

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

Regular Meeting Minutes

5:30 PM, Tuesday, March 16, 2021

Electronic meeting

<https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil>

Roll Call

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth

Councilor George Handley

Councilor Travis Hoban

Councilor David Shipley

Council Executive Director Cliff Strachan

Councilor Bill Fillmore

Councilor David Harding

Councilor David Sewell

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

Council Attorney Brian Jones

Conducting: Council Chair David Sewell

Excused: Wayne Parker, CAO

Prayer – Councilor David Shipley

Pledge of Allegiance – Councilor Bill Fillmore

Public Comment ([0:11:46](#))

Chair Sewell opened public comment, there was no response from the public.

Approval of Minutes - February 2, 2021 Council Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Action Agenda

- 1. Resolution 2021-10 consenting to the appointment of individuals to various boards and commissions. (21-039) ([0:16:57](#))**

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2021-10, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi presented. Samantha Curtis, William Toutai, and Larry Hunt were being recommended for the Parks and Recreation Board with terms expiring December 31, 2023.

Chair Sewell called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell, and Shipley in favor.

2. Resolution 2021-11 consenting to the Mayor's appointment of J. Brian Jones as the City Attorney for Provo City. (21-044) (0:19:02)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2021-11, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mayor Kaufusi recommended that Brian Jones be appointed as the new City Attorney for Provo. Mr. Jones had served as the Interim City Attorney since the retirement of the previous City Attorney, Robert West.

Several Councilors acknowledged the exceptional service Mr. Jones provides to the City. He was an invaluable employee.

Mr. Jones appreciated the comments and said this was a bittersweet transition because he had served the Council for 10 years. He would continue to serve the Council for the time being, it was up to them to decide if they wanted to select a new Council Attorney. Otherwise, it was fairly common for the City Attorney to serve the Council.

Chair Sewell called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell, and Shipley in favor.

3. Resolution 2021-12 authorizing the Mayor to approve an interlocal agreement with Utah County to conduct a vote-by-mail election for the Municipal Primary and General Elections to be held in Provo City in 2021. (21-041) (0:26:08)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2021-12, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Amanda Ercanbrack, City Recorder, presented. Ms. Ercanbrack provided an overview of the election; it would be a vote-by-mail election with some service centers open on Election Day throughout the County. She explained this was a resolution to authorize Mayor Kaufusi to enter into an interlocal agreement with Utah County for the 2021 elections. The agreement outlined the City's responsibilities, as well as Utah County's. The total estimated cost for a primary and general election was \$210,739.50, with a cost cap of \$2.25 per voter, per election.

Councilor Ellsworth asked about election fairness and who concerns could be reported to. Ms. Ercanbrack said the County Clerk and Auditor would be a great resource, and there were other resources available as well.

Councilor Harding asked if we would still pay for the pre-paid postage if it's not used and what would happen if there were no primary. Chair Sewell invited Amelia Powers Gardner, Utah County Clerk and Auditor, to respond. She said the City would only pay for the postage used and there would be no charge for a primary if there was not one.

Mr. Harding recalled that Administrative Services budgets for 50% of the total election cost each year. Ms. Ercanbrack confirmed that was correct and there would be enough in the FY 2022 budget to cover the cost.

Chair Sewell opened public comment. There was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell, and Shipley in favor.

4. Resolution 2021-13 outlining support for the continued ownership and preservation of sensitive lands in the foothills and canyons by the Forest Service. (21-040) (0:36:55)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2021-13, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Councilor George Handley presented. The resolution was in response to recent developments, including the creation of the Critical Hillside Overlay Zone. This would provide more rigorous standards for development in the foothills with the intent to minimize impact. The Open Space Recreation Zone had also been applied to a number of City-owned parcels. This was in response to a growing desire to preserve open space in Provo.

