

**Portland Planning Commission
Summary Minutes
October 28, 2008
12:30 PM**

Commissioners present: Andre' Baugh, Catherine Ciarlo, Amy Cortese, Lai Lani Ovalles, Michelle Rudd, Howard Shapiro, Jill Sherman, Irma Valdez

Commissioners absent: Don Hanson, Michelle Rudd

Staff Present: Gil Kelley, Eric Engstrom, Sallie Edmunds, Phil Nameny, Shannon Buono, Arianne Sperry, Joan Hamilton (Recorder), Planning; Stuart Gwin, PDOT;

Amy Cortese presided in Don Hanson's absence.

REQUEST FOR STREET VACATION

R/W #7001, Alley in Block 5, Homestead Addition

Action: Consent

Document Distributed: Staff Report and Recommendation

Commissioners unanimously recommended approval of the staff report on Street Vacation R/W #7001 by an Aye vote (Y-7; Baugh, Ciarlo, Cortese, Ovalles, Shapiro, Sherman, Valdez)

RIVER PLAN / NORTH REACH

Action: Briefing

Documents Distributed:

- Volume 1A: Proposed River Plan North Reach Policies, Objectives and Recommendations
- Volume 1B: Proposed River Plan North Reach Code Amendments and Zoning Maps
- Volume 3A: Willamette River Natural Resources Inventory: Riparian Corridors and Wildlife Habitat
- Volume 3B: Willamette River Natural Resources Inventory: Riparian Corridors and Wildlife Habitat – Appendices
- Volume 3C: Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy Analysis and Recommendations for Riparian Corridors and Wildlife Habitat
- PowerPoint: <http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=217976>

Gil Kelley introduced the River Plan North Reach Project, saying that the plan presents a profound set of issues that have involved substantial community conversations and analysis to strike the right balance of interests for all stakeholders. He said the North Reach of the Willamette River includes Portland's working harbor that is vital to regional economy, but also contains important natural resource assets and represents an area where people increasingly want to see trails and opportunities for recreation. He said the balancing act will be the subject of the public hearing on December 9, 2008.

Sallie Edmunds, Shannon Buono, and Arianne Sperry narrated a Power Point and described:

- Project documents
- Policy guidance for the project
- Key challenges related to private investment in the harbor, support for fish and wildlife habitat, improved livability for riverfront communities, streamlined permitting systems among local, state and federal jurisdictions, coordination of cleanup activities with land use planning, and improved connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians within an industrial setting.
- Process to develop the plan that involved advisory groups, task groups, workshops and substantial outreach efforts.

- Recommendations for economic prosperity, watershed health, improved access, livable riverfront communities, and strong partnerships.

Sallie Edmunds reported the intention to integrate the River Renaissance vision adopted by City Council in 2001 into the Comprehensive Plan as binding policy and to adopt the River Concept summary statements as objectives implementing the new policy.

Edmunds noted that one measure to promote economic prosperity relates to an item in the RICAP 4 package. She said the River Plan North Reach promotes economic prosperity by strengthening protections of industrial sanctuaries by prohibiting comprehensive plan amendments in *prime* industrial areas identified in Map 810-1 of the plan. She stressed that prime industrial lands are areas with characteristics that would be difficult or impossible to replace in the region, such as areas where rail, highway, water and pipeline infrastructure converge. She explained that a related action in RICAP 4 would require that approval criteria be met in order to change the Comprehensive Plan designation on industrial properties citywide that are not considered prime.

Edmunds noted the relationship between adoption of the Willamette River Natural Resources Inventory (WNRI) and adoption of a new river environmental overlay zone applied to natural resources along the river. She explained that a proposed river environmental overlay zone will apply to high and medium ranked natural resources along the river, and the new overlay zone was developed because of the unique conditions that exist in the North Reach, including river-dependent industries and the fact that most of the vacant land is contaminated. She said the proposal does not apply the river environmental overlay zone along portions of riverbank in active river-dependent use that are hardened, without vegetation, and rank low in the WNRI, or in flood areas where the only natural resource function is water storage for flood control. She said some permit applicants will be able to mitigate for impacts on-site and avoid a discretionary review process, while those whose sites provide no opportunities for on-site mitigation may opt to mitigate off-site or pay a fee into a River Restoration Program fund. She suggested that program funding will come from several sources, including a proposed fee assessed at one percent of project value that would apply as in-lieu mitigation for unavoidable impacts in river environmental overlay zones, as mitigation required by state and federal agencies, and as compensation for past damages related to contamination and City of Portland contributions. Restoration sites would be prioritized once the restoration program is operational.

