PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
APRIL 28, 2014

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT	ABSENT
Ms. Wendy Geckeler	
Ms. Merrell Hansen	
Ms. Laura Lueking	
Ms. Debbie Midgley	
Ms. Amy Nolan	
Mr. Stanley Proctor	
Mr. Robert Puyear	
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg	
Chair Michael Watson	

Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner
Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner
Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Watson acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison; Councilmember Elliot Grissom, Ward II; Councilmember Connie Fults, Ward IV; and Councilmember Bruce DeGroot, Ward IV.

Chair Watson then announced that Hutkin Development Company, on behalf of Clarkson Wilson Investors, has withdrawn its petition for an amendment to the City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2547 to remove the restriction prohibiting amplified or live music outside of enclosed structures at Clarkson Wilson Centre. City Attorney Heggie clarified that petition number P.Z. 07-2014 Clarkson Wilson Centre has been *withdrawn* – the Public Hearing will not be moved to a new date. If the petition is refiled, residents will be notified again per public hearing notification requirements.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – Commissioner Wuennenberg read the "Opening Comments" for the Public Hearings.

A. P.Z. 04-2014 Chesterfield Blue Valley (Simon Woodmont Development, LLC/Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC): A request for an amendment to Ordinance 2612 to modify development criteria for 137.6 acres zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the north side of Olive Street Road, west of its intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road (17W630058, 16W220010, 16W210044, 17W530190, 17W540111).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Project Planner Purvi Patel gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area noting that all State and City Public Hearing notification requirements were met

Comprehensive Land Use Map:

- The Comprehensive Land Use Map delineates the subject site within the *Mixed Use* Land Use designation, which is defined as a *mixture of office, office/warehouse distribution and retail development*.

Site History:

- The original 55.8 acres was zoned "PC" Planned Commercial in 2006 via City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2236.
- A second, adjoining tract, consisting of 75.063 acres, was zoned "PC" Planned Commercial via City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2425 in January, 2008.
- These two original subject tracts were consolidated under one governing ordinance via City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2443 in February, 2008.
- In 2010, an additional 6 acres (known as the *Brasher Property*) were added to the Planned Commercial District under the current governing ordinance, Ordinance 2612.

Request:

- The specific request is for a text amendment to Section 1.C.2(e) of the City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2612 to remove the requirement for a 10-foot parking setback from internal lot lines.
- The approval of this Ordinance Amendment would not approve any changes to the required parking or allow additional square footage.
- There is an additional 10-foot parking setback requirement from the principal internal streets that will remain on the site.

Preliminary Plan:

- The Preliminary Plan of the development shows the existing mall on Lot 2 and the proposed structures on the vacant parcels of Chesterfield Blue Valley.

Items under Review by Staff:

- Staff is awaiting outstanding Agency comments prior to preparing a draft Attachment A.

DISCUSSION

During discussion, the following points were clarified:

- The 10-foot parking setback requirement from the **principal internal roadways** (*Outlet Boulevard and Premium Way*) will remain.

- The request to remove the 10-foot parking setback from **internal lot lines** would allow, as an example, parking between Lots 1A and 1B without the required 10-foot setback on each side.
- The request would impact the entire site, not just Lots 1A and 1B.

Chair Watson expressed concern that the requested removal of the 10-foot parking setback from internal lot lines would allow for more buildings on the existing lots. Ms. Patel agreed that this would be allowed, but the developer will have to meet all parking requirements for any additional square footage, which will be reviewed as the individual Section Plans are submitted.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers - representing Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC and Simon Woodmont, LLC – 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO stated the following:

- Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC is the owner of Lots 1, 3, 4, and 5; Simon Woodmont, LLC is the owner of Lot 2, which is the existing St. Louis Premium Outlets. Both parties are applicants since the ordinance impacts all five lots.
- The request is the result of some site planning and Site Plans that will be coming forward to the Commission in the near future for new development on Lot 1, which has recently been subdivided into multiple lots; and Lot 4, which is adjacent to the Rombach property.
- The existing ordinance calls for cross access and shared parking, and while the ordinance allows a zero-foot setback for internal drives, it does not allow parking to be adjacent to the drive when there is a 10-foot parking setback requirement.
- The site includes a maximum F.A.R., maximum building square footage, maximum height, and maximum open space. They do not foresee exceeding any of these maximum restrictions or requesting amendments to the F.A.R.
- The only lot that may have more buildings is Lot 4 as there is a proposed hotel and field house for this lot, which will be filed in the near future.
- The request to remove the 10-foot parking setback requirement from internal lot lines affects Lot 1 as there are a number of projects that the petitioner is working on where this setback conflicts with adjoining developments. The intent is not to get more square footage but to work with the shared driveways. The 10-foot parking setback is causing problems in trying to "land plan" especially with the subdivided Lot 1 to accommodate the uses where there is a shared driveway and shared parking.
- They foresee conflicts with the parking setback requirement for Lots 1 and 5, the pieces of property that front Olive Street Road. They do not foresee any conflict with Lot 4.

