

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Meeting

June 7, 1994

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call.** Chairman Birchill called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Commission members present were: Chairman Eugene Birchill, Marge Stewart, Glen Warmbier, Chris Corrado, Susan Claus, and Rick Hohnbaum. George Bechtold was absent due to illness. Planning Director Carole Connell and Secretary Kathy Cary were also present.

2. **Approval of minutes of previous meetings:**

Mr. Warmbier moved, seconded by Mr. Corrado, that the minutes of the May 17, 1994 meeting be approved as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

3. **SP 93-1 Gray/Garrigus Building Site Plan approval for a one-year approval request:**

Chairman Birchill called for a staff report.

Ms. Connell reported that the applicant is requesting a one-year extension of the approval granted by the Planning Commission last year. She noted that the Commission discussed the request at their last meeting and tabled the subject in order to allow time for staff to determine the right-of-way requirements on Oregon Street. Ms. Connell read the following letters, which will become part of the file since there is no public hearing, urging requirement of road improvements:

1. Letter dated May 31, 1994, signed by five Old Town Merchants (Donna Revelle, Thomas A. Claus, Ode Gribble, Joe and Lynette Naughton, and Sherry Washington).
2. Letter dated June 5, 1994, from Donald K. Saxton.
3. Letter dated June 6, 1994, from Robert J. Claus.

Ms. Connell reviewed the supplemental Staff Report dated May 31, 1994, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission Minute Book. Ms. Connell commented that to obtain the full half-width improvement on Oregon Street will mean encroachment into the existing building. She noted that the applicant proposes to dedicate the same amount of right-of-way as did Fisher Roofing; seven feet rather than fifteen. Ms. Connell pointed out that should the Garrigus/Gray

building be destroyed, at that point additional right-of-way can be dedicated. Ms. Connell noted that the question of ownership of the building must be resolved; however, it is her understanding that the applicant is purchasing the property.

Russell Leach, Architect, Robert Gray Partners, Inc., P.O. Box 1016, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Mr. Leach commented that the Commission had previously required significant improvements. He noted that Oregon Street is a bigger problem to the City in that it will be necessary for the City to either buy or condemn property in order to obtain the sufficient right-of-way to build Oregon Street to the collector status. Mr. Leach advised that the applicant is willing to sign a non-remonstrance agreement and dedicate realistic and reasonable right-of-way; however, they can't dedicate property inside of the building.

Chairman Birchill commented that the Commission is not holding a public hearing on this item, however, comments from concerned citizens would be received. He noted that the agenda is quite lengthy, and requested that speakers be brief and to the point.

Jim Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Mr. Claus stated: "his concern is really very basic: I think this is a de novo hearing. You have someone who came in here, and as I understand it, says they don't own the building. They are now saying, 'they are in now in the process of buying the land'. If those things I am hearing are a fact, and in addition to the fact that Carole tells me, all of these forms were not properly signed by Southern Pacific Rail Road then you've altered this enough and any changes absolutely make this de novo hearing. He's over the extension, if he's a buyer, everybody wants him to come here; but, I'll remind everyone that any buyer or developer who comes into this town is required to put in these street improvements. And, the second thing is you're lacking some other things such as some basic traffic information here. The way this thing is being proposed, in spite of what Carole is saying, you have foot traffic in that area, and I would just caution you to make sure this isn't de novo. If you've got a person in the process of buying the land, has any kind of a signed contract, if you've got anybody that's bought the building and it has not been fully disclosed, if you've got someone coming in over the deadline, if you've got an application that Southern Pacific didn't sign, this action should be set aside until it is done properly. And if it is a de novo hearing, it should be published and there should be a full hearing. And I will caution you that going back to

three years ago is great, it's fine, it's good to talk four years ago. It's even better to talk five years ago and I'll remind you exactly what happened on Fair Oaks. We had exactly the same kind of thing of Fair Oaks. We handed this to Sam Goddard, we just had to do it for him, Sherwood wouldn't grow, we wouldn't have any more growth, we couldn't ask curbs, we couldn't ask gutters, we couldn't ask any other thing. Now we've got a subdivision up there and subdivisions across the street and what have we got in return? We've got people building French drains, development all around it. It's not five years away. Nobody got any breaks in their subdivision."