Recently, the Utah Valley Trails Alliance proposed a draft of a plan for Provo, as they had done for other cities, they wanted to receive feedback from the public on this plan. It provided a template to improve and create new recreational opportunities, as well as how to take better advantage of the open space owned by other entities like the US Forest Service. Councilor Handley explained they had placed the draft plan on Open City Hall and received over 500 comments from the public, and the comments were overwhelmingly positive.

The Council wanted to send a clear message to the Forest Service and other entities that the City wanted to be a partner and work together in preserving these areas. The Council was happy to have the support of Mayor Kaufusi.

Chair Sewell opened public comment.

The following Provo residents spoke in favor of the resolution:

- Kaye Nelson ([0:41:14](#))
- Craig Christensen ([0:42:38](#))
- Christina Davis ([0:44:32](#))
- Merritt Norton ([0:47:00](#))
- Bonnie Morrow ([0:47:57](#))

Chair Sewell called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell, and Shipley in favor.

5. Ordinance 2021-11 amending the Provo City Consolidated Fee Schedule to set electric service rates for small cell installations in Provo City, Utah. (21-034) (0:50:00)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Ordinance 2021-11, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Scott Bunker, Assistant Energy Director, presented. Small cell wireless facilities being installed by telecommunications companies required electricity from Provo City in order to operate. This ordinance would establish a new rate for small cell installations.

Chair Sewell opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell, and Shipley in favor.

6. Resolution 2021-14 appropriating \$11,979.76 from General Fund sales tax revenues to the Economic Development Division in the General Fund for a contractual Sales Tax Increment post performance payment to Day's Market. (21-038) (0:53:50)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2021-14, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Keith Morey, Economic Development Director, presented. In early 2018, the Economic Development office worked with Day's Market to craft a post-performance sales tax increment agreement to partially reimburse the Day's Market for renovations. The owners of Day's Market were planning an extensive remodel of their aging store and requested that Provo City assist in reducing the construction costs by entering into a sales tax reimbursement agreement on a post-performance basis. Days Market would spend approximately \$1.3 million dollars on the interior remodel of the store. Similar to other sales tax agreements, Day's would be able to earn back some of their costs if they produced sales above an established base line, which in this case was set at \$39,800. Based on sales tax information and a calculation, they qualify for sales tax reimbursement of \$11, 979.76 for fiscal year 2020. This was a ten-year agreement.

Chair Sewell opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell, and Shipley in favor.

7. An ordinance amending Provo City Code regarding the hold times for electronic signs and sign size limits. Citywide Application. (PLOT20210046) (1:00:32)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the resolution, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Vice Chair Shipley introduced the item and Chair Sewell presented. The ordinance was displayed while Mr. Sewell reviewed the proposed amendments. There had been no changes since the last discussion. It had been reviewed by the Planning Commission and they recommended approval unanimously.

The changes to Title 6 include updating regulations for hold times based on location and the underlying zone. The changes to Title 14 include updating terminology and definitions for hold times, adding residential zones that ban electronic signs, and adjusting corridors that allow electronic displays. Electronic signs would not be allowed on Center Street at the request of the downtown business owners.

In addition to the changes regarding electronic signs, the committee recommended replacing dated and difficult to manage size charts for signs with new tables which regulate sign size based on lot frontage or wall area.

Chair Sewell opened public comment. ([1:10:05](#))

Brandon King, Provo, owned Auto Performance located in Provo. He was opposed to the amendments. He thought small businesses should use their electronic signs however they choose because they had invested significant money in their signs.

Jeff Young, Salt Lake City, was President of YESCO. They had served hundreds of customers in Utah County. He was opposed of the ordinance. He did not think it was wise to stifle a business' abilities to advertise. Mr. Young had provided Council staff with traffic studies that supported his argument regarding hold times.

James Carpenter, Meza, AZ, was representing the Utah Sign Association. They found the brightness component was the most important sign regulation. A longer hold time would not correct this. They recommend maintaining the current eight second hold time. He said 38 states that had shorter hold times.

