

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

November 1, 2012
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Moss
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Scully
Commissioner Wagner

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Dan Eernisse, Economic Development Manager

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Esselman

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Moss called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present: Chair Moss and Commissioners Craft, Maul, Montero, Scully and Wagner. Vice Chair Esselman was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was amended to add approval of the October 18, 2012 minutes and a public comment period after the Community Renewal Area Update. The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Director Markle did not provide comments during this portion of the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The October 4, 2012 minutes were approved as submitted. The Commission also reviewed and approved the October 18, 2012 minutes as amended.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Tom Jamison, Shoreline, said he is against Aurora Square being a community renewal area, and he does not believe the City is being sincere in making that designation. He recalled that on September 4th, the City Council passed Resolution 333, which designated the Aurora Square area as a Community Renewal Area. At that meeting, Mr. Eernisse said the resolution complied with the direction given by the City Council at an earlier meeting in August. However, the City Council actually asked staff to bring back an ordinance and not a resolution. The resolution was not discussed as an alternative to bringing back an ordinance, and there was no mention of the change from the City Council's instructions. He noted that the issue was initially placed on the City Council's agenda on July 10th, which is coincidentally the same day that the City was notified by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) that they would enforce the lease agreement on the Recyclefest event, which has been previously held at the park-and-ride. A few days after Resolution 333 was passed on September 4th, it was announced that Sears would be the site for this year's Recyclefest.

Mr. Jamison commented that the idea that the amount of sales tax generated per acre has any kind of relevance for "economic blight" is preposterous. There has been no mention about what the return on investment would be for the current property owners at Aurora Square, and economic blight is not revenue blight. He reminded the Commission that the City commissioned the Buxton Retail Study in 2003 at a cost of \$49,599. If Aurora Square is such an important area to repair in terms of blight, he questioned why this study was thrown out. He also questioned what the study actually said in terms of requirements. He urged the Commission to look very carefully at the motivation behind the community renewal area proposal. Economic blight is just simply a strategy because the City has not been able to find another way to develop the property. He expressed his belief that the City's proposed action would be an abuse of the law.

NEW BUSINESS

Community Renewal Area Update

Mr. Eernisse reported that he is the staff member responsible for initiating the Community Renewal Area (CRA) designation, which was adopted by the City Council on September 4th. He explained that while the State of Washington has some very restrictive laws about what the City can do to encourage economic development in certain areas, the community renewal law allows cities to access a tool kit of enhancements that can be done in certain areas that need economic and/or health and safety renewal. Aurora Square would be considered an economic renewal area, meaning the area is not pulling its weight for the community and realizing its potential as an economic engine for the City.

Mr. Eernisse advised that there are five different litmus tests that an area must meet in order to become a CRA, and Aurora Square passed four of the five with flying colors in order to be designated as an economically-blighted area. He advised that the tool kit for economic blight is different than the tool kit for health and safety blight. Cities are able to use eminent domain or condemnation to address areas that are identified as health and safety blights. However, legal findings have indicated this approach would not be appropriate to address economic blight. He said that throughout the discussion, staff has

emphasized the fact that the City does not intend to use condemnation or imminent domain at Aurora Square. However, they do plan to access some of the other tool kit options for CRA's.

Mr. Eernisse provided an aerial photograph of the Aurora Square area and described the boundaries of the CRA and existing development. He explained that now that the proposed CRA area has been established, the next step in the process is to come up with a Community Renewal Plan (CRP). As the CRP process moves forward, the City would work with private enterprise and there would be no condemnation of properties. A light rail station has been proposed in the area, and the Aurora Square CRP could be used as a model for future transit-oriented development. He emphasized that the Planning Commission would play an important role in formulating the CRP. He advised that, when creating the plan, the City can utilize a variety of CRA tools:

- The CRA designation allows the City to enter into partnerships with private enterprise. Without the CRA designation, the City can offer general city services and resources, but State law does not allow the City to work cooperatively with individual property owners. A CRA designation establishes that it is in the public interest to have economic development occur in the area. Therefore, community resources can be used to work cooperatively and more closely with private enterprise.
- In a CRA, the City would be allowed to borrow, accept grants and build infrastructure specifically for economic purposes.
- The CRA designation provides an incentive for job creation.
- The City would be allowed to own property within a CRA for economic renewal. However, the City could only purchase property with the intention of reinserting the property into the private market in the near future. It would be illegal for the City to purchase and assemble property outside of a CRA and then sell it to a private developer. This is a particularly valuable tool at Aurora Square where there are numerous property owners and cohesiveness is difficult.

