

MINUTES FOR THE WEEKLY MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008 AT 3 PM IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, BUILDING F.

PARTICIPANTS:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chris Henderson
George Billups
Bill Porter
Mary Jones
Vaughn Poller
Rich Krapf
Julie Leverenz
Tom Tingle
Jack Fraley
Mark Wenger

NOT PRESENT:

Ruth Larson

STAFF PRESENT:

Tammy Rosario, Planning
Sarah Propst-Worthley, Planning
Ellen Cook, Planning
Allen Murphy, Development Mgmt.
Mike Woolson, Environmental
Steven Hicks, Development Mgmt.
Luke Vinciguerra, Planning
Scott Thomas, Environmental
Jennifer VanDyke, Planning
Bradley Weidenhammer, VDOT

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jack Fraley called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bill Porter motioned adoption of the December 8th minutes, with a second from Mr. Rich Krapf. In a unanimous voice vote, the minutes were approved.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL

Ms. Sarah Propst-Worthley discussed proposed changes to the Goals, Strategies, and Actions for the Environmental Section.

Ms. Propst-Worthley discussed the removal of GSA 1.4.9.

Mr. Krapf spoke on public input that was received on December the 8th via email from the Friends of Powhatan Creek Watershed. Mr. Krapf stated that he wanted to ensure that goal 7 from 2003 Comprehensive Plan that read as “continue to create a more sustainable community by linking environmental, social, and economic goals” had been adequately addressed.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that the theme and focus of the 2008 Comprehensive Plan is creating a sustainable community; therefore, the committee had previously decided that keeping goal 7 within the text was redundant.

Ms. Rosario clarified the reasoning for the tree clearing discussion being delayed. Ms. Rosario stated that tree clearing will be more fully discussed and addressed during the Community Character Section and any proposed actions will be assigned to the appropriate section at that time.

Mr. Krapf clarified that additional GSA's may need to be added to the Environmental Section once the Community Character Section is reviewed.

Ms. Mary Jones asked if 1.1.2h "continuing to promote the use of trees as a Best Management Practice" had been eliminated.

Ms. Rosario stated that it had been removed, but thought that it could be reinserted.

Mr. Chris Henderson inquired about 1.1.8. Mr. Henderson asked if the referenced Department of Environmental Quality is the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

Ms. Propst-Worthley confirmed that it is.

Mr. Henderson asked that all agency references include their state, locality, or federal affiliation.

Mr. Scott Thomas discussed the use of "BMP" in 1.1.2h as compared to "Low Impact Development measure." Mr. Thomas stated that tree saving measures can be better understood as a LID rather than a BMP.

Mr. Fraley stated that there are materials that reference the preservation of trees as BMP's. Mr. Fraley stated that they provide capture/reuse infiltration and evaporation of stormwater. They serve as preventive measures of soil erosion and sediment control. Mr. Fraley asked if the use of soils for infiltration purposes would be considered a BMP.

Mr. Thomas stated that the use of soils in this way would also be considered a LID measure rather than a BMP.

Mr. Tom Tingle stated that by keeping this item within the text it is serving as a place holder for staff and the committee to revisit.

Mr. Thomas stated that he is an advocate for placing within the Comprehensive Plan the initiative of tree preservation, though referencing it as a BMP measure may be inaccurate.

Mr. George Billups stated that it may be important to stress that this is a measure to retain existing mature trees.

Mr. Tingle motioned for preliminary approval of the GSA's for the Environmental section with a second from Mr. Krapf. In a unanimous voice vote, the section was granted preliminary approval.

V. TRANSPORTATION MODELING (1st & 2nd MODELS)

Mr. Luke Vinciguerra introduced himself. Mr. Vinciguerra stated that Mr. Bill Cashman, of URS will be presenting traffic forecasts at build-out conditions based upon the zoning map well as the Comprehensive Plan land use map.

Mr. Cashman introduced Mr. Eric Nelson of URS. Mr. Cashman reviewed the modeling process. Mr. Cashman articulated key assumptions in the build-out analysis. Mr. Cashman reviewed the socioeconomic data used for forecasting purposes.

Mr. Tingle asked if the retail employment numbers provided are a subset of the total employment number or if it is in addition to.

