

**65th STREET
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**



I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:20p.m. by Chairperson J.D. Stack.

II. ROLL CALL

Roll call was conducted.

RAC Members Present: Mel Billingsley, Chandra Clady, Gary A. Little, Betty Lopez, Marcia Maleske, Maggie O'Mara, Scott Rasmussen, J.D. Stack, and Christopher Wilson

RAC Members Absent: Robbie Abelon, Matthew Altier, Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Steven R. Jones, Dave Sikich

Staff Present: Gregory Ptucha, SHRA

III. INTRODUCTIONS

RAC members introduced themselves to the audience and audience members did likewise.

IV. APPROVAL OF RAC MEETING MINUTES

The minutes of the March 2, 2005 meeting were approved 8:0:1 as submitted on a motion made by Marcia Malesky that was seconded by Gary Little. Ms. Clady abstained.

V. REDEVELOPMENT ITEMS

A. Folsom Boulevard Left Turn Pocket at 64th Street Project

Ms. Ofelia Avalos of the City of Sacramento's Department of Transportation (DOT) was introduced. Ms. Avalos presented a plan for a new left-hand turn pocket to allow westbound traffic on Folsom Boulevard to legally turn into the new "F/65" retail/residential development. Currently, traffic turning left at this location is blocking a "through" lane while waiting for an opportunity to turn illegally by crossing a double solid-stripe in the middle of Folsom Boulevard.

The scope of the project described by Ms. Avalos included the new left-turn pocket along with lengthening of the existing left-turn lane from eastbound Folsom onto northbound 65th Street. There would be a raised median strip that would prohibit left turns from 64th Street onto eastbound Folsom Boulevard.

Mr. Ed Noriega of the Mark Thomas Company, consultant to DOT, described an expected implementation schedule that is expected to require approximately one month (20 working days) in June. The contract will require the work to be performed during 8:30AM until the lunch hour, the after lunch until 3:30PM. Additional work hours might include 6:30PM until 10:00PM and/or weekends—but only with special approval from DOT. DOT's objective is to minimize traffic impacts during peak travel periods. There were questions about how, besides the work hour restrictions, the contractor can minimize restrictions on traffic flow.

Some of the particulars of the construction were described, including how the raised median will be extruded material that will rest upon the existing street surface (i.e., no excavation required). Due to this condition, no landscaping will be included in the median strip.

Audience member Ms. Roxanne Fuentes described her opposition to the plan to prohibit left turns from 64th Street. Mr. Noriega noted that this decision was driven by safety concerns. Discussion occurred about possible alternative solutions to avoid the need for the new left-turn pocket. It was noted that no U-turns are permitted at 65th from eastbound to westbound Folsom Boulevard due to the width of the intersection.

Ms. O'Mara inquired about how the space needed for the left turn lane width will be provided. Mr. Noriega described that the combination of planter and lane width reduction would create space for the new left-turn pocket. Ms. O'Mara pointed out how this would force eastbound bicycle commuters to legally occupy the same traffic lane as automobiles, which will have the effect of slowing traffic flow and creating vehicle/bicycle conflicts.

As this was an information item, no action was taken. Ms. Avalos and Mr. Noriega were thanked for their presentations

B. 6409 -6415 Elvas Avenue

Mr. Trent Smith introduced himself as an employee of the applicant, but Mr. Smith indicated he was not in attendance to make a presentation on the project. No other applicant representatives identified themselves, so RAC staff Greg Ptucha summarized the proposal and referred RAC members to Attachment 2 of their agenda packets. Larger-scale site plans and elevation drawings were on display for the RAC and the audience to review.

It was pointed out that the proposal seeks these entitlements:

1. Plan Review approval for proposed construction of 9,186 sq.ft. in C-2 Transit Overlay Zone.
2. Variance to reduce rear building setback.
3. Special Permit to reduce required on-site parking.

Property owner James Dudley seeks approvals to construct a three-story commercial/office building on two adjacent vacant parcels located at 6409 and 6415 Elvas Avenue. Each parcel is 50-feet wide by 125-feet deep. Combined, total lot size is 12,500 square feet.