Mr. Eernisse advised that for property owners, a successful CRP would result in higher rents and/or property values or a decrease in development costs. There are many ways for the City to measure a CRPs success, and there are numerous ways the City can benefit from a successful Aurora Square such as providing additional goods and services, creating new businesses and jobs, establishing a community gathering place, increasing tax revenues from services, providing cleaner air and soil, providing better stormwater management, increasing surrounding property values, improving the efficiency of daily tasks by providing close-by services, and creating opportunities for truth, beauty and culture.

Mr. Eernisse expressed his belief that a successful CRP plan will share both success and cost. Through cooperative efforts, a CRP for Aurora Square would allow the City and private enterprises to cooperate to provide amazing amenities to the citizens of the City. He suggested that a successful CRP must improve connectivity around and through Aurora Square, make the Joshua Green triangle more attractive, allow the site to function more cohesively, improve and build new buildings, increase property and sales taxes, provide multi-purpose parking and use land more efficiently.

Mr. Eernisse said that while the CRA is not all about revenue, it is important to understand how little tax revenue the City collects from property owners on this site beyond the land value. He pointed out that the entire combined annual property tax generated from improvements on the properties within the CRA boundary is less than \$10 because single-story properties are devalued to about \$1,000 after about

20 years. No improvements have occurred on any of the sites, with the exception of an interior remodel at the Central Market. He advised that Aurora Square generates about \$6,000 per acre in sales taxes while Aurora Village, just a few miles to the north, brings in \$39,000 per acre. He expressed his belief that retail sales must improve.

Regarding the need for multi-purpose parking, Mr. Eernisse referred to the 500 parking spaces located at the 192nd Street park-and-ride, which are used exclusively Monday through Friday by commuters. If these parking spaces were located at Aurora Square, they could be used for retail, entertainment and/or residential parking after hours. He pointed out that this concept was utilized in the Northgate area.

Mr. Eernisse said a successful CRP must use property more efficiently. He noted that while the footprint of the building owned by WSDOT is relatively efficient for Shoreline, there is a lot of land that could be used for other things. He said the City needs to encourage WSDOT to expand to the level they need to be at, and then allow the excess land to be developed. He also expressed his belief that Westminster must serve Aurora Square and not just be an off ramp from Aurora Avenue to Greenwood Avenue. The current Westminster right-of-way is extremely wide.

Mr. Eernisse said staff believes there must be on-going talks with property owners and developers, and there should be at least two public meetings (one in the neighborhood around Aurora Square and a second one in the Council chambers). Staff is currently gathering information about the site and identifying important traffic aspects. The planning process should include discussions with stakeholders. For example, Shoreline Community College would like to have more presence on Aurora Avenue North. He emphasized that the Planning Commission would play a significant role in the planning process, and it may be appropriate for them to establish a subcommittee to study the issue further. Ultimately, the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Eernisse said he believes the City could wait a long time for the private sector to muster up the level of enthusiasm necessary to move a CRP forward. Realizing that the City would benefit from the CRP's success as well as the private sector, the two sides need to work to solve the problem. This would likely involve a performance agreement that lists what the City and the property owners will contribute to the success of the CRP, and this performance agreement could help the City market the CRA to private enterprises. For example, the agreement could include:

- Making the site more bite-sized. He advised that students from the University of Washington participated in a summer seminar that focused on Aurora Square, and they published a book of findings. He recognized that their findings were not necessarily practical, but it was interesting how most students felt it was critical to provide other ways through the site. Perhaps the City could build this infrastructure if the property owners agree to assemble the necessary land. This would allow the site to function more cohesively.
- Repurposing Westminster. He used Mill Creek Town Center to illustrate how back-in angle parking could be provided. He noted that Westminster has a right-of-way width of at least 100 feet. Perhaps the stretch of right-of-way between 155th and 160th Streets could be made more pedestrian oriented.
- Finance a garage. Currently, all of the WSDOT parking is surface parking. If the City were to finance a garage, the excess property could be used for other purposes. He acknowledged this would be an expensive proposition.