Mr. Cashman stated that it is in addition to the total employment number.

Mr. Tingle asked for clarification regarding how the build-out zoning and build-out Comprehensive Plan numbers were reached.

Mr. Cashman stated that current Comprehensive Plan land use designations and zoning designations were applied to the undeveloped lands with the maximum density that could occur at build-out.

Mr. Tingle asked if the build-out numbers are attributed to a forecasted date.

Mr. Cashman stated that it is not.

Mr. Henderson asked how the areas labeled mixed use were treated.

Mr. Nelson stated that for the large mixed used developments such as Stonehouse and New Town the known densities were applied. For other mixed use areas that are not developed, an average of the current mixed used developments was applied to remaining developable lands.

Mr. Billups asked if the Colonial Williamsburg employment data was delineated from the employment data shown for the County.

Mr. Cashman stated that the data presented is exclusively representative of the employment within the County. Mr. Cashman stated that regional data is being considered as noted from the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission.

Mr. Tingle asked how there is a 20% discrepancy between non-retail jobs in the zoning build-out model versus the Comprehensive Plan build-out model.

Mr. Cashman stated that using the Comprehensive Plan land use designation build-out model there is greater developable areas to accommodate retail venues compared to build-out by zoning designation.

Ms. Rosario stated that this may also be indicative of the Comprehensive Plan land use designation being in conflict with zoning designation.

Mr. Fraley asked if build-out by zoning designation is adjusted for non-developable lands.

Mr. Nelson stated that land that had environmental constraints had been taken into consideration as well as a number of other restrictive measures.

Mr. Fraley stated that having a Community Resource map available would have made this process easier.

Mr. Fraley asked why improvements to Monticello Road were not included with the other funded road improvement projects. Mr. Fraley stated that his understanding was that money had been put aside from collected proffers for the Monticello Road improvements.

Mr. Cashman stated that the source for this data was the current Six-Year Improvement Program, not the 2030 Long Range Plan.

Mr. Fraley stated that the Monticello Road improvement was planned.

Mr. Cashman stated that he would look into this further.

Mr. Steven Hicks stated that the only funded project for the Six-Year Secondary Plan was Ironbound Road. Mr. Hicks stated the allocation of funds for the Monticello project is through the Regional State Transportation Program funds. The commitment of the Monticello Road expansion is only available through an agreement to use secondary funds once the traffic volume has reached a threshold. Other funds potentially usable for Monticello Road improvements have been suspended on the state level due to budget shortfalls.

Mr. Fraley stated that the funds for the Monticello improvements were coming from proffers.

Mr. Hicks stated that there is money available from proffers, though there is not enough to cover the cost of a road expansion. The funding would have to come from the normal secondary allocation process.

Mr. Fraley asked for staff to look into this further and return with more information regarding funding for Monticello Road.

Mr. Porter stated that his understanding of the available funds is that it is allocated to very specific improvements though maybe not a widening or expansion.

Mr. Fraley stated that his understanding was that there was already an engineered design in place for this project.

Mr. Henderson asked if there was a unit count and a population per household estimate used for the build-out scenarios.

Mr. Nelson stated that he used an average per household that exists today projected into the future and it varies by Traffic Analysis Zone.

Mr. Henderson stated that he was interested in finding out the number of housing units that are currently in the pipeline though not yet constructed.

Mr. Cashman stated that he would be getting some exhibits that have been prepared to the committee members as well as information that has been requested.

Mr. Cashman presented the forecast volumes and proposed deficiencies for major roads in the County. Mr. Cashman discussed what information would be available through the work with URS.

Mr. Krapf asked if the proposed land use designation changes were included with the build-out for Comprehensive Plan land use.

Ms. Rosario responded no, the proposed land use changes selected by the Steering Committee will be reflected within a new model made available at a later time.

Mr. Krapf asked if the model would then become property of the County and if it could potentially be used as a tool by the committee while considering economic development with the Economic Climate section.

Mr. Cashman stated that the software used to create the model is licensed through URS and while it could be made available it requires a great deal of expertise to use. The data files created by URS would be made available.

Mr. Krapf stated he would like to consider how the committee could best arm themselves to understand the alternatives available, especially in light of the issues that have come up with state transportation funding.