Edmunds reported that the City also will update existing environmental conservation and environmental protection overlay zones to natural resources in the north reach that are outside of the river overlay zones and currently unprotected, but necessary for protection of natural resources in compliance with State Planning Goal 5 (Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy analysis (ESEE)).

Buono summarized that the proposed greenway trail alignment is based on guiding principles that reflect the challenges of locating a public trail along the river where river-dependent industrial uses exist and the Maritime Transportation Security Act applies, but also where there are existing opportunities for trail on sites that are no longer river- or rail-dependent. She showed a proposed route for the Willamette Greenway Trail alignment, including key greenway viewpoints, transitional points, and improved access to Swan Island. She explained that Code amendments will address a calculation for rough proportionality pursuant to Dolan vs. City of Tigard. She noted that short-term and long-term proposals for alignment are indicated on the proposed trail alignment map, but only near-term actions for the next 15 years appear in the Zoning Code map.

Arianne Sperry described recommendations for riverfront communities including St. Johns / Cathedral Park and the Linnton community, and opportunities for partnerships with community groups, companies, and organizations. She explained the need to improve livability and access to the waterfront as well as reduce noise and hazards for the residential neighborhoods bordering industrial areas. She emphasized the opportunity to develop an action program for a Linnton village that would be consistent with City Council's decision in 2006. She noted continuing efforts to work with public and private partners to improve regulatory efficiency for sites below the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM), facilitate contaminated site cleanup, improve communications between the City and tribal governments, and develop programs for continuing education and outreach on North Reach issues.

Sallie Edmunds summarized key challenges:

1. How to fuel private reinvestment in the industrial harbor
2. How to support industry and also improve fish and wildlife habitat in the North Reach
3. How to improve habitat and provide public access to the river
4. How to improve livability for riverfront communities near industrial businesses
5. How to coordinate and streamline permitting in an area governed by local, state and federal agencies
6. How to integrate cleanup of contaminated sites with land use planning
7. How to improve connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians in an industrial setting

Edmunds announced upcoming open houses on November 3 and December 3, and a Planning Commission hearing on December 9, to be followed by dates for continued hearing and discussion in 2009.

Commissioners' Questions

Sallie Edmunds, Roberta Jortner, and Steve Kountz answered questions.

- *Why does the map not refer to future impact of a Columbia River Crossing project?* The CRC project is a long-term project to reduce the bottlenecks on I-5, but this plan addresses short-term improvements to capacity in the harbor.
- *How would the proposed River Restoration Program be managed?* Three options include: 1) a city-run restoration program that would acquire properties, administer the fee program and do the restoration and monitoring; 2) management by the City in partnership with a for-profit entity that would provide an upfront capital investment; 3) management by the City in cooperation with team of local and state agencies and nonprofit entities, with possibilities for management by a nonprofit agency to provide independent oversight.
- *Is there a level of agreement on respective ranks in the Natural Resources Inventory?* There was significant collaboration with other agencies, stakeholders and property owners to determine environmental ratings. Designations were refined over time after considerable input. There are differences of opinion in the scientific community, and the City tried to apply a regional approach and document areas where there are differences of opinion. The intent of the inventory is to reflect the resources that are there even if sites are contaminated, because the next question is what to do with those areas.
- *How much support is there for fees in lieu of mitigation?* Concepts for fees arose from a year-long effort to integrate objectives of industrial and environmental communities; the fee represents a tradeoff for reduced regulation in support of more restoration. Fee amounts have not been broadly discussed, but other development costs such as permit and SDC fees would be deducted from the fee in-lieu of mitigation.
- *What strategies are in place to move components of the plan forward given financial realities?* A consultant is in the process of estimating permit activity over the next 20 years, which will provide an estimate of projected funding from that source. More information will be provided at an upcoming meeting.

Commissioners' Comments

- There's need for flexibility to adapt the plan as conditions change.
- Benchmarks in the proposal are essential to allow for testing of effectiveness over time.
- The substantial amount of work in this project is evident.

