

Montpelier Planning Commission
May 12, 2008
City Council Chambers

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Mark Kaufman, Chair; Claire Benedict, Anne Campbell, Alan Goldman, Matthew DeLorey, and Karen Vogan.
Youth Members Lucia Bragg and Ariana Lewis.
Staff: Gwen Hallsmith, Planning & Community Development Director.

Call to Order:

Mark Kaufman, Chair, called the meeting of the Montpelier Planning Commission to order at 7:06 p.m. Gwen Hallsmith said the Planning Commission needs to provide Lucia and Ariana with a mentor to help them understand things. Anne Campbell has agreed to be Lucia's mentor. Alan Goldman volunteered to serve as Ariana's mentor.

Review of Minutes:

The minutes of April 14th were moved as submitted by Mr. Goldman and seconded by Ms. Campbell. The minutes of the April 14, 2008 Planning Commission were approved unanimously.

Comments from the Chair:

Mr. Kaufman said under Other Business he wanted to talk about the coverage of our stakeholder meetings and e-mail updates in general. .

Presentation from Vermont Sustainable Heating Initiative (VHSA)

About Grass Pellet Systems:

Ms. Bragg said the Vermont Sustainable Heating Initiative is a student led initiative with two high school teachers involved. For three months they have been researching ways of reaching their goal, which is to get bio-mass pellets and make a switch from oil as our heating fuel in Vermont. They have been looking at both wood and grass pellets, but they believe it would be better to use grass pellets.

Grass pellets are very renewable and made with prairie grasses. They are perennials and grow back every year and don't require much fertilizer. They would use marginal land which is not being currently used. They would form farmers' co-ops.

The three focuses of the proposal are the producer and consumer. The producer would be the farmer's co-op. The farmers would be using their marginal land to grow grasses. It will also provide farmers a supplemental income. From the consumer standpoint they would first focus on LIHEAP recipients because they are the ones who are going to really feel the rising oil prices so they would like to have a cheap fuel that is environmentally healthy for them first. That is the main focus from the consumer side.

Also on the consumer side to reach the more middle and upper income groups they are thinking about starting a farmer's market and seeing what kind of demand and interest they have in making the switch. This proposal has recently been accepted by the Bristol Planning Commission and they are going to start as the pilot project for what they hope to be an example for the rest of the state.

They are trying to survey a five town area. Bristol is the first town, and now they would like to see Montpelier involved.

Ms. Campbell said she assumed the prairie grasses would be grown by local farmers. Can they grow prairie grass, or just a whole variety of grasses?

Ms. Bragg said they have researched that and there is 100,000 acres of marginal land in Vermont. If they were to ultimately reach their goal they have done calculations and to change our oil habit and go to just pellets they would need 120,000 acres. For now they do have the resources for this project.

Mr. Goldman asked how they defined marginal land.

Ms. Bragg replied it is what farmers not using.

Mr. Goldman said there is a defined soils map that defines a lot our soils. Would these be the non-prime soils?

Ms. Bragg replied yes. It would be something you couldn't grow other crops like corn on.

Mr. Goldman said he has a lot of granite and rocks in his pastures that he can't plant corn or anything else. He thinks the project is fantastic. How do you harvest the grass?

Ms. Bragg said it is similar to harvesting hay, but the process is less intensive. Shelburne Farms said it is like harvesting bag hay because you don't have to take care of it. any nutrients that leak from the soil upon harvesting, you lay the grass back on the grounds so the nutrients then leech back into the soil. It makes the pellets easier for burning with less nutrients in the grass.

Mr. Kaufman asked if there was a possibility for farmers in less desirable economic straits deciding this is a cash crop opportunity and changing tillable land into silage land.

Ms. Bragg said that was a possibility.

Mr. DeLorey said we also have a huge energy demand.

Mr. Goldman asked if there were going to be programs to help LIHEAP buy the pellet stoves. He would love to try this but doesn't have the equipment.

Ms. Bragg said that depends on the LIHEAP recipient. LIHEAP has an emergency stove replacement system. If their oil stove breaks down they are provided with a replacement stove because it is considered an emergency. Instead of giving them a brand new oil furnace they would replace it with a pellet stove and make sure there are volunteers available to help them in getting used to maintaining the stove, and every now and then bringing in a bag of pellets. She doesn't believe there would be any sort of subsidy or help in purchasing a pellet stove for a middle class homeowner. They are fairly inexpensive.