Mr. Dudley is proprietor of Design Annex, an industrial design business currently housed at 6290 Folsom Boulevard. If built as proposed, Design Annex would relocate to the new building. The building would provide approximately 9,186 square foot of space on three floors, comprised of about 2,000 sq. ft. of sales floor and 7,186 sq. ft. of offices. Building height would be 44-feet. Lot coverage would be 25.8% Estimated cost of the project is \$1.2 million.

A Plan Review for the new construction is required at the Zoning Administrator level. Building materials would be masonry, glass and copper. The building's design would include sustainable design features and plans to seek LEED certification for the building (note: LEED = "Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design" Green Building Rating

System.®) Mr. Wilson and others generally were very supportive of the design features, except for a suggestion that the applicant include some transparency (i.e., glazing) at the Elvas street level façade.

The Plan Review requirements are embodied in Zoning Code section 17.185. These reflect the 65th/University Transit Village Plan objectives as well as the goals/objectives of the 65th Street Redevelopment Area. The Zoning Administrator is the decision-maker, but RAC comments would be considered (to be submitted to Assistant Planner Evan Compton).

A variance has been requested to reduce the setback from the north (railroad) lot line, from 15 feet to 7.5 feet. Greg Ptucha noted that City Planning was considering whether the building should be located closer to the Elvas Avenue lot line to reduce the need for this variance due to concerns about vibration and noise from the adjacent UPRR rail tracks. Mr. Billingsley cautioned that future Elvas Avenue streetscape improvements might require City acquisition of real estate rights from abutting owners to install wider sidewalks, planting strips, etc., so that pushing the building to the Elvas lot line might be ill-advised.

Minimum parking for both uses is calculated at 1 stall for each 500 square feet of space, or 18 stalls. Sixteen on-site at-grade parking stalls are proposed, along with three times as many on-site bicycle parking spaces as normally required. The applicant is seeking the reduction from 18 to 16 vehicular stalls due to the property's location near light rail, the existing and expected parking needs of Design Annex staff and visitors and their encouragement of bicycle transportation. Mr. Smith described how the proposed 16 stalls exceed the current and projected future needs of the applicant for employee and visitor parking. A Special Permit is required to allow the requested parking reduction. Ms. Clady and audience member Ms. Fuentes expressed concern about whether, in the future, the additional stalls would be needed. Mr. Little noted that the applicant will presumably sell the building to another user in the future who may have different parking needs. Mr. Smith suggested that, in the future, the district will achieve its goal of having increased travel via transit, bicycle and on-foot—hopefully reducing the need for on-site automobile parking.

Turning movements in/out of the on-site parking were discussed. It was noted that Elvas Avenue currently has a raised median at this location, so movements will be limited to right-turn in and out of the property.

Scott Rasmussen made a motion that the RAC express its strong support for the application. This was seconded by Mr. Wilson and, after brief discussion, it was approved 8:0:1, with Ms. Clady abstaining.

C. 6800 Folsom off-site accessory parking at 1601 – 69th St

Mr. Darrell Ragland, applicant, was present along with Mr. Tony Gonzales, owner representative for both 6800 Folsom and 1601 – 69th Street (whose owner of record is Gonzales-Kimmel Enterprises).

Mr. Ragland described how three commercial tenants (Carpet One, A&A Appliance, Kelly Moore Paints) occupy the 6800 Folsom property, and the current on-site parking available is less than what is required under the zoning code. 6800 Folsom Boulevard is an existing building with approximately 21,263 square feet of retail space, 472 square office of related office space and 480 square feet of warehouse space. On-site parking at 6800 Folsom is at the west, north and east facades of the parcel and totals 29 stalls. Minimum parking required under the code for the three uses is 44 (calculated at 1 stall for each 500 square feet). Thus, the applicant is 15 stalls short of the minimum requirement.

The building fronts west onto a large parking lot, but most of that lot is controlled by a different owner, Mr. Jim Sullivan, who was present at the meeting. There is no reciprocal

parking agreement between the owners, and a barrier has been installed to prevent 6800 Folsom employees and visitors from using Mr. Sullivan's property. Mr. Sullivan explained that he was not in a position to allow joint-use parking, since his 6720 – 6770 Folsom Boulevard buildings (at 80,000 square feet) require 150 on-site parks to comply with zoning; so, there are no stalls to spare for 6800 Folsom's use. Ms. Lopez inquired about whether Mr. Sullivan's lot was striped efficiently to maximize parking capacity, and Mr. Sullivan indicated that the striping was improved from an earlier layout.

