

**MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2001 -- 7:30 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held on this date with the following members present:

Mr. Craig Barton Staff Present:

Ms. Nancy Damon Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director
Mr. Kevin O'Halloran Mr. Ron Higgins, AICP, Planning Manager
Ms. Kathy Johnson-Harris Ms. Tarpley Vest, Neighborhood Planner
Mr. Herman Key, Chair Mr. Pete Anderson, UVA Architect
Ms. Cheri Lewis
Mr. Eldon Wood

City Council Members Present

Mr. J. Blake Caravati, Mayor

Ms. Meredith Richards

Mr. David Toscano

Mr. Key called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m. and presented housekeeping matters such as limiting comments to three minutes; if the comments to be expressed are similar to those previously expressed, he asked that comments be limited to one minute or that the speaker state, "I concur completely." He also requested that speakers state their name and address for the record.

A. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

There were no matters raised by the public.

B. MINUTES

Mr. Key asked if there were any changes or additions to be made to the November 11, 2001 minutes. Ms. Damon requested clarification of a speaker's name which had been spelled different manners in the minutes. Ms. Damon made the motion to approve the

minutes with the correction of the speaker's name. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

C. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING

1. SP--01-10-15: An application for a special permit to use the property at 517 Park Street for a group home for up to 16 residents. The general uses allowed in the R-3 Residential zoning of the property are for multi-family residential development of up to 21 units per acre by right. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map #53 as Parcel 9, having approximately 70.5 feet of frontage on Park Street, 142 feet of frontage on Parkway Street and containing approximately 10,179 square feet of land, or .23 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for multi-family residential at a density range of twelve (12) to eighty-seven (87) units per acre. This item was deferred from the November 13, 2001 Public Hearing.

Ms. Vest presented the staff report which summarized the history given in the November meeting. The property at 517 Park Street was most recently the Virginia Institute for Autism. When originally built in the early 1980's it was

built for between 12 and 14 residents. However, there may have been up to 16 residents at various times. The property is currently zoned R-3. This particular type of group home is licensed under the Virginia Department of Social Services and may have up to eight residents

without a special use permit. Park Street includes a variety of zoning including R-3, R-2, R-1A and B-1. Ms. Vest also reiterated the requirements for approval of a special use permit. She then went over the concerns as previously stated in November. The

applicant is prepared to add four parking spaces to meet City standards/Codes. The house is subject to the City's noise ordinance. Staff will be present 24 hours a day. The house complies with the Land Use Plan. The applicant is pursuing a shared parking

arrangement with the adjacent property owners. The building was designed to house 12 to 14 residents and the public has expressed concerns over a density of 16 residents. In terms of impacting upon schools, the residents will be split between Albemarle County and Charlottesville City schools. The property falls under the review of the Board of Architectural Review. The applicant will comply with all Federal, state and local laws governing operation of a group home. This application was originally scheduled for review at the November 13th meeting. During that Joint Public Hearing, it became apparent that some property owners had not received proper notice so the item was deferred until the December meeting. Approval is recommended of a group home of up to 14 residents subject to the conditional approval of final site plan approval by staff.

Mr. Key called on the applicant to make a statement.

Ms. Carol Gloeckner, of 717 Wolftrap Road, Charlottesville, is part owner of the STARS program with her husband, Brian Webber. They have two other group homes, one in Johnson Village, which houses six girls, and another in the Belmont area, which houses eight girls. They must comply with and be licensed by the Interdepartmental Office of Regulations for Child Caring Facilities. Working under this office and under the Department of Social Services they face regular inspections as well as surprise inspections. They have had inspections with no violations at the other sites. The property at 517 Park Street has passed an inspection and licensure should be granted

by the end of the week for a capacity of eight with a guarantee of approval for whatever capacity is granted by the CPC. They want to use the facility to its full capacity to provide opportunities for the girls. At a meeting with the Neighborhood Association they found friends and support instead of the opposition they expected.

Mr. Key called for comments from the public.