Ms. Hallsmith said she converted from an oil stove to a pellet stove this winter. They aren't real expensive and the pellets are substantially less expensive than oil over time so the payback on the investment that a homeowner would make is relatively short, and will get shorter as oil prices continue to climb. If she understands Lucia correctly, they are doing a pilot study with a number of different components. One is they are looking to learn who in the city of Montpelier, if we agreed to be one of the five towns, would be interested in converted to pellets. Another is that they are researching the places that pellets can be grown. They are also researching some of the ways that low income homeowners can benefit from the technology and from a renewable and less expensive energy resource

than oil burners. Lucia would be looking to the Planning Commission to endorse the project and to say we would like Montpelier to be one of their five towns. There is going to be more details about this at the Energy Town Meeting that is being held on May 29th where there will be a presentation. She asked Lucia if they were looking for Montpelier to be one of their test towns. Ms. Bragg said definitely.

Ms. Hallsmith said that would mean they would work with Lucia and the Vermont Sustainable Heating Initiative to do some of the research and provide a clearing house for this kind of information in the community. The Energy Team is very interested in this initiative and is going to be looking to help homeowners all over the city convert to pellets before winter.

Mr. Goldman moved that the Planning Commission endorse the project of VHSI, and Ms. Benedict seconded the motion.

Ms. Campbell said if Montpelier were to agree to become one of the pilot towns we would be essentially researching what it would take to get up and running. What would she see as some of the second and third steps?

Ms. Bragg passed out the outline for the Bristol project for Commission members to review. Montpelier joining in the pilot project would be as close to exactly the same thing as Bristol's. They could hold town presentations for the public. At the Farmer's Market there could be a sign-up sheet or survey to gauge the interest.

Ms. Hallsmith said the interesting thing about pellets is that they can actually replace oil in your home in much the same way you use oil because you can develop a hopper system where it feeds into a replacement burner that is a pellet burner which can be put into the oil furnace.

Mr. Kaufman said there was a motion on the table to endorse having Montpelier being one of the survey and study communities. The motion was passed unanimously 6-0. The only missing member is David Borgendale.

State House Lighting:

Jon Anderson requested time on the agenda to discuss an initiative he has undertaken to turn out the lights at the State House to conserve energy. He has raised a question. What time would folks in Montpelier like the State House lights that are on for aesthetic reasons only to be turned off? Aren't we wasting electricity by having them turned on? The Commissioner of State Buildings did some research, and there are two different types of lighting at the State House. One is for security purposes, which would remain on, and the other is for aesthetic purposes. Until 9-11 the aesthetic lights on the dome at the State House were turned out at midnight. There was a feeling we needed to feel better, so the lights started being left on all night. That was when oil was \$20 or \$22 a barrel. Really, there is no need for them to be left on all night and Buildings and Grounds would just as soon cut them off as they think the City of Montpelier will allow them to take them off.

If they start turning them off at 9:00 P.M., the annual savings are \$990 a year; at 10:00 P.M. the savings is \$880; at 11:00 P.M., the savings is \$770; and at midnight the savings would be \$660. This is what he thinks of as the last stop to making a request that the lights be turned off and Buildings is waiting for a phone call.

He has met with the MDCA Board and sent letters to the editor. The MDCA is polling merchants, and the consensus of MDCA is that 10:00 P.M. is the right time to turn off the lights.

In the scheme of the state budget \$1,000 is not huge, but it is a highly visible way to remind people that we should be trying to conserve as much energy as we can. Secondly, he thinks the light in the night sky is not a good thing; it is unnecessary light. Thirdly, there have been enormous technology changes that enable us to cut down the amount we are spending on lighting and cut down on energy. By doing this and having it visible will hopefully encourage people to make other decisions all around Vermont as well.

Mr. Kaufman said he was in favor of something like this. Would holidays be exempted?

Mr. Anderson said State Buildings would prefer to have one night where the lights would be put on a timer and they don't want to pay somebody overtime to come in to adjust.

Mr. Kaufman said he could see something like this lending itself very easily to a PR campaign.

Mr. Anderson said he at various times has suggested to State Buildings they want to make a show of going through all of the state buildings and looking for ways to save energy dollars.

