

# Planning and Zoning Board



## *Study Session Minutes*

Mesa City Council Chambers – Lower Level, 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
Date: June 22, Time: 3:30 p.m.

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tim Boyle  
Shelly Allen\*  
Jeffrey Crockett  
Benjamin Ayers  
Troy Peterson

### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Chair Jessica Sarkissian  
Vice Chair Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo

(\*Boardmembers and staff participated in the meeting through the use of telephonic and audio conference equipment)

### STAFF PRESENT:

Rachel Prelog  
Michelle Dahlke  
Lesley Davis  
Joshua Grandlienard  
Jennifer Merrill  
Charlotte Bridges  
Robert Mansolillo  
Sarah Staudinger  
Pamela Williams

### OTHERS PRESENT:

Call meeting to order.

Boardmember Crockett declared a quorum present, and the meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

Review items on the agenda for the June 22th, 2022, regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.

Staffmember Josh Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00338. This is for Site Plan Review for Avalon Apartment Homes and is to allow for a multiple residence development. It is currently part of the Avalon Community- Avalon Crossing Community. It is within DU1 of that community. It is located south of Williamsfield, as well as east of the future Crismon Road alignment. Per the Mixed-Use Community General Plan designation, the intent of this area is to provide a mix of employment, medical, retail, educational, community, service, and other associated uses. As part of this, this will provide the residential component part of that. It is also within the Mixed-Use Community District of the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan. It also meets the conditions of a sustainable community by being a place for people to live. There is also a zoned Plan Community. Per the approved Development Unit

Plan 1 for Avalon Crossing, Multiple Residence, is a permitted use within that DU1. You'll see the site photo a couple of times during my presentation today; this is as close as I get on site because of the construction currently going at Williamsfield, as well as Crismon. So, you'll see this site for Avalon reused a couple times today. Here is the site plan for this specific site. Primary access is from Williamsfield Road, with secondary axis on the west side from La Belle. There are 400 dwelling units on site, for net dwelling on a 17.35-acre site, with a density of 23 dwelling units per acre. There is a Special Use Permit associated with this for a parking reduction, reducing the required from a 2.1 spaces per unit, to 2.03 spaces per unit. This is a total reduction of 29 spaces. It is currently slated for Design Review for July 12. At that point, staff will work with the applicant to address any comments provided by the Design Review Board. In the landscape plan overall, you can see some central amenities. As part of the amenity package, there is a pool, pickleball courts, I believe a barbecue court, as well as a couple other interior amenities for the usage of the people that would be living in this area, as well as some general event lawns where they could organize yoga, or things like that through their community.

As part of this project, it was required to have citizen participation for registered HOAs, and neighborhoods within 500 feet, as well as property owners. Most of those developments in that area are still under construction. So, most of that property owner by the master developer over there still, since that has yet to be sold. And based off that, staff finds that the request complies with the 2040 General Plan, applies the Gateway Strategic Development Plan, Section 11-69-5 for Site Plan Review, as well as the criteria for Special Use Permit 11-70-5. The staff recommends approval with conditions.

Boardmember Boyle inquired: So, you get this parking reduction, typically, there is some sort of trade; they've done some sort of additional amenity, or something that would benefit them, especially on a large apartment complex. A parking reduction would seem very concerning to me. What was the trade off?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard clarified: So certainly, on this site as part of the Avalon Crossing Community Plan, they had to incorporate more walkability, things of that nature to make it more mixed-use. And as part of that, they incorporated more walkways than typical, as well as making sure that the amenity space is fully accessible for everybody on site also, more of extended amenity packages than you would typically see on other projects elsewhere. And realistically, with the area that this is going into, we don't see that much existing parking demand on street parking, things of that nature, and realistically it is only a 29-spot reduction- out of a total of 840. So based off that, and the associated parking study that was provided for this, staff feels that this is meets those conditions.

