

MINUTES

CARBONDALE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Thursday May 25, 2023

Commissioners Present:

Jay Engstrom, Chair
Nicholas DiFrank
Jarrett Mork
Kim Magee
Nick Miscione
Kade Gianinetti
Jess Robison (Alternate)
Cindy Suplizio (Alternate)

Staff Present:

Jared Barnes, Planning Director
Kelley Amdur, Planner
Kae McDonald, Planning Technician

Commissioners Absent:

Jeff Davlyn

Guests and Attendees:

Angela Loughry (Confluence Architecture, Applicant for Little Blue Preschool)
Patrick Carpenter
Michelle Oger (Director, Blue Lake Preschool)
Kim Carpenter
Amanda Martinez, 461 S. 3rd Street, Unit E, Carbondale, Colorado
Drew Sorenson, 1328 Barber Drive, Carbondale, Colorado
Lynn Kirchner, 711 Main Street, Carbondale, Colorado
Savanna Mylott
Nilsse Peterson, 500 County Road 102, Carbondale, Colorado
Violet Lepe, 144 Navajo, Carbondale, Colorado
Bentley and Sandy Henderson, 46 N. 8th Street, Carbondale, Colorado
Rebekah Reed, 103 White Horse Place, Glenwood Springs, Colorado
Brittaney Lowennel, 85 N. 7th Street, Carbondale, Colorado
Adley Larimer, 924 Wheel Circle, Carbondale, Colorado

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Jay Engstrom.

May 11, 2023 Minutes:

Nicholas ***moved*** to approve the May 11, 2023, meeting minutes. Jess ***seconded the motion***, and it was ***unanimously approved***.

Yes: Jay, Nicholas, Jerrett, Kim, Kade, Jess, Nick

No: none

Public Comment – Persons Present Not on the Agenda

There were no persons present to speak on a non-agenda item.

PUBLIC HEARING: 55 N. 7th Street – Little Blue Preschool Expansion Combined Application: Administrative Site Plan Review, Subdivision Exemption, Special Use Permit and Rezoning

Applicant: Angela Loughry, Confluence Architecture

Location: 55 N. 7th Street

Jay noted that there may be a perceived conflict of interest for one of the commission members.

Kade replied that he is a partner and owns property at 689 Main Street.

Jay asked Kade if he thought he would be able to remain impartial through the meeting proceedings.

Kade answered in the affirmative.

Jay asked the remaining commission members if they were comfortable with Kade participating in the public hearing.

All the commission members answered in the affirmative.

Staff Presentation

Kelley proceeded to introduce herself and give a brief introduction to the project. She explained that Little Blue Preschool has been in their current location at 55 N. 7th Street for just over two years and they are proposing to double in size -- adding approximately 2500 square feet in two buildings – and increasing capacity from 36 to 72 children. She added that the school is asking to merge the two lots – one of which is zoned Commercial/Transitional and the other Residential/Medium Density – into one lot that is re-zoned as Historic Commercial Core. Kelley noted that the project as proposed requires four approvals:

- Administrative Site Plan Review, which the Planning Director has bundled with the other approvals and is being referred up to the Planning & Zoning Commission for referral to the Board of Trustees
- Subdivision Exemption for the merge of the two lots, a Planning & Zoning Commission decision
- Special Use Permit for the childcare, also a Planning & Zoning Commission decision
- Rezoning, which the Planning & Zoning Commission makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees

Kelley explained that Carbondale, along with the rest of the Roaring Fork Valley, desperately needs more childcare and that Blue Lake is an established childcare provider and the current location at 55 N. 7th Street is a good one that allows for walkability, local transit, and other factors. She pointed out that the question is whether the project as proposed complies with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the criteria for the four approvals that are being requested. She highlighted parking, noting that C/T zoning requires off-street parking for childcare and one space per employee, while the proposed HCC zoning does not require parking. Kelley explained that the preschool currently has seven off-street parking spaces and would retain two of them, and the proposed

expansion would accommodate 11 employees and therefore need 11 parking spaces if it continued to be zoned C/T. She noted that the off-street parking requirement would therefore limit the expansion and is part of the applicant's rationale for requesting a rezoning to HCC.