Ms. Campbell said her concern is that this be part of a truly authentic effort on the part of state government to conserve energy all around, that it is going through each building and turning off lights and making sure every socket is outfitted with energy efficient bulbs. She would be reluctant to get behind a window dressing.

Mr. Anderson said he agrees. There has been such an extraordinary change in energy pricing and a recognition of global warming.

Ms. Benedict said she felt 10:00 P.M. is early. She would tend to go with 12:00 A.M. She appreciates the sentiment behind it, but feels the State House is one of our architectural gems and the gateway to the city. It is beautiful lit up at night. We have such a sleepy little town and to shut it all down at 10:00 P.M. seems sad.

Mr. Anderson said his observation is that many merchants feel the same way she does. Some of the neighbors said to turn them off at 9:00 P.M. He said part of his income is based on tourists.

Ms. Benedict said 10:00 P.M. seems early. She thinks 12:00 A.M. would accomplish the goals of setting an example and saving energy without shutting down too early.

Mr. Goldman suggested that perhaps it could be a seasonal change.

Mr. Anderson asked Buildings if they could leave the lights on when the Legislature is in session and they really want to have the lights on a timer and turn them off. The portico lighting will be on as a security feature. That's the front porch area.

Ms. Lewis said when people get out of the movies they go to the State House lawn in the summer. In the winter months not many people are out.

Mr. Kaufman asked if the Planning Commission was looking at recommending a split.

Ms. Hallsmith suggested perhaps they could try it one evening so people could see how many lights are still on. What she is hearing peoples' fears about is the place will seem really dark, and yet it may not depending on what lights are left on.

Ms. Campbell said she is hearing that Buildings is very much opposed to anything other than one set time. They would be more in support it being midnight year round rather than. Mr. Anderson said they are concerned with the overtime to pay somebody to interrupt the lighting.

Mr. Anderson asked if he understood the recommendation of the Planning Commission would be midnight during daylight savings time and 10:00 P.M. during the regular time. Daylight savings time is the first weekend of April until the last week in October.

Ms. Campbell said she would support that until there is a really concerted effort that it is more than just symbolic.

Ms. Benedict moved the lights on the State House be turned out at midnight year round, with Ms. Campbell seconding the motion. The motion recommended to Mr. Anderson that the State House lights be extinguished at midnight year round. The vote was unanimous 6-0, with 1 absent.

Permaculture and City Planning:

Matthew DeLorey requested time to discuss how we might apply permaculture principles to city planning. Permaculture isn't exactly social ecology. It was practiced at the Institute for Social Ecology by himself and a number of others.

Ms. Campbell said her limited understanding of permaculture is the use of plants and other resources in cooperation with the environment and the land on which it is based toward sustainable practices that might involve the use of retention ponds with plant species that would help absorb the runoff.

Mr. DeLorey said it is regenerative sustainable closed loop systems and natural resources. The key ingredients are humans. It is really very important when you are discussing permaculture to have a clear understanding of what it is, otherwise you are advocating for something that doesn't exist.

Ms. Benedict asked if he could give an example.

The telatvia ponds. The tubs were small about 6 feet deep filled with water coming from the grey water system that was coming from the bathhouse. There were many residents in the summer and they needed to treat that volume of water, and rather than run the whole thing through the septic system they just oxygenated the area of the water to allow the fish to live.

The Institute for Social Ecology wanted to involve themselves with the land. They wanted to shower themselves, clean their water. Their water left the house, was treated by plants and animals, and they were able to harvest the plants and animals, and harvest the water in the end. It was a stacked function.

Ms. Campbell inquired what animals.

Mr. DeLorey said fish. Mr. Goldman said the Chinese have been doing it with ducks and carp. They take more protein out of their fish ponds than we take out of the ocean.

Mr. DeLorey said to extract from a pond you would be extracting some really viable nutrients and minerals far surpassing any of the compost you can make here on the land. There are two main precepts here with permaculture. One is that there are 12 principles. You can see those principles on the web site... David Holmgren in his book really put those 12 perspectives in a very natural and accessible way. It is backed by three ethics: Care for the earth first and foremost; care for its

inhabitants both humans and animals; and returning the surplus. You really want to be able to return the excess because if you don't there is no abundance.