Staffmember Jennifer Merrill presented case ZON21-00792 and the companion case, item \*5-b, which is Hawes Commerce preliminary plat. The request is for a rezone from LI BIZ and OC BIZ to LI PAD and OC PAD, and Site Plan Review, and also consideration of a Preliminary Plat. The purpose of the request is to allow for a new industrial development. The location is on the north side of Germann Road, on the east side of Hawes. On a photo of the site, it is looking north into the site from Germann. And then there is another photo looking southwest across the site from 85th Place. The General Plan Character Area is Employment, and the purpose of the Employment character area is to provide a wide range of employment opportunities in high quality settings, and office warehouse, research, and

development uses. The zoning is currently Light Industrial with a BIZ overlay, and Office Commercial with the BIZ overlay. There is quite a bit of history on this site. The LI BIZ and OC BIZ were approved more than 10 years ago for a movie studio. And the BIZ overlay was approved to allow some modifications to those code standards at the time. The BIZ overlay was attached to a site plan that was approved for the movie studio. The proposed rezoning is to LI PAD and OC PAD. It is a brand-new site plan and it is for industrial uses. The PAD overlay is requested to allow some different modifications to the current standard code requirements. Industrial uses are permitted in the LI zoning district. So, getting into those PAD requests, they include an increase to the maximum building height. The maximum building height allowed in the Light Industrial zoning district is 40 feet, and the request is to allow buildings up to 46 feet. The request is also involves some modifications to the development standards including parapet detailing, materials, and standard materials and colors. The parapet detailing section of the code requires cornices, moldings, and trim along the tops of the building edges. And the proposal is to not have those required. And also, with materials and colors- the code requires a maximum of 50% of each facade covered with one single material, and the request is to have tilt up concrete buildings so it would be primarily one material for all of the buildings. One of the requests is to modify the screening requirements. The code requires that all of the screening elements, and in this case it's parapet, be at or above the height of any rooftop equipment on a building. The request is for line-of-sight screening, so that the parapets aren't necessarily the same height as the tops of the rooftop equipment. But when you're standing at the ground level, and you're looking up at the building, your line of sight would not see the rooftop equipment because they're located far enough back, or central to the building rooftop and they're blocked by the parapets from the line-of-sight standpoint. The parking area screen wall is required to be five feet away from the parking spaces, and they're requesting a modification to reduce that to two feet. They're also requesting a modification to the standard parking space requirements. The code requires 75% of the gross floor area of industrial shell buildings to be parked at one space per 500 square feet, and 25% of the gross floor area to be parked at one space per 375 square feet. They're requesting a flat parking ratio of one parking space per 600 square feet of building area. The last set of requests revolve around the foundation base requirements. Exterior walls that have public entrances are required to have a 15-foot-wide foundation base, which is the landscaped area along the outside of the building. They're requesting a 12-foot-wide foundation base and that is to accommodate the fire access requirements, from the fire code. The building entrances for buildings larger than 10,000 square feet are required to have entry plazas that are at least 20 feet by 20 feet in dimension, and also 900 square feet in area. The proposal meets the 900 square foot in area requirement, but their entry plazas are more rectangular, so they do not fit well. All of their entry plazas have at least one dimension that is at least 20 feet. But some of them have dimensions that are as low as 16 feet. The justification for the PAD requested modifications are that the eastern edge of the site has an 83-foot-wide landscape buffer, and that is to buffer the industrial uses from the Queen's Park neighborhood, which is located across the street to the east. There is a 20-foot-wide required landscape setback adjacent to that street and so they are increasing that substantially to 83 feet. In the site plan you can see the three proposed industrial buildings. They total almost 550,000 square feet in gross floor area. There are some screen loading areas. They are behind building one, and then the screen loading area for buildings two and three are actually between those buildings. All of the screen loading areas are screened by eight-foot-tall screen walls and gates. Access to the site is from Germann and from Hawes. Hawes is not yet constructed, but this property, as well as some neighboring properties, are working together to construct Hawes Road between Pecos and Germann.

There are 1185 required on-site parking spaces, and they're proposing 931, per that one space per 600 square foot parking ratio that they're requesting. The following slides show the building elevations. They were discussed by the Design Review Board last Tuesday, at their work session. The Design Review Board had some comments regarding the building design, as well as the landscaping. And staff is working with the applicant to address those concerns. These slides also show the line-of-sight screening. So, they show that there is a diagonal dashed line which is the line of sight marking. And then there is a small, six-foot-tall human figure on the right side of each line-of-sight diagram and then the building is on the left side. So, you can see that the rooftop unit is proposed to be screened that way. Here is building three, and the line of sight is shown. Here are the renderings. These renderings are from 85th Place.

