



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 22, 2018
7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. STRODTMAN: Good evening. I'd like to welcome everyone to the Thursday, February 22, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting. May we have a roll call, please.

MS. TOOTIE: Yes. We have eight; we have a quorum.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns.

Present: 8 - Tootie Burns, Dan Harder, Sara Loe, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Rusty Strodman, Brian Toohey and Michael MacMann

Excused: 1 - Joy Rushing

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, is there any changes to our agenda?

MR. ZENNER: You have placed in front of you a request to table, so that will be one change, and that is for the subdivision item 18-41. Other than that, no, there are no other changes, sir.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, January 18, 2018 regular meeting minutes. Are there any changes or corrections needed to those minutes? I see none. Roll call.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thumbs up. Sorry. It's been a while. Thumbs up, everyone?
(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: It's all approved. Thank you.

IV. SUBDIVISIONS**Case # 18-41**

A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of Delta Tau Delta Association of Columbia, Missouri (owners), for approval of a replat of La Grange Place to be known as La Grange Place Plat 4, and a design adjustment to reduce the amount of right-of-way dedicated with the plat. The replat combines Lots 3 and 4 of La Grange Place into a single lot. The .58 acre site is zoned R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) and is located at 506 Rollins Street.

MR. STRODTMAN: At this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 18-41, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. I see none.

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report on this table to request [sic]?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. As you have indicated, this is the Delta Tau Delta house. It is proposed to be redeveloped and it currently is built over a property line, so the platting action is required. There is also, as the staff report that has been published indicated, there were two design adjustments that were originally asked for. At the time that we had prepared the staff report, there was a miscommunication between the applicant and staff in relationship to the design adjustment relating to some sanitary sewer -- sanitary sewer extension and it being removed from the request. We -- we were informed that they wanted to proceed forward with that design adjustment and, therefore, we informed that this particular report had been placed on the agenda and posted in this particular format with just one requested design adjustment and indicated that we could not talk about the other design adjustment without proper advertisement and posting. So, the request to table is to allow for the staff report to be revised. There will be a new staff report produced for the March 8th meeting, which addresses both design adjustments as initially requested by the applicant. So, we will have additional supplemental information that will be in the discussion section of the March 8th report. That is the purpose behind the request to table, and this is something to allow us then, as a staff, to be able to do the appropriate analysis of the design adjustment that we misunderstood was being requested to be removed. We would support the request to table.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Commissioners, any questions of staff?
Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: Real quick. As in past practices, it's not a public hearing --

MR. MACMANN: I apologize.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- but if there is anybody in the audience who would like to come forward and speak on this matter, please do so at this time. If not, Commissioners, any discussion or motions?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the case of 18-41, La Grange Place Plat 4 replat and design adjustment, I move to table.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, we have had a motion from Mr. MacMann to request to table this motion. We've had a proper second by Mr. Stanton. Is there any discussion needed on this motion?

MR. ZENNER: Can you specify the date to which the item is being tabled, please?

MR. MACMANN: I will. I believe staff said 8 March, and I will move 8 March, if Mr. Stanton will second that, also.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton, are you okay with that?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. Sounds good. So, the motion has been changed to a March 8th, that's the date that the table would be moved to. Any additional questions or discussion on that? If not, Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton,

Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns.

In the case of 18-41, La Grange Place Plat 4 replat and design adjustment, move to table to 8 March.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Harder, Loe, Russell, Stanton, Strodtman, Toohey and MacMann

Excused: 1 - Rushing

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**Case # 18-42**

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of J. Blaine and Ann A. Alberty (owners) to annex 10.0 acres of Boone County A-1 (Agricultural) zoned land into the City of Columbia and apply M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) as permanent zoning. The subject site is located at the southwest corner of Highway KK and Scott Boulevard, and addressed as 5800 Hwy KK.

MR. STRODTMAN: At this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 18-42, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us.

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of permanent zoning to City M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) upon annexation.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Commissioners, any questions for staff? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: You mentioned it's outside the USA and that connection would need to be given for sewer, but any comments on whether or not sewer capacity? I'm assuming the proposed use would be denser than what's currently there?

