

Minutes
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Michael LeVine, Chairman
January 25, 2022

I. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT read by Chair LeVine

II. ROLL CALL

Michael LeVine, Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held virtually via Zoom Webinar and telephonically, to order at 7:03 P.M.

Commissioners present: All Commissioners present via video conferencing – Michael LeVine, Chairman; Nathaniel Dye, Vice Chairman; Paul Voelckers, Clerk; Travis Arndt, Deputy Clerk; Dan Hickok; Mandy Cole; Josh Winchell; Erik Pedersen

Commissioners absent: Ken Alper

Staff present: Jill Maclean, CDD Director; Irene Gallion, CDD Planner; Beth McKibben, CDD Planner; Sherri Layne, Law

Assembly members: Alicia Hughes-Skandijs

III. REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA – None

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

V. BRIEF REVIEW OF THE RULES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – Chair LeVine gave a brief description of the rules for public participation via Zoom format.

VI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

VII. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION – None

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA – None

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

X. REGULAR AGENDA

AME2021 0003: Parking code revisions, which includes reorganization, establishing a “town center” parking standard, revised parking district boundaries, and allowing parking waivers downtown
Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau
Location: Borough-wide

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and make a recommendation to the Assembly to **APPROVE** the parking code revision, which includes reorganization, establishing a “town center” parking standard, revised parking district boundaries, and allowing parking waivers downtown. This recommendation includes staff proposals to (CHOOSE AS APPROPRIATE):

1. Move the “C Street line” to B Street.
2. Modify the No Parking Requirement Area boundary to encompass Manilla Square.
3. Include 310 Second Street, at the corner of North Franklin and Second Street, in the No Parking Requirement Area (or, document other boundary modifications).
4. Modify proposed code 49.40.220(a)(2) regarding Director and Commission review of items that may influence granting an off-street parking waiver: *Provision for alternative transportation* ~~or transit improvements approved by CBJ Capital Transit.~~
5. Modify CBJ 62.10.050(e) to replace the PD2 restriction with a No Parking Requirement Area restriction, and the PD1 restriction with a Town Center Parking Area restriction.

STAFF PRESENTATION – By Planner Gallion

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Vice Chair Dye noted the changes before them could affect Title 62 and asked to what extent the PC has authority to make changes to Title 62. Director Maclean answered the Commission does not have authority over Title 62 but they should be aware of how their decisions affect other sections of code. In the end, it would be up to the assembly to correct any conflicts between code sections. Mr. Dye asked whether it would be appropriate for the commission to inform the assembly that the PC did not evaluate the recommendation to modify Title 62. Ms. Maclean said that would be acceptable.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION – It was decided to consider questions proposed by Staff in the presentation and then go through the ordinance page by page.

Staff Proposal Questions:

- Move C Street Line of T CPA?
 - The PC agreed to move it to D Street
- NPRA encompass Manilla Square and 310 Second street?
 - Mr. Dye, Mr. Arndt and Mr. Voelckers said Manilla Square and 310 Second Street were intentionally left out during previous discussions and did not support adding them back.
 - Ms. Cole and Mr. Winchell felt that they should be included in the NPRA.
 - Ms. Maclean reminded the Commission that if any parking is required, even if it is waived, there will be a requirement for ADA parking.
- Modify Proposed Code regarding review of items that may influence granting waiver: Eliminate transit.
 - Mr. Voelckers felt the change makes sense and he is ok with removing the language.
 - Mr. Dye, Mr. Arndt, and Mr. LeVine disagreed. Mr. Dye said they are making the change for an unlikely scenario.
- Modify Vendor Regs to replace the PD2 with NPRA and/or PD1 with T CPA
 - The PC decided to make a recommendation that the assembly consider making conforming amendments to title 62.
- Corrected parking space table
 - It was decided to replace the table with the corrected version

PAGE 1

- Mr. Arndt suggested removing the “must be” from sentences and rewording them. For example, “Off-street parking must be provided” would change to “Provide off-street parking.” Ms. Maclean said it was important to keep the “must” and offered as compromise to remove “be” so it reads, “must provide” instead of “must be provided.”