Mr. Cashman stated that the model is a great tool to use at the macro level.

Mr. Krapf requested a copy of Mr. Cashman's Power Point presentation.

Mr. Fraley asked about the assumptions that were made for the build-out analysis within Rural Lands and/or A-1. Mr. Fraley pointed out that within A-1 there are by-right commercial developments that require a minimum of 1 acre, yet for residential purposes 3 acres are required as a minimum.

Ms. Rosario stated that she thought the assumption was made that the density would be one residential unit per 3 acres. Ms. Rosario stated that policy choices that need to be considered would weigh the impact of increased commercial use versus a change of density in the rural areas.

Mr. Poller asked if the model would provide which TAZ's lend themselves to better accommodate commercial development.

Mr. Cashman stated that from the model they would be able to project what sort of characteristics the TAZ would display at build-out. From this, the committee could determine if a given area displayed characteristics that they felt would be most appropriate for locating commercial zoning.

Mr. Poller asked if the model could provide a forecast as to how the placement of infrastructure would affect a particular geographic area and therefore help determine the ideal locations for infrastructure.

Mr. Cashman stated the model would be appropriate for this use.

Mr. Poller asked if with the data they could determine the cost associated with the placement of infrastructure.

Mr. Cashman stated the cost of road improvements would be provided but no other infrastructure costs would be available with the model and/or the provided data.

Mr. Billups asked if the data presented today represented an extension of the Primary Service Area and/or implemented changes of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Cashman stated that the data presented today for build-out by zoning reflects current zoning conditions. The data representing build-out by Comprehensive Plan assumes zoning conditions have changed to coincide with current Comprehensive Plan land use designation. The data does not reflect any changes to the PSA.

Mr. Fraley asked if this data could aid the committee in understanding how the build-out conditions would impact infrastructure such as water and sewer, schools, and tax base support.

Mr. Nelson stated that the model could forecast future needs for a number of public services, to include school needs, libraries, fire, police, and public safety.

Mr. Tingle stated that the committee needs to remain cognizant of the limitations of the model. The model is primarily used to forecast traffic patterns and data may not reliably forecast other public facility needs.

Ms. Rosario stated that Mr. Tingle's statement is accurate. Ms. Rosario stated that the sophistication of the model is also dependent on staffing and funding.

Mr. Fraley stated that he would like to better understand the capability of the model.

Mr. Tingle stated that he thought the Stonehouse area would have a new entrance from Rochambeau installed in the near future. Though this improvement is not included in the six-year plan it is a major improvement that will affect the traffic patterns coming in and out of Stonehouse. This alteration will also greatly affect Barhamsville Road and Anderson's Corner.

Mr. Cashman stated that this could be included in the next iteration of the process. Mr. Cashman stated that he thought it was included in the forecasted Comprehensive Plan build-out model and named Joshua Court.

Mr. Tingle noted that La Grange Parkway was also identified as a service level "F". Mr. Tingle stated he was uncertain why the Comp Plan build-out model was showing deficiencies in the residential areas within the PSA to the southwestern corner of the County. Mr. Tingle asked if this is attributed to the residential growth.

Mr. Cashman stated that they would look into this and will provide more information.

Mr. Tingle stated that in light of the retail employment numbers projected in both models, the committee needs to consider what sort of jobs the County wants to encourage.

Mr. Cashman stated that the model does not reflect market dynamics. Market dynamics will play a large role in the amount of retail and commercial development that the community will support and ultimately develop. Mr. Cashman stated that the actual retail employment numbers could be far below the projections made due to the lack of representation of market dynamics within the model.

Mr. Tingle noted that thus far the committee has taken the direction of maintaining a lower densities within rural lands and locating redevelopment and possibly higher densities in those areas zoned as mixed use and commercial. It would be important for the committee to better understand how this development pattern will tax the roadways and public facilities.

Mr. Cashman stated that the data reflects worst case scenarios as far as traffic deficiencies and cost of roadway improvements. The Logit model will allocate the likely growth you will have for a projected horizon year, not the end state of build out.

Mr. Poller asked if as the County builds out, will traffic densities or use decrease as a result of the inability to grow.