The applicant completed a citizen participation process. They mailed letters to property owners within 1000 feet of the site, and HOAs, and registered neighbors. The applicant also held a neighborhood meeting in person on October 19, of last year. There was a good turnout at the meeting. And there were a number of concerns that were brought up, and the applicant discussed with the neighbors how to address those concerns. The applicant also mailed out the public notice for this public hearing, as well as for the Design Review public meeting. Staff had not received any inquiries from the neighbors, but today I'm told there is a blue card from a neighbor who wishes to speak. In summary, the request complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan. It meets the criteria for the PAD, outlined in Chapter 22. And it meets the criteria for a Site Plan Review, outlined in Chapter 69, and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Conversation ensued and it was determined that case ZON21-00792 would be removed from the consent agenda if the speaker requested to speak at the public hearing.

Boardmember Peterson inquired: Just for the record, an issue regarding the treatment of USA fee irrigation right of ways on Germann Road and Hawes Road, and that some sort of requirements be added to the project, that there'll be approval by Queen Creek Irrigation District as part of the project approval process.

Assistant Planning Director Rachel Prelog responded: Did you need the applicant to address any anything?

Boardmember Peterson: I think we're good.

Boardmember Crockett stated: It's my understanding that there are still a couple of questions with regard to the Queen Creek Irrigation District and whether the site plan accommodates their existing right of way. Boardmember Peterson has proposed that we add a stipulation to the to the approval today. The planning departments could work on that stipulation between now and the public hearing. So, I think we'll have some language that we can hear on that issue and then move forward at that time.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: I did have a question on the on the parking reduction we're seeing. We're seeing a fair amount of requests for parking reduction on the applications that are coming

through. We talked about this a little at our last board meeting. And it would be helpful to me to have a little more information to be able to make these decisions. In the staff report, there is typically not a lot of information regarding the analysis around why it's appropriate to have the parking reduction. So, I'd appreciate seeing a little more discussion on the analysis around the parking reduction request. Or alternatively, if there has been a study done on the request, or to support the requests, it would maybe be helpful to see that as part of our board packet.

Assistant Planning Director Rachel Prelog responded: We'd be happy to do that.

Boardmember Crockett added: And then one other question with regard to the parapet that. I think in the staff report, part of the reason for the request is actually reduced the overall height of the building. And I guess my question is, with regard to the person on the street looking up, and it would be screened. I'm just wondering, in the neighborhood across the street, if you're in a house on the second floor what would you also see? Would you see the equipment on the roof? I'm not quite sure how that would work.

Staffmember Jennifer Merrill clarified: The line-of-sight study is taken from the sidewalk right of way along at 85th place. I'm not aware if there are two story homes to the east. I don't recall seeing any, but they are permitted to be. They're allowed to have two story homes there. But the line-of-sight study is from the pedestrian.

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges presented case ZON21-00966. This is a request to rezone the subject property from Limited Commercial to Multiple Residents 3, and then a Planned Area Development overlay. It also includes Site Plan Review, and it would be to allow for the development of a multifamily project. The location of the property is about 600 plus feet to the east of Recker Road, on the south side of Main Street. The General Plan designation for this area is Mixed Use Activity District. The purpose of a Mixed-Use Activity District is to create strong viable centers for commercial activity; they can include a residential component, and for this particular case, greater than 70% of this particular Mixed Use Activity District either has LC or GC zoning, as a primary zoning district, or is developed with the primary uses. It's also within the Transit Corridor. The purpose of the Transit Corridor is to create more transit oriented- pedestrian oriented development. As a part of a Transit Corridor, it specifically incorporates that U designation into the zoning district. The zoning request again is for Multiple Residents 3, with the U designation, because of that Transit Corridor location and then a Planned Area Development overlay. The project itself has 18.7 dwelling units per acre and is permitted in this particular use, the RM-3-U-PAD district. This is a picture of the subject property looking from the north side of Main Street south. The building, you can see in the background is an office complex. The site plan shows the development of 86 units, they're two-story units. The units themselves are in various configurations as far as numbers- anywhere from six, to eight or nine units in a row each. Each unit has two covered parking spaces, so it has a double car garage. And then in addition, 13 visitor parking spaces are provided where the amenity areas are. Access to the site is provided from Main Street. As a part of the PAD request, they are requesting a few modifications. The first is for the ground floor, open space dimension, to be less than 10 feet. In this case, they have the length is greater than 10 feet, but the actual width is less than 10 feet. In fact, it's five feet. So, there is that dimension. They're also requesting that the living area above the garage, be in plane with the garage, as opposed to the garage