Page 2 – No significant changes

Page 3 –

- Mr. LeVine asked for explanation of the difference between the phrase “walking distance” and ‘distance’. Ms. Maclean explained walking distance refers to the path a pedestrian would be expected to take using legal means (crosswalks, sidewalks, not jaywalking).
- Mr. Arndt suggested removing the word “several” from line 8.
- Mr. LeVine suggested removing the word ‘physically’ from line 25.

Page 4 –

- Mr. Dye suggested rounding down when calculating required number of parking spaces as opposed to rounding to the next whole number. Mr. Winchell and Mr. Pedersen agreed. Mr.

Voelckers and Mr. LeVine both felt it should not be changed with Mr. Voelckers pointing out that they have already made reductions in the table.

Page 5 –

- Mr. Voelckers asked what the school district feedback was concerning proposed parking requirements for schools. Ms. Gallion said they had reached out to the district and received no feedback.
- Mr. Arndt pointed out ‘guest parking’ and ‘visitor parking’ seemed to be used interchangeably and suggested replacing ‘guest’ in the table with ‘visitor’ for consistency.
- Mr. Arndt suggested changing sobering center from x number of parking spaces plus 1 visitor space to the total number of parking spaces (1 parking space plus 1 visitor space becomes 2 parking spaces)

Page 6 –

- Mr. Arndt asked what would make a space a visitor space. Is it just any space in excess of required? Ms. Gallion said it would be a space that is designated as such with signage or some other designation. Ms. Layne added that while ADA literature speaks of spaces designated by signage, they also address whether a facility is open to the public. If a facility open to the public has a parking lot with spaces not designated visitor parking, it would be assumed that those are available visitor parking spaces.
- Mr. Dye suggested referencing the ADA code rather than including the table for 49.40.210(b) since it is based on the federal code. By this method, they would not need to make an ordinance change every time there is a change to the federal code. Ms. Gallion explained it is required to include the table specifically because the federal code could change and we might not be aware of it unless it was addressed in ordinance.
- Line 3 change “parking spaces and no visitor parking spaces” to read “parking spaces and **that have** no visitor parking spaces. Ms. Layne said Code reads if visitor spots are provided then ADA space requirements kick in. It is not based on what is required but what is provided. It was decided to defer this back to the Law department to ensure the final verbiage is appropriate.

Page 7

- Line 25 Mr. Dye felt the second to last sentence on this page could be removed.
- Line 25 Mr. LeVine suggested adding an explanation of parking alternatives as ways parking can be shared and then making the sentences about the written instrument a stand-alone section.

Page 8

- Line 21 Mr. LeVine suggested adding an explanation of parking reductions
- Line 19 Mr. Voelckers suggested removing ‘and’ as unnecessary from the end of **49.40.215(b)(2)**

Page 9

- Line 15 Mr. Voelckers felt they could remove **(B)** provision for alternative transportation

Pages 10 through 14 – No significant changes

Page 15

- Line 15 Mr. LeVine pointed out the reference to video rentals on line 15. It was decided to deal with this later at Title 49.

Page 16 – No significant changes

Page 17

- Line 6 - Mr. LeVine suggested moving “Outside of the Town Center Parking Area” to the beginning of (g)

AT EASE 8:32 P.M. – 8:38 P.M.

MOTION: *by Mr. Dye to accept staff’s findings, analysis and recommendations and approve AME2021 0003 subject to agreed upon changes.*

Agreed upon changes:

1. *Change in boundary from C Street to D Street*
2. *Not taking a position on Title 62*
3. *Inclusion of the entire table*
4. *All other agreed upon edits agreed upon during the line-by-line review of the ordinance*

And

1. *Continue to exclude Manilla Square and the property at 310 Second Street*
2. *Leave the original language regarding Transit*
3. *For parking waivers, leaving the eligibility of providing capital transit, along with their concurrence*
4. *Page 4 Line 10 round down to the nearest whole number*
- 5.
6. *(Added on Amendment)*

MOTION to Amend: *by Mr. Voelckers to remove the option to round down in all cases and leave it to round to the nearest whole number*

Mr. Dye explained the reason for rounding down is to avoid encumbering a developer with additional requirements when the math says they need 0.7 spaces then they would be required to have one space and that would kick in required ADA spaces.

