own facilities?

MR. KLINGL: We have not yet to this date, however, we broke ground on our first two in Arizona this year, and they are going -- and they'll be going online about the time that they started construction next year. It's about a 12 -- 12-month construction cycle.

MR. STRODTMAN: And those will be in house -- ran in house?

MR. KLINGL: Correct. And that, basically, going forward, is going to -- we're going to be able to offer to our -- our partners, as well as ourselves, and to be able to continue to grow our network.

MR. STRODTMAN: Who is typically your patient? Do you -- insurance-related or --

MR. KLINGL: It's Medicare, yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Medicare.

MR. KLINGL: It's -- yeah. It's definitely insurance-related because again that's kind of what's bringing them to us. They can't stay in the hospital any longer, but they can't really go home yet, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Just one final question. On the 70 beds, have you received the certificate of need for those beds?

MR. KLINGL: The certificate of need has been received for this property, yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Any additional speakers who would like to come forward? I see none, so we'll close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions or comments? If someone would like to frame a motion, that would be okay, too. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: It is unusual to see downsizing of this measure, but given the conservation easement that was on the property that it is next to -- an R-1, I appreciate the downsizing. And it appears, based on the letter of support we saw in our package and the comments that you made -- one of my questions was going to be have you met with the neighbors -- that the neighborhood appears to support the project as it's moving forward. So I plan on supporting it as changed -- as proposed.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe. Anybody else? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'd like to form a motion, sir.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 16-171, Mainstreet Health & Wellness revised development -- O-P revised development plan, I recommend approval of the revised O-P development plan and associated statement of intent and design parameters.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. Do we have a second?

MR. TOOHEY: I'll second.

MR. STRODTMAN: We have a motion that's been made and also has been seconded. Any discussion on this motion? I see none. May we have a roll call, please, Ms. Secretary?

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So, in Case 16-171.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. LOE: We have eight votes for, zero against. Motion carries. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe.

Case No. 16-172

A request by Crockett Engineer Consultants (agent) on behalf of Tompkins Homes & Development, Inc. (owner) to rezone 0.06 acres from R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) to PUD-2 (Planned Unit Development) with an associated Statement of Intent and for approval of a major amendment to the Barcus Ridge PUD development plan to accommodate a private street. The 7.36-acres is located on the north side of Old Plank Road, approximately 700 feet west of Abbotsbury Lane.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approval of the requested rezoning from R-1 to PUD-2 with associated Statement of Intent.
2. Approval of the revised development plan.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Any questions of staff? I've got a quick one. So this little 0.06 acres was not part of the original site? It was another owner -- another -- owned by another individual and --

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- it was acquired to accommodate this?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. Conveniently, it's the same property owner that owns this site and one to the north -- the same developer. This is all part of a larger Barcus Ridge plat at some point, so I believe it is the exact same owner -- maybe a different LLC, but it is the same ownership group, so they will be required to replat this lot and the other lot to maintain the legal lots as all the lots evolve..

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Anything -- any additional questions? With that, we'll go ahead and open this public hearing to the public.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: And if anybody would like to come forward, we would welcome that.

MR. GREENE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission. My name is Andy Greene with Crockett Engineering, 2608 North Stadium Boulevard. I'm here representing Tompkins Homes & Development. Mr. Smith reviewed this request, very straightforward. During final design of this road, conflicts with the existing gas line, there were a couple of joints in the gas line, and the gas company wouldn't allow that, and so we had to shift our road to basically encroach onto the other property. We're asking for a rezoning of this and then, basically, combining this to a new revised PUD plan. And a pretty straightforward request, and here to happy -- or I'm happy to answer any questions you guys have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Are there questions of this speaker? So it wasn't as much as a topography matter as it was a gas line?

MR. GREENE: Initially, the road, during the first site submittal, it was all actually on the 7.3-acre piece. We came back and initially we were thinking the gas company gave us some -- some forward thinking as we could put the road where we wanted to and we wouldn't have any conflicts, but upon further design and analysis of the gas line, there are a couple of joints there and, I guess, those were special precautions needed to take place and you can't put a road over them, so we had to shift in and get it out of their way, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you for that. Yes. I see maybe a question over here in the --

MR. SMITH: My apologies. I think I said grading was the issue. I think I did write in the report that it was the gas line issue.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay.

MR. SMITH: I was thinking of the sidewalk when I said grading. I apologize.