One thing that he gets engaged with people he works with in permaculture is ask them to do an analysis of themselves or the organization they are a part of. He asked Planning Commission members to write down two pressing needs for the city and two abundant yields of the city. By doing this they will be able to analyze and assess the needs and yields of a good number of people. You can really start demonstrating ecological situations. You can retrofit that current situation, and if there is a problem there is a solution within the problem. If we can identify what our needs and yields are we can meet those needs. Maybe it is just as simple as addressing our needs versus Olympia addressing their needs. How is the connectivity happening? With all of these interdependent needs and yields, when they come together as a network is kind of like what the Onion River Exchange is doing and you bring these needs and yields to the table and the city grows sustainably.

Ms. Campbell asked if he was talking about needs across the board, such as transport.

Mr. DeLorey said yes.

Ms. Hallsmith said that is exactly the process they have been following with enVision Montpelier, which is the human needs framework, and looking at all of the needs and how we meet those needs and what some of the impacts are.

Mr. DeLorey said those are two amazing needs and yields. 97 percent of our food is coming from outside of our state. That is including all of the CSAs and organic farms. We consider ourselves a pretty conscious state. That's ridiculous. That's not sustainable, certainly not abundant. A demonstration of abundant city living is something he really wants to invigorate here in our city planning, conservation and district energy needs. The race vs. Olympia is a great opportunity for us to exemplify what retrofits we can do. In Portland, Oregon they have natural building convergence each and every year where they take over a block. Similarly, we are identifying we need to identify our neighborhoods with place names, and those place names are often in accord with the natural surroundings like the meadows. Imagine if we had demonstration sites in each neighborhood giving an example of how that neighborhood is ecologically, what is its niches, what are its resources. The Meadows has very different resources than the top of the hill or downtown. Sabin's Pasture is different, and how are we going to demonstrate positive regenerative design?

Neighborhood by neighborhood demonstrations would be a great start. You can understand how our culture really desperately needs a framework that can place these things. With regards to transport what we yield presently is our bio-diesel buses. What we yield presently is our exuberance for bicycles and pedestrian traffic.

Ms. Hallsmith said the only slight difference than the enVision Montpelier framework is that instead of yields we have been describing them as assets. The assets are all of those systems and programs in place that meet our needs where the yields are a little different. They are what we can produce ourselves. We have been looking comprehensively at how we meet all our needs in all of the different community systems. There is the social and human system, governance system, economic system, the build and natural environment, what our assets are, and also how to regenerate the capital we need in all of those areas.

Mr. DeLorey said enVision Montpelier is our number one positive yield. It is restoring and renewing interest in our home and calling for engagement. It's calling for neighborhood engagement, individual,

state, federal, local and private engagement. Permaculture is not just about farming on five acres in Marshfield but about your lifestyle. How can you recreate your lifestyle?

Mr. Kaufman said he would like to learn more. He asked Mr. DeLorey to draft a zero cost demonstration project to be done on the smallest possible scale and see where it could go. Mr. DeLorey said he could do that. He said the Winooski Valley Permaculture Group has been meeting and doing permaculture blitzes on a private level and are looking for a public level. The Vermont Grassroots Network award grants to environmental activists looking to work with the earth. We need to be doing this work in public places. He encouraged his Winooski Valley people to look to Montpelier as a place to do it because we are in a race against Olympia. We can look to the fall, which is the next grant cycle.

Update on Growth Center Project:

Ms. Hallsmith presented Commission Members revised population and growth projections that were produced for the city by the Regional Planning Commission. There is another meeting to think about drawing some of the lines on the map. The basic exercise is to look at how much growth we anticipate over the next 20 years and to figure out where in the city that growth will need to go. If we just took a linear projection of what had been happening in Montpelier we would be going down instead of going up, so we need to make a logical case for why we would be growing given that is not what has been happening. Because of the development that is on the books, the other trends out there like increasing oil prices that are going to make in-city locations much more appealing for people, changing demographics where people are aging, all of those things pulled together means that it is not outrageous for us to project 1,000 new units being needed before the year 2030. That's 1,000 new housing units. That doesn't mean 1,000 new single family homes, but 1,000 units. Then, you need to look at where development can happen in Montpelier, where the sewer systems and the water systems, where there is land available, the zoning and plug in housing units using that formula.