In response to Ms. Claus, Mr. Gray advised that he "has an option to purchase the building."

After discussion of improvements to Oregon and Pine Streets and adequate right-of-way dedication on Oregon Street, Mr. Hohnbaum moved, seconded by Ms. Stewart, that the applicant be granted a one-year extension of SP 93-1 with the additional condition outlined in the supplemental Staff report dated May 31, 1994, but with an amendment to delete the words: "If the applicant owns the land". Motion carried unanimously.

After further discussion, Mr. Hohnbaum moved, seconded by Ms. Stewart, that the condition in the supplemental Staff report dated May 31, 1994, be further amended to include the requirement for half-street improvements based on the physical constraints at that site, as well as pavement and sidewalks. Motion carried.

Mr. Hohnbaum moved, seconded by Ms. Stewart, that the request for a one-year extension of SP 93-1 Gray/Garrigus Building be approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. A storm drain pipe shall be installed on the Oregon Street frontage that connects to the existing culverts at each end of the site. The ditch shall then be covered, all in accordance with City standards.
2. Phase 2 parking lot improvements shall include catch basins to City standards.
3. Locate the loading area on the site plan.
4. Prepare a plant materials list for the Pine Street landscape strip and the parking area landscaping, and submit to the city for approval.

5. If additional signage is proposed on the Oregon Street side of the building, include on the final site plan in accordance with the Sign Code.
6. Provide a temporary handicapped parking stall until the permanent stall is provided in Phase 2.
7. Provide a bicycle parking rack with at least two spaces.
8. Parallel parking shall be provided and marked on the Pine Street frontage.
9. Phase 2 shall commence within 18 months of a building permit request for Phase 1.
10. When a building permit is requested, seven (7') feet shall be dedicated for Oregon Street right-of-way. The applicant shall install sidewalk and paving, modified to take into account the right-of-way, as approved by the City. The owner shall enter into a non-remonstrance agreement for street and other public facility improvements, except for additional street improvements to Oregon Street.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. **SUB 93-9 Sherwood Village Phase 1: Final Plat approval request for a 60-lot single-family subdivision on Sherwood Boulevard:**

Chairman Birchill called for a staff report.

Ms. Connell advised that the Commission is reviewing the final plat for Sherwood Village's Phase 1. She noted that this is not a public hearing, but is based on the preliminary plat, and at this point the Commission is reviewing how the final plat meets the preliminary approval. Ms. Connell reviewed the Staff report dated May 31, 1994, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's Minutes Book. She noted that the applicant must sign a non-remonstrance agreement, and indicated that the final plat meets most of the Staff recommendations as well as the six conditions of approval. Ms. Connell pointed out that the landscaping in Tract A will be maintained by an agreement under a Home Owners Association, the rules of which must be approved by the City. She noted that the storm water pond will be enclosed with a chain-link fence, which will be maintained by the City. Ms. Connell commented that the streets must also be renamed in accordance with City street naming policies.

In conclusion, Ms. Connell recommended that SUB 93-9 be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff report dated May 31, 1994.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Warmbier moved that SUB 93-9 be approved based upon the recommendations and findings of fact outlined in the Staff report dated May 31, 1994, as follows:

Prior to or in conjunction with filing of the final plat:

1. Enter into a non-remonstrance agreement with the City for future public street and utility improvements adjoining the site.
2. Provide a landscape corridor plan for Sherwood Boulevard and 12th Street as agreed upon by the City. Provide for a maintenance program of the 12th Street landscaping improvements.
3. Record utility easements across Tax Lots 501 and 502 to the site.
4. Provide one street tree (two on corner lots) uniformly planted in the front yard of each lot prior to home occupancy.
5. Construct a six (6') foot fence adjoining the elementary school, except at the pathway opening, when subdivision improvements are completed.
6. Revise street names as approved by the City.

Mr. Hohnbaum questioned the City's policy regarding Home Owners' Association's rules and who assumes the responsibility of assuring compliance. Ms. Connell responded that there is no City policy prohibiting home owners associations, and one exists in the Gleneagle project. She noted that sometimes an HOA works, and sometimes it doesn't; however, SUB 93-9 is only a part of a larger project and the HOA is a means of assuring that the landscaping is maintained. Ms. Connell pointed out that the CC&Rs of the HOA will be before the Commission for approval at a later time.