Ryan Young, American Fork, was the Vice President of YESCO. He shared a letter from one of their valuable customers who had a business in Provo. They felt this was unfavorable for businesses. Limiting the functionality of the sign would hamper and frustrate businesses who had invested money in their signage.

Paul Evans, Provo, asked about signs that already exist on the North University Avenue Design Corridor. He wanted to confirm that going forward there would be no design animations and hold times of one-hour in this corridor.

Councilor Harding asked how much of the City would get increased hold times, and how much of the City would get decreased hold times. Mr. Harding also recalled that previously the Council authorized digital signs anywhere backlit signs were allowed and he thought this was liberal. Some areas of the City could only change their sign three times per day, so going to every hour would be a big increase. He asked about properties with multiple signs; he said if each of those signs could change once an hour, but at different times, there would be a lot more changes per hour. Javin Weaver, Planner, said they limit the number of signs that can be in a single location, except for the SC3 Zone that did allow more signs, but they had to be a certain distance from one another. Overall, Mr. Weaver thought this made it less restrictive in parts of the City.

Councilor Fillmore asked if Staff had reviewed the studies that the public commenters had referenced. Mr. Weaver said that Hannah Salzl, Policy Analyst, had done this research.

Councilor Hoban thought the businesses moving from three times per day to every hour would greatly benefit from this. He wanted to maintain some regulation and he thought this was a good balance.

Chair Sewell spoke about which signs would be grandfathered in. He also said animation was already prohibited, so that was nothing new. Mr. Jones explained signs installed after 2013 would not be grandfathered in because brightness and hold times were not land use changes, these were not non-conforming uses. These provisions were in the business licensing provisions. There was already a provision in the code that said the brightness and hold time standards did not apply to signs that existed prior to 2013. Otherwise, nothing installed after 2013 was grandfathered.

Chair Sewell also talked about the highway studies that had been mentioned during public comment. There were conflicting studies, some indicated there was no correlation between hold times and accidents; but other studies suggested they did attract longer glances, that took drivers' eyes off the road for longer than was considered safe. Two seconds was the upper limit of what was considered safe for any driver to not be looking at the road. With an eight second hold time, most drivers would only see one change while passing by.

Mr. Sewell explained the standard that applied to a City should be different than what is recommended for a highway because cars were moving slower in the City. Signs on a freeway were further apart, but in the City, you may see multiple signs in a short distance. The comparison to billboards was not a good one, Mr. Sewell explained those signs were regulated by the State. The Council wanted to be pro-business, but residents had concerns over the brightness of digital signs. The goal was to accommodate more digital signs in locations that were not obtrusive for residents living nearby.

Councilor Harding was comfortable proceeding with a vote, but in the future, he wanted to look further into his concern about multiple backlit signs at a single business, which would be allowed to be converted to digital signs.

Councilor Hoban expressed that the City wanted to be business friendly, while striking a good balance for the residents too.

David Sewell wanted to investigate Mr. Harding's concern and requested to continue this item by council rule since this was the first hearing.

Councilor Hoban wanted to know what the objective was until the next hearing. Chair Sewell agreed that brightness was a big issue and the most bothersome and he wanted to address that eventually. But the continuance would give the public more time to weigh in on the current draft.

8. Resolution 2021-15 transferring \$1,900,000 from the Legacy CIP Fund to various funds and appropriating the transferred funds for the purposes described herein. (21-037) [\(1:48:19\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2021-15, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

David Mortensen, Budget officer presented. One month prior, the Council approved the transfer of approximately \$7.7 million into a legacy CIP fund. These funds were intended for legacy projects that would be a benefit to the City into the future. Previously, the Council appropriated \$3.9 million of those funds to be used for Fire Station 1 relocation, as well as improvements at the airport terminal. That left

just under \$3.9 million in the legacy fund. The Administration was recommending the following transfers from the Legacy CIP Fund: \$1,000,000 to the Parks CIP Fund and \$900,000 to the Economic Development CIP Fund. The Administration also recommended the following appropriations: \$1,000,000 in the Parks CIP Fund for Canyon Road Park and \$900,000 in the Economic Development CIP Fund to be used to attract a west side grocery retailer.