Mr. Voelckers, Mr. Arndt, and Mr. LeVine felt it should not be changed.

Roll call vote

YEA: Voelckers, Hickok, Arndt, LeVine

NO: Winchell, Pedersen, Cole, Dye

4 Yea 4 No – Motion to Amend Failed

MOTION to Amend: by Mr. Voelckers to change calculation text to 0.6 parking spaces per dwelling unit and delete the rest of the box and 0.4 in the town center column Line 24 on page 4/19 Senior Housing.

Mr. Arndt agreed with the reasoning for the Motion but the calculation seems to INCREASE the parking requirement in the town center and thought it should be decreased instead.

Mr. Voelckers rescinded his motion to amend

MOTION to Amend: by Mr. Voelckers to change calculation text to 0.6 parking spaces per dwelling unit and delete the rest of the box and 0.3 in the town center column Line 24 on page 4/19 Senior Housing

Mr. LeVine said he will be a NO vote on this saying he believes this will add confusion if there are requirements for visitor spaces.

Roll call vote

YEA: Voelckers, Cole, Arndt, Pedersen, Dye

NO: Hickok, Winchell, LeVine

5 Yea 3 No Motion to Amend Passed

MOTION to Amend: by Ms. Cole to include Manilla Square and 310 Second Street in the NPRA

Mr. Dye, Mr. Voelckers and Mr. Pedersen spoke against the motion.

Mr. Winchell spoke in support.

Roll call vote

YEA: Cole, Winchell

NO: Arndt, Pedersen Hickok, Voelckers Dye LeVine

2 Yea 6 No Motion Failed

MOTION to Amend: by Mr. Arndt to change the Sobering Center in the table striking the visitor space requirements and adding one space to the requirement for the town center column

Roll call vote

YEA: Arndt, Cole, Pedersen, Hickok, Winchell, Voelckers, Dye, LeVine

NO:

8 Yea 0 No Motion Passed

AMENDED MOTION: *by Mr. Dye to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve AME2021 0003 subject to agreed upon changes.*

Agreed upon changes:

- 1. Change in boundary from C Street to D Street*
- 2. Not taking a position on Title 62*
- 3. Inclusion of the entire table*
- 4. All other agreed upon edits agreed upon during the line-by-line review of the ordinance*

And

- 1. Continue to exclude Manilla Square and the property at 310 Second Street*
- 2. Leave the original language regarding Transit*
- 3. For parking waivers, leaving the eligibility of providing capital transit, along with their concurrence*
- 4. Page 4 Line 10 round down to the nearest whole number*
- 5. Change calculation text to 0.6 parking spaces per dwelling unit and delete the rest of the box and 0.4 in the town center column Line 24 on page 4/19 Senior Housing*
- 6. Change the Sobering Center in the table striking the visitor space requirements and adding one space to the requirement for the town center column)*

The amended motion passed with no objection.

AME2022 0001: Amendment to the CBJ Land Use Code Title 49 to make pre-application conferences optional and not mandatory
Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau
Location: Borough-wide

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and make a recommendation to the Assembly to APPROVE the proposed text amendment allowing pre-application conferences to be optional and not mandatory, recognizing that the pre-application conferences are an opportunity to make developers aware of challenges and opportunities within code, provide developers information on application submittal requirements, and if a developer opts out, the application review period may be extended if applications are incomplete. Furthermore, it is recommended that a pre-application conference remain mandatory for the following processes:

- **49.60.130, Procedure – Bonus Procedures;**

- **49.65.907**, Special Use Permit Applications, Wireless Communications;
- **49.70.130**, Concept Review, New Growth Areas.

STAFF PRESENTATION – by Planner McKibben

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Voelckers asked for clarification of what would qualify under **49.65.907** Special Use Permit Applications, Wireless Communications. Ms. McKibben said this is cell phone towers.