being recessed three feet behind the plane of the second story. And then the drive aisles adjacent for the foundation base, adjacent to the drive aisles because this is an alley loaded product. They're requesting that two foot minimum foundation base in the areas adjacent to the garages. That varies throughout the site, but in specific locations, it is only going to be two feet. And justification for the PAD requests focuses on the above average private open space that is provided throughout the development, as well as the overall above average common open space that is provided for the development, as well as the amenities throughout the site, and the fact that they are providing double car garages for each unit. The landscape plan shows perimeter landscaping, it shows foundation-based landscaping, and also shows the amenity areas and landscaping throughout the amenity areas. This project is scheduled for Design Review Board review on July 12. And planning staff will work with the applicant to dress to address any recommendations the Board may have.

As far as citizen participation, the applicant did hold a neighborhood virtual meeting early in July. It was attended by one property representative, from the property to the south. The question that the representative had was if the six-foot wall along the south property line would be installed. So, there is a section of that wall that is not there now and as part of this project, the continuation of that wall along the south property line would be completed. In addition, they sent out the required notifications for this public hearing. They also completed the school analysis is back from October, but Mesa Public School indicated that there is capacity for this particular development in the area. In summary, staff finds that the request complies with the 2040 General Plan. It complies with the review criteria in Chapter 22, for a Planned Area Development overlay, and it also complies with the review criteria for Site Plan Review outlined in Chapter 69, subsection 5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance, and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Boardmember Boyle inquired: I'm counting I think 12 units in a row. Is that correct? Or am I missing? I thought you said maybe there was eight in a row, but I'm counting 12 on this. I just wanted to clarify that because typically, I think the code says you're allowed three and then you need to have some sort of a break, like an architectural feature a doorway or something like that.

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges responded: That's correct. And you can't see it from this particular elevation, because we're not looking at the garages, but they're between each two units there is a wider wall that will separate, and we've counted that as an architectural feature.

Boardmember Boyle added: Just a wider wall, not like a building entrance or anything.

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges responded: No chair and board member Boyle, the entrances are all on the other side of the building.

Boardmember Peterson commented: Just a quick comment, it's always great to see investment in this section on Main Street. So happy to see that.

Boardmember Boyle added: I do have another one. So, the trade-off for this amount of density and everything seems to be just more private open space than normal?

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges responded: There is no trade off and density. The density that they are proposing is allowed. In fact, they are under density. The maximum would be 20 dwelling units per acre. They are at 18.7. But the PAD justification is in regard to the private open and then the building facades are that the light the configuration of the building with the garage and the second story. And then because of the alley loaded product, justification for that is the overall increased amenities throughout the site.

Boardmember Boyle added: Well, I guess this gives me pause because I do a lot of products like this and have always had to break up these large sections of 12 garage doors. And so now to see that come through, does this set a new precedent? Can I now go back and say, "Hey, obviously, the three you know, all we have to do is a slightly thicker wall, and then it's going to be okay." The precedent that this set gives me a lot of gives me a lot of concern, because something that I'm very acquainted with. So....

Asssistant Planning Director Rachel Prelog added: Charlotte, is there a change in plane on that, and the wall that is breaking up those units?

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges responded: There is, it's minimal. We're talking eight inches or less.