Mr. Brian Webber, of 717 Wolftrap Road, Charlottesville, agrees with the applicant, his wife. After meeting with the Neighborhood Association they decided to meet with the Neighborhood Association on a monthly basis with the availability of meeting more

frequently as needed. They want to be good neighbors and work out issues that may arise. The house has eight bedrooms and would accommodate 16 residents. Past use by a different organization was 14 residents and one room for sleep-in staff. Since staff will remain awake, all bedrooms are available for residents.

Ms. Patty Thomas Cato, of 2242 Hansens Mountain Road, Charlottesville. Has served as a CASA, Court Appointed Special Advocate, and as such has worked with abused and neglected children. She knows of the quality of STARS group homes and spoke in favor of the plan and the applicants.

Ms. Diane Ogher Smith, of 329 Parkway, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. The population density seems too high for that location. She believes that there is a great deal of opposition in the neighborhood. Ninety-six residents on eight surrounding streets were polled and 88 people signed a petition in opposition to the special permit. Of the eight non-signers, three had no opinion based on lack of information. Ms. Smith presented the petition to the CPC.

Ms. Barbara Shenfield, of 321 Parkway, spoke in opposition of the proposal after having talked with the director of the ARC of the Piedmont, which had built 517 Park Street for 16 residents and then found it to be too small. Further concerns involved the

adverse impact of 16 adolescent girls in a building that had most recently been a day school for 12 residents.

Mr. Kevin Burke, of 614 Park Street, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. He and his wife are not against the facility, but are concerned about the number of residents and the negative impact of STARS facilities with more than eight residents in other neighborhoods. The decision for this site could set a precedent for the City as a whole.

Mr. David RePass, of 227 East Jefferson Street, Charlottesville, spoke in favor of the plan. He had attended the neighborhood meeting skeptical of the home and left the meeting as a supporter. Having toured the property, he urges the CPC to grant the 16

resident request.

Ms. Marla Ziegler, of 616 Park Street, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal based on the density. She was not opposed to the home, only to the number of residents.

Ms. Jackie Taylor, of 104 Northwood Circle, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. Area residents with small children have concerns about this proposal. The home is needed, but the numbers will impact the neighborhood with traffic, parking, and the ability of the STARS staff to manage this number of adolescent girls.

Ms. Ashlin Smith, a 41-year resident of 620 Park Street, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. As the grandmother of three grandchildren who also live near the site, she is afraid for Park Street. Her concern is that the problems of the

adolescents will require every bit of existing space and more supervision than is provided. While the neighborhood has welcomed group homes, the number of

residents is too large.

Ms. Denise Lunsford, of 612 Malcolm Crescent, Charlottesville, spoke in support of the proposal. Residents will be using public transportation. They are required to work 20 hours per week. The girls will be busy with work, school and household chores.

Ms. Lynn Valentine, of 534 Park Street, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. Her concern was over the large number of residents. Sixteen adolescent females will have a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Ms. Toni Zeller, of 1144 Meriwether Street, Charlottesville, and an employee of STARS, spoke in favor of the plan and addressed concerns that had been raised by neighbors of 517 Park Street.

Mr. Stan Tatum, a 20-year resident of 540 Park Street, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. His concern is over the number of residents.

Mr. Bud Treacle, of 611 Park Street, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. As someone who raised three teen-aged boys, his hat is off to anyone attempting to care for eight to 16 teen-aged girls. His biggest concern is with the density of the home.

Having heard from all who had signed up to speak, Mr. Key asked for further comments from the public.

Ms. Jackie Lichtman, of 336 Parkway, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. She is not opposed to a home of eight girls, but she objects to the larger number of residents due in part to the lack of yard space for 517 Park Street.

Ms. Colette Hall, of 101 Robertson Lane, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. Her concern is with the lack of recreational activities for a large number of residents. The primary recreation source is the Downtown Mall which already has too many unsupervised adolescents throughout the day.

Ms. Andrea Reese, a former resident of the Shamrock STARS home, spoke in favor of the proposal. She spoke of the strict schedule which was followed by the residents.