Mr. Winchell asked for a definition for “new growth.” Mr. Dye said it is in the Comprehensive plan and it is complex. Mr. Voelckers added this is a once in a decade or every other decade occurrence and they can be very complex. Vintage Park and the area of Douglas where a second crossing is being considered are two examples of recent new growth areas.

Mr. Pedersen asked if CDD staff or if the Housing and Economic Development Task Force. Director Maclean answered the ordinance was drafted by the Law department but the recommendation was proposed by the Task Force.

Mr. Arndt suggested making the amended paragraphs uniform by using “shall” and “may” consistently in the preapplication paragraphs at **49.15.310(c)**, **49.15.321(b)**, **49.15.330(b)**, **49.15.404(b)**, and on through where there are sections on *pre-application conference*. Ms. Maclean said she did not think this had been done intentionally. Mr. Voelckers said he felt this would be considered a minor edit if they were to choose one phraseology and make it consistent throughout. It was decided this is a minor change and staff could take care of this change.

Mr. Pedersen asked if the statement at **49.15.402(b)** *“No statement made by either party shall be regarded as binding, and the result of the conference shall not constitute approval by the department,”* was in response to any particular situation. Ms. Maclean explained this is a department policy because the preapplication conference occurs before an applicant submits a completed application and there are often changes between this conference and the submission of the final application. It is stated in the preapplication conference report provided to applicants following the meetings. Mr. Pedersen felt applicants should be able to rely on what is said at the preapplication conference.

Ms. Maclean added for the record that she has concerns with this ordinance. She said the preapplication process is a public service the CDD provides for the community and it is a very useful process. During the conferences, CDD planners, permit techs, building inspectors, Public Works general engineering personnel, the fire marshal and other CBJ personnel can be in attendance. The meeting is an opportunity for applicants to come in with a concept even if they do not yet have a complete application that can be reviewed and analyzed. Therefore, the meeting is not binding.

Mr. Dye asked if staff would be more comfortable with removing the requirement for a preapplication conference if it was set in Code what constitutes a complete application. Ms. Maclean said she felt the strength of the preapplication conference was that participants include staff from CDD, Engineering, and other departments together to work with the applicant.

Mr. LeVine suggested changing the phrasing of the recurrent sentence "A development application is not required to have a pre-application conference," to read, "A pre-application conference is not necessary for processing of a development application" or something similar. He did not want to change the meaning but just wanted to make it clear. Mr. Arndt had interpreted the phrase to mean an applicant would not be required to do a development application in order to participate in a pre-application conference. Ms. Maclean clarified Mr. Arndt's interpretation is the correct one; an applicant can participate in the conference with just a narrative or concept. They do not need a completed application at the conference. Mr. LeVine asked that it be clarified but this does not amount to a substantive change so he was comfortable moving forward to a motion.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve AME2022 0001 subject to the minor changes agreed to by the commission.*

Mr. Voelckers spoke to his motion saying developers prefer these be optional as the conferences take time from the developers' schedules and they often are already aware of the process and requirements. This ordinance is a result of the committee listening to the needs of the developers.

Mr. Pedersen spoke against the motion for the reasons stated by Director Maclean.

MOTION to Amend: *by Mr. Pedersen to strike any language in the proposed changes which indicates that information discussed is nonbinding in the preapplication.*

Mr. Dye felt the CBJ is already exempt from binding language and could not be held to this. Mr. LeVine said that the amendment is simply removing the language that it is not binding but it does not add any language making it binding.

Mr. Voelckers spoke against the amendment saying he felt it should be made clear that this process is not binding.

Ms. Cole spoke saying she understands why he is making the amendment but she cannot support it. Mr. LeVine also spoke against the amendment saying he would be more sympathetic to it being binding if it were mandatory but not if it is optional.

Roll Call Vote

YEA: *Pedersen*

NO: *Arndt, Cole, Hickok, Winchell, Voelckers, Dye, LeVine*

1 Yea 7 No Motion to Amend Failed

Mr. Arndt spoke to say he appreciates the preapplication process and encourages people to take advantage of the opportunity. However, if it was optional, that is fine with him.