Mr. Cashman stated that with the Logit model analysis, a certain amount of growth is taken to a designated horizon year, and from this, projected conditions can be assigned. The actual growth will likely be less than the amount of growth shown in the two build-out scenarios provided. Less growth will

mean less traffic. How the growth is distributed will depend upon the alternatives the committee would like to see as the allocation of growth is applied in hypothetical scenarios.

Ms. Rosario stated that there are a limited number of scenarios that can be modeled due to budget constraints. It is constructive for staff as they are preparing for modeling, the Transportation GSA's, and the Land Use section to have the committee provide their reactions to the anticipated improvements and relay to staff how best to approach the challenges that have become evident. For example, would the committee consider a lower level of service a reasonable outcome while considering possible growth patterns, or would the committee prefer to consider widening roads? Staff will need direction from the committee regarding how to proceed.

Mr. Krapf stated that he would like to see further analysis and interpretation of the data when weighing the various options presented.

Ms. Jones stated that while considering land use designation proposals, she would like to know what difficulties should be anticipated while considering widening certain problematic roads such as News Road. Ms. Jones stated that the data provided is a very constructive tool. This data could potentially be helpful to developers in the community.

Mr. Fraley noted that trying to arrive at single-point forecast has many flaws, though finding a range of probabilities would be useful.

Mr. Porter asked for a definition of the level of service. Mr. Porter asked if the committee would have the capability to define its own acceptable level of service.

Mr. Fraley asked for a definition of level of service from the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Mr. Porter stated that it would be useful to have this definition provided on the website for the public to view.

Mr. Bradley Weidenhammer of VDOT provided a definition of the level of service. Level of Service (LOS) is a general assessment of the quality of traffic conditions. Arterial level of density is measured by the density or number of vehicles per lane-mile. The level of service for intersections is based upon the seconds of delay. These units are based upon the Highway Capacity Manual, which are federal standards. Therefore, the level of service cannot be redefined by the County or VDOT.

Ms. Jones stated that the committee can determine expectations related to level of service.

Mr. Weidenhammer stated he would provide more information on level of service standards.

Ms. Jones asked for clarification regarding the "improvement" and "costs" noted on the James City County Transportation Planning Analysis data sheet. Ms. Jones asked if the cost noted reflected an improvement of the road to then become a service level of "A".

Mr. Cashman stated that the cost addresses a deficiency. A deficiency is defined as a service level below "D;" therefore, the cost noted would improve the road above a service level of "D".

Mr. Henderson stated that Crossroads did a study of the Eastern State Hospital property. Mr. Henderson asked if this projected land use was included with the URS data.

Ms. Rosario stated that this was not included. The data reflects existing zoning and land use designations. If the committee would like to include this in future scenarios, that is possible.

Mr. Henderson asked if it is possible to examine the TAZ's neighboring James City County, particularly the area closest to Quarterpath in Williamsburg. Mr. Henderson stated that the approved Master Plan shows 1,500 residential units and 2 million square feet of commercial development. This development will greatly impact the James City County corridor adjacent to it. The Hampton Roads Planning District has provided a 2030 year analysis of the area. Mr. Henderson stated that the Quarterpath area was initially projected as a museum going by the land use designation.

Mr. Cashman stated that the 2030 analysis forecast that was developed by HRPDC coordinates with the local jurisdiction, who are the experts of where growth should be anticipated. Mr. Cashman stated that they will look into this further as this new development may have been noted within the 2030 forecast.

Mr. Henderson stated that he has similar concerns for the areas surrounding the Marquis development and I-64/199 interchanges at both the northern and southern points. Mr. Henderson stated that both of these locations are not in James City County but they do serve as access points for I-64 and they appear to not be addressed within the plan. The development in these areas, while outside of the County, would impact the area.

Mr. Cashman remarked that these two developments are within York County.

Mr. Tingle asked for clarification regarding the three developments referenced.

Mr. Henderson stated there is one in Lightfoot-Marquis, Quarterpath, and the land use for Eastern State Hospital as proposed by Crossroads.

Ms. Rosario stated that she would anticipate that the Steering Committee members would be compiling a list of those areas of future modeling scenarios, though she will make note of it.