MR. SMITH: The potential for the use would be more dense than what's there currently. Right now, it's single-family home.

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: Capacity in this area is the reason why they would need to build a new main the approximately 3,000 to 4,000 foot distance to the northeast. They cannot connect into the main that's closest to this location given capacity issues right now.

MR. STRODTMAN: So just to expand on that question, so they would be crossing KK?

MR. SMITH: Basically, going along KK. They have to basically clear Wyndham Ridge Subdivision to get to the north of that to get to a point where there's currently capacity in the system.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Let me double up on that on the water question. Thornbrook, which is not very far away, has had water issues. Is our water fine here? That's -- there's a question?

MR. SMITH: Water was fine, yes. Consolidated Water serves this site, and they

had no capacity issues. In fact, had more than enough water, it seemed like, to serve the site given future potential.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions for Mr. Smith? I see none. I'll go ahead and open this as a public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll open it to anyone who would like to come forward. We would just ask that you give us your name and address before you start.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong in Columbia. First of all, I would like to start off, Mr. MacMann, to answer your question. Yes. I've understood that Thornbrook does have -- have had some water issues. Thornbrook is in the City of Columbia water territory. This area is in the Consolidated Water territory, and the actual -- the water tower that's in Thornbrook is actually -- does not serve Thornbrook. That serves the water district, and it does not serve Thornbrook. So we would -- this piece of property would be served off of that water tower, while Thornbrook does not. Again, Tim Crockett, I represent the contract purchaser. They are unable -- husband and wife, they are unable to be here tonight. Their young daughter had surgery today, so I told them it was more important for them to be there than here. Quick overview. I think Mr. -- Mr. Smith did a pretty good job. We're only asking for rezoning at this time, along with the annexation. We're requesting the M-N district. We are saying it's ten acres gross, but it's really actually -- actually, it's about nine and a half acres given some street easements on the property, directly across the street from Beulah Ralph and existing commercial is already out there. I want to talk about the proper location for this M-N zoning. It has nodal location, and when I say that, when you look in Columbia Imagined, they have this diagram in there that kind of talks about major intersections and how they're kind of scattered throughout as far as the node map goes. And so, you look at that and then you look at what we have here. This is a map showing the area, as well. The blue portions are existing nodal commercial that's out there already. The teal that's in the middle is a proposed -- proposed development. And you can kind of see that it kind of falls in line with what Columbia Imagined kind of laid out there for us. The yellow hatched area, if you will, yellow shaded area is the city limits. So while we are on the limits, we're on the southern side of Thornbrook, on the, you know, south side of the city limits there, you can see there's a substantial portion of city limits that lies further to the south, a little bit further to the east. Also I want to talk about -- it's at the intersection of a minor arterial and a major collector. That's mentioned as well as far as where do we M-N zonings. It's in conformance with the Columbia Comprehensive Plan. It's compatible with the adjacent

zoning and land uses. These are all items that were mentioned by staff in the staff report. It's consistent with the goals and objectives of Columbia Imagined, and it's consistent with the City of Columbia UDC. Not too often do we have a -- you know, am I going to stand here and look at the Columbia UDC, Columbia Imagined, and have something that fits it so perfect as this one here. Talk about a couple of the statements that are made in the UDC. The purpose of an M-N district, it's very clear, very specifically states, the purpose of M-N is -- is intended to provide commercial shopping and service facilities in or near a residential neighborhood -- exactly what we have here. The principal land use is a small shopping area with sales and services oriented to the needs of the local population. While Mr. Smith did a little aerial that like kind of showed a half-mile radius, and I appreciate that, all of Thornbrook would be served in this area, basically. There's no other nodal locations for a neighborhood market in this area. And so, when you take in Thornbrook, Steeplechase, Wyndham, several other surrounding communities or subdivisions, we're looking at about 1,400 or more residential lots. Columbia Imagined states citizens have expressed a strong desire for mixed-use development which allows for further integration of commercial and residential land uses beyond the central business district into both existing and new residential neighborhoods. And I kind of like that here because we have existing residential neighborhoods and we have areas which could be new residential neighborhoods, as well. The idea is reflected in many citizen comments using the words "livable" and "walkable." And of course then the new neighborhood commercial nodes or urban villages should ideally be spaced approximately one-half mile apart to provide walkable goods and services to surrounding residents. While we necessarily can't hit half-mile here, as Mr. Smith indicated, we're about two miles to the north and about a little over a mile to the south. We're not hitting that half-mile, all the more reason why I think this node is a -- is a prime location for this -- this type of development. And of course neighborhood scale commercial is walkable, and are located within a residential neighborhood, again, exactly what we have here. And I like this part, it can include a small market, daycare, or professional offices. Well, we have a daycare going in right across the street from us, so it kind of fits that bill. And the proposed developer, the buyer, is looking at some offices. That's really one of the things he's looking for in this location potentially, maybe a small marketplace, but some offices, maybe some livable units upstairs, and that kind of thing. So it fits that definition right on -- right on -- right on cue there. So we think that this -- that this proposal before you meets the UDC. It meets the Columbia Imagined, and really we ask for your support tonight, and would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Is there any questions for this

