



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 31, 2016

7:15 p.m.

**City of Fredericksburg
715 Princess Anne Street
Council Chambers**

You may view and listen to the meeting in its entirety by going to the Planning Commission page on the City's website: fredericksburgva.gov

MEMBERS

Roy McAfee – Chair
Richard Dynes, Vice-Chair
Jim Pates, Secretary
Jim Beavers
Roy Gratz
Tom O'Toole
Kenneth Gantt

CITY STAFF

Chuck Johnston, Director
Erik Nelson, Deputy Director
Mike Craig, Zoning Administrator
Kathleen Dooley, City Attorney

1. INTRODUCTION - CITY MANAGER, TIM BAROODY

Mr. Tim Baroody, City Manager arrived at 7:15 p.m. and introduced himself to the Planning Commission members.

2. CALL TO ORDER

The August 31, 2016, Planning Commission regular meeting was called to order by Chairman McAfee at 7:30 p.m. Mr. McAfee explained the standard meeting procedures.

3. PLEDGE of ALLEGIANCE

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

- **July 13, 2016 – Regular Meeting – Adopted**

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 5. SUP2016-03 - HealthSouth Rehabilitation Hospital of Fredericksburg (lessee), requests an amended special use permit to expand its existing 52-bed rehabilitation hospital to include six additional beds (58 total beds) at 300 Park Hill Drive (GPIN 7779-38-5555) in the Commercial / Transitional Office zoning**

district (CT). The proposed expansion will bring the on-site Floor Area Ratio to 0.20. The CT zoning district permits a 0.5 Floor Area Ratio. The Comprehensive Plan designates the area for Commercial-Transitional / Office, which has no specific recommended commercial density.

Mr. Craig presented the staff report on the application.

Commissioners did not have any questions for staff.

Mr. John Hash, Engineer, Timmons Group, Ft. Defiance, VA 24437, applicant's representative. He said he had nothing to add to Mr. Craig's presentation but would be happy to answer questions of the Commission.

Mr. Pates said the owner of the property is listed as R. I. McLaughlin MC, LLC, and asked the names of the principals of the LLC.

Mr. Hash said he was representing the applicant and that although he could not recall the names off the top of his head at this time, the information Mr. Pates is seeking had been listed in the application material.

Mr. Pates said he understands Mr. Hash works for with the Timmons Group that was hired by the applicant and it would be nice to hear from the actual owners of the property.

Mr. Hash said HealthSouth is the actual user and that representatives are present this evening to answer specific questions regarding the project.

Mr. Dynes asked staff how far this [addition] encroaches on the 100-foot setback.

Mr. Craig said there is an existing encroachment up to 65 feet and that they are planning on continuing that line so there is no further encroachment into the setback, essentially maintaining the original encroachment. He also noted that this hospital facility was built prior to the use standards being adopted.

Mr. McAfee opened the floor for public comment.

There was no public comment

Mr. McAfee closed the public comment period on this application.

Mr. Gantt made a motion to recommend approval of SUP2016-03 (HealthSouth Rehabilitation Hospital of Fredericksburg) to include the conditions outlined by City staff.

Mr. Dynes seconded the motion.

Motion carried by a unanimous vote of 7 – 0.

6. RZ2016-03 - Hamptons at Family, L.P. (contract purchaser), requests a zoning map amendment to change the R2, Residential designation on a portion of GPIN 7769-87-3295 (44 Briscoe Lane) and GPIN 7769-77-8378 (30 Briscoe Lane) totaling 20.84 acres, to Commercial Highway (CH) (Conditional) and R12,

Residential (Conditional) to permit the development of commercial highway uses, 78 townhomes, and 120 multi-family dwelling units. The rezoning includes proffered conditions with land-use controls, transportation improvements, architectural features, cash proffers to offset public facilities impacts, and site amenities. The CH portion of the site is proposed to be 4.31 acres, which would permit a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 0.70. The R12 portion of the site is proposed to be 16.53 acres and will consist of a total 198 dwelling units at 11.98 units per acre. The R12 zoning district permits residential density at 12 units per acre. The Comprehensive Plan designates the area for Planned Development-Commercial, which has no specific recommended residential or commercial density.

Mr. Craig presented the staff report on the application.

Mr. McAfee asked Mr. Craig to touch on two additional proffers that were in the staff report but not mentioned during the discussion, relating to schools and fire services; and, he asked Mr. Nelson to expand on the cash contribution for wayside panels, which the applicant also voluntarily proffered.