Mr. Dye said he agrees with the importance and value of the process and he agrees with the staff concerns that people who do not do this normally will be left behind if they skip the preapplication meetings. He will not support the motion. Mr. Pedersen also spoke against it. Mr. Winchell spoke against the motion saying he had the same reservations expressed by Mr. Dye and Mr. Pedersen.

Mr. LeVine spoke in support of the motion saying he would encourage developers to use the process but not require it.

Roll Call Vote

YEA: Voelckers, Cole, Arndt, LeVine

NO: Winchell, Hickok, Pedersen, Dye

4 Yea 4 No Motion Failed

MOTION: by Mr. Pedersen to refer this item back to Title 49

Roll Call Vote

YEA: Pederson, Cole, Arndt, Winchell, Voelckers, Dye, Hickok, LeVine

NO:

8 Yea 0 No Motion passed

AT EASE 9:56 P.M. – 10:05 P.M.

AME2022 0002: Revision to 49.65 Article XI Marijuana Establishments to remove the requirement for a five-year review for Conditional Use Permits issued to marijuana establishments

Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau

Location: Borough-wide

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and make a recommendation to the Assembly to APPROVE the proposed text amendment to 49.65 Article XI Marijuana Establishments to remove the requirement for a five-year review for Conditional Use Permits issued to marijuana establishments.

Conditional use permits issued to marijuana establishments under this chapter shall expire upon six-months if the owner takes action consistent with an intent to abandon the conditional use permit or the conditional use permit holder has ceases operations and not substantially resumed. Determination of expiration shall be made by the Director and supported by written findings. An expiration determination may be reconsidered within 20 days of the date of

determination. No appeal of an expiration determination may be made unless reconsideration is first sought. [Added on amendment]

Add the applicable verbiage from 49.30.225 Reconsideration of Abandonment Declaration and to edit that verbiage to make it consistent with marijuana businesses. [Added on amendment]

STAFF PRESENTATION – by Planner McKibben

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Arndt asked how it would work if a marijuana business was changing ownership. It is his memory that obtaining a valid license is a condition of permitting. If the license is not transferable, then the only way he sees for the conditional use permit to remain valid would be for both the outgoing and incoming owners to be licensed at the same location at the same time. If the former owner drops their license at the time of sale and the new owner has to wait for the sale to obtain theirs, then there is a window of time where the location is unlicensed and that would invalidate the conditional use permit. Ms. Maclean explained the CUP process is to obtain the CUP first, then pursue the State license, followed by the CBJ license. Mr. Hickok asked if the assembly has to approve the transfer of marijuana businesses. Ms. McKibben explained there is a separate Borough license that is obtained after the State license is issued and she did not think that required assembly approval.

MOTION: *by Mr. Dye to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve AME2022 0002 with a change to replace section C with new language as follows:*

Conditional use permits issued to marijuana establishments under this chapter are nontransferable and shall expire upon six-months if the owner takes action consistent with an intent to abandon the conditional use permit or the conditional use permit holder has ceases operations and not substantially resumed. Determination of expiration shall be made by the Director and supported by written findings. An expiration determination may be reconsidered within 20 days of the date of determination. No appeal of an expiration determination may be made unless reconsideration is first sought.

Mr. Dye spoke to his motion explaining his proposed changes address Staff's concerns regarding possible unintended consequences.

Mr. Arndt asked why we would be making the permits nontransferable if the State has made the licenses themselves transferable. Mr. Dye explained the conditional use permits issued for marijuana establishments are very focused on aspects of operation that it is important to be certain the new owners are aware of all of the requirements. Because of that, a new conditional use permit hearing at the time of transfer is justified.

Mr. Hickok asked why the PC is discussing selling, renewing and transferring licenses when the subject of the ordinance is the 5-year review. Mr. Dye's thinking is that the result of his motion will be that the removal of the 5-year review.