speaker?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Crockett, I just want to start out by saying I'm a big supporter of neighborhood nodes. I think they're wonderful ideas. A question that occurred to me, and this will also be asked simultaneously to staff. This is great, there's going to be a small market there, with the elementary school across the street. We're going to have a traffic issue. We addressed this twice at Council in the last three or four months.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Oh, my gosh. We need a safety crossing. Have we thought about this? I mean, whether Mr. Crockett's development goes forth or not, someone will do this?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, one item that we have to do, Mr. MacMann, when a -- when a development plan will come in, according to the UDC, if we hit certain levels, we have to provide a traffic study, and that traffic study is going to address not only vehicular, but also is going to be -- have addressed --

MR. MACMANN: Pedestrian?

MR. CROCKETT: -- pedestrian, as well. And so that will be something that we'll have to do when we have a final development plan. And so certainly we want to -- you know, we want to make sure that we have proper access to the school across the street and from -- to and from this development. So I think it will be addressed at a development plan stage.

MR. MACMANN: I have full faith that you will. I wanted to get it on the record --

MR. CROCKETT: Absolutely. I understand.

MR. MACMANN: -- so we are not readdressing this three years from now or four years or now.

MR. CROCKETT: Correct. Understand. Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? I see none. Thank you,
Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional speakers like to come forward this evening. I see none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, discussion? Questions? Before anybody

makes a motion, I have a question of staff. Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STRODTMAN: Since this is outside of the urban boundary zone, who services -
- is this going to be Boone County Fire District?

MR. SMITH: The Boone County Fire Station No. 14 is the closest, so it would be the first responder, but generally it will be a joint agreement for servicing the property.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay.

MR. SMITH: This is usually how it works when Boone County has a closer station.

MR. STRODTMAN: Just curious. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If I might, I'd like to follow up on that. We've covered water, sewer, fire, and traffic, and storm water and electrical, I'm sorry, I'm kind of kind of going -- you know, going backwards to come forwards. Which electrical service will provide power to this area?

MR. SMITH: This is Boone Electric.

MR. MACMANN: This is Boone. And the storm water, it doesn't appear that's going to be a serious issue there, but our storm water, Beulah Ralph is fully integrated into our system there. This is the Hinkson flow, is that where this goes, or County House or where does this -- do we know?

MR. ZENNER: It may be Mill Creek.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. Sorry drainage area, that's where I was going there.

MR. SMITH: Mill Creek, yes.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: But it will be subject to our storm-water requirements when developed.

MR. MACMANN: Right. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton? You still had your hand up?

MR. STANTON: I did. As it relates to Case 18-42, I move to approve the zoning of M-N, also allows for full range of residential uses if commercial demand is not realized. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm off completely. I move to approve permanent zoning to City M-N, Mixed-Use Neighborhood, upon annexation.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Do we have a second?

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. We have a motion on Case 18-42 by Mr. Stanton, which received its second by Ms. Russell. Do we have any discussion on this motion? If not, I'll take a roll call, please, Ms. Secretary.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr.

Stanton,

Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr.