SCHOOLS ZONING ISSUE UPDATE, SHORT-TERM WORK PROGRAM

Documents Distributed:

- Memo from Eric Engstrom, Schools and Parks, Response to Planning/Zoning Issues, Oct. 20, 2008: <http://www.portlandonline.com/planning/index.cfm?c=41664&a=220253>

Eric Engstrom reported on the Planning Bureau's work program to develop and revise policies and regulations that affect schools and parks. He explained that staff may bring a Code project to the Commission in Spring 2009. He explained that there's need to work with all the school districts within Portland's boundaries, not just Portland Public Schools (PPS). He said school policy that is referenced in the existing Comprehensive Plan may be implemented in a variety of ways, including zoning regulations, agreements for action, and funding. He stressed that the Zoning Code can address traffic, noise, and various impacts related to the use of a property, but it does not regulate classroom operations or programs as well. He explained that the current Zoning Code implements Comprehensive Plan policies by providing a conditional use process to provide for review of the extent and nature of activities and land uses allowed on school and parks sites and to offer neighbors opportunities to appeal in some instances. He noted that the Zoning Code has complex thresholds for identifying the kinds of changes in school activity that trigger conditional use review. He said Title 4 allows Bureau of Development Services (BDS) to suspend zoning enforcement actions. With regard to some specific zoning complaints against schools, BDS is doing this pending a public process to clarify and/or improve the code. Planning has determined the need to review and clarify certain Code provisions related to this issue. He explained that interested persons have been offered time to comment at this meeting.

Amy Cortese encouraged speakers to coordinate their efforts and to identify issues with concise remarks.

Public Comments

Lisa Turpel, Portland Parks and Recreation (PPR), expressed support for the proposals for short-term Code and long-term Comprehensive Plan designation fixes as a two-pronged approach to problem solving. She stressed six key points to consider:

1. PPS and PPR have operated under a collaborative joint use agreement since 1957.
2. Language on page 4, Deliverables 2), should say "Clarify conditional use review thresholds that describe school district and parks flexibility to . . ."
3. It's time to clearly define and describe the park use thresholds for land use review.
4. Any required analysis that covers a 10-year timeframe needs to be feasible to produce with PPR's existing database.
5. There are significant differences between adding new amenities and facilities versus programming an amenity with varying intensity over time. City staff at PPR, Planning, and BDS as well as the Planning Commission need to work closely together to find solutions involving numerous stakeholders' groups and complicated issues. Talking Points were provided for the record.

Doug Capps, PPS Government Relations, supported the proposed work plan and listed three reasons for doing it:

1. The Zoning Code is not the appropriate means to address programming changes at schools unless there is an unusual impact such as a change of an elementary school into a high school –
 - a. The School Board is the proper jurisdiction to decide on program changes
 - b. Schools built in 1911 or 1932 have experienced significant changes in enrollment over time, with enrollment decreasing from 90,000 in 1972 to 45,000 now.
2. A consortium composed of staff from PPS, BDS and other City bureaus have formed a collaborative working team to review issues concerning land use review and to clean up the Code where provisions don't work.
3. PPS and City of Portland through PPR have operated under a Joint Use Agreement since the days when schools and parks were sited together in Portland, that policy was reinforced by the 1979 City Schools Policy, but the 1979 policy was intended to encourage City engagement in public schools and coordinate City resources and programs to support a City Schools agenda.

Capps stressed that the 1979 agreement provides for recreational and educational services that benefit the entire city, but current Code provisions fail to address broad community interests and instead foster individual complaints. Talking points provided.

Steve Taylor, Grant Park Neighborhood, described efforts by volunteers to renovate Fernwood Field with private funds and his participation on a task force that included representatives from Hollywood Little League (HLL), Hollywood Soccer Club (HWSC), PPS and PPR. He said the task force brought neighbors together to address problems related to foul balls and other concerns and eventually produced the Grant Park Neighborhood Agreement. He described burdensome procedures required to comply with City regulatory provisions in response to complaints that were filed. He stressed the citywide importance of school fields as neighborhood playgrounds that promote healthy activity for children. Written Testimony provided.

