Albemarle County Planning Commission
March 30, 2004

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, March 30, 2004 at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Rodney Thomas, Chairman, Calvin Morris, Marcia Joseph, Jo Higgins, William Rieley and Pete Craddock, Vice-Chairman. Absent from the meeting was Bill Edgerton.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning & Community Development, Francis MacCall, Planner, Yadira Amarante, Planner, Joan McDowell, Principal Planner and Greg Kamptner, Assistant County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Thomas called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

Mr. Thomas invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Consent Agenda:

SDP-04-18 Service Master Office/Warehouse – Request for approval of a critical slopes waiver, which will allow the approval of a preliminary site plan for 5,400 square feet of warehouse and 2,000 square feet of supporting office space.

Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioner would like to pull any item off the consent agenda. There being none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Rieley moved for approval of the consent agenda as presented.

Ms. Higgins seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of (6:0). (Absent – Edgerton)

Mr. Thomas stated that the motion carried (6:0) for approval of consent agenda.

ZMA-2003-11 Rio East Commercial Area (Sign #10, 11) - Request to amend the proffers of ZMA-1996-004, to allow a veterinary hospital by special use permit. The property, described as Tax Map 61, Parcels 124A part of & 124B part of, contains approximately .8456 acres, and is zoned PDMC - Planned Development Mixed Commercial. The proposal is located on Rio East Ct (private), approximately .1 miles from the intersection of Rio East Ct and Rt. 631 (Rio Road East), in the Rio Magisterial District. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Office Service in Neighborhood 2. ***DEFERRED FROM THE MARCH 2, 2004 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.***

SP-2003-58 Rio East Commercial Park (Veterinary Hospital) (Sign #35, 39) - Request for special use permit to allow a veterinary office and hospital in accordance with Section 25A.2.2.1 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for uses by special use permit in the C-1, CO, and HC districts, which a veterinary office and hospital is one of those uses. . (Francis MacCall) ***DEFERRED FROM THE MARCH 2, 2004 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.***

Mr. MacCall summarized the staff report. The applicant is requesting to amend the proffers of ZMA-1996-004, to allow the use of a veterinary hospital and office, which would then allow that use to be permitted by special use permit in that PD-MC zoning. Staff worked with the applicants on the proffers in order to get them done in a clean and concise form. The changes that have

been made to the original proffers are not that extensive. The proposed proffers are very much the same proffers that were approved in 1996, except the statement was added that the owner was agreeable to adopt the original proffers, which would remain in effect for those parcels that are not part of this particular application. The other changes were just the dates referring to the sketch plan that they had in front of them and letter d) under # 2, which was the use by special use permit of the veterinary hospital. Staff has reviewed this for compliance with the principles of the Neighborhood Model and the Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends approval of the amendment to change the proffers, the approval of the special use permit with the conditions and the modification of the supplemental regulations discussed in the report.
Ms. Joseph asked for clarification on the modifications.

Mr. MacCall explained that Section 5.1.11(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that a soundproofed building shall be located no closer than two hundred (200) feet to any agricultural or residential lot line. There is a residential lot line in the R-15 directly across the street, which the Commission saw as Glenwood Station. In Glenwood Station's review, there was some commercial put in the front and the reduction would be from the 200 feet down to 145 feet as shown on the plan. The Zoning staff has taken done sound meter readings and found it was in excess of 55 decibels. Therefore, staff feels that the modification would be acceptable.

Ms. Higgins noted the odd shape of the parcel near the entrance and asked why the special use permit for the veterinary clinic was on both sides of the entrance.

Mr. MacCall noted that what was shown is area out of the restricted area, which pertains to #2 in the proffers. The rest of it #1, specifically refers to the restrictive area and that was just a redrawing of what was originally approved in the original proffers. He pointed out that it an approximate area of 575' by 275' area, which was the extent of this special use permit in regards to the amended proffers.

Ms. Higgins stated that the area defined as proposed special use permit area - when you deduct the restrictive area, it wraps around the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Rieley stated his assumption was that was for a different parcel.