Mr. Craig said the applicant has voluntarily proffered \$99,990 to offset the project's impacts on fire and rescue services and over \$900,000 to go toward schools; amounting to almost one million dollars in cash proffers.

Mr. Nelson explained that the subject area was a Civil War battleground in May of 1863, during the Chancellorsville Campaign, and that the City has a panel/wayside exhibit program specifically in the Smith Run/Cowan Boulevard area, which could logically extend into this area. During discussions early on in the application process for this project, staff suggested that perhaps funds for interpretative panels could be proffered, which the applicants readily offered.

Mr. Beavers said that most models are not accurate and noted that the proposed project is projecting approximately 62 school-aged children. He asked if anyone has ever gone back to review how accurate those models are.

Mr. Craig said the school data comes from the School Administration and that he is confident that the data reflects reality.

Mr. McAfee noted that the Planning Commission had previously asked the School Board this question, with respect to The Haven's project, and they said at that time the figures were adequate, or very close to those projected.

Mr. Dynes said he would like to see the property to the south integrated into this project as retail use, so people would have the convenience of walkability.

Mr. Dynes asked the City Attorney her opinion with respect to the Proffer Statement.

Ms. Dooley said she and Mr. Craig have reviewed the Proffer Statement and, by and large, the Proffer Statement is clear with regard to who is going to do what, when, where and how, and the applicants have made some adjustments to the Proffer Statement in response to questions posed by City staff.

Dr. Gratz noted that on both the Generalized Development Plan (GDP) and page two of the Proffer Statement, the word "proposed" was used with respect to the car dealership. He suggested that this be modified and that "proposed" be stricken from the Proffer Statement and the GDP.

Mr. Craig said he and Ms. Dooley had already talked with the applicants and that they have agreed to strike the word "proposed" from their Proffer Statement.

Mr. O'Toole referenced a memo Mr. Craig had written for a previously-held Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting on this application. One issue was with respect to the Chesapeake Bay Overlay District. Specifically, he said the TRC wanted the 100-year floodway addressed now; he had also noticed on the plans that the applicant intends to address it at a later date, which is in conflict to what was requested.

Mr. Craig said there is an existing stormwater pond that has an emergency spillway for a 100-year storm, and the City's Senior Environmental Planner had some concern on where this 100-year storm level of water was going to go, and he posed that question to the applicant, to which he responded that this was really a Site Plan engineering requirement detail, which would come later in the process.

Mr. O'Toole said it appeared to him that the staff asked for it for a specific reason and the applicant's just not doing it.

Mr. Craig said the applicant will be required to meet any state and local regulations in terms of stormwater management. He also noted that the applicants have an arrow depicted on the submitted plans (GDP), indicating that they do intend to deal with this issue. This was sufficient for the Senior Environmental Planner.

Mr. Johnston said a GDP is supposed to be "general" and not a detailed Site Plan. After the rezoning is approved, this would be a Site Plan requirement, which must be in substantial conformance with the GDP.

Mr. O'Toole asked how much the new fire station is going to cost, relative to how much the applicant has proffered.

Mr. Johnston said he believes there is a "ballpark estimate" of about \$10-12 million, but it has not yet been designed.

Mr. Pates referred to the Proffer Statement, page 2, under "Generalized Development Plan." He said it states that "[t]he Property shall be developed in general conformance with the GDP,...." He asked how this relates to the City's general requirement that any material change [in a GDP] has to come back and go through the planning process.

Mr. Craig said any changes in use, density, etc., are major changes, which would obviously have to go back through the process. Even with the overall road network of this project, or the fronting of the houses, if they wanted to change these things it would be considered a material change. But exploring Mr. O'Toole's concern regarding the storm pond, if it were to have to change a little bit from the blob that is indicated on the GDP, that is the kind of leeway that the statement is intended to give, and that is how staff interprets it.

Mr. Pates suggested that perhaps this paragraph might be amended to include an explicit statement that says that any material changes would require a proffer amendment. He moved on to page 2 of the Proffer Statement, "2. TRANSPORTATION." He said one of the things that he has always been interested in with conditional rezonings is what is really a proffer, and what is not. For example, he asked, with respect to the Briscoe Lane Improvements; what portion of those would be a requirement for any applicant and what portion is actually a proffer? He said a lot of times an applicant will say "we will improve the intersection," when in reality they are required to improve the intersection as part of the site plan requirements.