Mr. Sullivan indicated plans to replace the existing chain link construction fencing with a more aesthetically pleasing permanent fence material after a survey is completed to confirm the property line. He indicated support for Mr. Ragland's proposal.

The application seeks two Special Permits from the City's Planning Commission:

1. Off-site accessory parking for retail uses.
2. Exceed maximum parking ratio in the Residential Mixed-use Transit Overlay zone (RMX-TO)

The applicant's objective is to provide off-site accessory parking for customers, employees and visitors to the property. If approved as proposed, the applicant would grade and pave the now vacant parcel across Redding Avenue (address: 1601 – 69th Street) for 100 parking stalls with landscaping and trees. The parking would be accessed from Redding Avenue. This would result in the building having on-site and off-site parking totaling 129 stalls. At 129, the proposal exceeds the maximum allowed by 27 stalls.

Mr. Ragland said his application was conditioned by the City so that the permit for off-site parking at the 69th Street parcel would expire in ten years. This condition was tied to the redevelopment objectives for the area and linked to the existing leaseholds governing the 6800 Folsom property. In light of the "sunset" condition, Mr. Ragland showed conceptual plans for potential future development of a 30-unit apartment building on the 69th Street parcel.

Mr. Billingsley inquired about the presence of entryways to 6800 Folsom through its east façade. Mr. Ragland indicated that there are existing entries on that side of the building.

Ms. O'Mara noted that the proposed bicycle parking facilities are located at the far east end of the 69th Street parcel, and would be less likely to be used due to their distance, and the location would put bicycles at risk of theft and vandalism. She encouraged the applicant to revise the plans so that those employees and customers/visitors who arrive by bicycle can park at the 6800 Folsom parcel.

Ms. O'Mara inquired about the number of employees at this location (answer: 20) and whether they were offered transit passes as an alternative means to commute to work as compared to the free parking offered by the employer. Mr. Ragland and Mr. Gonzales were amenable to consider this option.

Mr. Billingsley inquired about how pedestrian safety can be maximized, given the tendency of many auto drivers to speed around a nearby corner. Mr. Ragland pointed out a planned crosswalk at Redding Avenue connecting the proposed lot with the 6800 Folsom parcel.

Since the stall-count proposed exceeds the maximum allowed, Mr. Billingsley encouraged Mr. Ragland to reduce the stall count by providing a number of overly-large stalls to generously accommodate contractor trucks and their loading needs.

Based on the rationale that development of the property for the use-mix and densities targeted under the redevelopment implementation plan and the 65th/Univeristy Transit Village Plan, Mr. Billingsley put a motion forth to recommend approval of the application with the ten-year expiration requirement. Mr. Little seconded the motion. During discussion, Ms. O'Mara offered an amendment that the recommended approval be conditioned on:

- a.) The applicant's agreement to offer free transit passes for employees at 6800 Folsom; and
- b.) Relocation of bicycle parking facilities from the 69th Street parcel to the 6800 Folsom parcel.

Mr. Billingsley accepted the amended motion and Mr. Little concurred. The motion was approved on a vote of 6:3:0.

D. Project Prioritization Process

Staff Gregory Ptucha directed RAC members to Attachment 4 in their board packets. In that memorandum, the project prioritization process to-date was summarized, beginning with the proceedings of the February 2, 2006 and March 2, 2006 meetings. Subsequent to the last RAC meeting, an internal meeting of City of Sacramento staff representing Utilities, Planning and Transportation was convened on March 15th by SHRA staff. The internal meeting attempted to develop consensus about those projects that the City could recommend the RAC consider as priorities given need, achievement of redevelopment objectives, readiness and lack of alternative funding. (It was noted that Parks Department staff was invited to the March 15 meeting, but they could not attend.) The March 15 meeting developed agreement on some—but not all—matters:

1. Many transportation projects would likely be delayed from implementation until after the pending Circulation Plan study and Supplemental EIR are completed, which will likely take two years or so. This would include streetscape improvement projects (most of which have few funding sources) and any shared parking structure near 65th/Folsom.
2. SACOG's partial funding commitment for Redding Avenue improvements may cause the need for gap financing after design, environmental clearance and right-of-way acquisition is complete.
3. The "Superblock" sewer diversion project is currently estimated at \$600,000 and would likely be triggered by development currently underway or planned for the Superblock and/or the Station Block.
4. There is a need to complete an infrastructure assessment and financing strategy for the redevelopment area south of Highway 50 (i.e., S. 65th Street Area Plan and remainder of redevelopment area not included in the 2004 assessment study).
5. No water distribution projects are planned.