Mr. MacCall stated that the existing layout of the remaining 5.6 acres was what they were changing in that area, which was specifically for this special use permit. That was the extent to what was outside of the restricted area. The original proffers still apply to all the others around the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Higgins stated that was proposed lot 6 and a portion of proposed lot 5 was excluded. Therefore, it was the remainder of lot 5.

Mr. MacCall stated that was correct, but that currently it was all 124A and 124B. Those are proposed and staff has not seen that proposed subdivision yet proposed.

Mr. Thomas asked if there were any more questions for staff. There being none, he opened the public hearing on the special use permit and zoning map amendment for applicant and public comment.

Jordon Juliano, with Rivanna Realty, stated that he would respond to any questions the Commission may have.

Mr. Thomas invited public comment. There being no public comment, the public hearing was closed and the matter brought back to the Commission for discussion and possible action.

Action on ZMA-03-11:

Mr. Rieley moved for approval of ZMA-03-11 Rio East Commercial Area with the proffers as outlined on Attachment E of the staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any more discussion.

Ms. Higgins noted that on the proffer form it referred to a copy of something that was attached, which was a copy of the Zoning Ordinance as it exists today, but that it was not attached. She pointed out that would become a part of this action too and should be attached when this was sent forward.

Mr. MacCall apologized for that oversight and noted that it would be included as part of the packet when it was sent forward to the Board.

Ms. Higgins stated that the use of the property outside of the restricted area also refers to that and on the proffer amendments when you change them that she was not sure what was changed. She pointed out that she did not have a problem approving this because it seems very specific, but she did not think that it reads very specifically.

Mr. Morris seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of (6:0). (Edgerton – Absent - No)

Action on SP-2003-58:

Ms. Joseph moved for approval of SP-03-58 Rio East Commercial Park as outlined by staff and subject to the following conditions:

1. A site plan shall be submitted for approval that shall be in general accord with the sketch plan prepared by Keeney & Co, Architects dated 3/12/04.
2. Any enlargement or expansion of the veterinary office and hospital use will require an amendment to this Special Use Permit (SP-2003-058).
3. No overnight boarding use other than for those animals under medical care shall take place at the veterinary hospital.
4. Granted a waiver of Section 5.1.11(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires that a soundproofed building shall be located no closer than two hundred (200) feet to any agricultural or residential lot line.

Ms. Higgins seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of (6:0). (Edgerton – Absent)

Mr. Thomas stated that the motion carries for both the zoning map amendment and the special use permit and will go to the Board of Supervisors on April 14.

SP 2003- 087 Mosby Mountain Subdivision Plat Extension (Sign #66) - Request to extend the life of SP-01-065 a special use permit approved 5/1/02 which allows for an earthen fill and bridge/culvert crossing in the floodplain, per Sections 30.3.05.2.1 and 30.3.6.1 of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is zoned R1 (Residential with a density of 1du/acre) and FH (Flood Hazard Overlay District) and is described as Tax Map 90, Parcel 1B. The property is located in the Samuel Miller Magisterial District on Rt. 631 (Old Lynchburg Road) across from Southwood Estates Mobile Home Park. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property for Rural Area uses in Rural Area 5 and Neighborhood Density (3-6 du/acre) uses in Neighborhood 5. (Yadira Amarante)

Ms. Amarante presented the staff report. She asked to correct the title of the request because it really was an extension for a previous special use permit. This is a request to extend the validity of a special use permit that approved by the Board of Supervisors in May of 2002. The special use permit will expire May 1 of this year. The applicant has not begun construction of that bridge crossing as of yet. It is indicated that construction has been delayed because of the amount of time that it has taken to get the road plans, storm water management plans and tree conservation plans approved, which has delayed the construction of the bridge. The applicant is asking for an extension. Staff's assumes that the extension would be for two years, but it was her understanding that they will begin construction in a few months. Staff recommends approval of

this extension request mostly because the bridge will be in the same location as was originally approved. There have been no significant regulation changes in terms of our ordinance or policies. The characteristics of the neighborhood have remained the same. There have been no changes to the site since the two year time period. Staff is recommending approval with the original conditions.

Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioner had any questions for staff. He stated that in the previous staff report under the unfavorable items, on page 10, it says, "The proposed use will cause a development that is inconsistent . . ."

Ms. Amarante stated that was an analysis that staff makes when looking at special use permits and rezonings to compare it to the Comprehensive Plan to see if it is something that would be recommended. This property is a property that has old zoning on it. It is R1 zoned property in the Rural Areas as identified in the Comprehensive Plan. There is only a small portion of this property that is actually within the development areas. She pointed out that she was trying to state that it was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, but again it has the correct zoning on it.

Mr. Thomas asked if the applicant had any comments.

Mr. Gaylon Beights stated that he would respond to any questions the Commission may have.

Ms. Joseph asked the applicant where they were in the process.

Mr. Beights stated that the final plat was approved in February of this year. They have bonded the improvements and have begun construction. They have clearing for the entrances up to the stream crossing, and actually have a temporary stream crossing in order to get the logging out. It just took them from May, 2002 to February, 2004 to complete the final plat process.

Mr. Thomas asked if there were any other questions for the applicant. There being none, he asked if there was any one else present who would like to speak on this application. There being none, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter back before the Commission for discussion and a possible action.

Ms. Higgins stated that she had a question for staff or Mr. Kamptner. She stated that her understanding was based on the extent of the work is that described that the construction has commenced and that an extension of the special use permit is not going to be necessary.

Mr. Kamptner asked staff if the Zoning Administrator made a zoning determination on that issue.

Justin Beights stated that he had talked to John Shepherd, of the Zoning Division and he indicated that vesting rights would be more complicated than coming to the Planning Commission and requesting an extension of the special use permit. He noted that was the feedback that he had gotten and was why they were here today.

Mr. Rieley stated that it was the first time in his recollection that the Planning Commission was the easiest path to take.

Mr. Morris moved for approval of SP-2003-087 subject to the following conditions:
1. Albemarle County Engineering Department and VDOT approval of final grading plans and bridge and road plans and computations;
2. Albemarle County Engineering Department approval of an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to include stabilization of fill;
3. Albemarle County Engineering Department approval of mitigation plans for disturbance of the stream buffer;
4. The CON/SPAN bridge system must be installed per manufacturer's specifications.
5. The final subdivision plat should reflect any changes to the floodplain and floodway limits,

and the applicant must provide computations supporting any such changes, as well as copies of the correspondence demonstrating FEMA approval of the revised floodplain or no changes in flood plain levels can occur.

6. In an effort to minimize environmental degradation, no soil shall be removed from the stream to compensate for any fill.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 6:0. (Edgerton – Absent)

Mr. Thomas stated that the motion carries and would go to the Board of Supervisors on April 14.

ZTA-04-01 Cluster Developments – Amend Sections 10.2.2, By special use permit, 10.3.3.3, Special provisions, and 10.5.2, Where permitted by special use permit, of Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code, all of which pertain to lands within the Rural Areas (RA) zoning district, to delete provisions allowing rural preservation developments having more than twenty development lots by special use permit. Rural preservation developments are a cluster form of development. Effective July 1, 2004, Virginia Code § 15.2-2286(A) (12) will prohibit localities from authorizing cluster developments by special use permit. Rural preservation developments having twenty or fewer development lots will continue to be allowed by right within the Rural Areas (RA) zoning district. The complete ordinance is available for examination by the public in the Department of Planning & Community Development, Room 218, Second Floor, County Office Building. (Joan McDowell)

Ms. McDowell summarized the staff report. The State passed a law that as of July 1 of this year that all cluster developments, which includes Rural Preservation Developments, will be by right. The County is currently very involved in reviewing the Comprehensive Plan, and part of that Comprehensive Plan addresses Rural Preservation Developments. Staff anticipates changing the ordinance after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted in relation to Rural Preservation Developments. Currently the County allows Rural Preservation Developments by right if they are under 20 lots, but if they are over 20 lots they are by special use permit. This change would bring the County into compliance with the State Code and it also would not allow Rural Preservation Developments at least temporarily until they were ready with ordinance changes for over 20 lot Rural Preservation Developments. The staff report addresses how many Rural Preservation Developments have been approved with less than 20 lots and for over 20 lots. Staff does not anticipate a huge difference in the way subdivisions are done in the rural areas while this portion of the ordinance would be removed. If there were any questions, she would be happy to answer them.