Ms. Jennifer Ferguson, of 721 Cargil Lane, Charlottesville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. While she is not against a group home, she is also concerned with the large number of residents. She suggested opening the home with eight residents and

then, after seeing how it impacts the community, begin to increase the number of residents gradually.

Ms. Elizabeth Cuchar, 528 Valley Road, Charlottesville, wanted clarification on referrals, especially what is "appropriate" and "inappropriate."

Having no further public comment, the applicant was recalled to answer members' questions.

Ms. Lewis verified that this would be the third house for the applicant and inquired about the location of the organization's offices. Ms. Glockner stated that they would be in the 517 Park Street facility. Ms. Lewis further asked about how many employees would man the corporate office there, to which the applicant replied that there are six work stations but not all will be in use at the same time. Ms. Lewis asked how many would be in the house at one time to conduct business.

Ms. Lewis then asked for a description of who the residents would be if the permit were granted. The applicant replied that the majority of the girls are between 15 and 17. Eighty percent would be in high school. Ms. Glockner also explained that there is no

"typical" resident.

Ms. Johnson-Harris wondered how many would be from Charlottesville community and the applicant estimated one-fourth.

Mr. Barton asked if that meant the city. Ms. Glockner replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Johnson-Harris requested a break down on City and County schooling. The applicant had no response at this time.

Mr. Tolbert asked about the corporate office being located at 517 Park Street especially as regarded parking spaces since parking spaces had been planned based on resident needs and not employee needs. He stated that additional parking would be needed above and beyond the four planned spaces.

Ms. Lewis wondered if the shared parking proposal had been resolved. Mr. Webber spoke with PHA over shared parking issues, they have spaces available for STARS

staff after normal business hours. Ms. Lewis inquired if the agreement was formalized.

Mr. Barton inquired about the size of the other properties owned by the applicants. Mr. Webber stated that the other two are probably smaller than 517 Park Street.

Mr. Barton then asked how the amount of occupants had been decided for the other properties. Ms. Glockner stated by the number and size of the bedrooms.

Mr. Barton then asked about the benefits of increasing the size of the household from eight to 16. While he understood that the house is big enough for more than eight, he wanted to hear about the benefits for the household community. Mr. Webber

stated that eight more children would have a place to live.

Ms. Lewis asked if there would be a resident counselor for the home. Ms. Glockner stated that all of the staff are residential counselors. There would be no live-in full time employee.

Ms. Lewis then asked if the applicants had yet closed on the property. The applicants are in a lease/purchase. The lease is a closed contract. However, there is a purchase contract with a spring closing date.

Mr. Caravati asked if they had considered locating elsewhere to be closer to their client base. The applicants had not considered the county because of the availability of public transportation and the proximity of jobs and services.

Mr. Lynch inquired as to how many of the 14 residents at the other two homes are working and how many are in school. Ms. Glockner provided a break down for

him. Only three of the 14 are in need of jobs.

Mr. Caravati asked how the girls got around. The applicant stated that they used public transportation.

Mr. Caravati then asked how the proposed residents would get to the County schools and how was City versus County decided. The applicant stated that it is the decision of the social worker as to which school is attended.

Mr. Tolbert asked if there were resident counselors at the other homes. The applicant replied in the negative.

Mr. Wood asked if there would be a problem with truancy and how the girls would get to the County schools. Ms. Glockner replied that there was a County bus stop at the corner of Hedge and Park.

Mr. Barton asked if referrals could be refused. Ms. Glockner answered, "Absolutely." The applicants are not forced to take referrals. The applicant estimated that they turn down five kids for every one they take.

There being no further questions, Mr. Key allowed the applicant to offer some rebuttals to the community concerns.

Ms. Glockner believes that the other homes do not adversely impact their neighborhoods. No neighbor has ever been victimized by a resident. There has

never been a violation of the noise ordinance and there are rules governing listening to music – none can be played outside.

Ms. Damon asked if the police ever come with sirens on. Ms. Glockner replied that they never had.

Mr. Webber explained state licensure.

Mr. O'Halloran asked about office staff. Mr. Webber is the only staff person. Everybody else is a residential counselor first. Mr. O'Halloran then asked if the same people did both residential counseling and office work. Ms. Glockner stated again that Brian Webber was the only staff person.