DISCUSSION

Chair Watson asked if there will be issues with parking if the request is not granted. Mr. Stock explained that there will be issues with *shared parking* – for example, with the parking setback, there would be a green space between the internal parking - but they would like the parking spaces to be "head-in with each other and a property line down the middle".

Chair Watson asked if there would be any green space between the parking. Mr. Stock stated that the site includes MSD stormwater requirements so they are implementing

green space within the parking lots for bio-retention – a lot of this green space would be included at the end of the islands, not necessarily down a long row of perpendicular parking.

Councilmember Hurt felt that the situation Mr. Stock described is similar to Chesterfield Commons and inquired as to whether there is a zero setback between the restaurants along Chesterfield Airport Road. Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services confirmed that there is a zero setback in that area because the businesses share entrances and parking spaces.

Councilmember Hurt stated that while shared parking has been effective, there are concerns of having straight asphalt without green median breaks. Mr. Stock indicated that the shared parking would not occur throughout the entire development resulting in a "sea of asphalt". He feels that the request is a "responsible request to do responsible, sustainable development within Lots 1, 3, 4 and 5."

Mr. Geisel pointed out that all the parking lots will still have landscaped islands, end caps, and trees but the removal of the 10-foot setback would allow the petitioner to mass a front end-front end parking area along a property line with landscaping within each site – it does not reduce the overall green space but may allow it to be more uniformly applied.

Chair Watson still expressed concern that the request could result in a "sea of asphalt". Mr. Geisel stated that the City's landscape guidelines will not allow such a situation and removal of the setback requirement does not eliminate adherence to the landscape guidelines. Mr. Stock added that for every 10 parking spaces there is a requirement of 200 sq. ft. of green space and they are not asking to eliminate this requirement.

Before the petition comes before the Planning Commission again, Chair Watson would like information on the parking in Chesterfield Commons.

Councilmember Hurt asked Mr. Geisel if he is confident that there are ordinances in place that will prevent a "sea of asphalt" if the request is approved. Mr. Geisel indicated that he does not have any concerns that the requested change will result in a "sea of asphalt" but rather will allow the developer to break up the asphalt more uniformly.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR: None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION: None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL: None

ISSUES:
City Attorney Heggie asked Ms. Patel to work with the petitioner in providing a visual example of how some of the proposed Lot 1 developments would appear with, and without, the 10-foot parking setback.

Ms. Patel then pointed out there is a 30% open space requirement included in the governing ordinance and each stand-alone lot would have to meet this requirement.

B. **<u>P.Z. 06-2014 Four Seasons Plaza, Adjusted Lot 2 and Part of Adjusted Lot 1 (Caplaco Seven Inc. & Dierbergs Four Seasons Inc.)</u>:** A request for a zoning map amendment from the "C-2" Shopping District and "PC" Planned Commercial District to create a new "PC" Planned Commercial District and to add an additional use and amend the development criteria within the existing "PC" Planned Commercial District for a 8.29 acre tract of land located on the south side of Olive Boulevard west of its intersection with Woods Mill Road (16Q220719, 16Q210763, and 16Q220690).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

<u>Project Planner Jessica Henry</u> gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area noting that all State and local Public Hearing notification requirements have been met:

<u>Request</u>:

- The purpose of the request is to permit a drive-thru in order to accommodate the relocation of an existing restaurant tenant to a new space within the development.
- A previous request (P.Z. 18-2013) for an ordinance amendment to add *Restaurant, with drive-thru window* was withdrawn by the Petitioner in order to expand the request to include a change of zoning for a 0.04 acre portion of the adjacent Adjusted Lot 1 and to amend certain development criteria contained within the current governing Ordinance 2492. The request for the additional use of *Restaurant, with drive-thru window* was carried over to the current request.
- Staff will not review the design specifics of the requested drive-thru until the Site Plan review phase of the development process. If approved, the ordinance amendment would simply permit the drive-thru use in the development and would not be approving any specific layout, design, or restaurant tenant.

<u>Drive-thru Exhibit</u>:

The Petitioner has provided Staff with the following exhibit to provide a depiction of the proposed drive-thru, which shows a very basic, u-shaped drive-thru lane.