Kelley then highlighted the rezoning request, noting that unlike other rezoning requests, the C/T/ zoning is an appropriate zoning for the block and functions well as a transition between the higher-intensity downtown commercial core and the surrounding residential area. She pointed out that the project is proposing a spot zoning, which is typically discouraged, and raises the question are the blocks north and south of Main Street between 7th and 8th Streets most appropriately zoned as C/T or should they transition over time to HCC and referred the commission members to the meeting packet for a more in-depth comparison of the two zoning districts and how the HCC zone district compares to the Future Land Use Map. She reminded the commission members that the Unified Development Code requires commercial development to construct a raised curb and gutter, sidewalks, and street trees for all construction projects, and noted that the applicant is proposing to re-orient the four parallel parking spaces in front of the preschool to be head-in parking which will provide space for up to nine cars.

Kelley pointed out that other items included in the meeting packet include referral comments from the Police Department, Public Works Director, the Fire Department, and the Town Arborist. She noted that 57 public comments were received with the majority expressing support for the project based on the need for more childcare, but that the four adjacent property owners submitted comments that highlighted concerns over scale and parking impacts. Kelley explained that staff is looking to the P & Z Commission for guidance – if the lots are merged and zoned C/T, the preschool could still expand, but would need to fill the parking requirement in some way which could include a request for alternative compliance; page 12 of the staff memo lists strategies that could mitigate parking and traffic impacts. Kelley concluded that the P & Z Commission needs to determine which zoning is most appropriate and if a rezoning is approved if the impacts to adjacent properties and the public right-of-way can be mitigated. She re-capped the actions before the Commission:

- Approve or disapprove the subdivision exemption for the lot merge
- Special Use Permit for the childcare
- Recommendation to the Board of Trustees on the Site Plan Review and Rezoning Application
- Staff recommends that the Commission continue the hearing after the public input and discussion to the next P & Z Commission meeting on June 8th to allow staff to prepare recommended motions and findings based on the feedback at this meeting.

Questions for Staff

Nick asked if the applicant has met the criteria for approval.

Kelley replied that that decision is up to the Commission; she referred to the staff memo, noting that the application met some of the criteria clearly and others not so clearly so it's whether the proposed impacts are able to be mitigated sufficiently to fulfill those findings.

Jay asked if it was recommended to the applicant to retain the C/T zoning.

Kelley replied that Jared initially met with the applicant, but they have continued to discuss options throughout the application process.

Jared pointed out that much of that conversation was centered on and around zoning, noting that there are a lot of similarities – but a major difference is the requirement for on-site parking and how that impacts the public right-of-way. He noted that they had discussed that topic in-depth with the applicant and worked with them on the variety of site plan options including various parking designs.

Nicholas asked if staff focused on the static nature of the site plan, noting the importance of considering the transitional qualities of circulation planning.

Kelley agreed, noting that the applicant would highlight the different age groups of children and the different times of day that they would attend school, adding that the nature of timing for drop-off and pick up are described in the application and were discussed with the applicant and staff. She pointed out that the alley presents a unique condition, so there are pros and cons to the parking that exists on the Alley and there are obviously varying site conditions along 7th Street. She added that depending on which part of that block you are considering there are varying conditions and parking is handled differently in front of each property.

Nicholas asked if the Town has a position.

Kelley asked for clarification as to whether Nicholas was asking if the Town has positive or negative feelings regarding parking, traffic, and circulation. She reiterated that they understand the nature of timing of drop off/pick up, noting that Little Blue provided the necessary traffic numbers. She pointed out that there is a complexity to the nature of the traffic and parking impacts. She noted the concerns expressed by the Police Department and Public Works director regarding 7th Street, but those conditions are likely to change. She stated that staff had no concerns about converting parallel parking to head-in parking.

Jared added that as applicant represented, the current drop-off and pick-up occurs in the public right-of-way and that configuration will continue, and while the increase in student numbers wasn't directly discussed, it will be part of a larger conversation regarding impacts to the public right-of-way.

Nicholas asked if the Applicant discussed the proposed changes with the surrounding neighbors.

Jared replied that it was publicly noticed, and the application is available on the Town website.

Jarrett asked if with the consideration of an HCC zoning to mitigate parking, how are the standards for substantial development applied.

Kelley replied that if the lots merge and it is rezoned to the HCC, there isn't a parking requirement.

Jared confirmed that the HCC doesn't require parking for commercial uses – regardless of scale or size – except for hotels.