Ms. Joseph asked what the time line was on the rural areas amendments.

Ms. McDowell stated that a lot of the time line depends on the Commission. The next work session is scheduled for next week on April 6, which will hopefully be our last work session. If a decision is made next week, then this zoning text amendment can proceed to public hearing and on to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that one suggestion might be to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the changes not take effect until the last possible date. That way they would not be creating an unnecessary change prior to the date that the State requires that the change be made.

Mr. Thomas asked if the date of the change is July 1, and Ms. McDowell stated that was correct.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the County Attorney could advise us as to the date that the Board might want to enact that as part of the change.

Ms. Higgins stated that she had a question about an attachment, which was dated December 10. She asked if on December 10 that the resolution had been acted on.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the Board of Supervisors acted on the resolution on December 10.

Ms. Higgins stated that the resolution of intent is to bring the ordinance into conformance with the Virginia Code. She noted that what the Commission has seen and what was coming back next Tuesday was changes to the Rural Area section of the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that means that there has been no roughed out framework for the changes to the ordinance. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it would not be advisable for the Commission to be changing the ordinance based on the Comprehensive Plan that has not been adopted yet. Therefore, in their timeline in trying to look ahead that staff would love to be finished next week in the work session so that the amendment can go on to public hearing, and then the Board has to deal with it as well. He pointed out that staff just felt like it would not all be done in time.

Ms. Higgins stated that they do not have the language for the ordinance itself.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that was correct. He pointed out that staff anticipates that it would be some time after July 1st before the second part of what the ordinance changes need to be to come before the Commission.

Ms. Higgins asked if they have any alternatives.

Mr. Rieley stated that he did not think that they do. One of the things, which he understood, is that the only reason that we can retain fewer than 20 lots is that we are not changing it. It is by right and they were not changing it. If they were to modify or change it, then it would come under the same criteria as the change that would be above 20 lots.

Mr. Kamptner stated that the law that they were trying to address grandfathers by right cluster regulations adopted before 2002. There will actually be a two-step process before we actually have regulations to implement the new law. Once the Comprehensive Plan is adopted he thought that there would be a second step where they would study to come up with a design criteria that they will be allowed to be put in place as part of the by right approval of these new cluster developments.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it would be for whatever their number might end up being.

Mr. Kamptner stated that he imagined that it would be a complicated and fairly lengthy process because once they do all of them under the new regulations they will have to be by right. The Board is going to have to be comfortable with the design criteria they adopt so that they will be satisfactory in all situations.

Ms. Higgins stated that it was clear in our conversation about the rural area plans that we are generally, if not totally, in support of rural preservation versus traditional subdivision. They are proposing to take an action to take them off the table completely for an unidentified time because there is a two-step process. The other part is if we do not take this action, then they would become by right and not require a special use. She asked if the ordinance was not appropriate to allow this. She pointed out that there may only be one request, but once it is done then you cannot undo it.

Ms. Joseph stated that the way she understands this is that clustering is by right on July 1 and that whatever is in the ordinance is by right. She noted that what they were trying to do is to make sure that whatever is going to be by right is something that they can live with and something that does not change the ordinance substantially. Therefore, they were just removing the provision for the over 20 lots being required by special use permit because they could not require a special use permit anymore.

