

**CITY OF ISSAQUAH
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
MINUTES**

September 3, 2014

City Hall South
Council Chambers

135 E. Sunset Way
Issaquah, WA 98027

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Carl Swedberg, Vice Chair
Michael Brennan
Raymond Leong
Mel Morgan, Jr.
Richard Sowa

STAFF PRESENT

Lucy Sloman, Land Development Manager
Keith Niven, Economic Development Manager
Christopher Wright, Project Oversight Manager
Sheldon Lynne, Public Works Director

APPLICANT TEAM

Jackie Frank, Costco VP Real Estate Dev.

CALL TO ORDER

SWEDBERG, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY BRENNAN that minutes of the Development Commission meeting on August 20, 2014 be approved as presented. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT: Project Update and Continued Discussion

Application for recommendations on: (1) a Master Site Plan Amendment and (2) a Land Plan for Future Development of 1,500,000 sq. ft. of office, with the potential to substitute up to 250,000 sq. ft. of non-office uses on 47 acres, as part of the City's Development Agreement with the Costco Wholesale Corporation

SWEDBERG explained that tonight's meeting is an update on the Costco Wholesale Corporation (Costco) Development Agreement. He asked people who want to comment to sign up and try to keep their remarks to five minutes.

Schedule Update and Expectations

Niven noted that a lot of correspondence on these proposed actions has been received by staff, and at this point, everything that has been received has been forwarded to the Commission. He went over the schedule adjustments for reviewing this project, specifically the possible need to add another meeting in order for the Commission to have more time to discuss the proposed agreement. He continued meeting time has been set aside for Wednesday, September 17, if it is needed in order to continue tonight's discussion. He suggested that issues that cannot be resolved and that require more discussion at the next meeting be placed in a "parking lot" during tonight's discussion. He reviewed the agreement under consideration tonight.

MSPA Staff Report

Sloman continued staff's presentation with an overview of the Master Site Plan Amendment (MSPA), noting that the bulk of the last meeting was spent on the Land Plan. She gave

background on the Land Plan and MSPA, and described the concerns and confusion expressed at the last meeting about removing one or more Pickering Place property owners from the MSPA. She noted that staff has now prepared a separate plan for the Land Plan and the MSPA, in order to make the MSPA issues more clear.

SOWA asked what is meant by “may take over” in item IV. A. xx, under the Drainage Conditions, which reads, “The City may take over the monitoring program.” Sloman said that means that the City chose not to take over responsibility for monitoring. She said she isn’t sure how the decision was reached, but assumes it was the City’s choice.

She continued with a description of the three new conditions in the Master Site Plan that are being proposed be added to the previously described five conditions. The three new conditions are as follows:

New Condition #6. Maintain a 200-foot setback from Issaquah Creek as permanent open space. Staff recognizes this as Tract A.

New Condition #7. Limit use of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides within 200 feet of Issaquah Creek.

SWEDBERG asked what does “limit use” really mean; what quantities, time frames, and so on are being used to determine limited use. Niven put this issue on the parking lot list.

New Condition #8. The private property CC&Rs, as they may be amended from time to time, will remain on the property and will govern the use, ownership, and maintenance of commonly owned areas and facilities.

BRENNAN asked about the advisability of referring to private CC&Rs (covenants, conditions, and restrictions) in the conditions, given that these CC&Rs are not under the City’s control. Doing so seems to be blending private CC&Rs and City regulations, he noted. Niven said neither Sloman nor I were here in 1987 when the Master Site Plan was approved, and in fact we have been surprised by a lot of the details we have found in this permit. For example, the City is a signatory to these CC&Rs, he explained. Staff has been puzzling over how the City should address issues with the commonly owned facilities, such as the pond in the middle of Pickering Place, if the partnership dissolves. It is a good point, he continued, and one we are trying to deal with in the agreement. Sloman said another option is that this could be noted as binding in the agreement, but not be a condition. BRENNAN said staff may want to talk with legal counsel about the advisability of having a permit condition that references a set of private CC&Rs. Also, he continued, he agrees with SWEDBERG about clarifying the “limited use” of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides, and said perhaps there are references to industry standards in other City documents that could be referenced here. Sloman made a note of it.