- Manage stormwater and consider eco-district opportunities. Currently, there are 10 different property owners. If any one property owner develops, stormwater must be managed on site. If the property owners work cooperatively, a regional system could be developed to handle stormwater for the entire site.

Mr. Eernisse summarized that he needs the Commission's help to move forward with Phase 2 of the CRP. He said he sees the Planning Commission as the formal public process, along with the more informal neighborhood process, to vet the various ideas.

Commissioner Scully asked if the City Council has provided guidance as to a budget and timeline for the CRP project. Mr. Eernisse said he has requested \$25,000 in both 2012 and 2013 to do studies and master plan work. He noted that one of the first steps in the process will be an accurate survey of the area. However, the City Council has not made a commitment to fund a significant infrastructure project at this time. This decision will not be made until they have a clear understanding of what the developer could provide in return for the City's investment.

Commissioner Scully asked if additional funding sources would be unlocked because of the CRA designation. Mr. Eernisse said the CRA, itself, would not unlock additional funding options. However, as they saw with the Aurora Corridor Improvement Project, an established CRA can send a clear indication to people who are granting funds that the City is serious.

Commissioner Maul asked if staff has contacted all of the property owners regarding the potential CRP. Mr. Eernisse said he has attempted to talk to all owners of property within the CRA, itself. In some cases, he has talked with property managers, but not the property owners directly. Generally, the responses from property owners of for-profit retail businesses have been quite positive in favor of the CRA. Property owners of not-for profit and government businesses have indicated a general desire to continue the status quo.

To illustrate one way the CRA designation would help the City, Mr. Eernisse explained that if WSDOT were to build a parking garage that results in a surplus of land, State law would prevent them from selling the surplus land to a private enterprise. However, the City could purchase the land and then sell it into the private sector if the property is designated as a CRA. Commissioner Maul asked how much the City knows about WSDOT's plans for expansion in the area. Mr. Eernisse explained that WSDOT's traffic monitoring equipment is currently located on the 4th floor of their existing regional headquarters building, which is not seismically strong. WSDOT has submitted preliminary plans to construct a new seismically sound traffic bunker to the northeast of the existing building. They have also discussed expanding the building so that the staff and equipment that is currently located at the eastside facility can be consolidated into the site.

Commissioner Montero asked if the owners of the Sears property have indicated a willingness to participate in the process. Mr. Eernisse said the owners of Sears have not indicated either support or opposition to the CRP concept. He recognized that Sears is a critical piece in the proposal, as it is the largest property owner in the CRA at about 16.6 acres. The next largest property owner is WSDOT with about 13 acres. Mr. Eernisse briefly reviewed some of the changes that property owners in the area are

currently contemplating. He summarized that there has been a lot of movement related to potential redevelopment.

Chair Moss requested clarification about the concept of the City spending \$20 million to build a parking garage. Mr. Eernisse clarified that the concept involves the City financing a parking garage rather than actually paying for the garage. There is a significant difference. As per the concept, a private developer could borrow money from the City to construct a parking garage.

Chair Moss requested additional information about the funding mechanisms that would be available to the City for infrastructure projects within the CRA. Commissioner Craft explained that bond financing is a fairly common practice around the country, and there is a lot of historical data on both the successes and failures of these types of investment vehicles. He summarized that there is a wide variety of financing vehicles the City could take advantage of that could create both protections and a return for Shoreline taxpayers. He suggested that perhaps the next step in the process would be to talk about the numerous components of the various financing opportunities. Mr. Eernisse advised that the City's new Administrative Services Director has significant experience with municipal bonds and could provide additional information to the Commission. However, he cautioned that it would be putting the cart before the horse to start talking about financing before a CRP plan is in place. Commissioner Craft agreed, but suggested it would be helpful for the Commission to at least have a basic understanding of the funding mechanisms early in the process.