Mr. Dwain Quandt, Modern Homes Development, Inc., 1215 Hillsboro, Oregon, 97123, advised that he is the applicant of this project and has been enforcing HOA CC&Rs for several years and they have been very successful. He noted that Phases 2 and 3 of the project will be part of the total HOA and that dues will be collected and will provide for the

maintenance of the landscaping.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Corrado, and at call for the question, carried unanimously.

5. **Public Hearings:**

Chairman Birchill read the hearing disclosure statement and requested that Commission members reveal any ex-parte contact, conflicts of interest or bias with regard to any issues on the agenda.

Mr. Corrado advised that he had been very actively participating in efforts to lobby for passage of the school bond; however, he did not feel he had a conflict and could participate in voting on school issues on the agenda.

Mr. Hohnbaum pointed out that his spouse is employed by the School District and he has two children in the Sherwood Schools; however, he planned to participate in discussion on vote upon the school issues on the agenda.

Ms. Stewart advised that she had written a letter to the Sherwood Gazette supporting passage of the school bond; however, did not feel there are any conflicts.

Chairman Birchill stated that he had worked with the architectural firm of Dull-Olsen-Weekes in developing fire department access and fire protection systems for the building. He commented that he had no conflicts of interest or bias.

A. MLP 94-4 Gray: a two-lot Minor Land Partition on Borchers Drive:

Chairman Birchill called for a staff report.

Ms. Connell advised that approval is a "defacto situation". She noted that the Commission previous approved a duplex subdivision which included a plan amendment. Ms. Connell commented that the City Council's review revealed that Tax Lot 800 had never been legally partition and instructed that the applicant file an application to the Planning Commission to legally partition the lot. Ms. Connell pointed out that the Commission's action is to make the partition legal and clean up the tax lot maps and there are no conditions attached to the request. Ms. Connell briefly reviewed the staff report dated May 31, 1994, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's Minutes Book. In conclusion, Ms. Connell recommended that MLP 94-4 be approved without

conditions.

Chairman Birchill opened the hearing for testimony from proponents or opponents. There being no testimony or further discussion, Chairman Birchill closed the public hearing and noted that the hearing could be opened at any time at the request of one of the Commissioners.

Mr. Warmbier moved, seconded by Ms. Stewart, that MLP 94-4 Gray be approved based upon the recommendations of staff and the findings of facts outlined in the Staff report dated May 31, 1994. Motion carried unanimously.

At 8:30 Chairman Birchill called for a 10-minute break, after which the Commission considered the following:

- B. CUP 94-1 Sherwood Elementary School: request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a new school on Sunset Boulevard; and**
- C. PS 94-1 Sherwood Elementary School: request for Site Plan approval to construct a new elementary school on Sunset Boulevard:**

Chairman Birchill called for a staff report.

Ms. Connell advised that the Commission is considering two requests: a Conditional Use Permit which is required for each use in the IP zone and a simultaneous Site Plan Review. She requested that the Commission review both requests, that the conditions of approval be tied to the site plan review, and that the Commission vote separately on each request. Upon poll of the Commissioners, members concurred with Ms. Connell's request.

Ms. Connell reviewed the Staff reports dated May 31, 1994, a comply copy of both are contained in the Commission's Minute Book. She noted that a complete Geo-Tech report is also available. Ms. Connell pointed out that Tax Lot 900 must also be re-zoned IP. For the record, Ms. Connell noted that the applicant has also submitted a request to the City to "co-develop" some of the amenities at the school site.

In response to Mr. Warmbier's questions, School Superintendent Hill replied that the "portable" buildings on the grounds of the current intermediate school will eventually be removed; however, time certain is not yet known.

In conclusion of her report, Ms. Connell recommended that CUP 94-1 be approved without any conditions and that the use be

allowed on the site.

In response to Ms. Stewart's questions, Ms. Connell advised that neither the traffic report nor Washington County felt that a signal is warranted at Four Corners (Sherwood Boulevard and Ladd Hill Road) at this time.