Councilor Handley asked about the \$900,000 to attract a grocer. He wondered if it was necessary to spend this amount of money. He acknowledged they would not be obligated to spend it all if it was not necessary. Mayor Kaufusi said the amount was determined due to the need for a grocery store on the west side of Provo. She was making this a priority and wanted to have this available to use if needed. Isaac Paxman, Deputy Mayor, agreed that if the money was not used, it could be reallocated. The money could be used in a number of ways including incentives and infrastructure to attract a grocery retailer.

Councilor Ellsworth recalled an email saying that if the money was allocated and not used for the grocery store incentive that it would not need to come back to the council before being reallocated for a different incentive. Mr. Paxman read an email from Mr. Parker that said the funds could not be used for something else without council approval.

Chair Sewell opened public comment. ([1:56:36](#))

Sharron Memmott, Provo, was on the northeast bench near where the Rock Canyon Park would be. She wanted to know what allocating \$1 million would do for the park. She wondered if it would make it bigger and better or just make it happen sooner.

Jennifer Griffin, Provo, was supportive of the park and having more green spaces. She thanked Mayor Kaufusi for pushing for a grocery store on the west side.

Rachel Luke, Provo, supported the park being funded. This funding came from COVID, so she was glad to see something that related to mental health like a park that allowed people to be outside without cost. These funds also open the backlog of other park projects, so it would eventually benefit all areas of the City. She was glad the City did not just do gift cards like other cities.

Anne Alan, Provo, was supportive of the park and grocery store on the west side. She appreciated Mayor Kaufusi for her efforts.

Bonnie Marrow, Provo, was glad to see efforts to put a grocery store on the west side. Green spaces were desired in the northeast area and she was glad to preserve green space.

Councilor Harding said this had been discussed multiple times. The Administration had explained the process used to make these decisions, but he felt like there was more to be explained. He wanted to understand the merits of each project selected. Seeing the parks level of service map in work meeting had been helpful to understand the need for a park in this area, and Mr. Harding was comfortable funding the park. A grocery store on the west side was much needed, if the money was necessary to make that happen, then it was money well spent. His concern was that since the money was being earmarked as an incentive, that every proposal from retailers would require the full amount.

Councilor Handley said they had an obligation to move forward with the park. This money would help other projects advance sooner too. Regarding the grocery store, they need a grocery store in the

southeast too. He did not like the idea of focusing on one area of the City over another. He encouraged the Administration to use the money as wisely as possible. Mr. Harding was ready to support both proposals.

Councilor Ellsworth asked what the line items would be for the \$900,000. Keith Morey, Economic Development Director, said this showed their interest in attracting a grocery store. No one had a specific line item for how this would be used. The intent was to give the flexibility to facilitate this development. There were currently no funds that could be used to encourage or study a project like this. The money could be used to bridge any gaps that might exist, like infrastructure. It was not the City's responsibility to solve all of the problems a retailer might encounter but being able to help was beneficial.

Councilor Fillmore said the Edgemont Neighborhood had a legitimate expectation for a park. When the park at Timpview was sold to the district, this new park was promised. It would benefit all of Provo, not just the northeast. He appreciated Mayor Kaufusi's initiative to attract a grocery store. He trusted the Administration to use the money wisely. There would still be \$2 million of CARES Act funding left for other projects.

David Walter, Redevelopment Director, said they were also working on getting a store in southeast Provo too. Mr. Morey said the conversations on the west side grocery store had accelerated and the prospect of this funding could be important in keeping that momentum.