Commissioner Scully said that given the number of unknowns, the Commission may want to start their discussion by identifying a pallet of elements they would like to change and potential funding options, and then solicit support from the various property owners. He noted that because the City has agreed not to use eminent domain, the infrastructure improvements proposed in the CRP would not be useful unless the property owners offer their support for the changes.

Commissioner Wagner noted that, aside from condemning a property, which the City has agreed they will not do, the CRA designation would not compel an owner to sell property to the City. Commissioner Maul pointed out that property owners would not have to give up their buildings. The changes could be implemented by reshaping some of the properties and altering the access points. If the CRP is designed properly to encourage multiple uses and synergy, the existing businesses could prosper. Mr. Eernisse agreed that it is not the City's goal to push out the existing businesses. He explained that the private sector has a clear understanding of the current access issues, and their goal is to generate more retail. They also understand how a community gathering place could add to the center. Several property owners have indicated their support and excitement for a private/public partnership.

Commissioner Montero asked how sales tax revenue per acre at Mill Creek Town Center would compare to the sales tax revenue generated by the Aurora Square and Aurora Village developments. Mr. Eernisse said he does not have actual numbers, but he anticipates the sales tax revenue per acre at Mill Creek would fall somewhere around \$20,000 per acre. He noted that the sales tax revenue per acre at Aurora Village is significantly higher because of the revenue generated by Costco and Home Depot. He clarified that he did not mean to imply that Aurora Square should generate \$39,000 per acre in sales tax revenue, but it could be possible and current sales tax revenue of \$6,000 per acre is very low. Commissioner Wagner asked staff to also provide information about the sales tax revenue generated by

the Gateway development. Mr. Eernisse explained that sales tax revenue is limited because it is very difficult to get retail development over one story. However, additional stories of residential development would increase the improvement value significantly, resulting in more property tax revenue. Suburban cities seek big box stores because they generate a lot of sales tax revenue.

Chair Moss asked if the performance agreement would require the consensus of all property owners. Mr. Eernisse said it is likely that some elements of the performance agreement would require the participation of all property owners, and others would not.

Chair Moss asked if the City has identified a loose timeline for when the CRP would be completed and construction would begin. Mr. Eernisse said he would like the CRP to be in place by mid 2013 to identify a pallet of options and the various types of financing tools that could be used. He noted that because what works well for one property owner may not be appropriate for another, it is important that the plan remain flexible. On the other hand, the plan must be resolute enough for the property owners to know that the City means to do what the plan says it will do.

Commissioner Wagner asked staff to explain the next step in the process and what they expect the Planning Commission to do. Mr. Eernisse explained that the purpose of tonight's discussion is to engage the Commission in the process. They may want to form a subcommittee to work specifically on the CRP. Property owners would be notified of the various public meetings, as well as any future City Council actions. In addition, staff would stay in close contact with the property owners, specifically encouraging them to identify the elements they want included in the agreement.

Commissioner Wagner asked staff to explain the process that would be used to move the CRP through Commission review and to the City Council for formal adoption. Director Markle pointed out that the City has never done a CRP, but she anticipates the process will include Planning Commission study sessions, public open houses, and a public hearing. Mr. Eernisse added that State Law requires that all CRA's must have an approved plan in place. The Planning Commission will be asked to forward a recommendation to the City Council for formal adoption of the CRP, and the City Council will take the final action. Director Markle agreed that staff would identify an appropriate process for moving the CRP forward and report back to the Commission.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that the property is already zoned mixed use, so a rezone would not be necessary. He suggested that the first step in creating a CRP is to generate some realistic concepts of what the City and property owners would be willing to do. The conceptual plan could be used to generate momentum. Mr. Eernisse agreed that when approaching neighborhood groups, it would be helpful and wise to illustrate potential options rather than presenting a whole master plan for the area. For example, the City could provide ideas for how 160th Street and Westminster Avenue could be better designed. He noted that the CRA includes the surrounding rights-of-way, making the City the largest property owner. He emphasized that property owners have the ultimate control of their properties and the City must work with them to implement the common goal of creating a vibrant center.