MacMann. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am. Our recommendation will be forwarded -- our recommendation for approval of permanent zoning M-N will be forwarded to City Council.

Move to approve permanent zoning to City M-N, Mixed-Use Neighborhood, upon annexation.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Harder, Loe, Russell, Stanton, Strodtman, Toohey and MacMann

Excused: 1 - Rushing

Case # 18-43

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants, LLC (agent) on behalf of Build Taco, LLC (contract purchaser) for approval of a major amendment to the C-P Plan for Crosscreek Center, Lot 105. The subject property is 1.25 acres and is located east of S. Highway 63, north of the terminus of Stadium Blvd., and west of Cinnamon Hill Ln./Maguire Blvd.

MR. STRODTMAN: At this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to this case, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us.

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Rachel Bacon of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the major amendment to C-P plan for Crosscreek Center, Lot 105.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Bacon, for that thorough presentation. Commissioners, any questions for staff? I see none.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone would like to come forward.

MR. STATES: Commissioners, good evening. Thank you for allowing us to come. My name is John States; I'm one of the members of Build Taco, and I'll get to that in just a minute. But I'm also one of the original developers of this property and -- and Rachel is correct, I did have a lot of mediation with the neighbors. And it's been a successful process, I feel, through the whole process of the development that's happened. I've had numerous meetings with all the neighbors on every building that we've built out there. We actually own the FFO facility. We built the Taco Bell. We built the Break Time. And in all those -- all of those buildings that we built, as Little Dixie, we had numerous meetings

with the neighbors and -- and it worked out very well. On this particular project, we contacted the neighbors early, just like we told we would do seven years ago or whenever that was. Shepard has recently came back and met with me. She did come over to the office, look at it. She sent me an e-mail, which I've given copies of. She said I wouldn't hear anything else. So you had mentioned that it was her opinion, but she told me I would not be hearing anything else from them because we were building what they wanted, an office structure with mixed use with a retail below. The Timberhill area, they did come. We met, we showed them the plans, and they immediately approved it and like our look. I do have a handout I'll give so you can see what -- so I included the architect's rendering of -- of the structure that we're going to be building. Just so you know, it's going to house my office, as well as Cameron Dunafon's office, so Build Taco Cameron is the Taco Bell entrepreneur, we're the builder. The lawyers came up with Build Taco, we didn't, so that's how that all came about. We first started getting calls asking if we're going to build another Mexican restaurant next to Taco Bell, and so, we -- we nixed that real quick. So rest assured we're not going to have that. But, anyways, we will have two offices upstairs and then the main level will be retail or, you know, we've already started getting a lot of calls regarding more office space on the lower level. We've worked with Rost Landscaping to design the new landscaping requirements that meet the UDC code, as well as the original code -- well, it's a very extensive landscape plan that we had to do originally with the neighborhood agreement, and it's -- it meets above and beyond all that. We're here if you have any questions tonight, and we appreciate it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. States. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, sir. Any additional speakers like to come forward this evening? I see none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, questions? Discussion needed? Comments?
Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to go ahead and make a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: We'd love to have that motion.

MS. RUSSELL: In regards to Case 18-43, I move to approve the major amendment for the C-P Plan for Crosscreek Center, Lot 105.

MR. TOOHEY: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Russell, for the motion for approval, and I have a second from Mr. Toohey. Is there any discussion needed on the motion? I see none.

Ms. Secretary, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr.

Stanton,

Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr.

MacMann. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am. Our recommendation for approval of this major amendment to the C-P Plan for Crosscreek Center will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

In regards to Case 18-43, move to approve the major amendment for the C-P Plan for Crosscreek Center, Lot 105.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Harder, Loe, Russell, Stanton, Strodtman, Toohey and MacMann

Excused: 1 - Rushing

VI. COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

MR. STRODTMAN: Would anybody like -- from the public like to come forward and speak?