Mr. Hohnbaum expressed concern that the special events at the proposed intermediate school might create parking problems at the school as well as nearby neighborhoods and questioned the safety of the traffic pattern on the school ground. Ms. Connell pointed out that there are 25 classrooms, and the school is required to have two parking stalls per teacher. She noted that 60 parking stalls are required and the 96 stall are proposed. Chairman Birchill suggested that in view of the potential parking problems at the site and in the surrounding neighborhoods, that consideration be given to parking by permit only, such permits to be issued by the City.

After further discussion the Staff report on SP 94-1, Ms. Connell recommended that SP 94-1 be approved based on the findings of facts and conditions outlined in the Staff Report dated May 31, 1994.

Chairman Birchill opened the public hearing for testimony from proponents.

Norn Dull, Architect, Dull-Olsen-Weekes, 319 SW Washington, Suite 200, Portland, addressed the Commission. Mr. Dull advised that he is the architect for the project and commented that Ms. Connell made an excellent of the combined application. Mr. Dull offered to answer any questions the Commission members may have. Mr. Dull requested that the following revisions be made:

1. Condition No. 3 b be changed to require half-street improvements as part of the development of Tax Lot 900 since the lot will be partitioned off until a decision is made with regard to use of the lot.
2. Condition No. 3 d, add the word "pedestrian" between the words "eliminate" and "gates" since vehicular access is needed for maintenance.
3. Condition No. 3 e, revise to require a bicycle rack near an entrance to the building.
4. Condition No. 3 g, remove the requirement for wheel stops since there will be a curb and the bumpers of

automobiles will extend over the landscaping thereby avoiding damage to the automobiles and landscaping. Requiring wheel stops is an unnecessary expense.

5. Provide an exemption for a 24-inch caliper, freestanding tree approximately 60 feet distance from the grove of fir trees, and include a provision that, at the discretion of the applicant's arborists and in concert with the City, trees that are determined to be unsafe or unhealthy may be removed.
6. Condition No. 8 regarding the school sign, additional information will be provided clarifying that the sign as proposed meets the City's criteria and dimensions.
7. Condition No. 9, indicate that the benches will be a co-ordinate effort with the City.

In view of the previous discussions with regard to the traffic pattern and controls for students crossing Sunset, Mr. Dull stated that he would like to be included in any discussion the City may have with the traffic consultant.

Lillian Yocom, 615 SW St. Charles Way, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Ms. Yocom commented that she is in favor of the school projects; however, has problem with the traffic when trying to turn left off of St. Charles Way onto Sunset Boulevard at 8:00 a.m. Ms. Yocom stated that she felt there would be a major traffic problem at that area, especially when the adjacent developments are completed and occupied. Ms. Yocom commented that she is also concerned with a pedestrian opening near the railroad track and the apparent lack of security for the children. She stated that another concern is the parking in the Gregory Park area during special events at the school. In response to Ms. Yocom's question, Mr. Dull stated that the tree the applicant would like to remove is in the proposed ballfield.

There being no further proponent testimony, Chairman Birchill opened the hearing for comments and testimony from opponents.

Jim Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Mr. Claus stated: "First I want to state that to me this is and clearly we can't complain, because I'm supporting the application, but I don't like the plan, and I'm going to tell you the same thing that I told Bill before this passed. Sherwood is essentially, the School District is the largest employer in this town, there is just no getting around that, they're No. 1. You also have another problem, that they way in which they use land they have pre-empted for

many uses, and for whatever the wisdom of their purposes were, they developed a closed-campus policy. And repeatedly the School District acts as if do something and as the major land use in the Sherwood district and even though their municipality is different that our municipality, the only difference is it's larger, they draw from a different area, they even draw from outside of our county lines. They have never done anything to offset the problems they cause. Virtually, the downtown is a hostage for the School District.