BRENNAN asked for clarification of the discussion about removing properties from the Pickering Place Master Site Plan as part of this proposed amendment. Niven said if other property owners in Pickering Place also want to remove themselves from the Master Site Plan, they can do so under this Council action. The City Attorney has determined that a written request from the property owner is required in order for a property owner to remove themselves from the Master Site Plan. The rationale is that the Council has already stated that it has a different vision for the future redevelopment of this area, he continued, so from that standpoint if property owners want out, the Council has already wrestled with the issues. So rather than make them go through a separate process, they could take advantage of the “door being open” right now. BRENNAN

said that seems like something the City would want to encourage. Niven said the likelihood that all the property owners would want to do that is low; but some may choose to take advantage of it. MORGAN asked could that “door of opportunity” be extended for, say, 12 months. Niven said staff tried that approach but the City Attorney indicated it could not happen that way.

SWEDBERG asked has the City contacted the affected property owners and advised them of this. Niven replied Costco has been talking with other property owners about this opportunity. He referred to a meeting held two weeks ago by Costco to which all the property owners were invited, so those who chose to attend heard the message. Sloman noted that all property owners are also receiving all these materials associated with the project. SWEDBERG spoke in favor of a separate letter from the City to property owners advising them of this opportunity. Niven put it on the parking lot list.

Briefing Response Memo

Sloman continued her presentation on the Briefing Response Memo included in the agenda packet. She noted the memo contains 49 issues and staff’s response to each. She proposed focusing on eight of those 49 tonight that created the most discussion and confusion at the last meeting, although staff is happy to answer questions on any of the others as well. During her presentation, Commissioners had the following comments and questions.

- 1) Community Spaces (item 1, page 2 of 24)

Sloman showed photographs depicting similarities between the proposed project and the Amazon campus in the South Lake Union neighborhood of Seattle.

- 2) Mix of Uses (item 5, page 4 of 24)

BRENNAN asked of the 250,000 square feet of non-residential, retail shown in the Land Plan, could that also include square footage on the existing warehouse floor. Sloman replied yes. BRENNAN noted this could result in a very large retail footprint, and said ideally he would like to see that square footage “scattered around” the site a little more.

- 3) Pedestrian Orientation (item 17, page 10 of 24)

BRENNAN referred to the trail that runs on the east side of the site and that connects to the southeast corner. He said he thinks the plan is still missing an opportunity to take full advantage of that trail and integrate it into the project; the project feels like it is “turning its back” on the trail. Sloman replied there will be more frequent pedestrian connections for the public connecting the trail to the street. She continued that Costco has proposed semi-public spaces that are used for seating, lunchrooms, etc. on the back side of the project, along the Creek. She said that staff felt that the design met the intention of the standard. She also noted that the building will be a four-sided structure, with no discernible “back.” BRENNAN said he would like to keep an awareness of this issue as the discussion moves forward. Niven added it to the parking lot list.

- 4) Building 4-A (item 18, page 10 of 24)

Sloman read the proposed revision to Condition 4 (“The southern wing of Building 4-A needs to fulfill the corner requirements to the extent possible, given the intersection’s acute angle and opportunities to preserve and/or highlights views and vistas.”).

- 5) Skybridges (item 26, page 13-14 of 24)

Sloman noted that staff and Costco heard the Commission's concerns about skybridges as expressed at the August 20 meeting and is proposing a modification to the Development Agreement, specifically a change to allow one skybridge to cross the right-of-way rather than two.

LEONG said skybridges can block views but he doesn't see them as necessarily a negative feature. They can be attractive and architecturally interesting, he continued, particularly when they are primarily transparent.

MORGAN said he is conflicted about skybridges; they move people safely and out of the weather between buildings, but to the extent that people are using skybridges then they are not out experiencing the pedestrian world. He said a huge feature of the CIP was improving the pedestrian experience from the street. He added that he didn't notice any skybridges in the Amazon campus photos shown earlier. Niven added skybridges to the parking lot list.

BRENNAN said he also recognizes that multiple interests are at play with the use of skybridges. He said he noted at the last meeting that he is not a fan of horizontal glass tubes, and has already spoken about the need to make skybridges architecturally interesting, but he also recognizes that they offer safety and efficiency for users. He said we need to be very strategic about where they are located.