Mr. Billups stated that he is interested in the area on Rochambeau, as it may require coordinated efforts with York County. Mr. Billups asked what sort of modification could be anticipated with the "improvements" noted on the James City County Transportation Planning Analysis data. Mr. Billups stated that it is important for the committee to identify priorities. Mr. Billups stated that legally speaking there is still ambiguity as to whether proffers could be used for schools or schools and roads.

Mr. Cashman stated that once the models have been fully evaluated assigning priority to road improvements will be done.

Ms. Rosario stated in response to Mr. Billups that one scenario will include an extension of Mooretown Road, which would impact the Rochambeau corridor.

Mr. Hicks stated that while addressing transportation needs for the County, the committee should keep in mind that there is little funding available for improvements. Future transportation needs are also difficult to predict.

Mr. Fraley stated that the state did take legislative action this year to regulate proffers. Proffers are now properly written and have to be used for the intended use. As a result of the legislative change more care needs to be taken to have the proffers properly written. School proffers are the adopted policy of the Board of Supervisors, and must be applied exclusively to schools. Mr. Fraley stated that he does not want to lose sight of the hot topics that came out of the work done by the Community Participation

Team, specifically the pace of growth, though while considering the pace of growth the committee needs to keep in mind the rights of property owners and developers. The County must take a balanced approach to impact positive change; this could include Board-initiated policies. The Planning Commission is currently recommending adoption of a Cumulative Impact Study for public facilities to include water and sewer, fire, and police, in which case, if public facilities are not in place, development will not occur. In this vein, policy could be created to remove the possibility of development occurring in those areas where the roads would not support the anticipated traffic conditions. If availability of funding is not in place to improve impacted roads, then the other option is to eliminate or postpone development. The Board of Supervisors has also supported staff's recommendations of micro-master planning.

Mr. Krapf stated that in response to Mr. Fraley's recommendation that facilities be in place before development occurs, in 1980 the Virginia Supreme Court Case *Lerner Versus Loudoun County* upheld the County's rights to restrict development of a shopping center until a population threshold was met. This may be a growth management tool that is worth considering.

Mr. Fraley stated that the committee should consider making the land use designations match the zoning designation.

Ms. Julie Leverenz stated that the Community Character will also have a very direct impact on the roadways. If the committee were to consider which roads they did not intend to improve this may serve as a means to limit growth within the corridor.

Mr. Fraley stated that another tool could be code reform. Reforming codes to adopt more form-based or performance-based zoning may be useful. Form-based zoning stipulates to the citizens and the development community what type of development the community wants in given areas. In the light of the retail employment numbers provided the data, it stresses the importance of the Business Climate Task Force. How best to treat rural lands outside of the PSA has been a difficult task for an extended length of time.

Mr. Poller stated that the data provided seems to indicate that many of the roads listed are in the PSA; therefore, something is working. The public has been very concerned with the rate of growth, though this opinion is balanced with those considerations that affect the quality of life.

Mr. Fraley stated that the rate of growth affects more than the aesthetics, it also affects the tax base. Mr. Fraley stated that there are developers that are currently working in the County on projects that are by-right. Rural lands require greater attention especially considering the number of developments that are occurring by-right. As development occurs, greater consideration to the pattern of development needs to be paid specifically to rural lands.

Mr. Tingle stated that this issue needs to be addressed in many different ways, not just transportation. By adopting policy that would eliminate the possibility of development if the infrastructure is not in place, it would limit the ability to attract those types of jobs that are desired. If Route 199 and Longhill Connector were not put in place, development patterns within the County would look very different. Speaking to Ms. Leverenz's point, by not improving certain roads the committee can encourage growth in other areas by selecting where greater infrastructure in roadways will be put in place.

Mr. Hicks stated that once a roadway hits 8,000 vehicles per day it is warranted for four lanes. With this in mind, there are many roadways within the County that have already hit this threshold. Widening Longhill Road and Centerville Road from two to four lanes is a result of past development. Difficult decisions will need to be made due to current conditions.

Mr. Porter asked if the current level of service is available for the noted TAZ's. Mr. Porter stated that the committee needs to consider possible future development of multi-modal transportation, such as the possibility of light rail.