Ms. Henry pointed out this is only an exhibit to demonstrate how a drive-thru could fit into this space; however, Staff will only review formal engineered drawings against the Municipal Code requirements and will request outside agency comments if this request is approved and moves forward to the Site Development Plan phase of the development process.

Site History:

- Adjusted Lot 1 of the subject site was zoned "C-2" Shopping District by St. Louis County in 1965. There is no site-specific ordinance for this site and no changes to the zoning have occurred in the decades since that time.
- Adjusted Lot 2 was zoned "C-8" Planned Commercial District in 1975 under St. Louis County Ordinance 7836. The Center was originally limited to just three uses - retail shops, an office/bank building, and a forty-lane bowling center. Each of these uses had a maximum square footage limitation.
- From 1976 until 1989, the ordinance has been amended six times:
    - The first four amendments from 1976-1980 pertained to parking and loading spaces, and other minor site specifications, such as the maintenance requirements for the fence on the southern property line.
    - In 1980, an amendment introduced the restaurant use to the development; however, the use was limited to a single restaurant not to be located in a free-standing building.
    - In 1989, the ordinance was amended to increase the limitation on the number of restaurants; to permit a second restaurant within the commercial shops' square footage; and added a 20% parking reduction. Although a second sit-down restaurant was permitted, the drive-thru use was still excluded on the site.
- In 2008, the City of Chesterfield approved Ordinance 2492 which changed the zoning from "C-8" to "PC" Planned Commercial District. At this time, several modifications were made to the ordinance.
- As it pertains to this proposal, fast-food restaurants were permitted in 2008; however, drive-thru and free-standing fast-food uses were specifically excluded by the Petitioner after the Planning Commission expressed concerns during the Public Hearing process. At that time, the limitation on the number of restaurants permitted within the development was eliminated from the ordinance.

Current Request:

The current request was expanded from an earlier project, PZ 18-2013, which was only for an ordinance amendment to add the drive-thru use. The current request consists of three parts:

1. A zoning map amendment for a small portion of Adjusted Lot 1 from the "C-2" Shopping District to the "PC" Planned Commercial District.
    - The property boundary line between Adjusted Lot 1 and Adjusted Lot 2 falls within the parking island adjacent to the parking area that is being proposed as the drive-thru location.
    - As a result, certain components of the proposed drive-thru, such as the menu board and speaker, could potentially conflict with Municipal Code requirements if they were located on two separate parcels with two different zoning designations.

- A change of zoning for this small 0.04 acre portion of Adjusted Lot 1 would allow the area to be incorporated into Readjusted Lot 2, forming a new PC district under a new governing ordinance.
- In order to accomplish this, the Petitioner has filed an application for a Boundary Adjustment Plat which would adjust the boundary line in question to match the proposed zoning district boundaries.

2. A request to amend certain development criteria found within the current site specific ordinance.
   - The proposed amendments are two-fold; they would both allow for the accommodation of items related to the proposed drive-thru, as well as updating the existing ordinance to reflect existing site conditions.
   - This would eliminate some conflicts with the parking and structure setbacks; update some of the landscape criteria; and change some minor criteria related to the wooden fence.
3. The addition of the drive-thru in conjunction with a fast-food restaurant on the site as a permitted use within the "PC" Planned Commercial District.

Adjacent Zoning:

- There are several different residential and commercial zoning districts in this area.
- The Four Seasons residential subdivision is directly south of the development; record plats for this subdivision were all approved between 1962-1967 with most of the homes being constructed during that time, which pre-dates the commercial development in Four Seasons Plaza.

Comprehensive Land Use Plan:
The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates the subject site as *Community Retail*, which is defined as:

> *A center characterized by one national anchor store or grocery store at a maximum of 150,000 square feet that provides general merchandise and services and attracts customers from multiple neighborhoods within Chesterfield and neighboring municipalities that will generally travel up to 15 minutes to reach the center.*

Items under Review by Staff:

- Outstanding Agency Comments – Staff is awaiting comments from several agencies.
- Building and Parking Setbacks – Staff is currently working with the Petitioner on proposed revisions to the building and parking setbacks. The exact setback requests will be reflected in the draft Attachment A and on the preliminary plan presented at a future Planning Commission meeting.
- Compatibility of Use with Surrounding Uses – The request does not approve the exact drive-thru design for the tenant that the Petitioner will be proposing this evening; it would allow for any restaurant user to submit plans for a drive-thru. Therefore, the base issue when evaluating this request is whether or not the drive-thru use is appropriate for this area considering the mixed commercial and residential nature of the area.
- Drive-thru Use - Staff strongly recommends that the use be restricted by ordinance to a single drive-thru within the development. As indicated in the Petitioner's Narrative, the Petitioner is amenable to this restriction.