Mr. Craig said that is a situation where Public Works has a lot of discretion, and they are always in the mode to make things work on a site. He said he does not know the answer to Mr. Pates' question but believes that this adds a level of certainty to the standard that the City expects.

Mr. Johnston said there is obviously a bit of grey area and the Ordinances do talk about sidewalks, per se, but by proffering that there is a sidewalk network as shown on the GDP, this makes it more specific and the purpose of the proffer is to tie it to the property.

Mr. Pates asked staff to talk more about "Exhibit B – Materials."

Mr. Craig said the applicants have provided in Exhibit B some general elevations of the apartment buildings, general layout and type of construction and they have noted materials to be used, such as asphalt shingles, PVC trim, vinyl, shake and lap siding, and brick. Townhomes will be no less than 18 feet in width, and the general features for the commercial project shall be generally similar to the adjoining Mercedes and Volvo Car Dealerships.

Mr. Pates asked if they have set any minimum percentages [for use of specific materials].

Mr. Craig said they have not.

Mr. Pates said it appears to him that the elevations roughly show about 20% brick and he thinks they should be able to calculate that number. He said what has been submitted looks very similar to what is going up out there now.

Mr. Craig responded, yes sir.

Mr. O'Toole referenced page 95 within the application material. Specifically, page 95 of the Fredericksburg, Virginia Unified Development Procedures Manual: "*h. A statement certifying the use and development of the property, and all improvements thereon, are subject to the final General Development Plan as well as to the generally applicable regulations set forth in UDO Section 72-33.*" He asked if this addresses what Mr. Pates was asking and should it replace the previous language, because it has to be somewhere in the GDP, according to the application requirements.

Mr. Craig said he thinks the question regarding Briscoe Lane by Mr. Pates was an interesting one. He said the UDO sets a certain level of standard, but there is also a lot of administrative leeway in developing these projects. He said what Mr. O'Toole just read is a required statement in the application to ensure that if someone puts something

on their GDP that is not in accordance with the general regulations and gets missed then there is no recourse of saying "Ahh, gotcha." Instead, we can say, we missed this and to bring it into conformance.

Mr. O'Toole said this references a Final General Development Plan. He said what the Commission has before them is a General Development Plan but the documents call for a "Final General Development Plan."

Mr. Craig asked Mr. O'Toole if he was reading from the narrative of the application.

Mr. O'Toole said it is in the zoning map amendment application.

Mr. Craig said there are certain statements that they are required to make, and that sounds like one of them. He said if it is in the narrative, it is information the City requires.

Mr. O'Toole said he did not see the statement on the Plans and that it is supposed to be on there.

Mr. Craig asked Mr. O'Toole if he was suggesting that it be on the GDP.

Mr. O'Toole said it says it has to be somewhere, so he would assume that is where it should be, which would clarify a lot of GDP concerns.

Mr. McAfee asked that, for clarification purposes, if there is something that is supposed to be indicated on the GDP and it is not, staff will ensure that all requirements are met prior to the application moving forward.

Mr. Craig said, absolutely.

Mr. Charlie Payne, Hirschler Fleisher, representing the applicant. He thanked staff for providing such a detailed presentation. He reiterated details of the proposed project. He also noted that the proffers offered by the applicant fall under the old proffer regulations. He restated the proffers and noted that the applicant had indeed agreed to strike the word "proposed" for the Car Dealership use. He noted that the Future Land Use Plan calls for this area to be PDC but that this parcel of land cannot meet the zoning requirements of that zoning district as it stands today. PDC projects encourage a minimum of 150 acres for development and a location that can handle over 500,000 square feet of commercial use. He said that cannot work for this site, which is roughly 20 acres. He said, in looking at the development pattern, that the highest and best use for this area appears to be what is being proposed today – Commercial Highway and Multifamily residential. He said in regard to the proffers, he cannot recall anyone offering a cash proffer of one million dollars to the City. He noted that this breaks down to \$4,545.50 per unit.

In answer to a question raised by Mr. Pates regarding material changes, he said he agrees with staff that it is important, given the requirements of the City in the GDP, that they proffer the [GDP], which is required under the City's application process, and clearly explain exactly what they are going to do.

With respect to the question by Mr. O'Toole regarding the Chesapeake Bay Overlay District, Bill Pyle, Bowman Consulting (representative for the applicant), said he had e-mail and phone discussions with the Senior Environmental Planner about the 100-year floodway. He said the terminology "floodway" was not what the Environmental Planner had meant. What he meant was the 100-year outfall from the existing stormwater management pond located on the Noble site. Through discussions, it was determined that it was too early to really go through a detailed design at this point, so he and the Environmental Planner came up with the note that is currently on the GDP. Therefore, staff comments have been satisfied.