MORGAN agreed, and said he can accept skybridges between buildings on the property itself, but the one shown over the right-of-way is the one that concerns him. He said he recognizes that there may be safety concerns with traffic, and that Costco is looking for security on their campus, and that having connections between buildings may be a better alternative than planning for huge buildings that don't need external connections. He said another concern is that the use of a skybridge on the Costco campus may result in a proliferation of skybridges in developments under the CIP, which is not an outcome any of us probably want. The Commission agreed to continue this discussion at the next meeting.

6) SEPA review (item 29, page 14-15 of 24)

MORGAN said of the total 2.4 million square feet of development for the urban core under the Central Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), this planned action would use up about 1.5 million square feet, so about 900,000 square feet would be left. Niven confirmed that is correct. The package includes another 497,000 square feet of service/retail development and another 4,769 multi-family units before the need for another EIS would be triggered. If someone wanted to use some of that capacity, say to build an office, the impact would likely be covered within the EIS that has been done because office space typically has less environmental impact than retail space. However, if the proposed new development had impacts not covered in the EIS, then another environmental review would be required. MORGAN asked if, in 15 years or so, Costco's development is up and running, would there still be nearly a half-million square feet that Costco could be "sitting on" while others who may want to develop are stuck waiting in the queue. In that case, could the City take another look at reserving all that square footage, he asked. Niven replied if developers wanted to develop in the CIP, then market forces could come into play. He explained how the City could incentivize additional development.

7) Development Commission Role in Review of Future Permits (item 24, page 12 of 24; item 36, page 18-19 of 24)

BRENNAN noted he is still trying to get comfortable with the changes in the review process under the CIP. He clarified that on projects less than 150,000 square feet in the urban core, the appropriate City official makes the decision about whether or not the project meets CIP standards. On projects over 150,000 square feet, the Commission will discuss the proposed project, including a community conference, and make a recommendation to the Council, who will make the decision. Sloman noted in the new process, a community conference is not required; it is scheduled at the option of the applicant. She continued the Council will be looking to the Commission to provide an in-depth review of the Land Plan, and a lot of the design features and so on will be dictated by the CIP design and development standards. BRENNAN noted the level of detail with reviewing the Land Plan is significantly different and far less detailed than the review the Development Commission has provided in the past. The extent of our review seems to be just moving blocks around on properties, he stated. So the shift is away from Development Commission review and relying more on professional staff for their review. Sloman noted the Development Commission is being asked to weigh in at a more conceptual stage than it has in the past.

MORGAN asked does the imagery shown to the Commission, such as the photos and drawings provided for the Costco project, become part of the official plan for the project. Sloman replied yes, they become part of the Land Plan.

LEONG asked why the plans for each building are not coming back to the Commission for review. Sloman replied if the project falls under the CIP and is less than 150,000 square feet, it does not require Development Commission review. If the building is more than 150,000 square feet and is part of an approved Land Plan, it will come to the Commission for input but the Council will be the decision maker. LEONG expressed his concerns about the lack of details for the Costco project that would ensure the project results in a viable, enjoyable, attractive addition to the community. He said everyone has their own concept from the plans that have been presented here, and he feels uncomfortable with approving a Land Plan without more detail about the project. Niven explained one option for the Development Commission is to recommend that the Commission has to review every building over 150,000 square feet. He said if the Commission doesn't feel comfortable with this process, or can't come to a consensus, that can also be forwarded as part of the Commission's recommendation to Council. Niven put the Development Commission review process on the parking lot list for additional discussion at the next meeting.

SWEDBERG said he understands that the Commission is looking at conceptual drawings only, and the actual design may or may not resemble what we are seeing today. So when the drawings come back to the Commission for our input on color, modulation, and so on, we aren't being asked to make a decision but only to give our input. Where does that input go, he asked. Sloman said staff would take those comments in its discussions with the applicant. We would be relying on the Development Commission to make sure that the plans that the applicant has proposed and that staff is working with them on meet the CIP standards, and that we haven't overlooked something.