Mr. Ptucha then directed RAC and audience members to Handout #1, which provided a summary of storm water drainage projects that the Department of Utilities generated after the March 15th meeting. This list contained eight projects (one of which might not be within the redevelopment area boundary) that are estimated to cost approximately \$7.7 million. (Note: \$4 million of the \$7.7 concerns debt financing of the planned detention basin that is being sought from the CA Infrastructure Bank.) A map showing the various drainage basins in the 65th St. Redevelopment Area was attached.

Mr. Billingsley asked about the extent to which the planned detention basin and the proposed storm water drainage projects would increase the capacity of the combined sewer system to provide future new hook-ups in the redevelopment area. Greg Ptucha needs to research this question.

It was also reported that a meeting was recently convened by District 3 Council member Steve Cohn, that concerned the development options and site assembly opportunities/obstacles for the Station Block. This led to discussion about use of

redevelopment monies to assemble a site adequate for new development envisioned in the 65th/University Transit Village Plan.

It was noted that current plans are for the required 20% housing set-aside funds are not planned for use in leveraging the loan from the City to SHRA for 65th Street, so affordable housing project/program decisions do not need to be part of this prioritization process.

The result of the above meetings and information-gathering was a “short-list” of projects shown in Attachment 4, page 3, and reproduced below.

“Short-list” of Potential Projects

<i>Public Facilities Projects</i>	<i>RDA Funds</i>	<i>Other Funding / Remarks</i>
Transit Village Circulation Plan Update	\$115,000	SACOG \$885,000 (approved)
Folsom Sewer Diversion (to be triggered by either 20% build-out of Super Block or 50% build-out of Station Block)	\$600,000	City Sewer Funds cannot be used. Developer funding commitments being investigated.
South 65 th area infrastructure assessment (RDA S of Hwy 50)	\$200,000	Includes cost of subsequent financing strategy.
RFQ/consultant for Regional Sanitation & CSUS sewer options	\$100,000	Results could be ready Q1 2007
Elvas E-side curbs, gutters, sidewalk	\$975,000	J to signal, St. Francis HS
Redding Avenue design, acquisition, environmental clearance	\$ 85,452	SACOG \$745,000 (approved)
Redding Avenue construction (gap created by SACOG grant amount)	\$2,169,548	May not be needed during 3-year timeframe
Detention Basin gap financing for environmental mitigation	\$600,000	I-bank \$4,000,000 (pending)
Subtotal:	\$4,845,000	
<i>Commercial Development Projects</i>	<i>RDA Funds</i>	<i>Other Funding / Remarks</i>
Acquisition of key parcels	TBD	

<i>Affordable Housing Projects/Programs</i>	<i>RDA Funds</i>	<i>Other Funding / Remarks</i>
TBD	TBD	20% money won't leverage loan amount

Greg Ptucha then described how the RAC may want to consider the use of screening criteria that reflect the goals/objectives of the redevelopment area (included in Attachment 4). Staff suggested that, for allocation of the expected \$6 million in loan proceeds, the three major redevelopment program areas, i.e., Public Infrastructure and Facilities, Commercial and Economic Development, and, Affordable Housing, the RAC may want to consider, as a model, the November 1, 2005 Guidelines adopted for the Downtown Redevelopment Project Area. The downtown guidelines (as embodied in Resolution 2005-056) were reflective of that area's development priorities. SHRA staff suggested allocations by percentage of resources be identified to project types (in the abstract) as follows:

- Transportation & Streetscape Projects
- Drainage, Sewer & Water Distribution Projects
- Parks and Recreation Open Space and Facilities Projects
- Commercial & Economic Development Projects (including Mixed-use Housing/Commercial Projects)
- Affordable Housing Projects/Programs (only if the 20% tax increment monies are used to leverage the city bond and loan amount).