Jay asked if the intent of the rezoning to HCC is to satisfy the parking requirement and the P & Z recommends that the lot remains C/T with a request for relief, will it be a burden on the applicant to reapply with that request in mind.

Kelley explained that the alternative compliance would be a Director decision. She reminded the commission members that the project would still require a subdivision exemption and rezoning for the smaller lot.

Jared added that because there is a noticed Public Hearing, they wouldn't have to reapply. He pointed out that what the applicant is requesting is this Commission make a recommendation to the BOT regarding a transition to the HCC rezoning request. He reiterated that if an additional application is required, the process wouldn't have to start over.

Jarrett voiced his concern regarding the request for a five-year term of vested rights.

Kelley explained that the applicant requested that length of time to pursue fundraising.

Jarrett replied that with Commission term limits set at four years he was concerned that the next iteration of the P & Z Commission wouldn't have clarity on the decisions made by the current Commission.

Applicant Presentation

Angela introduced herself, along with Patrick Carpenter – also an Architect -- and Michelle Oger, the Director of Blue Lake Preschool.

Michelle began the presentation by providing background information on Blue Lake Preschool:

- She has been the Director of Blue Lake Preschool nearly 22 years ago. The program started out with three classrooms and has expanded to serve 114 children per day, providing care for infants through 5th grade.
- The program also provides afterschool care for Kindergarten through 5th grades for the five elementary schools in the area. They also provide full daycare opportunities for winter/spring/summer breaks.
- They began exploring options for a satellite program in Carbondale seven years ago and opened in the building at Merrill and 8th Street. Their goal is to offer high-quality care and ample space is important, and that space wasn't ideal. However, because of the many state requirements for space and parking, they found that there are not a lot of spaces suitable for childcare in Carbondale, so the building at 55 N. 7th Street is a good location and does offer opportunities for expansion.
- The childcare ratios for infant and toddler – 1:4 and 1:5, respectively – the proposed expansion will help balance the costs of care.
- Blue Lake Preschool serves parents commuting up to Aspen, while Little Blue is a more community-centered preschool with patrons walking, riding their bikes, or taking public transportation to deliver their children to the preschool.
- CRMS preschool also struggled when they moved to their current location on Mian Street.

Angela noted the 50 letters of support in the meeting packet. She shared her screen to highlight graphics from a recent Aspen Times article on the need for childcare and pointed out the large discrepancy for the younger ages between the number of available spots and the number needed. She explained the process that helped them arrive at the project design:

- Design approach is all about infrastructure - in addition to the parking, traffic and sidewalk infrastructure, but we also need to consider our mission as a child care provider, treating child care as social -- or “soft” –infrastructure.
- The Little Blue attendees get out a lot – they walk to the library, the Rec Center, ride Roaring Fork Transportation Authority. The current location is also great for local families – 50% walk or bike in the summer, 20% in the winter.
- Constraints of the site location resulted in the four applications:
 - The alley ends in a five point intersection at 8th and Main Streets – this configuration was discussed in-depth during the initial application two years ago – and resulted in a head-in parking requirement.
 - There are overhead utilities in three directions and two utility poles with guy wires in the alley that reduced the number of usable parking spaces in the alley.
 - Street trees along 7th Street have damaged the sidewalks; the sidewalk is only three feet wide, as well.
 - Zoning condition – the larger parcel is part of the original Town plat, while the smaller is the Weaver addition. A portion of the parcels overlap, but this has been a historic condition since the property changed hands in the 1950s and has run with the property since then. The parcels are currently zoned differently.
- The proposed design is an answer to the stated constraints:

Child, Staff, Car Numbers Proposed

Type of child space	Proposed					
	Children	Staff	morning car trip (7:30-9:30)	day car trip	3:00 pm car trip	evening car trip (4-5:30)
full day infant	10	2	48			48
full day waddler	9	2				
full day toddler	11	2				
full day preschool	18	2				
director		1				
3/4 day preschool (share schoolage room)	20	2			1	
school age after care	20			1	1	
Totals	*68 children	11 staff	113 car trips			

*88 children served, only 68 at any one time

-
- After school care is from 3 to 5:30 pm, but added space would provide opportunity to add ¾ day preschool to maximize use of space