There are some constraints we need to consider like it is hard to get water service up above 950 feet in elevation because of where our reservoirs are and the way the water system works. There are zoning constraints. There is a lot of town zoned MDR but big chunks of town that are zoned LDR which are not necessarily appropriate for growth center designation. Next week the staff is going to be looking at the 950 foot limit and the MDR districts and try to figure out if those two constraints could form a shape of a place that 1,055 units could go in between now and 2030.

Ms. Benedict asked if the city was constrained by the state's timeline.

Ms. Hallsmith said they were constrained by the grant's timeline to hire the consultants to do the studies and prepare the growth center application. This needs to be done by fall. There are a few things that influence the timing. One is that it is fundamentally a political decision on the part of the city. The City Council will have to vote to designate a growth center. Prior to that vote, perhaps even at an upcoming Planning Commission meeting they would make a recommendation to the City Council on that designation.

Ms. Benedict inquired if that would be when they would hear negative comments from the public.

Ms. Hallsmith replied yes. There are plenty of possibilities for public comment on this. We would hold a public hearing prior to submitting our recommendation to the Council. The arguments in favor of the growth center designation are that we do have surplus infrastructure and school capacity in the city, which is unusual. Usually, if you are going to add units you also need to add water, sewer, roads and schools, but in fact we are not in the position. We can add those units within the existing infrastructure that we have, so that is an argument in favor of it. Another argument is that by encouraging growth in

compact areas like Montpelier so we absorb some of the growth that might be sprawling out into the suburbs. Obviously, in this day and date contributing more CO2 to the atmosphere as people commute into the job centers if we have growth in Montpelier people can walk to work and walk to the stores. If we have growth out in East Montpelier and Calais they have to drive to get anything they need, and that is going to be more and more of a problem for people. Also prime agricultural land is being exhausted because of all of the development on it.

In addition, having growth center designation allows the city to use tax increment financing to build more supportive infrastructure, which means we can build infrastructure without it being a tax burden for the city. It means we can invest in new roads in an area where we would like to have development and the state pays for it.

The down side is people don't like change, and every development that is proposed in the city is in somebody's backyard. People like to have open space and have things be pretty much as they have always been so there is a reaction against new development just about anywhere it is proposed. If people were talking about converting Hubbard Park to housing development, she wouldn't like it either. People have questions about growth in general. A lot of people in the city, and quite legitimately so, question a world where growth has been the dominant paradigm, where growth for growth's sake is the way our economy has been working and the way our cities and towns have been working. However, right now she believes growth makes sense here in Montpelier because we do have the infrastructure, close to central services, and are able to absorb some of the people who are going to want to move in closer to things they need as oil gets more and expensive and it gets more difficult to live farther out.

Mr. Goldman said on a responsibility level Montpelier keeps creating new jobs so we are pushing the ground, but it is just happening outside the city. The Master Plan speaks to 3,500 jobs. How many do we have now – 12,000 or 13,000? We have had that much job growth and the population has been declining. By receiving these grants to do these kinds of improvements we help steer the development and where it goes.

Ms. Hallsmith said it gives the city more tools to work with to make the development we have here more in keeping with what everybody here wants.

Mr. Goldman said he thinks it is fantastic. He has been speaking about this for 20 years as he has watched the fields around Montpelier get chopped up.

Ms. Benedict said there was something proposed in the Legislature that was going to change the growth center designation status. What is the status of that?

Ms. Hallsmith said the housing bill passed. That lifts some of the Act 250 regulatory process for developments that are in a designated growth center which will actually provide incentives to develop in the city whereas now there are a lot of disincentives. It is much more difficult to in-fill development from a financial point of view than it is to do green fill development. We need to figure out ways to make it affordable to develop inside the city limits and reduce the regulatory burdens. A lot of the Act 250 criteria speak to things we have already solved in Montpelier. How we treat our waste water and how we get our water supply is already built into the city.

Ms. Benedict asked what the Planning Commission needs to do to sell this to people.

Ms. Hallsmith said when we get closer to the moment that we need to make a decision as a city, which is when the City Council will vote on it, we should do some neighborhood meetings. She hasn't heard a lot of opposition to this.

Mr. Goldberg said he thinks outlining what Gwen just described would be good listing the positive things and what are the social responsibilities and how to affect real change. What Gwen has been briefing us on needs to be in the newspaper?

Ms. Benedict asked if there environmental groups they should be talking to now so they are on board to help promote this.