SOWA said his understanding is that staff isn't making decisions indiscriminately, but within the parameters set forth in the CIP. The Commission will be taking a look at what is being proposed and seeing whether in our opinion it is or is not consistent with the CIP, he continued. Sloman said that is correct, and one issue is whether you feel it necessary to have decision-making authority to make that happen, or is having that conversation with staff and the applicant sufficient. In other words, is the Land Plan framework sufficient or not. The Commission agreed to continue this discussion at the next meeting.

8) Transportation Improvements (item 30, page 15 of 24)

Sheldon Lynne gave details about the three primary projects in the suite of transportation projects included in the Master Transportation Financing Agreement (MTFA) between the City and Costco, as outlined in detail in Exhibit H-1. He noted the cost for all three of the primary projects within the suite is roughly \$50 million. LEONG asked what the time frame is for these projects. Lynne replied the East Lake Sammamish project is scheduled to begin next year; all three should be completed by 2020.

SWEDBERG referred to the letter from Mr. Bill Williamson (copy on file) which states that “should Costco elect to build less than 1.5 million square feet, then they have over-mitigated for traffic impacts and the draft development agreement contemplates their ability to be reimbursed for any overpayment.” Does this mean that Costco will give the City \$24 million in transportation project money for the project to be fully built out, but if only half is built, Costco will want \$12 million back. He asked staff to comment. Niven said because of the timing of the transportation projects and Costco’s development plans, the cost payments shown in Exhibit H will track concurrently with Public Works’ construction of those projects. So the City will be invoicing Costco over the next six years or so as the transportation projects move forward. If, ten years from now, Costco has only built half of their entitlement, then they will have over-mitigated for their development. The concept is that, in that case, Costco should be able to monetize that investment in the infrastructure in some way, specifically by “selling” the trips it essentially purchased with its contribution to the transportation projects to other developers. SWEDBERG asked would that be similar to a TDR (transfer of development rights) trade. Niven replied yes. SWEDBERG said so an actual exchange of cash would not take place. Niven replied that is correct. Costco would essentially be paid back for their investment in City streets by another developer, which could even be the City. MORGAN asked could Costco force the City to buy back the trip rights. Niven replied no. He noted Costco does intend to expand their campus; this provision provides a way for them to recoup some of their investment if for some reason their plans don’t materialize.

MORGAN asked for clarification of Costco’s financial commitment. Lynne replied of the \$49.5 million total cost, Costco is committing to 48 percent plus 2.5 percent of contingency, which is about \$23.7 million. The City is assuming responsibility for 52 percent plus the first 2.5 percent of contingency, which is about \$25.7 million. The contingency fund assures that both parties share the risk. MORGAN asked is the contingency optional for Costco. Lynne replied no, and referred to the outline of costs in Exhibit H-2.

MORGAN asked is there any future expectations for the I-90 overpass. Lynne replied it is still on “the radar screen.”

Applicant Presentation

Jackie Frank, Vice President of Real Estate Development for Costco Corporation, said this Development Agreement is very important to Costco. He described Costco’s mission and code of ethics, and explained how they are relevant to this Development Agreement and Costco’s working relationship with the City. He continued his presentation with a description of the characteristics of the corporation; its expectations for future growth and expansion; its need for additional building capacity; the history of the proposed Development Agreement; the history of Costco’s relationship with the City over the years; how the CIDDS (Central Issaquah Development and Design Standards) provide the framework for this proposed development; and the integration of community spaces into the campus. He showed photographs of existing

building entrances of buildings Costco has built in the Pickering Place complex, plus paths, trails, existing skybridges, views, and pedestrian connections nearby. He explained why the Development Commission should have confidence and trust in Costco's commitment to this project, the principles of the design and development standards, and the Issaquah community at large.

Public Comment

Randy Bass, Bass & Bass Property Partnership, owner of several properties on SE 62nd Street, distributed a map and showed where his property is located. He gave some background on his and his family's history with the City, including his donation of a portion of SE 62nd to the City. He described the impacts the Costco project will have on his property and his ability to continue doing business. He described how much it has cost him so far to protect his property and noted the project will result in his need to redevelop his property. He asked that the City and Costco work with him, his attorney, and his traffic engineer on providing him with more than a single egress/access point. He said he thinks this problem can be solved and that a solution can be achieved.