Now there are several problems you've got. First of all, Mr. Dittman in his infinite wisdom is now slowly beginning to acknowledge that the deal I made with my partners on Villa puts us very much in control of the walk paths down there. I don't like the way you are doing the walk paths, they don't integrate into anything. Secondly, we've got another property under option that I got an unrefundable money that this impacts. Further, I can tell you every time they do something at the high school, they affect part of downtown. They don't have adequate parking at the high school now and now they are putting another school on the other side. Now, we gave them everything they wanted in this bond issue. It is clearly a cadillac bond issue. They have for years taken from the Cit of Sherwood and they have closed off. Now is it unreasonable to start saying, you're going to load the downtown up and you are going to close it off with your football game, you are going to take all of the parking and you are going to close all of the businesses while you take those spaces. In a case like this, they go back to the drawing board and think about two things: they think about our paths and our walkways. I think it's unfair and I think its silly that you come to the landowners like myself and you say 'we want you to give away very valuable property to the Park system'. In fact, in our case, you are actually offering us less money than it cost for the wetlands inventory and the survey. And now I'm turning around and finding out that you are going to turn a bunch of school kids, in effect loose on those paths, and you're gonna do some things, and I've got an agreement, that as I read it, says you can't do it and I'm not going to let you do it. Now, what I think they ought to do is go back and look at the park paths, I think they ought to look realistically at the parking, and they've got to stop this nonsense they are they are not a main entertainment center, that they are not a recreation center, that they don't act like that and that they start putting in those facilities for parking. Please remember we didn't have to buy parking for the theater, we bought it separately at considerably difficulty of the Internal Revenue Service because it was the right thing to do. I'm fighting with you to clean up an alley because it is the right thing to do. This School District has enough money

and they have enough excess land, why can't they do the right thing and act like the major employer, connect the paths, put in extra parking and not over load the land downtown and then wonder why there are negative results. For three years now I've been harping on this theme: you don't have to give away anything in this town. Absolutely nothing. We have arrived.

People will pay, people will put in the improvements. We can get improvements equalling any town in Washington County and the buyers will gladly pay the price for the house to offset that. If we're going to hammer on a Lou Fasano to get an extra \$100,000 to \$150,000 out of him, if we are going to go back to a Handley and say we want ten acres for nothing, and we want parks and we want storms...let's get something from the School District. We didn't ask them to buy that site, they chose it. And, all I'm saying is, 'for God's sakes let's tell them that part of the town, and they want part of the town, if they are not part of the town just refuse the application. Let's get some parking, let's get our parks, and I don't want to have trespassers, I don't want to have the kinds wandering down as they do now, let's organize it and respect everybody's property values and let's not ask anybody else to give away all of the public improvements. And I just don't think that Bill and his people are spending any time thinking about the town of Sherwood. They are thinking about their School District. And please understand, like an irrigation district, they are a bonafied municipality by law, they have no right to impinge upon another municipality. And, I'll come back and tell you several things. And remember, we got a fixed tax base, it's only \$360,000. That's all the taxes we take out of this County. We don't have the money to go back and put these things in, we just don't have the money. But the real problem is them, all we're asking for is a parking lot. They've got the ground, they can do the landscaping. We're asking for a minimum protection so they don't impinge on peoples' property and they are connecting an inter-working system. I just hope that you send them back to the drawing board and let them come back with something that gives us a little parking. Why do we have to be blocked up downtown every time they have an activity at the school and that's what happens.

There being no further opponent testimony, Chairman Birchill opened the hearing for rebuttal.

Mr. Dull again addressed the Commission. He commented that he was puzzled by Mr. Claus' comments and noted that the code requires 60 parking stalls and the applicant is providing 96.

Mr. Dull pointed out that the applicant had met with City Staff to develop the pedestrian paths in accordance with

City's plans and policies. He noted that the paths tie the schools and the community together and will be used by the community as a whole, as will the school grounds. Mr. Dull pointed out that he too is a resident of Sherwood and feels that the school is an integral part of the community.

There being no further testimony, Chairman Birchill closed the public hearing and noted that the hearing could be reopened at any time at the request of one of the Commission members.

Extensive discussion ensued with regard to the number of parking stalls; traffic patterns, safety and security of students crossing Sunset Boulevard and on the pedestrian paths; size, configuration and location of the school sign; perceived parking problems created in Old Town and parking-by-permit in adjacent neighborhoods; fencing of the trash compactor; frequency of special activities at the school; and suggested revisions to conditions of approval.