Mr. Arndt asked if, under this motion, the conditional use permit to a new owner would be an entirely new permit or would it be more of a renewal of the current permit. Mr. Dye thought it would be a new permit but expected it would be relatively smooth process and likely a consent agenda item.

Mr. Winchell spoke to support the motion.

MOTION to Amend: by Mr. Arndt to excise "are nontransferable, and" from the original motion

Mr. Arndt spoke to his motion saying if the business is following the rules regarding security, operations, disposal and the like, then it should not matter who owns it so long as the rules continue to be followed. He felt it should be transferable as long as they comply with the permit.

Roll Call Vote

YEA: Arndt, Cole, Pedersen, Voelckers

NO: Hickok, Winchell, Dye, Levine

4 Yes 4 No Motion to Amend Failed

Chair LeVine asked for the reason for the clause 'unless reconsideration is first sought'. Mr. Dye said it came directly from the nonconforming code section. Mr. LeVine asked staff to explain reconsideration. Ms. Maclean said this gives applicants 20 days to bring in new information or take actions to bring themselves into compliance. Reconsideration is a method for avoiding appeals.

Mr. Winchell spoke in support of the reconsideration clause for the purpose of exhaustion of remedies.

MOTION to Amend: by Mr. Arndt to add a cross-reference to the applicable verbiage from **49.30.225 Reconsideration of Abandonment Declaration**.

Mr. Winchell wanted to be sure they were also adding language that an appeal cannot be pursued until after reconsideration.

Ms. Maclean said rather than cross reference, they should add the verbiage to the section and make it applicable with Marijuana businesses.

Mr. Arndt rescinded his motion to amend.

MOTION to Amend: by Mr. Arndt to copy the applicable verbiage from **49.30.225 Reconsideration of Abandonment Declaration** and to edit that verbiage to make it consistent with marijuana businesses.

The motion to amend passed with no objection.

Ms. Cole asked why, if there was no public comment and staff had proposed the original recommendation, the PC would go so far to change it.

Roll Call Vote

YEA: Dye, Winchell, LeVine

NO: Hickok, Pedersen, Cole, Arndt, Voelckers

3 Yea 5 No Amended Motion Fails

MOTION: *by Ms. Cole to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve AME2022 0002*

Mr. Dye spoke against the motion saying they have already seen a license abandoned and would like to see something in that.

MOTION to Amend: *by Mr. Arndt to add back the information regarding abandonment and reconsideration*

Mr. Hickok asked if they are discussing abandonment of the CUP or the license. Mr. LeVine said the CUP runs with the land. If you lose your license, the CUP is still in effect when you get the license back. The amendment would allow the CUP to expire upon abandonment.

Mr. LeVine spoke in support of the amendment

Roll Call Vote on Motion to Amend

YEA: Arndt, Cole, Pedersen, Hickok, Winchell, Voelckers, Dye, LeVine

NO:

8 Yea 0 No Motion to Amend passes

Roll Call Vote on Amended Motion

YEA: Cole, Arndt, Hickok, Winchell, Pedersen, Voelckers, Dye, LeVine

NO:

8 Yea 0 No Amended Motion passes

XI. OTHER BUSINESS – None

XII. STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Maclean announced CDD is fully staffed. Scott Ciambor is the new Planning Manager and the other vacancies have been hired. Now they will be training but will be up to speed soon.

XIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Voelckers reported the Mayors Task Force met last week and are focusing on the Table of Dimensional Standards

XIV. LIAISON REPORTS

Assembly member Skandijs reported the Assembly COW has chosen to exempt the PC from looking at the long-range waterfront plan amendment. This prevents the PC from having a conflict in the case it comes to PC for permitting.

XV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

XVI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. LeVine announced Committee and Liaison assignments
Title 49 – Arndt, Chair; Cole; Dye; Hickok; Pedersen; Winchell
Governance – Hickok, Chair; Alper; Voelckers

Liaisons:

Lands – Cole

PWFC – Pedersen

JCOS – Voelckers

Wetlands – Alper, Winchell

Blueprint Downtown – Dye

Douglas – Pedersen

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION – None

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT – 10:58 P.M.