The screening criteria/expenditure guidelines could also articulate how priority would be given to projects that achieve certain objectives (modified to reflect 65th Street goals):

- Achieves multiple redevelopment goals.
- Leverages existing assets and/or other investment resources.
- Appeals to a large, diverse group of users.
- Make a significant aesthetic improvement to the urban environment.
- Meets Transit Village objectives and employs "Smart Growth" principles.
- Has no alternative source of funding.

Staff described how the recommendations of the RAC are intended to serve as guidelines for decision-making on project funding proposals that would be formally presented in the upcoming three-year period. As such, they are intended to allow for flexibility, given various unknowns that may arise.

RAC members discussed how best to confirm their priorities and how structure their recommendations to the SHRA Commission, which will soon consider a staff report that is intended to lead to a mid-May action by the City Council. Mr. Billingsley articulated the specific projects from the "short list" that have identified budget gap totaling as much as \$2.8 million. Mr. Rasmussen was in agreement. There was discussion about use of funds to assemble a development site at the Station Block. Ms. Maleske asked for confirmation about how those funds would likely be used. Mr. Little placed emphasis on the detention basin, whose \$4 million in funding has yet to be firmly committed. Mr. Billingsley touched upon the need for projects that increase the ability of new projects to be developed as soon as practical, so new tax increment can be generated. Ms. O'Mara placed emphasis on new park facilities that would serve and attract new residents. There was discussion about large, existing parks facilities near the redevelopment area.

Mr. Wilson recommended a formula using percentages divided as follows:

<u>Project Category</u>	<u>Percent of \$6 million bond/loan proceeds</u>
• Transportation:	20%
• Water/Sewers/Drainage:	40%
• Commercial/Economic Dev:	30%
• Parks/Recreations:	10%

Discussion followed:

1. Mr. Rasmussen suggested an increase in the percentage allocated to Commercial and Economic Development assistance.
2. Ms. O'Mara emphasized the need for neighborhood parks.
3. Mr. Billingsley inquired about urban parks design. Mr. Sparky Harris of the City's Planning division described how the adopted 65th St./University Transit Village Plan includes urban parks development guidelines.
4. Alternative objectives for project support were offered that achieved an unofficial consensus of support.
 - Transportation & Streetscape Projects: 20%
 - Drainage, Sewer & Water Distribution Projects: 40%
 - Commercial & Economic Development Projects 35%
 - Park Facilities, Recreation, Open Space Projects 05%
5. Audience member Todd Leon urged the RAC to maintain flexibility in its formula, particularly to allow for funds to be available for site assembly opportunities that would lead to a transit-oriented development. Mr. Rasmussen agreed.

Mr. Billingsley made a motion that, after some friendly amendments, was seconded by Mr. Stack. The motion voted upon reads thus:

65th Street RAC recommendations on use of the anticipated \$6 million in bond/loan proceeds have an overall objective for early implementation of desirable developments that will generate new tax increment revenue. Over the next three years, new projects will be considered for funding as circumstances warrant. RAC priorities for distribution of redevelopment funds will be, in this order:

1. Drainage, Sewer & Water Distribution Projects
2. Commercial & Economic Development Projects (which could include assemblage of parcels if circumstances dictate a need to do so).
3. Transportation & Streetscape Projects
4. Parks/Community Facilities, Recreation, Open Space

In addition, the following, previously identified transportation and utilities projects are priorities for the levels of financial support specified, if needed:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Other Funding / Remarks</i>
Transit Village Circulation Plan Update	\$115,000	SACOG \$885,000 (approved)
Redding Avenue bike/pedestrian improvements (scope: design, acquisition, environmental clearance)	\$ 85,452	SACOG \$745,000 (approved)
Redding Avenue bike/pedestrian construction costs	\$2,169,548 (gap created by SACOG grant amount)	May not be needed during 3-year timeframe; or, seek funding during next SACOG round.
Detention Basin gap	\$600,000 (may not be	I-bank \$4,000,000 (pending)

financing for environmental mitigation	required)	
--	-----------	--

The motion was approved unanimously.