VII. COMMENTS OF THE STAFF

MR. ZENNER: All right. I need to give you all a month in between meetings. We seem to finish things up faster. Your next meeting will be March 8. Unfortunately, you don't get another reprieve. We do have items on that agenda that will need to be covered. They consist of a single subdivision plat, another annexation request, and a neighborhood association down-zoning request on the west side of town. And as discussed this evening during our work session, we will be adding a public comment session with a potential Planning Commission vote on a text change to the Unified Development Code for this particular agenda on March 8. To go over the items that we have, though, it's not deja vu. There are two different maps here for two different cases. One is a final plat on property at the end of Strawn Road, which the City acquired recently through donation. And then the corresponding very similar map is for the permanent zoning and annexation of the same property. This is a parcel that is being sought to be annexed into the City as R-1 zoned land, which is consistent with the current County R-S. We have held a series of public information meetings on this since this application was received about a month and a half ago in order to address Council-related desire to have public engagement prior to the item coming to them for consideration of annexation to try to identify potential future land uses for this space. So our staff report will have some information in it that you often do not see for annexation requests, and it will be a summary of that public

engagement. And what we will ask the Commission to consider at our next meeting when this is discussed publicly as a permanent zoning request, we may have residents of the community coming and expressing their desire for future land uses that may be able to be accommodated on this property in the future. We, however, have had the application submitted on behalf of the City with the request to currently just zone it to the comparable zoning classification of the county, but as we do not have any final decisions yet made about how this property may be utilized by the City over time. So part of the staff report, again, as I said, will include what the public has expressed as future desires and then you may get that at our Planning Commission meeting, which will be an odd experience as it relates to normally annexation requests and normally only the applicant shows up about what to do with the property. The plat is being presented for the purposes of being able to create two lots and the future road right-of-way, so that plat will identify that as the actions being sought on the final plat for this property. Again, this is property that was donated, roughly 47 acres of land, that has a future development potential for something other than R-1 uses, which would require additional rezoning actions and public hearings at both Commission as well as at the Council level. And then our other main event item is a down-zoning request being presented to us by the West Ash Neighborhood Association, as well as other individual property owners. This is consistent with the down-zoning policies that the City has and that are incorporated in Columbia Imagined. There are 38 total properties shown on this map, and Mr. Smith will present this. We have public advertising out. The requested zoning changes are generally going from our R-MF zoning district, multi-family, to R-1 and R-2, and I believe there are one maybe minor exception there. So this is the second major down-zoning effort that we have had within roughly a year and a half. Our original one was in Benton-Stephens, and it had 35 parcels. So those are the items that will be coming up on your agenda, and the one that we do not have is, of course, the text change that we discussed this evening. Should you decide to vote on it after public comment relating to our FPO overlay corrective language that we have been working on. As I had mentioned in work sessions this evening, we will have a work session item, in addition to having Ms. Loe provide a presentation on the Smart Roof Conference from San Francisco, we will also need to be discussing the potential appointment of a Planning Commission member to the Fair Housing Task Force. This was an item that was discussed at Monday night's Council meeting, and there will be -- there is an expectation of participation by Commissioners from different boards and commissions, yours being one of them, with a deliverable being brought back to City Council in anticipation of helping to provide advice as to how to address fair housing related matters within the next consolidated plan, which

is something that is produced out of our community development block grant component of community development run by Randy Cole out of the first floor of the parking structure on Walnut. I will provide information with the Planning Commission packet as it relates to the staff report, the resolution that was approved by Council, so you have that in context. And if you have desire to participate, come prepared to maybe offer your services for a short stint with this task force to allow them to develop that plan. We do need at least one Commissioner, though. That is -- that is mandated by the Council direction that was approved on Monday of this week. That was the item I wanted to discuss with you before we had a break from work session before tonight's meeting. With that, that is all I have, and we look forward to seeing you in a couple of weeks.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

VIII. COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: A real quick one. I just wanted to let everyone know that I have interest on that -- to serve on that commission.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: And Mr. Stanton has something for us, I believe.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I have interest in that commission as well.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton. Any additional comments from Commissioners?

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE - March 8, 2018 @ 7 pm (tentative)

X. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STRODTMAN: If not, I would take a motion for adjournment.

MS. BURNS: I move to adjourn.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: And thank you, Ms. Russell. We are adjourned. Have a nice evening.

(Off the record)

(The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.)

Move to adjourn