Mr. Barton asked about license requirements regarding the ratio between counseling staff and residents. The applicant replied that during the day it is one to ten, evenings are one to 15. However, the applicants currently do one to four or one to three.

There are also one to one times.

Ms. Damon asked about emergency procedures. The applicant explained that all employees have cell phones, all are trained in crisis management.

Mr. Key inquired about emergency back up. He asked if there was a staff on call other than the two individuals. The applicant stated that, yes, there was an on-call staff every night. In fact, there was an on-call staff member for every hour of the day.

Ms. Lewis inquired of the Neighborhood Development staff and the City Attorney if there was a resident counselor requirement for group homes in the zoning ordinance. Ms. Kelly stated that was an interesting question.

Ms. Lewis stated that this was her neighborhood and thanked STARS for providing program information. She also thanked the neighbors who met with the applicant. In her opinion, the facility is okay for the purpose intended. However, she felt 14 should be the maximum number of residents. She is concerned about the amount of parking available. She expressed the hope that the applicant and the neighbors could

become good neighbors.

Ms. Johnson-Harris felt that even though there is a need for these facilities, the staff's recommendation of 14 or less residents would be better. She also expressed a concern over parking needs. A smaller group allows more individual time between staff and

residents. She cannot support 16. She would have to go with 14 or less.

Mr. O'Halloran was impressed by the neighborhood coming together. He was persuaded by the neighbors concerns about increased density. He stated he was in favor of doing what current zoning and state law allow and suggest. He suggests going with a group home of eight residents.

Ms. Damon would only support eight to start to see how it worked out in the neighborhood.

Mr. Barton stated he was impressed by the points expressed. The issues concerning him include the fact that the size of the house should not dictate the number of residents. He feels that the house was overbuilt for the lot. He also stated his concern over the inability of the applicant to demonstrate the benefits of having 16 residents as opposed to fewer residents.

Mr. Wood expressed his concern over the amount of supervision of the residents. He also expressed concern over the fear factor of the neighbors. Due to these reasons, he felt that the special use permit should be denied at this time.

Mr. Wood then moved that the request for the special use permit be denied. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Halloran.

Mr. Key commended both the neighborhood and the applicant for a positive experience and the dialog between them. He then also stated that he felt the home could support 12 adolescents which would provide a ratio of one counselor to three residents.

Ms. Lewis, in further discussion, stated that in addition to the parking and traffic issues, the necessary programming for the residents would impact the neighborhood if there were more than eight residents.

Mr. Key stated that the motion had been made and seconded to deny the special use permit. He then asked for further discussion. Seeing none, he called for the vote.

Mr. Higgins called the vote. After voting had started, Mr. Key brought up the procedural question of whether the special permit which was being voted on was for 14 or 16.

Mr. Tolbert stated that the motion was to deny the special permit as requested. Mr. Key reiterated that the special permit request was for 16 residents. Ms. Kelly clarified the motion and vote. Her understanding was that the motion was to deny the

special permit request as applied for by the applicant, which was for 16. That was seconded and was voted on. Ms. Kelly expressed the opinion that it was too late to amend the original motion.

The vote carried six to one with Mr. Key voting against the motion.

Mr. Tolbert clarifies that Board did not deny permit, but rather made a recommendation to City Council to deny which will be taken up at a later meeting, probably January 7th meeting.

Let the record reflect that Mr. Caravati has left his seat on City Council and joined the public for the next matter on the agenda

ZM--01-11-19 and SP--01-11-20 were presented, discussed and voted on jointly.

2. ZM--01-11-19: A petition to rezone from R-2 Residential to R-3 Residential Multiple Dwelling the property 11th Street NW along the rear of 1101 and

1105 Little High Street at the rear 12' of 1107 and 1109 Little High Street and the rear 50' of 1115 Little High Street. The general uses allowed in the R-2 zoning are single and two-family dwelling. These properties are further identified on City Real Property Tax Map #54 as portions of parcels 106, 107, 107.1, 110 and 111, having collectively 50 feet of frontage at 11th Street, N.W. and containing

approximately 12,329 square feet of land or .28 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for one and two-family residential at a density range of seven(7) to twelve(12) units per acre.