- Hours of Operation - The Petitioner has proposed limiting the hours of operation for this use from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Due to the proximity of the adjacent residential development, Staff recommends that this restriction be incorporated into the new site-specific ordinance if the Planning Commission chooses to recommend approval of this request.

DISCUSSION

During discussion, the following topics were discussed and clarified:

Loading Dock:
A loading dock behind the building will be necessary to accommodate the proposed tenant but it does not exist at this time.

Setbacks:
Setbacks have not been included on the Preliminary Plan or included in the Staff Report. This is an older development that has had six ordinance amendments over the years resulting in a lot of minor setback conflicts. Staff is working with the Applicant to establish new site setbacks to correct the existing issues, as well as what will be needed if the request is approved.

Parking:
The placement of the drive-thru will eliminate a number of parking spaces. As of now, the residual parking spaces would meet the City's parking requirements; but this would be fully evaluated at the Site Plan stage. The Applicant has been made aware that they will need to meet every municipal code requirement, including parking standards.

Western-North-South Access Road - Landscaping:
The original ordinance called for deciduous trees in this area but it is currently landscaped with a variety of shrubs and plants. During review of the petition, this non-conformity was noted and the Petitioner is, therefore, requesting a modification to the ordinance to replace the trees with low-growing shrubs or grasses and with beds of annual flowering plants.

Green Space Median:
It was estimated that the existing green space median is approximately 10-20 feet wide.

Noise and Light Concerns:
During the earlier Public Hearing for P.Z. 18-2013, concerns were raised about the potential noise and light that could be generated from the proposed drive-thru. During review of P.Z. 18-2013, information was submitted from a noise engineer regarding the technology that would be used and documenting that noise levels would stay relatively low. This information can be brought back if the Commission so desires.

Site Plan:
Senior Planner Jonathan Raiche pointed out that the way the petition is currently proposed, the Site Plan would be reviewed administratively since most of the work being proposed is flat work – there are very few minimal changes to the structure. If there are concerns about the proposed use, they should be voiced at this time.

Mr. Geisel clarified that, as currently proposed, if the zoning is approved, the site plan review would be done administratively and would not be reviewed by the Planning Commission per City Code regulations.

Drive-thru:
The proposed menu board would be on the southbound lane; motorists would then have to complete a 180^{o} turn to the northbound lane to reach the pick-up window. Staff has not received a scaled drawing detailing the distance between the pick-up window and the menu board. During the Site Plan review stage, Staff would evaluate this area for stacking requirements.

Mr. Geisel emphasized that the current request is to review the **use** of a drive-thru – not the design of the drive-thru.

Councilmember Hurt noted that the location of the proposed drive-thru is adjacent to a public lane and he has safety concerns regarding queuing off a public lane. Mr. Geisel explained that if the drive-thru use is approved, all of the safety concerns and site plan requirements will be reviewed and incorporated into the plan. At this point, the Commission's responsibility is to determine whether an additional use of a drive-thru is appropriate for this site regardless of the tenant occupying the space.

Highland Park Drive:
This drive currently goes through to Four Seasons residential development. Mr. Doster clarified that this lane is not a dedicated street or recorded easement. There used to be a gate at the south end of the boundary, which was on the property of the subdivision and it was the subdivision's responsibility to maintain it. The gate is no longer in place.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:
1. Mr. Mike Doster, DosterUllom, attorney representing the Petitioner, 16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Chesterfield, MO stated the following:
    - The Petitioner was before the Commission with this same request through the earlier petition, P.Z. 18-2013. They are before the Commission at this time because they have a 0.04 acre portion of land on Lot 1 that needs to be included in Lot 2 in order to satisfy some setback concerns.
    - While they recognize that the Commission is approving the requested use – and not the user, it was pointed out that they have an existing tenant in the center on Lot 1, who has been there for many years. This tenant represents one of the original St. Louis Bread Company stores.
    - Their current tenant space is outdated and cannot accommodate their current model. They would like to remain in the center and the Petitioner would like to retain them as a tenant as they are a quality tenant that helps maintain the quality of the development.
    - If the drive-thru use is not approved, Panera Bread will relocate from the center.
    - If it is possible for the Commission to review the Site Plan, they have no objection to it.
    - The issues that have been identified are essentially the same issues identified at the prior Public Hearing and include:
        - Hours of operation – Currently the only hours of operation that exist for Lot 2 are the hours of operation applicable to the bowling alley. They are requesting hours of operation from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

- Potential Noise Pollution – They responded to this with a letter containing technical information about the equipment. They will resubmit it as part of the record for the current petition.
- During review of the previous petition, they were asked to submit a Preliminary Plan, which initiated discussion of the setback issues and required a rezoning of the 0.04 parcel of land prompting the filing of this new petition.
- Drive-thru Use – Is the drive-thru use appropriate for this location? They invited adjoining property owners to a meeting regarding this request but no one attended. As far as they know, no residents have indicated any kind of objection other than one email from a resident (not adjacent to the property) who had traffic concerns, which was referred to Staff.