Boardmember Boyle continued: I mean, typically, when we've had to go back, we've had building entrances, we've had to add architectural features, and all these things that the code calls for. So that gives me a lot of concern about this. And then the very, very small amount of amenity space that's actually in here for the amount of units, I think is something that doesn't, maybe it fits in the numbers in there, but it seems like an awfully small pool community, or a dog park, and pickleball court to make. I didn't catch, has Design Review seen this yet, or is it still going to Design?

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges responded: It goes to Design Review Board in July.

Boardmember Boyle added: I would prefer the Design discuss this before we take an actual vote on it. I don't know if that's something we're allowed to do.

Boardmember Allen stated: My opinion is, I would prefer it if we see it after the Design Review has seen it. I don't know if that's an option, if it's an option for them to postpone it or, you know, have it brought before us next month is if that's an option.

Assistant Planning Director Rachel Prelog: If you would like to continue it, the board could do that they can make a motion to continue, continue it to the July 13 hearing. You would make that motion at the public hearing.

Boardmember Boyle stated: Okay. All right, then I would just recommend we pull this off consent.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case: ZON22-00023. This is for the Avalon Crossing, this specifically is for the Community Plan amendment, as well as the associated rezone. So, a little bit of

history on this one, this one is a bit unique. Avalon Crossing came through, originally it was submitted in 2018 and was approved in August 2019. As part of that, it did not include a notch portion that is currently zoned AG. It is 1.5 acres that is adjacent on all sides to the Avalon Crossing Community. It is just north of the 24 alignment; that previously was a DOT right of way that they no longer needed, as part of their update to the alignment for 24. So, they sold off that property to which the master developer purchased it, in order to incorporate it as part of the Avalon Community itself. So, that Avalon Community again is south of Williamsfield Road, east of the Crimson Road alignment, as well as just west of 222nd Street. It is again, within the Mixed-Use Community. The intent of this is to create the residential uses. As part of that, this section compared to the previous case I spoke to earlier tonight, this is within the single residence portion of DU2. So, this is more for intent for single residence detached model, rather than in DU1, which the intent is commercial and mixed in multiple residence. Again, it is within the Mixed-Use Community District, so is providing a place for people to live as part of a sustainable community to live, work, and play. The zoning for this site specifically as AG. As part of this Community Plan amendment, there will be an associated rezone to the PC, as required for Avalon Crossing and to incorporate, as part of the community. Again, here's the same site photo from Williamsfield and 222nd, just due to the inability to get further on site.

So as part of this request, property owners within 1000 feet, HOAs, and registered neighborhoods were reached out to and notified. I did not receive any comments on this, or any associated cases with Avalon. Staff finds that the request complies with the 2040 General Plan, complies with the Mesa Gateway Strategic Plan, as well as the Community Plan Amendments for Section 11-11-4 of the MZO, staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Conversation ensued between Boardmember Peterson and Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard referring to a slide on the presentation. It was clarified where on the map single family was identified.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: This was going to be continued, and then it got added late and I didn't get to look at it very carefully. What becomes of that 1.5 acre, is that going to be incorporated in the plan? So, there would be a homes built on it?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard clarified: So that is actually the case further on this agenda. But essentially, it's going be for four single lots and an extension of three, I believe three on the north side. It was previously, again, DOT right of way. So as part of this, they're basically extending the existing development as part of it. Not on this PowerPoint, but on a later Power Point.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: Why was this going to be continued? Was there some issue that was being addressed that got addressed?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded: As part of the community plan itself, there are some minor exhibits that we need to swap out to have maps updated to the new maps. We wanted to make sure those were all updated prior to that, were able to get them before the agenda was published. So that's why it we updated.