Due to the lateness of the hour and number of revisions, Chairman Birchill requested that CUP 94-1 and SP 94-1 be tabled until the next meeting of the Commission. Mr. Dull stated that doing so would create an undue hardship for the school district and requested that the Commission continue until a decision could be made. Upon poll of the Commission members, the meeting was continued.

After further discussion, Mr. Warmbier moved that SP 94-1 and CUP 94-1 be approved based on the recommendations and findings of facts outlined in the Staff report dated May 31, 1994, and subject to the following revised conditions of approval:

Prior to issuance of a building permit, unless bonded for or more appropriately provided prior to occupancy, as determined by the City, the applicant shall:

1. Properly redefine Tax Lot 900 and 1300 by lot line adjustment or partitioning in accordance with City and County requirements.
2. Assist the City in completing a Plan/Zone Map Amendment designating Tax Lot 900 Institutional/Public (IP).
3. Prepare detailed construction plans for public utility and facility improvements to City, USA and TVFRD standards. Provide a security bond and one year maintenance agreement to ensure completion of the public improvements. In addition to standard

provisions for sewer, water, storm water, fire protection, grading and erosion control, include details to:

- a. Dedicate ten (10') feet to Sunset Boulevard right-of-way and provide half-street improvements to minor arterial standards, including a six (6') foot sidewalk. Extend the half-street improvements to the intersection of Sunset Boulevard and St. Charles Way. Provide a pedestrian-controlled crosswalk in the vicinity of the St. Charles Way/Sunset Boulevard intersection.
 - b. Dedicate ten (10') feet to Sherwood Boulevard right-of-way. Provide half-street improvements along the frontage of Tax Lot 900 in coordination with the City sidewalk construction project. Extend a pedestrian trail to City standards from Sherwood Boulevard to the school site.
 - c. Eliminate construction of a pedestrian trail to Tract H in Gregory Park.
 - d. Provide pedestrian path delineation and eliminate pedestrian gates to Tract I in Gregory Park and to St. Barbara Way.
 - e. Provide weather-protected bicycle racks near an entry to the building.
 - f. Unless determined unnecessary by the TVFRD, provide an eight (8") inch water line from St. Barbara Way south across the site to Sunset Boulevard.
 - g. Provide a paved parking lot with striping, wheel stops and other provisions required by City standards.
4. Preserve the grove of Fir trees in the northwest corner of the site, with the exception of one twenty-four (24") inch caliper Fir tree, free-standing about sixty (60') feet away from the grove, and any other tree determined by the applicant's arborist and the City to be a hazard to students and the general public.
 5. Maintain a twenty (20') foot rear yard setback for the existing house on Tax Lot 900, unless it is destroyed.
 6. Provide fence material details for City review and

approval.

7. Provide outdoor solid waste collection and screening details for City review and approval.
8. Provide proposed entry sign details so that the lettering and copy area do not exceed thirty-six (36) square feet, and illustrating that the sign is no closer than fifteen (15') feet from the front property line.
9. Provide benches and other play equipment around the playfields as negotiated between the applicant and the City.
10. Residential parking shall be by permit only in surrounding areas when parking becomes a problem, as determined by the City. Signs will be posted by the City and paid for by the School District. Permits shall be issued by the City for a nominal fee, to be determined at the time of implementation. Also, sign verbiage to be determined at the time of implementation.

After further discussion, the motion was seconded by Mr. Hohnbaum and carried unanimously.

D. SUB 94-3 Novak: a three-lot Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plat on Tualatin-Sherwood Road:

Due to the lateness of the hour (11:30 p.m.), SUB 94-3 was tabled until the June 21st Commission meeting and will be the first item on the agenda.

5. **F.Y.I.**

Ms. Connell advised that items under the FYI section of the agenda are for informational purposes and no action is required.

6. **Director's Report:**

Ms. Connell noted that a copy of her April report to the City Council had been included for informational purposes.

Ms. Connell advised that the proposed shopping center will be on the July 5th Commission agenda and it has been requested that the project be reviewed by the City Council.

Chairman Birchill advised that a meeting of the City Tree

Committee was scheduled for 7:00 p.m., June 9, 1994, and appointed Mr. Hohnbaum as the liaison member.

7. **Adjournment:**

There being no further items before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at approximately 11:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Cary
Secretary