MR. STRODTMAN: I appreciate the clarification. Any additional questions for this speaker?
Thank you, Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional speakers or anybody else who would like to come forward? I see none. We'll close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any comments, questions, motions?

MS. LOE: This one seems very straightforward, as has been observed already, so I think we should just go ahead with a motion if no one has any comments.

MR. STRODTMAN: Looks good. Go.

MS. LOE: To move to approve Case 16-172, recommendation to approve the requested rezoning from R-1 to PUD-2 with the associated statement of intent and approve the revised development plan for the Barcus Ridge PUD.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe, for that motion. Do we have a second?

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. BURNS: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton, it sounds like he was a little closer, so I'll give you the motion -- the second. We've had a motion that has been placed on the floor and a second has been received. Do we have any questions on this motion? I see none. May we have a roll call, please, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Yes. Case 16-172.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns. Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. LOE: We have eight votes for, zero against. Motion carries. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe. Mr. Greene, appreciate you coming. We don't typically get to see other people besides Mr. Crockett, so we appreciate that.

VII) COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

MR. STRODTMAN: Is there anyone in the public that would like to give us any other comments? I see none.

VIII) COMMENTS FROM THE STAFF

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Well, your next meeting will be September 22nd, and it will be at 7:00 p.m. We do have a regular work session and that will be at 5:30. We will not have any special meetings that week, so it's just a regular P&Z meeting, 5:30 and 7:00 p.m. Your agenda, however, for September 22nd is very busy. You will notice we have three subdivision actions, Creek's Edge, Plat No. 2. This is a preliminary in the Mattingley Subdivision, one lot, final plat. And the Sigma Nu Fraternity, again, another one-lot final

plat. We'll have the public hearing, hopefully, for the Ridgemont Park PUD on this agenda, the one we tabled today. A rezoning request at 1201 North College Avenue. This is to combine a -- correct a zoning inaccuracy with an existing building that is on the property and you'll see that in the locator map here. And then we have lots that are on either side of your Lynn Street Cottages project, the City of Columbia's Lynn Street Cottages project, that are currently zoned C-P, seeking to be rezoned, I believe, to PUD to be added to our Lynn Street Cottages development. And then we will have a combined hearing, and I believe I had indicated this to you previously, that we have received the Breckenridge Park annexation and permanent zoning request and the preliminary plat. That will be a combined public hearing/subdivision item on the agenda. And just to familiarize everybody with where we are talking about all of these projects, the Creek Ridge Plat No. 2 subdivision plat is south of the existing Creek Ridge No. 1, which off of Old Plank Road and Bethel, which is just to east off of the map. You have the Mattingley Subdivision, this one-lot plat that is being brought forward and not I'm not quite sure why we're platting at this point. It may be a part of a need for some type of building or construction approval. You have our Sigma Nu Fraternity parcel. This was a former fraternity that was torn down. The rear lot, which you see was an annex parcel, the annex has been removed and they are desiring to reconstruct a new fraternity home on the property and their parking was going to -- was proposed initially to be where the annex lot was. As part of the site plan review process, we indicated that they could not have off-site parking in an R-3 zoning district, therefore, they were required to submit a final plat to bring the property together under a single lot. The Ridgemont Park rezoning request, which you have seen that plat or that layout tonight. That is at College Park, Ridgemont, and just east of Ridgefield. The North College Avenue rezoning request, as you can see here, we have R-2 to the south, you have C-3 to the north. That is a commercially used correct office today. It is not seeking to go to C-3. If I recall correctly, I believe that is a C-1 application in order to accommodate the office use that is -- the office or the commercial use that is on the property. I don't have the specifics, but that is why this request is being presented. It's to try to conform the zoning to the actual use of the property today along the College Boulevard frontage there just south of the Business Loop. And then our Lynn Street Cottages project, which I -- if my recollection serves me correctly -- I've got too many mice on my table here. The Lynn Street Cottage project is here in the middle. This is our community development land-trust project that we are doing. You have seen this previously. It was a PUD for four cottage-style houses. These two parcels we have recently acquired and we are seeking to, I believe, to have them merged into the overall project in order to expand the cottage concept that we are looking at with our land trust. And then, last, but not least, our Breckenridge rezoning or annexation and then preliminary plat request. One thing I will point out with this particular project, while the annexation acreage has not changed any, the zoning requested has. This is all now a single R-1 proposed annexation. There is no planned unit development associated with it, so this a standard, a single-family lotted subdivision, and that is what the preliminary plat will show. There has been some significant conversation with the adjacent property owners, and as far as I know at this point, we believe they are in support of the project. We are still working through our staff review comments at this point and we'll have that final report available before the meeting on the 22nd. But early indications would indicate that a