Staffmember Robert Mansolillo presented case ZON22-00260. The request is a Rezone and Site Plan Approval, and the purpose is for a restaurant with a drive thru. The location is west of Ellsworth Road east of the loop 202 Freeway, and south of University Drive. The zoning is currently Multiple Residence 4, and the request is to rezone to Limited Commercial. The General Plan in this area is Neighborhood Village, and one of the goals of that designation is to provide shopping areas that serve the neighborhood within a two-mile radius. On a site plan, looking southeast from University Drive, it is currently vacant. And here is the site plan of the overall site. The entire parcel is approximately four acres, and it will be split into two lots. Lot One, which is on the west side is 2.1 acres, is the site with the site plan. And Lot Two on the east side is approximately 2.2 acres, and that will come in at a later date for site plan review. Access will be via University Drive and Ellsworth Road. And here is the site plan for the western portion. There is a new 2647 square foot restaurant with a drive thru, and access will be by via University Drive, and parking spaces are provided on site. Landscape yards along all property lines are provided for, as well as parking lot landscape islands, as well as a 15-foot-wide foundation base along the southern portion of the building itself. And here are some elevations. On the left is the south elevation, and on the right is the eastern elevation. On the left is the northern elevation that'll be facing University Drive, and then the western elevation, that'll be facing the loop 202 highway. And here's a rendering of the building.

Citizen participation- property owners within 1000 feet, HOAs, and registered neighborhoods were notified and staff did not receive any concerns from interested parties. So, in summary, this proposal does comply with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, and it meets the review criteria for Site Plan Review outlined in Chapter 69 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. And staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00293 and the companion case, Preliminary plat ZON22-00292. This again is a request for a development plan amendment for Avalon Crossing and the associated preliminary plat is for the expansion of the existing residential, single residence community within Avalon Crossing. Again, this is a site that is adjacent on all sides to State Route 24 on south, and then on the east, north, and west by the existing Avalon Community. Just south the Williamsfield Road and east of the Crimson Road alignment. Again, is within the Mixed-Use Community, so is providing a residential use within that community, to provide a sense of place. Again, it is within with the Mixed-Use Community District of the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan, as part of that, it is helping to provide a residential place for the people to live as part of a sustainable community. The current zoning, as previously stated is AG, as with that request with ZON22-00023, there's a request to rezone to PC and associated with that, these would be current on the City Council agenda. And I'll get into that code section in a moment. But just so you understand, that prior to the preliminary plat, it would be rezone to that Plan Community. Here's the site looking west, southwest from Williamsfield and the intersection of 222nd.

Again, here's the citizen participation- 1000 feet, no comments from interested parties, and Staff recommends with approvals based off of the 2040 General Plan, Gateway Strategic Development Plan, the Development Plan amendment under the Avalon Community Plan, as well as the required criteria of a Preliminary Plat in Section nine 9-6, and staffs willing to answer any questions you might have on that.

I assume you want to see the plot, based off of the previous discussion. So, the highlighted sections are the added lots. So, as you can tell, this is quite a large plat as it is, it is this located box in the corner over here (trying to cursor as much as I can). And there is a zoomed in parcel. It's currently just a retention track, as part of that they're keeping the retention in there, but also extending lots, these four lots here 590 through 593, and then adding 595 through 598.

Assistant Planning Director Rachel Prelog stated: That is all for staff presentations, because the remainder of those preliminary plats were already covered in previous presentations. I do believe we have the Development Services Director on his way over to get us an update.

Development Services Director Dr. Nana Appiah spoke: So, I'm here to just say a very big thank you to Tim Boyle for your amazing, excellent services. So gratefully you have dedicated your time for this past six years to help us really, take the City to a whole different direction. You've be very supportive. I know you'd be very passionate to make sure that you know the City is developing well. And I know so many times when the development community, or when we meet with people, they will say what do you think Tim is going to say? So, I just really want to say thank you so much. I know you're going to be missed on the Board, but serving on the Board is one part of your service. We have several things coming up: design guidelines, the General Plan, which is going to be a big overhaul, so we will be expecting you to participate greatly. I just want to come in and say thank you from the whole department, myself, and the rapport that we've had for the past at least three and a half years, since I've been here. So, thank you.

Boardmember Boyle responded: Thank you very much, everybody. Sorry to everyone whose feathers are ruffled too many times.

Boardmember Crockett concluded: Well. Yeah, I think we all agree we'll miss you here. And I think we'll probably be seeing you back here hopefully and with some, projects before us, so we wish you well and hope to hope our paths continue to cross frequently. Thanks, Tim.

Boardmember Boyle motioned to adjourn the study session.

The motion was seconded by Boardmember Peterson.

The Study Session was adjourned.