Mr. Kamptner stated that all that this zoning text amendment was doing was eliminating the special use permit form of the cluster development that allows more than 20 lots to be created.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that one of the concerns is that a 25-lot rural preservation development cannot be processed anymore. The real effect of this language is that they could not have just changed it on May 25 by right either because that would change the provisions that already exist in the ordinance, which would not have been possible to do either. Basically, they could only remove the special use permit aspect. They had to keep everything else as it is in order for it to be grandfathered. If they had changed 20 lots to 21 lots then they would have to revamp the whole ordinance.

Mr. Kamptner stated that this was the best that they could do to preserve any form of cluster development under the law. The other option would be to do away with cluster developments entirely until the design criteria were established and the new regulation was adopted. This preserves as much as we can.

Ms. Higgins stated that clearly it looked like it was a choice between taking off the table cluster developments of over 20 lots completely versus making cluster developments over 20 lots by right.

Mr. Kamptner stated that the risk is, as Ms. McDowell was saying, that the rural areas study is going on and they want to have the rural areas plan adopted, and then from that plan move to the design criteria that will delineate what is appropriate for a cluster development in the rural areas.
Ms. Higgins stated that they could have taken the words out that say no criteria for the 20 lots and under.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that it would have had to be by right with essentially no criteria.

Ms. Higgins asked if there was no criteria for the 20 lots and under.

Mr. Kamptner stated that there was in our existing ordinance.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that could stay, but if they were to rewrite it that they could not put it in.

Ms. Higgins asked if they were saying that it could not be applied to the over 20 lots.

Mr. Rieley stated that they could not make those kinds of changes and still have it grandfathered.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that they could redo the ordinance to say no special use permit for any size cluster, but you would then have to appropriate conditions that would be the guideline for which they were approved. That would need policy support to do, which needs the rural area changes to the Comprehensive Plan, and staff did not think that would be in place in time.

Ms. Higgins stated that these questions are all directed at that should be an extremely high priority because once a piece of property starts forward and does not have this tool to use, then that was one more piece that we could have captured into something more desirable than less desirable.

Mr. Rieley agreed, but also wanted to point out that there have been very few rural preservation applications for greater than 25 lots, and that some of them have been turned down.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that this was interesting because when this all came to the General Assembly they actually argued against this change in the enabling legislation because we felt that they were actually cutting their nose off to spite their face in what they intended to do. The General Assembly, in its wisdom, decided that this was worth doing. Therefore, they were taking

away something that otherwise they were able to give to people because the General Assembly did not like special use permits.

Ms. Higgins stated that they wanted to make clusters generally by right. She stated that the reasoning behind that was what their goal is. She questioned the wording that specified the agent as the Director of Current Development and Zoning, which was a new title and made it different from the rest of the ordinance.

Mr. Kamptner stated that was a new title, but that "agent" applies to the implementation of the Site Plan Ordinance or the Subdivision Ordinance.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the agent is not referred to in other sections of the ordinance, but rather it refers to the position under the new reorganization.

Mr. Kamptner stated that it would be in the context of those two regulatory schemes. He pointed out that it was an existing position.

Ms. Joseph echoed Ms. Higgins' frustration because there were so many things that she wanted to say about this and do, but it was really kind of obvious when she read the resolution that it was just moving on to make sure that they have something that is legal by July 1st.

Ms. Higgins asked if they could add that this is recommended to take effect at the last minute of whatever that date might be on June 30.

Mr. Thomas opened the pubic hearing. Since the County is the applicant, he asked if there was any one in the audience that would like to speak on this application.

Rob Duncan, with Southern Development, stated that they actually have a rural preservation parcel that will be coming before the Commission shortly. One concern, which does not directly relate to what they were dealing with tonight, was one thing that they could keep in mind in the future. He pointed out that Mr. Rieley made note of this tonight in that you have very few applications for rural preservation developments over 20 lots. What they found to be a struggle with those large parcels is the fact that you are often times stopped by ending up with a large parcel with only one building right that is suppose to be run as a farm. So you may have 700 acres with one dwelling unit after you do the RPD. It is very difficult to run a 700-acre farm or an 800-acre farm with only one development right. There would be no manager's quarters, tenant houses or barns to mark out stalls and do those sorts of things. He felt that many of the developers share the frustrations that they have in the larger RPD's in that the one large lot with only one dwelling unit is not sufficient to operate a farm. He felt that the County would see many more applications for large RPD's if they could somehow work in a formula that would accommodate additional dwelling rights for manager quarters and farm operations on a day-to-day basis. If they want to see more of those types of developments, he thought that it might make sense to try to work in that provision to the new by right proposal that they were now working on.