- 48 car trips may represent multiple children served by the preschool; these numbers are based on the preschool counts in El Jebel where 90% have younger sibling/expect similar ratios at Little Blue
- Economics dictate the need for older children care and five classrooms would provide for a financially stable model and continuity of care
- Removing parking along the alley will allow for a larger playground
- Respect HCC design guidelines in architecture

Patrick explained the philosophy of the proposed parking design:

- Existing configuration is four parallel parking spaces in front of the building; there are five parking spaces to the northwest and three to the northeast. They are proposing nine head-in spaces and one ADA (double-wide) space; this will require the removal of three street trees along 7th Street.
- There is no clarity in the parking alignment along 7th Street which leads to less efficient spacing; the proposed head-in parking adds clarity and efficiency
- There are approximately 113 car trips per day with 48 in the morning and the remainder in the afternoon and there are defined traffic times – 8-9 AM, 3 PM, and 4 to 6 PM.
- There is a big trade-off in playground space versus parking in the public right-of-way.

Angela reiterated the trade-offs between parking and childcare. She noted that the proposed application has been through four different planners and prior staff never mentioned the possibility of rezoning. She emphasized the benefit of Little Blue Preschool to the community and noted that there is concordance between zoning and the Comprehensive Plan. She added that childcare is an essential service for the commercial core, and summarized their intent for rezoning to the HCC

- It corrects a historical mistake in zoning and does so in a way that is in keeping with the comprehensive plan. It provides clear improvements to the infrastructure that does not only benefit the preschool, but the entire community as well
- It makes childcare an integral part of the downtown core
- It is a gentle rezoning

Questions for Applicant

Jarrett asked if the applicants had discussed sharing parking with Colorado Mountain College. He also asked if Little Blue would be willing to fund all the parking spaces along 7th Street.

Angela replied that they had discussed that option, but CMC would only spare five spaces and charge \$5,000.00 in rent per year. She added that there are other considerations including the CMC PUD agreement's parking arrangements, five parking spaces doesn't fulfill the required spaces, alternative compliance isn't fully codified, and it only applies to the HCC zoning and the proposed improvements are a one-time cost. Angela didn't think the neighbors wanted head-in parking in front of the home. She reiterated that Little Blue is willing to do their part and partner with the Town for improvements.

Jay expressed his concern for adequate space for both parking and drive lanes and wondered if it would be possible to shift the sidewalk to the west.

Angela wasn't sure that would be possible, noting that the sidewalk configuration presents design challenges.

Jarrett asked if a drop-off aisle was considered.

Angela replied that, unlike public school, state regulations require a parent walk in with a child and the time it takes for the transfer is dependent upon several variables. She added that parents can't drive down the alley and there isn't room along the edge of the street for a drive lane thereby placing an even greater burden on the public right-of-way.

Jay pointed out that the priority for parking is that it is a safe zone.

Nick noted that the lack of a sidewalk at Sopris Montessori presents the challenge of knowing where to walk.

Jay reminded the commission members that there is no parking for the CRMS Preschool because they received an exemption due to the need for childcare. He said the decision is whether parking is a priority over "soft" infrastructure.

Kade asked if Little Blue had approached the neighbors about rezoning to HCC.

Angela replied that the Jaywalkers weren't interested because they had just completed a lengthy planning process and the property owners of Shade Salon were happy with the uses allowed. She noted that HCC zoning discourages residential use of the first floor, so other property owners contacted weren't interested.

Public Comment

Lynn Kirchner (711 Main Street [Business] and 636 Surrey Road [Residence], Carbondale, Colorado) explained that she discussed the project with two other neighboring businesses – Sopris Crossings and 689 Main Street – and they are concerned about the safety of the intersections and parking. She didn't think that the parking supported a transition to the HCC and pointed out that the profile of the HCC along Main Street was different than that on 7th Street. Lynn noted that they have maintained the head-in parking in front of their business since they moved in in 2006 and expressed concern that those spaces won't be available for clients with the expansion of the preschool. She added that open communication is key, and she hopes everyone can be considerate of one another.

Ian Edlind (34 Maroon Drive, Carbondale, Colorado) explained that they have been fortunate to have a space for their toddler at Little Blue. He acknowledged that while not everyone with children at Little Blue live in town, they are able to walk or bike most days and he hasn't observed a lot of cars on 7th Street at those times. He expressed his appreciation to Little Blue for providing opportunities for the kids to walk to a variety of locations throughout town and for the humanity of the leadership after they lost their four-month-old in January.