Councilor Shipley was comfortable with the park and relying on the Administration's decision. He lived on the west side and would personally benefit from the grocery store, but a \$900,000 blank check was a little unnerving. Mr. Shipley said if it allowed them to do something through public works to provide infrastructure, that would be a good use of the money.

Councilor Hoban said there was a sense of urgency, making them more apt to move forward. He asked the Administration to be good stewards of the money. A grocery store on the west side should be a priority. He was supportive of both uses.

Councilor Ellsworth said allocating \$900,000 without knowing how it would be used made her uneasy. The southeast also needed a store, she hoped all areas of Provo could benefit.

Chair Sewell was supportive of both items.

There was no further discussion, Chair Sewell called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell, and Shipley in favor.

Chair Sewell adjourned the meeting of the Municipal Council and RDA Chair Shannon Ellsworth convened the meeting of the Redevelopment Agency of Provo by unanimous consent.

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

- 9. Resolution 2021-RDA-03-16-1 authorizing the Chief Executive Officer to sign an Assignment Agreement and an Amendment to the existing Lease Agreement with Liberty George Provo, LLC for a parking structure in Provo Town Square. (21-042) [\(2:26:00\)](#)**

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2021-RDA-03-16-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

David Walter, Redevelopment Agency Director, shared news unrelated to this topic before beginning. He was proud to announce that he had been working closely with potential buyers of The Mix, which was located at 2230 N. University Parkway, and the deal had been finalized and deeds were being recorded. This would allow demolition to commence and make way for the new development.

Mr. Walter explained the Redevelopment Agency had previously contributed funding and property for the construction of the parking structure currently behind the Provo Town Square buildings. There was a 50-year ground lease for the property on which the parking structure is located. The lease required the owner of the building to maintain the structure. The current owners planned to sell their property, including the parking structure, to Liberty George Provo, LLC. This resolution would authorize the Chief Executive Officer of the Redevelopment Agency of Provo City to sign the amendment and assignment agreements with Liberty George Provo, LLC for the lease of Agency-owned property for the Parking Structure at Provo Town Square.

Keith Morey, Economic Development Director, added that this was a critical portion of the Downtown environment. This presented a great opportunity and the new owner held to the tradition of the environment. The new owner had pointed out the neglected condition of the parking garage and they were eager to make improvements. Many people had been involved in negotiating a solid agreement that would improve Provo Town Square.

Councilor Shipley asked if there was a financial penalty to cancel the current lease agreement. Mr. Walter said the original ground lease contemplated letting the owner buy the property, but that right was never exercised. Gary McGinn, Community and Neighborhood Services, explained they owned the structure, but the RDA owned the land. The only ability the City had to obtain the structure was if they defaulted on maintenance as described by the lease agreement. A few years ago, they contemplated declaring a default, but that would have required litigation. At the time, the owner expressed interest in selling. The RDA was concerned about taking on a parking structure that was not owned by Provo Town Square. Typically, financing for the commercial building would be dependent on having control of the parking structure. The new agreement was basically the same as before but included a provision that required the new owner to cooperate with the City on parking.

Mr. Shipley asked if there was any way to ensure there would be public access at a reasonable cost. He worried that they would just give passes to their employees, and then charge an excessive price to ensure employees had spots. Mr. McGinn said there would be a study session on March 30, and they would discuss the parking structure agreements that existed. Ultimately, the City had no control what the owner could charge. Mr. Morey said there was a huge portion of Provo Town Square designed for retail and use, so it was unlikely they would only make the parking available to their employees.

Chair Ellsworth opened public comment.

Quinn Peterson, Downtown Provo Inc., previously ran a business that was in Provo Town Square. He had good and bad experiences with the current property owner. This project specifically was a blight to downtown. It was currently free public parking and it had sewer backup in the basement. The owner lived in Bali and the structure was just not maintained. Mr. Peterson said this was the fourth group to buy the property and he felt like this group was ready to make the repairs that were necessary, and they were already receiving letters of interest for spaces in the building. He encouraged the Council to

act quickly so that funding was not lost, the buyers had a strict timeframe for getting this approved in order to proceed with funding.