Sam Rodabough, attorney for Bass & Bass Property Partnership, referred to his co-counsel Bill Williamson's letter (on file) about Mr. Bass's concerns. He noted that Mr. Bass's property will be uniquely impacted by the proposed roadway improvements, resulting in loss of significant frontage, about one-third of the total site, and full access on the south roadway. He said the City and Costco are obligated to mitigate the impacts to the Bass property, and said his understanding is that the City and Costco have not cooperated fully to meet that obligation. He gave details about the access Mr. Bass is seeking be restored and asked that the Development Agreement be amended to require mitigation of the full impacts of the project to the Bass property. He also said he has questions about how the transportation concurrency provisions work that are not addressed in the Development Agreement. He asked the Commissioners to take a close look at the letter from Mr. Williamson and asked staff and Costco representatives to set up an expedited meeting to resolve the Bass property issues.

Chris Brown, traffic engineer for Bass & Bass Property Partnership, gave background on his 40-year history working on projects in Issaquah. He distributed a copy of his analysis regarding egress/access on SE 62nd Street, and said his analysis indicates it is possible to have full access on the south side of the driveway. He showed the location on a map. He explained the assumptions contained in his analysis. He continued that given the damages to the Bass property by this project, he is requesting a meeting for all parties to work through a solution to this problem, which he thinks is solvable.

Jim Siebers, owner of Pickering Square, referred to a letter he sent to staff and Commissioners dated September 2, 2014. He noted that Costco owns only half the property at Pickering Place, and noted that Pickering Place is a corporation with CC&Rs (covenants, conditions, and restrictions) and an existing development agreement with the City. He said CC&Rs can't be changed without concurrence. He continued that Costco has not always been a good member of Pickering Place, and gave examples. He gave his perspective on what Costco's future in Issaquah could be, noting that corporations move around the country and internationally all the time, and described how this agreement will impact the other members of Pickering Place. He said we are trying to arrange a full owners' meeting before year-end to try to reach some concurrence.

John Traeger, 710 7th Ave. SW, Issaquah, said he is a former City Councilmember and currently is Vice Chair of the Economic Vitality Commission. He said the existing Master Site

Plan that applies to the Costco campus is old and in need of replacing, noting that the first MSP did not include an end date. He questioned why a separate agreement is not being used for each building on the campus rather than using an overall Development Agreement. He noted the unique characteristics of this project and spoke in favor of Costco as an employer and member of the community. He said the process for approving development agreements under the new CIP does mean a reduced role for the Development Commission, but the process is aligned with the direction set by the Council during the last few years. He noted that the community spaces are within an essentially private campus and the proposed skybridges can be architectural opportunities, and urged the Commission to recommend approval with the amendments and conditions discussed so far.

Greg Spyridis, 10605 NE 193rd, Bothell, said he owns a business in Pickering Place and believes he speaks for the majority of other owners. He said earlier in the meeting, staff stated that property owners received all the information released about this project, and was relying on Costco to meet with property owners to explain the project. He said the project information is dense, complex, and not something that can be digested quickly or easily. He continued he feels that property owners have been left out of the process. He encouraged staff and Costco to include property owners in these proceedings as much as possible, particularly as the project seems to be taking place at breakneck speed. He urged the Commission to help reach out to property owners so their voices are heard on this project.

Matthew Bott, Greater Issaquah Chamber of Commerce CEO and Squak Mountain resident, spoke about Costco's support and contributions to Issaquah as an outstanding employer and community member, noting Costco's charitable contributions, positive economic impacts, the spin-off effect of vendors and others who do business with Costco, etc. He said he has seen the difficulty of getting federal and state dollars for much-needed transportation improvements around the City, so Costco's participation in the transportation improvements associated with this project is welcome. He also said Costco's expansion has been identified as one of the largest drivers in our community's business growth, and sends a message to other businesses that Issaquah is a good place to invest and do business.

David Kappler, 255 SE Andrews Street, Issaquah, said the electronic documents released in advance of tonight's meeting were difficult for him and likely others to access, and asked staff to make sure that materials on the website for projects of this magnitude are easily accessible. He expressed his concerns about whether this project fits with the CIP's vision to create environments where people can work, live, and play. He said if people aren't going to be living here because housing isn't part of the project, then transportation and traffic issues have to be examined very carefully. He said skybridges have a place in construction, and is somewhat surprised that Costco hasn't argued more forcefully for skybridges as a safety issue. He said he would like to see more consideration for trails to bring people into and around the site, including expanding existing trails, adding new bicycle facilities, and separating bike and foot traffic. He also encouraged Costco to take a larger interest in the state park that will border its site and how to promote access to the park.