Mr. Rieley stated that it was a good point. He asked if there was a mechanism, such as the mother-in-law apartment, that could be used to have two or three independent structures that are not sub dividable, as a dwelling unit.

Mr. Rieley stated that this poses a very interesting point because clearly what they want to encourage is rural use on their residue property.

Ms. Joseph stated that there was a threshold as to how many acres you could have for a residue.

Mr. Rieley stated that they were also encouraging a larger percentage of the land to be left as a residue under the new provision. He stated that was a very good point.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that he believed that staff was processing one for Mr. Duncan right now.

Ms. Higgins asked Mr. Duncan if he had a request coming soon to the Commission for a RPD.

Mr. Duncan stated that they have several parcels in Albemarle County that they were evaluating now, and in fact, he had met with the Nature Conservancy last week on one in particular. He stated that they were actually approaching the Nature Conservancy to purchase their rural preservation tract in advance because they have found that the developers end up being stuck with these parcels. He stated that they have several that could go either way, but he felt that a lot of it will fall into what the new rural preservation development looks like for the by right for over 20 lots.

Ms. Higgins asked if the one in process is the one for more than 20 lots.

Mr. Duncan stated that it possibly could be for more than 20 lots because it consists of various tax map parcels that could be broken up in multiple forms. He noted that they would love for it to be over 20 lots, but their limiting factor is that one large lot remaining would be approximately 700 acres.

Ms. Higgins stated that if the Board adopts this and if it was not done by June 30 then anything over 20 lots would not be allowed.

Mr. Duncan stated that they would then do a standard by right development for the 21-acre parcels at that time. He stated that if they had multiple tax map parcels that they could break it up into smaller RPD's. Therefore, they could do smaller RPD's utilizing each tax map and parcel. He pointed out that it would reduce their infrastructure costs and would make sense all the way around to do a large lot, but the one thing they end up with is having that large lot residual and just being stuck with that time and time again.

Ms. Higgins asked if the action tonight would have any effect on something that might be in the process. She asked how that works if someone has already applied and if on July 1 it would just cut it off.

Mr. Kamptner stated that in this case it would, because of the State law that would be in place. The Board's action on the zoning text amendment will be effective July 1 and the Board will have to act on those pending applications by that date in order for them to fall under the existing rule.

Mr. Duncan stated that their application was not in the process, but his concern was just to address that for the future.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any further public comment. There being none, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter back to the Commission for discussion and a possible action.

Mr. Rieley stated that many legitimate concerns have been raised, and there were many concerns that they need to keep in mind as they move to the next level in the Comprehensive Plan and the ordinance provisions. He stated that they do not have much of a choice in this decision since this is the only way that they can preserve the process of the rural preservation development and allow it to move ahead. He pointed out that most of their rural preservation development requests are in that category. Therefore, they need to do this and then move as expeditiously as we can on both the Comprehensive Plan changes and the ordinance changes.

Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Rieley and felt that there were many good comments and suggestions made.

Mr. Rieley moved for approval of ZTA-04-01 Cluster Development as presented, with the recommendation that the effective date be as close to July 1, 2004, as possible.

Mr. Morris seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of (6:0). (Edgerton – Absent)

Mr. Thomas stated that ZTA-04-01, Cluster Development, would be heard by the Board on May 12.

New Business:

Mr. Kamptner informed the Commission that he has four limited training sessions, some of which can be addressed in memo form. He will work with Mr. Cilimberg to schedule a date.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned 7:00 p.m. to the next meeting on April 6, 2004.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon Claytor Taylor, Recording Secretary.)