number of the issues associated with the project's densities and its configuration with sink holes and a variety of other things, most of that has been addressed, and the roadway connection and construction issues with the extension of Smith have been dealt with also within the plat. Smith will not be shown on the plat as being extended through the site. Broadway will be for the right-of-way at least, and Mr. Smith will overview all of that when you have the staff report in front of you. Another one of these complex and multi-parted projects. That is the agenda for the 22nd. Just as a reminder to the Planning Commission and to the public, we have one last special Planning Commission work session to discuss the UDO related issues and comments spreadsheet, as well as to share with the Commission several of the revisions that we have made or will be making as a result of the conversations that we have had over the last what seems to be about two months, if I recall correctly, and that the draft -- final draft, final public hearing draft of the Unified Development Code will be being released on the 26th of September, which is the Monday following the 22nd's Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. We will be having discussion of the UDO at the 22nd's work session, as well, so if there are any loose ends that we need to tie up before we finalize that draft or that we need to be working on as the draft is out for public review prior to the public hearing, we will be able to be aware of that. The public hearing for the UDO is scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on October 20th, and that public hearing will not have a time limit associated with it. We will hopefully be able to take public comment until the public has ceased to give any more, and then have the Commission act upon the document as they so choose. We are nearing the end and train light is not always going to hit us. It is the completion of this relatively massive project that we have all been diligently working on. I know you will be glad and I will be glad, as a staff member, and my staff will be, as well. That is all we have to offer for you tonight. Thank you very much for your attention.

IX) COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

MR. STRODTMAN: Any comments from the Commission? Mr. Zenner, on the 26th of September when the final draft comes out, will we be notified or we just need to check the -- will the public need to just check the website to find that document or is there a 3:00 p.m. --

MR. ZENNER: Well, I would check -- I'm going to buy a banner plane and we'll fly it, just so the community knows, and then we'll have smoke signals coming from City Hall. No. We will likely notify through our Planning and Development Listserv that the document has been posted along with the link that the document can be obtained from. The size of this document is such that it cannot actually be emailed. It is too large. So, what we will do is it will be available under our Planning and Development Code update page where all of our documentation up to this point has been located. It will be available in the public library at the reference counter, which is where we currently have the November version of the document, or I should say October 2015 version, and then the May version, which we went through as a part of our -- the precursor to our special work sessions. We will retract both the October '15 and the May '16 versions from the library, and then we will likely replace that with probably two copies of the final public hearing draft document for the public to review, and it will be available online. What I will probably suggest at this point is that the online version will have greater searchability within it. It will be a pdf document, it will not be a Word document, so through a simple control-F, you can do search parameters for particular

key words and be able to identify things within the document that way. So I would -- I would advise the public, if they are interested to be able to review the document, to review it online. Some don't like reading online, but we will not be producing printed copies for the public due to the scale of the document.

MR. STRODTMAN: And do you anticipate, Mr. Zenner, that that document will be complete?

MR. ZENNER: We believe that it will be fully complete. I'm not going to guarantee that we will not have particular cleanup items that we may need to be making some tweaks to that through our discussions, through the special work sessions that we have potentially not been able to fully resolve at this point. We will have shelled out those areas that I believe we can identify within the document through side-margin note that may be under further development. I have been asked by a number of our consultants, as it relates to Appendix A or the administrative manual document, it's referred to in both instances in the Development Code right now as Appendix A or the admin manual, we are in the process of finalizing up the pieces of that and I believe all of those pieces should be fully integrated. Now, they may not be in the final format of what we would like for the public hearing, but the components of the actual administrative manual, all of the pieces of what should be there will be there. That is my understanding with our staff as they've been working on it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a quick question for Director Zenner. The administrative manual will hopefully be searchable also?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. It will be a separate -- and just for the public's knowledge, as well as just to remind the Commissioners. The administrative manual will not be -- while it will be presented as part of the Unified Development Ordinance, it will not be codified as part of the Unified Development Ordinance. The only part -- it will be an administrative manual outside of the codified Code. Part of the purpose behind that, as we had discussed previously, is to allow for advance -- as advancements come with particular components of our application process or possibly regulatory other best management practices, we would like to be able to have the ability to amend that Code or amend the manual without going through a regulatory approval -- reapproval process. That does not mean, and I want to stress, that does not mean that if we are making a manual change that our partners that we work with -- the development community -- would not aware of those types of changes. Often, what we see, we make application change requirements quite frequently right now to address new things that have come up in varying departments in their capacities of review that we sometimes have to modify. If you put those types of conditions within the codified Ordinance, every time we have to do that, we theoretically would have to go through the process of amending the Code, and we would like to avoid that. So that is -- it will be separate, searchable, and they are going to be cross-referenced between. Wherever we have a reference in the UDO itself that refers to an administrative manual, it is going to be titled a particular title and then we will have reference to that so people can reach it. Again, the size of the document and some of the complexities associated with it are what we're still working through. We're dealing with particular aspects also of how elements of the Code are being addressed by our law department as they relate to some legal matters. So some of the format of the document may be slightly different than how it was