Connie Marsh, business owner at 1175 N.W. Gilman Blvd., Suite B-11, Issaquah, and Issaquah resident, said Costco's presentation tonight was about the corporation's value to the community, not the community's value to the corporation, similar to Microsoft's approach some years ago. She said when she reads the proposed Development Agreement, she doesn't feel particularly optimistic that good things will necessarily happen for the City long-term, and that the Development Agreement is probably only really understood by one or two staff people. She said at one point in the past when the CIP was first being discussed, the Costco CEO at the time

said that housing on the valley floor was a great idea, and now the CIP is in place and housing isn't on the table. She said she fears this is what will happen for future projects as well; the language in the CIP will be contorted to fit what someone wants. She continued she has concerns about the lack of signage and poor condition of the trail connection from this project to the state park, and would like to see a condition added to the agreement that Costco and the City will address that.

Additional Commissioner Discussion

Niven referred to the list of parking lot items compiled during the meeting, and asked whether the Commissioners have other items to add. SWEDBERG clarified that staff will work on these issues for additional discussion at the next meeting. He also clarified that, regarding the issue raised during Public Comment by Mr. Bass, the Development Commission's purview does not extend to issues such as the acquisition of private property. Niven replied that is correct.

LEONG asked why the road shown in yellow on the diagram is not straight. Lynne showed why the road in question cannot be straight, noting that it would result in cars queuing into the intersection and would result in greater environmental impacts due to the presence of wetlands and other factors.

BRENNAN commented that a theme he has heard tonight is that property owners around Costco do not feel they have been engaged in this process, or at any rate have not been heard. He said if staff can facilitate anything between now and the next Development Commission meeting so that these property owners feel they have been informed and heard, it would be a good investment of time. He said he realizes that this process is complicated, and that Costco brings a lot of value to the community, and that he isn't aware of exactly what communications have already been extended. That said, his concern is ensuring that people and businesses affected by this project do have every opportunity to become engaged.

LEONG said Costco's reputation with the City is good, and the design he has seen thus far seems acceptable, but his concern is whether Issaquah as a whole is being adequately considered. He said the applicant spoke about reasons why we should have "confidence" and "trust" in Costco, but this is a pretty big project for the City and it deserves close scrutiny. He continued he thinks the project should move more slowly. He said he would be more comfortable seeing the proposed design for each building when it gets to that point, rather than being asked to approve everything now. He also encouraged better communication between the City, Costco, and the neighboring properties. He said from what he has heard so far, the process doesn't seem fair to the other property owners in Pickering Place and he would favor moving slower to approve this project.

MORGAN said he would like to know more about Costco's financial contribution to the cost of the traffic mitigation projects. He continued his calculation is that their contribution works out to about \$17.25 per square foot, and would like to know more about how that figure was derived and how it compares to other projects. He also said he would like to see more discussion of the view corridor with regard to the building shown at an acute angle in the diagram. He said at public meetings for the CIP, many people who attended said their biggest concern was the loss of vistas. He said he would not like to see blocked views with this project, given that so many people said that preserving views was very important to them.

SWEDBERG noted that the Development Commission will meet again on September 17, 2014 to continue its discussion of the Costco project.

Development Commission
09-03-14

OTHER BUSINESS: Election of Chair and Vice Chair

SWEDBERG asked Commissioners for nominations for Development Commission Chair and Vice Chair.

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY BRENNAN that HARRISON be nominated as Chair of the Development Commission.

MOVED BY BRENNAN, SECONDED BY MORGAN that SWEDBERG be nominated as Vice Chair of the Development Commission.

MOVED BY LEONG, SECONDED BY BRENNAN that the nominations be closed and that HARRISON and SWEDBERG be reinstated as Chair and Vice Chair of the Development Commission for the next term of office. MOTION CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE OF ALL COMMISSIONERS PRESENT.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to conduct, SWEDBERG adjourned the meeting at 9:56 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Lowe
Recording Secretary