Gene Hand, Exec. Dir. Portland Youth Soccer, provided statistics on the numbers of members in the youth league and in sports user groups and stressed the need for the City to find solutions for all users. He described problems with regulations that prevent resizing fields to accommodate different users, so that parents eventually move to different areas to find fields that are the right size for youth soccer. He stressed the need to be able to use fields differently and establish sites that meet the best needs in the community.

Dick Spies, Group Mackenzie, described volunteer efforts for Portland Public Schools, including conversion of Lincoln High School Field into a center of the community. He reported on the goal to recreate greens for 10 district high schools to reverse the trend of people moving to the suburbs to take advantage of those facilities. He stressed the need to consider development patterns for the next 30 years as more people want to live in a revitalized city center. He cited Rosa Parks School as a model and advocated for creative partnerships for multi-use, shared facilities.

Chris Altenhofen, stated there's need for orderly development of fields adjacent to residential areas. He said foul balls threaten safety when they hit his and his neighbors' properties and homes, and the school did not consider neighbors' concerns before relocating the field. He noted that unsavory activity occurs in the dugout at night now that the field has been moved away from the street. He stressed that changes to Fernwood Field were poorly planned without sufficient input from neighbors, and if the Conditional Use process had been followed, a layout could have been developed that would meet everyone's needs. He stressed that the existing process is clear, and a permit never should have been granted. **Discussion:** In response to questions, Chris Altenhofen indicated that if Conditional Use review were not available, he would be willing to talk about another type of review that would involve neighbors' input.

Cliff Gibbs stressed that the Conditional Use process exists to look at issues and to mitigate impacts. He said he appreciates that Portland Public Schools puts children first, but the quality of maintenance at schools has changed. He said changing the process would allow PPS to do what they want with facilities based on program changes, and he's most concerned about what happens outside schools. He stressed that construction of sports facilities on what used to be playgrounds causes dramatic changes in use, and demolition of a park for a sports facility represents more than a program change.

Lynn Schore cited the failure of Portland Public Schools to observe State laws and their continuing circumvention of the democratic process. She said she began filing complaints with the City in March, but Portland Public Schools engaged in further violations in September. She stressed that the Comprehensive Plan sets goals for the City, and failure to follow the City Schools Policy makes the Comprehensive Plan meaningless. She stressed that much of what the Commission is hearing about regulatory provisions is inaccurate, and the proposal to change the Zoning Code is outrageous given 135 valid Zoning Code violations since March. She stressed that citizens are the owners of public school properties and the Planning Commissioners serve as stewards for the Comprehensive Plan.

Planning Commissioners requested that Lynn Schore summarize remarks, but Schore objected to a 3-minute time limit. She stated that she had been told there would be 30 minutes to present her groups' concerns. **Mark Bartlett** stated that both Planning and the Park Bureau should put planning on hold and not implement any rules without making processes transparent. He noted that Portland Public Schools changed the process for disposing surplus property at a meeting the night before without adequate input. Eric Engstrom stated that the City has no intention of passing new regulations without completely scoping issues. He explained that he originally invited Bartlett, Schore and their group to bring comments to the Commission, but other interested persons asked also to be allowed to express their point of view. He acknowledged that there had been a communication failure about the length of time available for testimony. Gil Kelly committed to finding a slot in a future Planning Commission meeting for continued discussion with Bartlett and others in his interest group.

Commissioners' Comments

Commissioners thanked participants for their comments. They expressed the Commission's regrets about limited time for comments that evening and remarked as follows:

- The City is caught in conflicts over policies developed a long time ago, so there's clear need to develop flexible long-term policies on how land uses might change as population density continues to increase.
- As the City densifies, open space near schools is like gold in the city, and persons with differing interests all have strong, valid claims.
- Communications and public involvement will be critical as the City works with schools, parks and neighbors to develop policy with more flexibility that also responds to concerns.

Amy Cortese concluded that the Commission desires more feedback and to listen carefully to neighbors' issues. Gil Kelley added that staff needs input in developing a short-term project to review policies and regulations.

REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT CODE AMENDMENT PACKAGE 4 (RICAP 4)

Action: Continued Hearing

Documents Distributed:

- Staff Amendments to Proposed Draft for Oct. 28, 2008 Planning Commission Meeting

Eric Engstrom requested that the Commission recommend adopt the proposed draft of the RICAP 4 report, with amendments proposed in the Oct. 28, 2008 memo.