Mr. Fraley stated that the County needs to identify areas where commercial or residential development is desired, taking a proactive approach rather than reactive. For instance, due to the conditions that would greatly elevate the cost associated with expanding News Road, the Board may need to consider adopting policy that would prevent further intensive uses in this area.

Ms. Rosario stated that the consensus she is reading from the committee would be a hybrid approach. The committee wants to be respectful of the Community Character Corridors. They want to consider road widening where it is appropriate as well as evaluate the possibility of new roads. They want to consider densities and uses especially in rural areas. Adequate public facility testing is an approach to be further considered.

Ms. Jones stated she is interested in developing an acceptable level of service and evaluating the implications.

Ms. Rosario stated that she is reading from the committee that an ideal level of service would be a "C".

Mr. Tingle stated to encourage redevelopment and higher densities there will be places where a service level less than "C" would be acceptable.

Ms. Jones suggested that it could be based on land use designation.

Mr. Fraley stated he could agree with that, it should go with the land use designation.

Mr. Henderson stated that this would particularly apply to the rural lands where you want to maintain the highest level of service since they will be the furthest removed from emergency and police access. Establishing an acceptable level of density in rural lands would be useful. The committee may want to consider 1% of traffic would be dealt with through multi-modal components. As the County is very linear, rail service for the County would be ideal.

Mr. Henderson stated that the data does not reflect the quality of roads, such as identifying roads which have a path for bike access. Mr. Henderson stated it would be useful to identify those roads that do not meet a current standard but are still performing.

Mr. Cashman stated that they could adjust the capacity of the roadway accordingly. The data at this point only identifies the road by the number of lanes.

Mr. Henderson asked how a bikeway plan is reflected in the data.

Mr. Cashman stated that a multimodal element will be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Porter asked if there are ways to identify the most suitable sequence of development.

Mr. Cashman stated that the model as it is currently configured is not sensitive to time.

Mr. Porter asked if the Steering Committee identified a sequence that should occur, is there a way to place it within the Comprehensive Plan text.

Ms. Jones suggested a mini-master plan with identified areas for development.

Ms. Rosario stated that with the land use designations, specific language can be added for particular areas, most often seen with mixed use land designations.

Mr. Henderson discussed the evolution of the Candle Factory, which is currently being considered for a land use designation change.

Mr. Porter stated that there were some options that had been considered and denied in the past that could be reconsidered.

Ms. Rosario suggested these ideas should be brought up in the blog for further consideration.

Mr. Krapf stated that a few meetings ago during the Environmental section, staff highlighted successes since the 2003 Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Krapf suggested that this would be a good way to preface each new section in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Fraley stated he liked that idea.

VI. OTHER ITEMS

Mr. Tingle asked about the bus trip for the land use applications and the prioritizations that were requested.

Ms. Rosario asked for an indication of those individuals intending to go on the proposed bus trip.

Mr. Fraley asked Ms. Rosario to provide what she would consider the top ten choices.

Ms. Rosario stated that they are looking to establish an evening or weekend date for a future meeting.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mike Capless of the James City County Citizen's Coalition spoke to the committee. Mr. Capless stated that modeling is a useful, dynamic tool that offers many benefits. The model does require updating. In addition to having a model, the Comprehensive Plan should look at what can be done to correct and improve traffic conditions today, tomorrow, and years beyond. The citizens of the County are interested in the improvements that can be made now as well as years into the future. VDOT uses a great model for traffic forecasts called the Cubed Voyager; this could be used with the assistance of VDOT.

Mr. Weidenhammer stated that assisting and providing information using the Cubed Voyager model has some complicating issues. Due to staffing constraints, VDOT involvement would have limitations. Mr. Weidenhammer stated that at this time most of the modeling VDOT is working on is at the state-wide level.

Mr. Porter stated that his impression of state involvement requires the region and local jurisdictions to construct their own modeling.

Ms. Rosario stated that staff has been working closely with VDOT. Ms. Rosario does anticipate continuing a joint effort on this project with VDOT.

Mr. Billups asked if there is data available that identifies areas of concern. VDOT may have information on where the most traffic is seen entering into the main roads such as 199, I-64, 60, or 143.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Billups made a motion to adjourn, with a second from Mr. Krapf.

There being no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Mr. Jack Fraley, Chair