A. Redevelopment Area Update

Gregory Ptucha updated the RAC and audience on the following items:

Detention Basin

1. Site control (via eminent domain) is being processed by the city's Department of General Services.
2. The city's Utilities Department is trying to reduce the higher-than-budgeted environmental remediation cost estimates for Fairy Shrimp habitat
3. The i-Bank loan application may be acted upon during a meeting scheduled for the last week of April.
4. Ms. Janet Baker, Parks Development Manager, indicates that Master Planning for the "passive" park at the detention basin will occur once the City takes title to the property. Ms. O'Mara suggested that the Local Government Commission be approached about new urban park planning in the redevelopment area.

Target Corporation Proposal

Ms. Kimberly Kaufmann-Brisby of City of Sacramento Planning recently sent a follow-up letter to Mr. John Dewes, Target representative. The letter summarizes city staff comments about needed changes to the schematic plan presented on March 1 at the pre-application meeting. Mr. Dewes has since approached Ms. Kaufmann-Brisby to arrange a follow-up meeting.

Mr. Billingsley inquired about when the RAC and the public would have the opportunity to see Target's plans. Greg Ptucha explained that, technically, Target has not submitted an application to the City. The pre-application meetings are intended to let the applicant and city staff identify major issues and problems that might be resolved before the application is formally submitted.

Ms. O'Mara asked if staff can inquire about how many of the Golden One employees who formerly worked at the site now controlled by Target Corporation utilized Regional Transit passes to commute to that location.

RAC Recruitment

The City Clerk will advertise for a replacement to fill Linda Shafer's (District 3) position from April 5 through 12, 2006. Greg Ptucha mentioned that application forms were available near the entry to the meeting room.

Code Enforcement

Regarding University Garage, Mr. Bill Hutcheon, City of Sacramento Code Enforcement, indicates that the property/business owner has removed a number of the old cars from the front area. He was given a little more time to remove the other vehicles. Code Enforcement Supervisor Ted Freeman and Zoning Investigator Brian Ramsey plan to complete an independent, in-depth investigation to determine all that can and should be done with the property to finally get it into compliance. Mr. Hutcheon will then take their recommendations and integrate them into the project.

III. COMMUNICATION FROM RAC MEMBERS AND PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

- Greg Ptucha noted that RAC members need to submit their annual Statement of Economic Interest to the City Clerk by April 28, 2006.
- Ms. Beck Heieck, Executive Director of the Power Inn Business & Transportation Association (BTA), introduced herself. She addressed the RAC about the possible installation of a traffic signal at Power Inn Road and Belvedere Avenue. She recommended against this, since the intersection is very close to an existing signal at 14th Avenue and Power Inn Road. As an alternative, Ms. Heieck inquired about whether the RAC might support study of a possible extension of 14th Avenue so that it would run from Power Inn Road east to Florin-Perkins Road. Ms. Heieck discussed the need for this connection, to alleviate truck traffic in the area. She also referred to the SEATS study and its range of recommended transportation improvements. It was noted that the area east of Power Inn Road is outside the 65th Street Redevelopment Area boundaries, and that justification of use of redevelopment monies for such a study might be difficult unless a direct correlation to potential benefit to traffic flow inside the redevelopment area could be established. Whether the planned Circulation Study could include Ms. Heieck's suggestion in its scope of work is unclear. Ms. Heieck also suggested that the Belvedere traffic signal would serve a more useful purpose if installed where an extended 14th Avenue would intersect Florin-Perkins Road.
- Ms. Heieck then focused attention on the need for study and improvement of the "triangle" area within the redevelopment area boundaries surrounded by the UPRR rail tracks (west), 14th Avenue (north) and Power Inn Road (east). This area is a mix of industrial, commercial and residential uses that has many needs for infrastructure improvements (e.g., curbs, gutters, sidewalks, street lighting) and also has significant criminal activity that flows over into the industrial areas served by the BTA. Mr. Billingsley suggested that any study of these issues be fashioned to solve the problems cited by Ms. Heieck in a manner that would invite new, desirable development that would achieve the redevelopment plan goals and generate additional tax increment. Ms. Clady noted that the City of Sacramento has an economic development staff that might be useful in addressing some of the issues and strategizing solutions.
- There was discussion where Mr. Rasmussen and Mr. Little confirmed that Texas-based JPI has taken title to the 13.5 acre former driving range. The new owner is seeking a developer to whom they can sell the property.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At approximately 8:50 pm, the meeting adjourned upon unanimous vote on a motion by Mr. Billingsley and a second by Mr. Little.