Chair Moss pointed out that the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) Vision 2040 Plan identifies the area around 155th Street as a transit-oriented community, and Metro will open a RapidRide E Line along Aurora Avenue North next year. This new line will likely result in significant changes at Aurora Square

and elsewhere along Aurora Avenue. She commented that any time change is afoot, surrounding residential property owners become concerned. She reminded the Commission and staff that, in the past, members of the public have expressed concern that they were not included in the process. Before creating a draft plan for the public's consideration, she suggested that staff should educate the public about what a CRA is and is not and solicit feedback from the surrounding property owners. This would allow them to identify their big concerns. She said it is important the CRP to address these big concerns and get buy in from the surrounding property owners. She suggested the City establish a web page that provides information and announcements related to the CRP process and allows the public to submit comments.

Chair Moss recalled that the community was heavily engaged in the Aldercrest Subarea Planning process. Members of the community reached out to have discussions with neighbors who would be impacted by the plan. This process was effective because it pushed a lot of the conversation to the community to identify what is important. When this high level of community development has not occurred early in the process, there has been a lot of divisiveness and the process has been slowed down.

Mr. Eernisse cautioned that creating a plan for private property is much different than planning for public property such as the Aldercrest Annex site. He explained that, from a property owner's perspective, the properties are privately owned and appropriate zoning is already in place. While the City can solicit public response, it is important to send a clear message to the community that property owners have certain rights to build whatever is consistent with the current zoning code. While the City can meet with surrounding property owners, it is important for them to understand that the City cannot require a property owner to do something that goes beyond what is required by zoning. Chair Moss said she understands that no zoning changes are anticipated, and it will be important to help the public have a clear understanding of where their feedback can and cannot be applied. Mr. Eernisse agreed and pointed out that if the City were to provide a funding mechanism for infrastructure development, there would be strings attached and public input would be solicited.

Commissioner Wagner suggested that it would be helpful for the staff to prepare a list that clearly articulates what the City can and cannot do as part of a CRP. Mr. Eernisse agreed that would be appropriate.

Mr. Eernisse said he looks forward to working with the Commission. He said he believes the result of the process will be significantly improved as good minds work together.

The Commission discussed the process for moving the CRP forward. Rather than creating a subcommittee now, they agreed that the first step would be for staff to develop a draft plan to present to the public, along with an explanation of what the plan means and its potential impacts and possibilities. Once this information is available, the Commission could determine the appropriate process for moving the plan forward, and forming a subcommittee may be one option. The Commission requested staff provide regular updates and helpful information related to the CRP. Mr. Eernisse agreed to bring some form to the nebulous state of the CRP concept and then invite feedback from staff, community groups and stakeholders to further hone the plan. Staff would provide regular updates of how the process is proceeding forward and notify the Commissioners of the scheduled community meetings.

Michael Germak, Shoreline, said he lives adjacent to the WSDOT facility at Aurora Square. He said he has an interest in what is going on in his community, and he commended the City of Shoreline and its leadership for what they have done in their forward thinking to clean up Aurora Avenue North. He agreed with Chair Moss' comments about the need for extensive community involvement early in the process.

Tom Jamison, Shoreline, said he hopes that minutes are prepared for the meeting and published in a timely manner. He said that as he listened to the staff's presentation and the Commission's discussion, he made the following observations:

- There was no mention of the inevitable executive sessions that will be required for the performance agreement. This will result in a lack of public visibility.
- There was no mention of the budget until Commissioner Scully specifically asked about it.
- There was no mention that WSDOT and the Northwest School wanted to opt out of the CRA, but it was not allowed by the City Council.
- There was no rejoinder to his public comment asking for why the CRA was done as a resolution instead of an ordinance. A resolution is not binding, and an ordinance is.
- There was no mention of the environment and tree canopy. Would the trees be removed from the "wasted space" on the WSDOT property to accommodate future redevelopment.
- There was no mention of the potential of enlarging CRAs after they are initially established, which is done by a lot of communities. Designating the commercial area only at this time, is misleading at best.
- There was no mention of the coercive power of eminent domain even if it is not exercised. This is a way a single developer may be able to get other developers to sell at sub market prices. Although a lot of statements have been made and Resolution 333 states that eminent domain is not authorized by the resolution, it does not specifically prohibit it. The resolution does not need to authorize eminent domain because it is authorized by the CRA law, and the City Council did not take a positive stance saying they would not use eminent domain. He suggested that the City Council should have indicated their intention in a more obvious and direct way.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Markle announced that the City Council will consider the Commission's recommendation on the Comprehensive Plan amendments for the first time on November 5th. They will also conduct a public hearing on the budget on November 5th, so the public will have an opportunity to speak specifically about the \$250,000 request for station area planning. The City's review of the Comprehensive Plan amendments will continue on November 13th and 19th and December 3rd.

Ms. Markle advised that staff met with representatives from Sound Transit last week to receive an update and discuss the status of their draft Environmental Impact Statement and the City's station area planning process. The Sound Transit Board requested that their staff update the transit-oriented development policies. She noted that their current policies are mainly geared towards "agency transit-oriented development," and they are proposing a new component called "community transit-oriented development." She explained that agency transit-oriented development typically takes place on property

that is owned by Sound Transit, and the community transit-oriented development policies would allow Sound Transit to engage more with community members such as cities, utility districts, etc. to talk about transit-oriented development on other properties. They will likely act on the proposed policy changes by early 2013.

Ms. Markle reported that she plans to attend a Court of Appeals on November 7th where Save Richmond Beach will present oral arguments on BSRE's appeal regarding vesting of their permit.

Ms. Markle said the 185th Street Station Subcommittee will meet for the first time on November 5th. They will discuss a potential grant application and develop the next steps for their subcommittee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Craft said the Station Area Planning Subcommittee did not have a report to provide at this time. Their goal is to meet to discuss steps the City staff is taking and how the subcommittee's work could follow. This will allow the subcommittee to clarify the direction they will take. He stressed the importance of including future subcommittee reports on the agenda so that proper notification is given to the public.

Commissioner Scully asked if a City staff member would attend the 185th Street Station Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Szafran said he plans to attend the event. Commissioner Scully said he would likely attend, as well.

Commissioner Maul reported that he and Chair Moss attended the Implementation Strategies Workshop for the Growing Transit Communities Partnership, which was sponsored by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). The PSRC grouped the planned stops for station areas into categories depending on existing conditions and outlined some potential strategies for moving forward. The PSRC also sought input from those in attendance regarding their outlines and strategies. He said the event provided him with a broader sense of the strategies that are available and the thought that the PSRC has put into the matter. Chair Moss said she picked up copies of the meeting materials for the two other members of the Station Area Planning Subcommittee. She noted that the information is in draft form and intended to get conversation going. The PSRC's website provides resources related to "growing transit communities."

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran announced that the Point Wells Subarea Plan docketed amendments will be presented to the Planning Commission for a public hearing on November 15th. The amendments should have been included in the October 18th public hearing as an element of the Comprehensive Plan amendment docket. The November 15th agenda will also include a study session on commercial design standards.

Chair Moss advised that in order for the Comprehensive Plan amendments related to the Point Wells Subarea Plan to move forward to the City Council as soon as possible, the Commission will need to have a special meeting to approve the minutes from the November 15th public hearing. She invited the Commissioners to review their schedules and be prepared to schedule the special meeting at their next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

Donna Moss
Chair, Planning Commission

Steve Szafran
Clerk Pro Tem, Planning Commission

TIME STAMP
November 1, 2012

CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 1:44

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 13:10

NEW BUSINESS

Community Renewal Area Update: 18:00

Commission Questions: 45:55

Public Comments: 1:42:25

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 1:48:42

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: 1:52:03

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING: 1:57:35

ADJOURNMENT