Phil Nameny and Engstrom described three proposed changes:

- Division Street Main Street Retail Size Limitation – The exception to the 10,000 square foot limitation of Retail Sales and Service uses would apply only in existing buildings on floors other than the ground floor.
- Comprehensive Plan Map amendments for Industrial and Employment Designations – Additional approval criteria for Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments would address Metro's concern that the City address attainment of job capacity goals with a Comprehensive Plan Map amendment proposal.
- Title 17 Public Improvement Code – Amendments for residential curb cuts would provide for street trees, stormwater management, and meet the intent for a minimum curb length between driveways.

Public Testimony

Dave Johnston, Collins View NA, requested clarification of design standards for duplexes and attached houses on corner lots in the R20 through R5 zones. He objected to Code language that results in driveways and garages for duplexes and attached housing on corners to be located on the same street. He recommended introductory language at 33.110.240E that would say, "With regard to duplexes and single-family homes on corner lots, the main entrance is the entrance appearing to represent the front of the house and includes the front door, front walk, garage door and driveway." **Discussion:** In response to Commissioners' questions, Eric Engstrom explained that Planning recommends other design standards on corner lots.

Division Main Street/Green Street Provisions

Neighbors testified for and against recommendations to amend retail size limitations.

Testifiers against the amendments to Division Street regulations included the following:

- Kai Krenek
- Brent Green
- Morgan Walker
- Curtis Salgado
- Jesse Johnson
- Mark Loebner
- John Kosydar
- Lailah Hamblin
- Jef Myers
- Kay Spielman
- Paul Wendlick
- Randy Morrison
- Rod Richards
- Forest Hofer

Persons who opposed the amendment to Division Street regulations stated the following reasons:

- Original retail limitations were intended to mold development on the corridor for the next 20 years, with exemptions only for grocery stores.
- Amendment will produce overwhelming competition for existing businesses that the original plan tried to protect.

- A Gold's Gym in the old Natures/Wild Oats location would likely force Loprinzi's to move out and then rely on a membership-selling system that would last only about 3-4 years.
- Changes to size limitations would result in worse traffic.
- Original plan intended to keep out big box chain franchise businesses such as Gold's Gym or MacDonalds.
- Neighbors support Division Street corridor area for its current ambiance – progressive neighborhood that supports local businesses, small shops and restaurants and reinvestment of local funds, with plenty of bicycle riders.
- Proposals for amending Code language at this point are short-sighted and show lack of imagination – the street could support a theater or a Saturday Market.
- The street is changing for the better with active businesses such as Stumptown Coffee and New Seasons Market, and more businesses will move in over time.
- Loprinzi's Gym offers diverse clientele who wouldn't be found at Gold's Gym – members of Loprinzi's will continue going there because of its uniqueness.
- The City does not hesitate to break its own rules to achieve what it wants – Dignity Village continues without Code enforcement; Day Labor Center serves illegal immigrants. The City listens when neighbors on Hayden Island want to fight WalMart, but won't support Southeast neighbors who oppose big box businesses.
- The credibility of the 75 people who signed the petition against the amendment should be restored – they were not just Loprinzi's customers, but citizens of Portland who support the law that is written. They would support a 10,000 square foot gym based on the law that exists, but want to be treated fairly.

Commissioners ascertained that opponents would prefer to find an appropriate business and let the building remain vacant for awhile longer and that they disagreed with the proposal regardless of the provision to keep the ground floor limitation at 10,000 square feet and agreement by neighborhood and business associations.

Advocates for amending retail size limitations included the following:

- Allen Field
- Ned Pender
- Charles Kingsley
- Stan Amy, New Village Group
- Steve Pfeiffer, Perkins Coie

Advocates for amending retail size limitations stated the following reasons.

- Hosford Abernethy and Richmond Neighborhood Associations and the Division Clinton Business Association support the revised Code language because the old Natures/Wild Oats Building has been dark for a long time, and businesses across the street are failing.
- There's concern about competition, but no one who goes there now will stop going to Loprinzi's, and there already are competitive gyms in the city that draw people away from the neighborhood.
- The Division Vision Coalition represents a majority of people who worked on a collaborative process for six years; they opposed MacDonalds on Hawthorne and support overall vitality for Division.
- The amendment represents a Code refinement that does not support or oppose any one business, but instead applies an approach to eight buildings on the street so that they might have more business.
- Surveys and several public meetings revealed widespread support for a full-service health club.