Ms. Hallsmith said they need to do more outreach. Maybe they should go to the MDCA and some of the groups they have been visiting with enVision Montpelier. She said heard a comment about why would we want to grow at one meeting.

Ms. Campbell said in the past there has been an overwhelming sentiment to keep Montpelier small. She looks at the population projections and she doesn't see a huge difference.

Ms. Hallsmith said the population projection isn't to grow the city or double its size at all. It is actually bringing it back to a size it was somewhere in the 1960's. In Burlington with the Legacy Project they really bit off a lot. They wanted to double their size by the year 2020, and that was just abhorrent to people. It didn't come from people in the community. Here if we are just talking about making more family housing and bringing in more people to help pay the taxes and water and sewer bills that there aren't too many people who will object to that.

Mr. Kaufman said he thinks once the map is drawn is when the highly vocal minority will come out. He likes the idea of a one-page leaflet that can be distributed freely. He doesn't think they should have to sell anything other than information.

Ms. Hallsmith said the growth center designation is the additional benefit that would give the city the possibility of doing some of the things we need like improving the infrastructure in the downtown. It is still the city's choice. She is just trying to make it possible for that choice.

Draft Vision Statement & Economic Goals:

Ms. Hallsmith distributed copies of the Draft Vision/Values Statement and Goals for enVision Montpelier to Planning Commission Members for review. From this they will be developing benchmarks along the way to meeting the goals. In Economics and Livelihood today they were speaking about regional cooperation as a way to create an economic center for Central Vermont that includes Montpelier, Barre, Berlin and other neighboring communities. One of the benchmarks for that initiative might be to convene a tri-city council of governments where the select boards and city councils from the three communities meet regularly together to talk about shared infrastructure, shared services and mutual aid and district energy. The number of meetings or degree of cooperation that you could measure in that type of structure would be the benchmark. The vision is supposed to be more inspirational, short, and really capture the core values of the people in the city.

Mr. Kaufman said he likes it and it sounds familiar to him. In 1967, when his family moved to Colorado, this was very similar to what Royal Construction Builders had for their planned community.

Capital City Challenge:

Ms. Hallsmith said she has had several meetings and correspondence with potential sponsors of the Capital City Challenge. She is trying to sign up sponsors that would help us. She has met with Google in California because they are spending billions of dollars on renewable energy and they also spend lots of money on carbon offsets. She is hoping they can get them involved in investing in the community in a number of different ways. There is the possibility of them helping the city invest in renewable energy or smart grid technology, which is essentially turning your home into a smart electricity user so you can monitor the energy you use in every plug and outlet in your house. The way the smart grid technology works is turning your electric wires into broadband.

She has also been talking with Bosh, which is a big appliance maker that has developed a smart refrigerator so your refrigerator could actually talk to the grid and know when peak power is being used and go to low power. It's the peaking power that costs the most money in the electric system.

Other Business:

The Planning Commission has agreed to meet once a month during the enVision Montpelier process. The next meeting will be June 9th.

It had been decided that serving on the Steering Committee would be a rotating process. He thinks the idea of a rotating representation on the Steering Committee is good and he would like to set it up for the next few meetings. Lucia Bragg and Alan Goldman volunteered to serve. There should be representatives from the Planning Commission at each of the stakeholder meetings.

Ms. Campbell said it was her understanding that the reason they were going to have only one Planning Commission meeting per month during the enVision Montpelier process was so they could free the Planning Commission members up to attend enVision Montpelier the other night of the month.

Ms. Hallsmith said Mayor Hooper had asked that Mr. Kaufman and David Borgendale, as the Regional Planning representative, to come to the next City Council meeting on May 28th to talk about parking and transit. The City Council did make a commitment to using the results of the stakeholder meeting and surveys to set some priorities for the year. Since they all voted on abandoning a parking garage and focusing on in-city transit and satellite parking they are going to want to make that one of their priorities. In the interim they have had the good fortune to have a very good intern who wants to do a study on what local transit options might be. He is going to be a graduate student at the University of Pennsylvania studying transportation planning. He will be working this summer to examine the various types of local transit that are available around the country and try to put some pieces together that might work here in Montpelier. It should yield some really information for the city to consider.

Adjournment:

Upon motion to adjourn by Ms. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Goldman, the Planning Commission adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Gwendolyn Hallsmith, Director
Planning and Community Development