SP--01-11-20: An application for a special permit for higher density residential at the combined properties at 1111 Little High Street. This would allow for reconstruction and addition to the present apartment building of 24 units into a configuration of 43 units of mixed sized, at a density of 38 units per acre instead of the 21 units per acre allowed by right. The general uses allowed in R-3 Residential Multiple dwelling zoning are multi-family development of 12 to 87 units per acre. This property is further identified on the City Real Property Tax Map #54 as combined parcels of 1074.2 with portions of parcel 106, 107, 107.1, 110 and 111, having 50 feet of frontage at 11th Street, NW, 60 feet of frontage at Little High Street and containing approximately 50,069 square feet of land or 1.15 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are multi-family residential at a density range of 12 to 87 units per acre and two-family residential at a density range of 7 to 12 units per acre.

Ms. Vest presents the staff report with regards to petition submitted to rezone 7400 square feet of property at 1111 Little High Street. Purpose is to allow parking and access off of 11th Street, NW. Currently 24 apartment units on site, applicants requesting higher density to move to 43 units. May body of property currently zoned R-3. Gives current uses of surrounding properties in the neighborhood. Site does meet parking requirements for the site and staff feels that moving access to 11th would improve circulation and hopefully encourage traffic to move toward 11th Street, sufficient utility to provide for increase density; noise, light, dust, odor and fumes additional residence may increase noise some but proposal will only create 59 new bedrooms as opposed to 96 by right, additional lighting fully shielded and downward direct, not dust, odor or fumes anticipated; advises Board of current Land Use Plan for property; renovation may result in increase value and increase rent for tenants which could price some out of complex. Preliminary Site Plan Conference held on November 7th, concern from public impact of additional units on neighborhood character, concern of dumpster location, November 29th Preliminary Agenda Review Meeting, concerns from public: impact increased density on neighborhood, impact of building mass, possible future

construction on existing access drive on Little High Street. Staff recommends approval of Special Use Permit with final administrative approval of the site plan. Staff recommends approval of the Rezoning.

Mr. Key call the applicant forward to present.

Jim Grigg of Daggett and Grigg Architect. Asking for zoning request because thinks it is better plan to providing access to complex. Asking for special use permit but want less than what is allowed under code. Points out a couple of neighborhood that have the same type of mixed dwelling diversity.

Mr. Key calls members of the Public to speak.

Caroline Belt of 1010 Little High Street; will impact traffic and parking, points to Stonehedge traffic, if no washers and dryers which will impact traffic; likes residential atmosphere of community; will have more people and traffic will not be taken care of;

will change the neighborhood, maybe for better or worse.

Elizabeth Alcorn of 1131 Meriwether Street: not informed of any neighborhood meeting, property is a real mess, presents pictures to the board; problems with property and the landlord, hasn't been properly maintained; like to know what kind of landlord he is; do not know what the site plan looks like as not informed; bad storm drainage issues with the property; hopes questions answered before approval given.

Laura Duvolt of 1114 Little High Street: asking board to defer until next month; neighborhood association has a number of concerns which will be addressed by

other; applicant did not discuss plans with anyone in neighborhood until November 30th when invited to neighborhood association meeting; want applicant to be more forthcoming.

John Kesler of 1125 Little High Street: past history of site not good, but improve under new owner; concern about size; like idea of moving driveway and renovating the building; also request for more time.

Jonathan Snare of 1117 Little High Street: personal interest is location of dumpster; only learned about plan six weeks previous, heard nothing from developer; ask the board delay approval; moving drive to 11th Street will not improve traffic on Little

High Street.

Rebecca Stralemyer of 1124 Little High Street: have a few macro issues that board should address, will decrease the aesthetic value of the city, will increase personal ownership of property; ask the Board to deny application.

Mark Haskins of 1140 Meriwether Street: this is a special neighborhood with real character; would be better off allowing 21 4 bedroom units properly maintained versus an exception to landlord whose property not properly maintained now; ask that

question be deferred.