- The drive-thru use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and approving this use would enable them to keep a quality tenant in the center, which "is good for the center, good for the area, and maintains a gathering place that is important to the people in this part of the City".

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Geckeler referred to the Panera's on Clarkson noting that this location is very popular and appears to be thriving without a drive-thru. Mr. Doster stated that Panera's is in the process of implementing its new model wherever possible. The lease for the subject site expires in 2015 so they are facing the possibility of losing this tenant if the drive-thru use is not allowed.

Commissioner Wuennenberg referred to Mr. Doster's statement that Highland Park Drive is an internal road and not a public roadway and that it does not have easement rights to the subdivision, which he feels is important to the discussion of this petition. Mr. Doster stated that since the road has been there for a long period of time, and has had intermittent use, there may be some issue as to whether or not they have acquired some kind of right prescriptively or an applied easement – but their research shows that there is no platted easement, recorded easement, or dedication of any kind of public right. Commissioner Wuennenberg asked that more information on this matter be provided when the petition next comes before the Commission. Commissioner Lueking stated that there was a chain across this road about a year ago. Mr. Doster then stated that a member of the development team just reminded him that there used to be a fireman's lockbox in this area, which suggests it may have been an emergency access at one point. They will do more research on this matter.

2. Mr. Bill Remis, DosterUllom, 16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Chesterfield, MO stated he was available for questions.

3. Mr. Pat Cunningham, 11850 Studt Avenue, St. Louis, MO stated he was available for questions.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR: None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION: None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL: None

ISSUES:
The Commission noted its consent to have the restrictions recommended by Staff included in the draft Attachment A.

In addition to the issues identified by Staff, the Commission added the following:

1. Review the possible fire access.
2. Provide the width of the existing median.
3. Appearance of the proposed back loading dock – provide information such as dimensions and location vs. the existing doors that are in this area. *Mr. Doster clarified that this area will included more of a ramp than a loading dock.*
4. Modifications proposed for the fence. *Ms. Henry stated that there are no changes being proposed to the fence. The fence does not meet some very specific criteria regarding the distance from the property as outlined in the original ordinance – this is an "ordinance clean-up item".*
5. Provide clarification on the requested zero-foot setback adjustment for the drive-thru elements.
6. Provide information on what the setbacks may be as they apply to the zoning that would be included in the Attachment A.
7. Hours allowed for loading/unloading and trash pick-up.
8. Is it possible that Planning Commission can review the Site Plan? *Mr. Geisel stated that Staff will respond to this in the Issues Letter.*

Commissioner Wuennenberg read the Closing Comments for the Public Hearings.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Puyear made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the April 7, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Geckeler and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0 with 2 abstentions** from Commissioners Lueking and Nolan.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO stated he was available for questions pertaining to the Virtual Care Center for **Mercy Health Systems**.

Councilmember Hurt asked for information about the ongoing clearing being done along Chesterfield Parkway. Mr. Stock replied that the clearing going south under the Parkway is for the sanitary sewer extension.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

A. Mercy Health Systems: An Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Amended Conceptual Landscape Plan and Amended Tree Preservation Plan for a 43.35 acre tract of land zoned "UC" Urban Core District located north of Chesterfield Parkway East, south of Interstate 64/US Highway 40 (SE Quadrant).

Commissioner Proctor, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Amended Conceptual Landscape Plan, and Amended Tree Preservation Plan for Mercy Health Systems. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nolan and **passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0**.

B. Mercy Health Systems (Virtual Care Center): A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Tree Preservation Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, Architect's Statement of Design, and Parking Demand Study for a 43.35 acre tract of land zoned "UC" Urban Core District located north of Chesterfield Parkway East, south of Interstate 64/US Highway 40 (SE Quadrant).

Commissioner Proctor, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Tree Preservation Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, Architect's Statement of Design, and Parking Demand Study for Mercy Health Systems (Virtual Care Center). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nolan and **passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0**.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS - None

IX. NEW BUSINESS

Chair Watson announced that election of officers for the Commission will be held in June. Anyone interested in serving on the Nominating Committee should contact him.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

_____

Steve Wuennenberg, Secretary