There were no other comments from the public.

Chair Ellsworth invited Ryan Smith, the potential buyer and lessee to speak. Mr. Smith said they were in escrow to acquire this property. He reiterated what Mr. Peterson said, they were ready to make these improvements and their interest aligned with the vision. He assured the Council they would take care of the parking garage and work with the Downtown community to make sure this was a value-added asset. They were willing to invest a significant amount of capital. He also said they were required to keep 50 spaces for public spaces and had to charge an amount similar to other parking garages.

Dixon Holmes, Deputy CAO and former Economic Development Director, said in 2000 their offices were located above Black Sheep Café, which is in Provo Town Square. Things were fine until the current owner purchased Provo Town Square. Things were fine for a little while, but eventually they lost interest and things stopped functioning well. A new owner who was engaged and glad to be a part of the community was important.

Councilor Harding was not happy that there was such a rush to approve this, and it was not discussed in work meeting. He was not aware of this item until the documents were made available on Thursday. Mr. Harding thought the buyer sounded great and would be a wonderful buyer. But he had concerns about the changes being made to the agreement and it seemed there was no option to continue the item without jeopardizing the purchase. ([2:49:26](#))

Councilor Fillmore said this was a good deal for this City and had multiple benefits for Provo. He appreciated Mr. Harding's concerns. He was not aware of any problem with the lease in its current form. He was sensitive to the information shared by Quinn Peterson and wanted to see this approved.

Councilor Sewell agreed it would have been nice to have more notice about this. However, he trusted Mr. Morey and Mr. Walter to recognize a good deal when one is presented. The comments from Quinn Peterson and Ryan Smith were persuasive. He suggested the possibility of a special session to address everyone's concerns.

Councilor Handley was supportive and wanted to vote now.

Councilor Hoban was undecided.

Councilor Shipley was mostly concerned about public access since the public owned the ground. He wanted to ensure this was truly public parking. He hoped the motivation of the new owner would align with the City's goal to get cars in this lot safely. He felt persuaded that the purpose would be served and he did not want to prevent the deal from moving forward.

Mr. Morey apologized for the rush. Projects like this tend to move quickly. He assured Council this had been reviewed by the RDA Executive Board. The reserve fund had been removed from the agreement because it had not been maintained prior to this agreement and creating that fund along with making the improvements necessary was not financially reasonable.

Councilor Harding clarified it was not his intent to vote against this, but he was not happy with the circumstances in which they were learning about this. Often when assigning and amending contracts, they are walked through the changes by legal counsel. He did not fully understand all of the amendments being proposed. He thought there were other ways to go about this and hold the current owner responsible for their obligations. Due to the time constraints, he saw no other option than to move forward.

Chair Ellsworth said the RDA Executive Board did not have this depth of information.

Councilor Shipley asked if the City had the legal right to lean the property based on an unfulfilled obligation and a loss to the public. Mr. Jones said that was possible, they would have to petition the court for a lien and provide evidence that they did not do what they were supposed to do. Mr. McGinn said some of these leases were entered into in the 80's and 90's, it was never the goal to have a unified parking plan. They could declare a default and through litigation take back the structure. Several years ago, when they contemplated litigation, the property was open to the public without any fee because it was not being maintained. The current owner wanted to get out of the ownership of Provo Town Square, but part of that included the parking garage. It would be difficult for someone to get financing for the commercial space without the parking structure too. There were limitations to these agreements. That was a longer discussion for another day, said Mr. McGinn.

Chair Ellsworth suspected this was a good deal, but she was also uncomfortable with the way this transpired. There was no further discussion and Ms. Ellsworth called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell, and Shipley in favor.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 8:50 p.m.