Ralph Shifflett of 1143 Meriwether: opposed to any rezoning in the neighborhood and impact on traffic.

Mr. Key closes public hearing.

Ms. Johnson-Harris questions staff about Neighborhood Association. Mr. Tolbert explains that this Neighborhood Association has not really existed in about ten years.

Ms. Johnson-Harris moves to defer matter to let Neighborhood Association to meet with the developer with the help of staff. Then motion was seconded by Ms. Damon.

Mr. Key calls for discussion.

Ms. Damon asks for clarification if defer with regards to a timeframe. Mr. Tolbert explains that the board has 90 days from this nights meeting to take action on this application. Mr. Higgins explains that this would have to done by February

meeting as March meeting will be about 92 days.

Mr. Barton makes a friendly amendment that deferral of ZM--01-11-19 also defers SP--01-11-20. Ms. Johnson-Harris accepts friendly amendment.

Mr. Barton speaks to motion made, will support the motion to defer and encourage developer and neighborhood to meet.

Ms. Key makes a friendly amendment to the motion that the applicant and neighborhood association meet by next meeting of the Board.

Mr. Key states the motion before the Board is to defer the item until the January meeting of the Board.

Mr. Higgins calls the roll and the matter passes unanimously.

Mr. Key calls for Site Plans approved administratively.

Ms. Damon asks about 1815 JPA trees. Mr. Higgins explains that the trees have been lost, they could not be saved.

Ms. Lewis moves to approve the site plans approved administratively 11-01 to 12-01. Seconded by Mr. O'Halloran.

Mr. Key calls the vote and it passes unanimously.

LIST OF SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

11/1/01 TO 12/1/01

1. File No. 196 Office Renovations at old 200 McIntire Road

Grocer Store Complex (Ridge-McIntire)

2. File No. 1269 1815 JPA Apartments 1815 Jefferson Park Avenue

Landscape Amendment

3. File No. 547 & 647 Kuttner Building – East 1108 East Market Street

Market Square – Use Changes

And Parking Addition

4. File No. 192 Office Change of Use at 922 922-928 East Jefferson

East Jefferson for People Street

Places, Inc.

5. File No. 418-A Dumpster Replacement Project Hardy Drive

- Walkway and landscape

Changes - West

Mr. Key calls for the Commissioners reports.

Mr. Wood reports that he has no report this month.

Mr. Anderson speaks to north ground connector which has been bundled in with western bypass and is now on indefinite delay, UVa proposing to build connector themselves, explains that two building projects are about 6 months behind arena project which will

renovate the south end of the Lawn and New Cabell Hall.

Mr. Barton reports that he has no report this month.

Ms. Damon reports that, though not official, there is a new director of the Planning District Commission, explains that the person has deep roots here but does

not currently live here.

Mr. O'Halloran informs board that went to MPO technical committee meeting and also attended first meeting of the University Precinct committee which got off to a great start.

Ms. Johnson-Harris informs board she could not attend the ICP committee meeting due to sickness of office staff, still waiting for invitation to attend Neighborhood Federation meetings, Ridge Street Task Force Committee reallocated some funds.

Ms. Lewis reports that she has taken the oath for the Board of Zoning appeals, December meeting was cancelled so will be attending first meeting in January, attended first meeting of the Historic Preservation Subcommittee for the Zoning Amendments

and it went well.

Mr. Keys give his chair report. First parks committee, states committee would like City Council to make a decision regarding the leash issue, CDBG Task force is in preliminary stage of discussion some proposals that have come in.

Mr. Tolbert gives the staff report. Attendance in first 4 of 6 zoning committee meeting great, comments that per board's request the Neighborhood Construction Report and provided to the members of the board a new planning commissioner handbook to

maybe help board members do their job.

Ms. Damon moves that the meeting be adjourned until the 8th of January at 7:30pm. Motion is seconded by Mr. Barton.

Mr. Key calls for a vote and it passes unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Tolbert, Secretary

APPROVED:

Herman Key, Chair