Alex DeGolia (687 Surrey Road, Carbondale, Colorado) also noted that he has a child at Little Blue and echoed Ian's sentiments regarding the preschool programming and staff. He acknowledged that while he isn't a traffic engineer, in his experience it is much safer to get a child out of a car that is perpendicular to the road rather than parallel.

Garrett Larimer (924 Wheel Circle, Carbondale, Colorado) commented that childcare is important to the community and the current situation is complicated. He pointed out that there may be no straightforward solutions – only trade-offs – and sacrifices may need to be made in some areas. He stated that people are more important than parking and while it isn't easy with the variety of requirements, he hoped that the parking requirements wouldn't limit childcare.

Amy Kimberley (85 N. 7th Street, Carbondale, Colorado) commented that she has contributed a lot to the community since moving here. She pointed out that while she loves Little Blue, there is only one remaining neighbor from the three that were there when she moved in. She did note that Angela is the only one that has communicated with her and while she feels she has been a good neighbor, she doesn't feel included. She stated that she is against the rezoning to HCC and does not want to have head-in parking along the length of 7th Street because the lights shine into her home. She suggested a better location for the preschool expansion might be the upcoming Town Center development. She added that she wants her property to be considered as a single-family residence in any zoning change and that she doesn't want and can't afford to improve the sidewalk in front of her house.

Bentley Henderson (46 N. 8th Street, Carbondale, Colorado) explained that he is a dispassionate observer with regards to the preschool. He applauded the effort to eliminate the parking space below the guy wire. He noted that if the parcel is rezoned HCC it will change the dynamics of that property and the request for five-year vesting rights is a big deal that could create other challenges. He pointed out that there should be careful consideration of the beneficiary of any parking allowance and that the parking and utilization of the parcel can't be separated.

Amanda Martinez (461 S. 3rd Street Unit E, Carbondale, Colorado) noted that she has been a teacher and instructional coach for the local school district for 11 years. She pointed out that the recent passage of the Universal Preschool funding opportunity will only increase the demand for childcare. She pointed out that students that have no access to preschool programming generally need more help in later school years and more access to preschool opportunities will also bring about more equity in education. She acknowledged the parking challenges but reiterated the immediate demand for childcare.

Motion to close the public hearing

Nick made a motion to close the comment portion of the public hearing. Nicholas seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Discussion

Nicholas acknowledged the passionate and thoughtful comments and commented that his concerns were less about parking, but more about the community and precedent setting. He noted that he has two young children and understands the need for childcare. He added that he would like to find a way to recommend approval, but has concerns about the congestion, weather complications, two narrow travel lanes, and a lot of kids. He pointed out that a traffic study would have been beneficial.

Nick agreed that safety was the real issue. He talked through several of the criteria for approval including the requested rezoning from C/T to HCC including C/T designation for small parcels along Highway 133.

Nicholas pointed out that it was important not to misrepresent aspects of a zone district – particularly the emphasis of the C/T zoning along Highway 133 – and that C/T is meant primarily to be a transition from the HCC to New Urban.

Nick replied that that the Comprehensive Plan shows this lot/block transitioning to downtown and Criteria #2 trumps C/T altogether. He also noted that the rezoning was unlikely to result in material adverse impacts to adjacent properties.

Nicholas replied that three immediate neighbors disagree with that process.

Nick stated that neighbors don't have veto power over the Comprehensive Plan.

Jay commented that the C/T and HCC zone districts are very similar, but that the HCC is more oriented towards pedestrians.

Nick replied that that is where Criteria #6 comes in – providing facilities and services.

Nicholas replied that while he agrees that pedestrian access is important and allows for elimination of parking, he wondered what that might happen without the neighbors' support.

Jay agreed that it won't be a clean transition and thought it made more sense for either side of the street to match. He pointed out the historic buildings at the intersection of 7th and Main and thought that made a good argument for that block to be zoned HCC.

Kade agreed that 8th Street is a more definitive break to New Urban. He pointed out that 7th Street could be a soft transition between the two. He pointed out the impact on 7th Street with the town "growing up," and the improvements being proposed are more residential than commercial. He thought that a soft transition would be beneficial for high value real estate with high need and the rezoning made sense to him.