- Anticipated uses in the building can coexist with the existing gym, and as many people as testified tonight could return to testify on behalf of the change.

Commissioners questioned Stan Amy, the building owner, regarding amended language that states the business would primarily serve the surrounding neighborhood. Amy supported the language, noting that as a former planning commissioner, he supports healthy, vital neighborhoods. He stressed that the best way to preserve culture is with a varied ecosystem, and the Division Vision promoted busy nodes and an anchor to draw customers along the corridor. He said the only standard for local-serving is trip frequency, and a gym would create only slightly more trips than a supermarket, but sufficient trips to revitalize other businesses.

Phil Nameny noted that the purpose statement would be applicable during an adjustment process to increase the retail limitation, and LUBA remanded the original proposal for clarification of the purpose statement regarding businesses desired on the corridor.

Additional Written Testimony

Aleta Fullenwider
Christi Howe-Story
Dave Johnston
Carey Klein
Nona K. Leiner
Mark Loebner
Linda Nettekoven
Rod Richards
Anita Seely
Jan Secunda
Kay Spielman
Anna Troupe

Gil Kelley confirmed close of public testimony.

Planning staff and Commissioners clarified points in response to testimony:

- Eric Engstrom clarified changes to corner lot design standards – he said the Code doesn't currently link driveways and entrances because of transportation safety issues from PDOT; for instance, they don't want driveways on arterial streets. He said on corner lots, often driveways are located on alleys.
- Catherine Ciarlo recommended that language concerning Title 17 address safety of pedestrians where driveways cross pedestrian sidewalks. She said language should support protection and preservation of the pedestrian environment, not just strive to reduce conflicts.
- Gil Kelley clarified that a Zoning Code provision can restrict uses, but it can't regulate ownership, tenancy or whether a business is local or national; it can address issues such as variety of sizes of retail business or limitations to small spaces that would serve the neighborhood better.

Commissioners' supported staff's recommendations, with the following comments:

- We live in or know the neighborhood and support small businesses, but testimony of the Division Vision Coalition described how they thought through issues and tried to address unintended consequences.

- The City can't regulate what businesses go in, and a gym was the top choice for a majority of neighbors who responded to a questionnaire at neighborhood events. Competition is healthy.
- Failure to create more flexibility for redevelopment could result in the building's demolition for a mixed use development that would defeat objectives for reusing buildings.
- More development is needed on Division to support small businesses – it's very different from Hawthorne.
- It's not a competition, but an effort to help local businesses and still preserve the culture of the neighborhood in the long term. The Neighborhood Association developed and passed a vision, there were unintended consequences when a grocery store closed, the developer went through the legal process and faces that process again, and this proposal is an attempt to preserve the culture of the neighborhood.
- This was a long-time neighborhood process that failed to see desired development take place, so the City needs to encourage it.
- It's necessary to do what is best for the community; it's unfortunate that one side will not win, but the Code and the community's needs are clear.
- Different opinions make it difficult to determine the right thing to do; however, everyone involved in the proceedings should continue to work with the neighborhood and business associations.

Howard Shapiro's motion to recommend approval of staff's recommendations was seconded, and Commissioners passed the motion unanimously (Y- Baugh, Ciarlo, Cortese, Ovalles, Shapiro, Sherman, Valdez (7).

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Gil Kelley reported that budget cuts most likely will be necessary this year, so the Planning bureau will update its 3-year workplan in relation to possible cuts. He requested volunteers from the Planning Commission to serve on the bureau's Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). He indicated they would need to attend 2 or 3 meetings and at City Council.

ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM COMMISSIONERS

- Howard Shapiro requested to hear from the Vision Into Action (VIA) Committee soon.
- Catherine Ciarlo announced she will leave the Commission in January, which will leave an opening for another Planning Commissioner to serve on the Airport Futures committee. She stressed that the project covers the intersections of commerce, livability and the budget.

The Commission adjourned at 10:50 p.m.