presented from May to July due to some of those legal-related matters. So we don't want the public to think that we're doing a bait and switch with the document. Some things may not be in the same location that they saw, but we will try to make clear enough reference in the document so people know where we've moved particular things to -- to or from, and that is really -- our goal is right now is to make sure that the document that the public sees is the document that they were accustomed to through the May submission process, but we realize we want to try to set the document up for ordinance processing purposes and that may require some adjustments to particular section and textual groupings just to basically prepare for that. The effort of trying to prepare the ordinance document is, while not as challenging a process as it is right now for us to compile the document, it's still going to be a lengthy process, and our law department is asking for that. They're asking for enough time to be able to do that appropriately, not being rushed. So, you know, October will come around a lot faster than we all think.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Any additional comments, Commissioners? I see none. Yes, sir?

MR. KATZ: I'm not used to these types of meetings. My name is Marty Katz; I'm -- I live at 1304 Fieldcrest. And considering the fullness of your agenda next time, there's considerable neighborhood opposition to the proposed Ridgemont Park PUD, and I was wondering if we'll be limited on time that we'll have to present, just so I can inform my colleagues of -- you know, so we can plan.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah. You know, we've not had that discussion with the staff yet as to the formalities of it, but if there is a formal opposition, then that -- the formal organization will have more time to speak than the individuals outside of that group. So we'll have that conversation with staff and be able to allow ample time.

MR. KATZ: Yeah. We're just a group of individuals, but we're working together and we can coordinate our efforts to make things more efficient. I know -- you know, I see you presented the agenda. You've got an awful lot and you don't want to be here all night, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: I would suggest that you get in contact with Mr. Zenner tomorrow or next week as soon as you can, and just let him be aware and make sure that he is aware. And if you have any documentation that you would like to forward to him, then he will also pass all that information on to us.

MR. KATZ: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: So he can kind of be your funnel for information, as well as to us. But please utilize him and then he can instruct you if there's anything outside of the normal process.

MR. KATZ: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. Look forward to seeing you next -- the 22nd.

MR. ZENNER: I'd also like to add, before we wrap up, the September 22nd meeting is actually your officer elections, as well, so we will take care of that during the work session. So give some thought to who you may -- who you may like as your leadership, and be prepared to vote. We will have the voting ballots, as we have done in the past, for that election. And as it relates, if I may, Mr. Chairman, in order to save a phone call, the standard practice for public engagement is generally six minutes. Organized opposition normally will get ten, and each subsequent speaker has three minutes to speak. So if you have

a speaker that will be leading up your organized opposition, that individual can speak up to ten minutes. They then -- they could yield a portion of that ten minutes to other speakers, and anybody other than your organized opposition would have three. So if you have a single leader, that leader could speak for that period of time.

MR. KATZ: Are we allowed to have slides?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. And if you -- if you do have a slide presentation, please show up at about 5:15 on the 22nd so our AV staff can load that up onto the laptop for you and just bring it on a stick and they'll -- a memory stick, and they'll be able to take care of it for you. No need to send it to us in advance unless you have written comments that you would like the Commission to see prior to the meeting, and if you do have any written documentation, if you will bring enough copies for the Commissioners, total of nine.

MR. STRODTMAN: So just come back to this room a little before the meeting so they can load your presentation up. Thank you. Commissioners, any additional comments? None.

X) ADJOURNMENT

MR. STRODTMAN: Motion for adjournment?

MS. LOE: I'll move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe. Second, Mr. Stanton. All in favor, thumbs up? Everyone have a nice evening and we'll see everyone next Wednesday at 6:00 p.m.

MR. ZENNER: That is correct.

(The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.)

(Off the record.)