Nick wondered if it was possible to approve a general rezoning with contingencies and clarify the pedestrian infrastructure.

Jay asked about the step-down of buildings for neighboring units and whether it applied to both C/T and HCC zoning.

Kelley replied that there are always considerations for transitions between zoning districts and the current proposal is appropriate given the scale of the proposed expansion compared to the adjacent historic building.

Jared added that the UDC isn't just specific on zoning, but also on uses, so the residential use compatibility compared to the commercial use compatibility.

Nicholas stated that the C/T value is in its transition and step down in use.

Kade stated that it is the 11 parking spaces required for the C/T zone district that is the issue and that didn't make sense to him. He thought there was adequate parking available near the property, but in any case, parking should be in front of the building and not in the alley.

Jay replied that that was tricky because HCC zoning doesn't require on-site parking while C/T does.

Kim wondered why the whole area wasn't zoned HCC to begin with and if the sole difference between the two zone districts is parking.

Jared clarified that the Town is discouraging the use of the alley as a thoroughfare to the five-way intersection at 8th and Main Streets because it isn't functional. The Town would prefer traffic to return to 7th Street, especially with the possibility that the alley could be closed at some future time. He added that C/T buffers the intensity of use from commercial to residential, and one of the ways that it does that is by requiring properties to park their obligation.

Jess wondered if there was a way to require the nine parking spaces to remain in perpetuity.

Nicholas pointed out that parking is unlikely to be undone.

Kade asked about traffic speeds and whether a four-way stop could be installed.

Kelley replied that that is a Public Works issue, and the Commission could make a recommendation to the BOT as part of the approvals.

Nicholas commented that a lot is being asked for and that the applicant will need to carry some of that.

Kade reiterated his point about the 11 parking spaces and wondered if there is enough public parking for peak period of drop-off?

Jess clarified that if no parking is provided, the surrounding neighborhood has enough parking to absorb peak usage. She went on to say that required parking is an archaic expectation.

Jay cautioned getting caught up on the 11 parking spaces because it is based on the number of employees and doesn't reflect how the facility functions. He noted that there was no traffic study, so it isn't clear how many parking spaces are needed.

Kelley pointed out that the parking requirement for childcare is unique because it is based upon the number of employees and parking for most other commercial uses is

based upon square footage. She noted that many of the criteria in the four applications overlap, especially as they relate to parking and traffic impacts for the Special Use Permit and Site Plan.

Nick commented that they have touched on parking and traffic, which affects several applications, but he is hesitant to require a traffic study due to the extra costs for the applicant. He thought the Subdivision Exemption approval was a formality and expressed his support.

Kade suggested requiring a stop sign and safety improvements to the alley.

Jay would like to see a street alignment move and push the sidewalk back to align with the perpendicular parking to the south rather than the parallel to the north.

Jess wondered if there would be any benefit to some demarcation between the road and the parkway.

Kelley pointed out that along 3rd Street the new parking has a ribbon curb, but the neighboring residential area has raised curb and gutter.

Nicholas asked each commission member whether they supported a rezoning to HCC:

- Jay replied in the affirmative
- Nick replied in the affirmative
- Jarrett replied in the negative
- Kim replied in the affirmative
- Jess replied in the affirmative
- Kade replied in the affirmative
- Nicholas replied in the negative because he is in favor of transitional zoning.

Jay asked if remaining C/T would discourage the project and if there was an avenue for alternative compliance.

Jared commented that they received good feedback. He stated that remaining as C/T zoning wouldn't "kill" the project but would change it. He reiterated that there could be a path forward for some expansion, but maybe not the extent they are requesting in the current application if they must have some of the required parking on-site. He noted that there was a recent application where alternative compliance for on-site parking was granted due to mitigating factors in the areas.

Motion

Motion Passed: Nicholas ***moved*** to continue the Public Hearing to the June 8, 2023, Planning & Zoning Commission meeting. Jess seconded the motion and it was ***unanimously approved.***

Yes: Jay, Nicholas, Jerrett, Kim, Kade, Jess, Nick

No: none

Staff Update

Staff had no updates.

Commissioner Comments

There were no Commissioner comments.

Motion to Adjourn

A motion was made by Nicholas to adjourn, Nick seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.