Mr. McAfee asked, with respect to the final site plan, he asked if it is the intent of the applicant to have the front of the buildings front the road on which they are located.

Mr. Pyle said the intended orientation is as indicated on the GDP. The townhouses are rear load so the fronts will face the roads and the rear will be the garages. The front doors on the multi-family units will be as shown on the GDP.

Mr. Craig said the GDP has arrows that indicate the front of the units will front on the roadways.

Mr. Pates asked if the applicants would be willing to amend the Proffer Statement under 1B by adding a statement that *any material changes would require returning for a proffer amendment* (just to be clear).

Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Pates if that would be somewhat inconsistent with his previous observation that the UDO already requires it.

Mr. Pates said, no. He said there are all these exceptions, which he is concerned about – all the exceptions regarding general conformance with the GDP. He said he wanted to circle back and clarify that any material change to the GDP would require a proffer amendment, which is what the law is, but he would like to see it added to the proffers.

Mr. Payne said even if they were to make a minor change it would have to be approved by the Zoning Administrator, so the bar is already high to make any adjustments. He said he would look it over, but he said he did not believe there would be an issue with adding the language.

Regarding the cash proffers, Mr. Pates asked how they arrived at those numbers.

Mr. Payne said it comes to what they believe the impact will be. If you are generating 62 children out of the whole development, the capital impact of that is fairly minimal. He said it's capital facilities and not operating costs. The taxes generated from the site help contribute towards the operating costs. The other factor is economic feasibility – what the project is going to cost and what the applicant can afford to provide. He said he believes the proffer numbers are pretty high for purposes of those impacts.

Mr. Pates asked regardless of whether the amount is \$3,000 or \$30,000 per unit, isn't it supposed to bear some relation to what the actual costs will be? He said he is interested to know how it was computed or if the numbers were simply pulled out of the air.

Mr. Payne said what they do is look at other projects and what they have consistently proffered, and this is on the high end of that.

Mr. Pates asked the City Attorney if, under the new [proffer legislation], she believes these proffers are ones that the City would be able to accept.

Ms. Dooley said she would like to hold that discussion until we get to the overall presentation.

Mr. Payne said this application falls under the "old" proffer law, which allows for more flexibility between the jurisdiction and the developer.

Mr. O'Toole asked, in general, what the rental rates would be for the multi-family units.

Mr. Payne said for multi-family, he believes a one-bedroom will go for \$1,100 a month and a three-bedroom will run about \$1,500 a month.

Mr. O'Toole asked if this includes all utilities.

Mr. Payne responded, no, only water and sewer.

Mr. O'Toole said he had read in the provided documents that the applicant expects that the people renting these units would be in the \$35,000-\$75,000 [income] range and that there was going to be approximately 20% federal subsidy involved.

Mr. Payne said he believes those figures were \$47,000-\$78,000. He said because of where this project is located (in the Washington Metropolitan Area), they are able to take advantage of the Income Tax Credit Program, which basically gives you the ability to borrow cheaper money but still be able to develop a quality project and attract the median incomes that are in that jurisdiction.

Mr. O'Toole said he was curious of how the 20% subsidy will work.

Mr. Payne said it is not a subsidy. It is a 20% less rent than what the market rate would generate, so you are borrowing money cheaper.

Mr. Beavers asked if there is insurance behind the program.

Mr. Payne said yes, it is a HUD program.

Mr. O'Toole asked if the applicant had done any studies to project how much money the project will provide to the City.

Mr. Payne said they have not conducted such an analysis.

Mr. O'Toole asked if the townhouse units would also be rentals.

Mr. Payne said they would be marketed to be owner-occupied.

Dr. Gratz asked if there has been a traffic study conducted.

Mr. Payne responded, yes.

Mr. Pyle said Public Works asked them to conduct a traffic-impact analysis on queuing and stacking along Fall Hill Avenue into the site.

Dr. Gratz asked if people want to [drive] west, toward I-95, how they would be able to exit the project?

Mr. Payne said that as many may recall, the Noble Way and Fall Hill Avenue intersection is going to be a full-light intersection.

Dr. Gratz said then that there will only be one way in and out of the project.

Mr. Payne said, yes, and you cannot turn left on Briscoe out, but the intersection will allow folks to go left.

Mr. Craig said one of the areas that Public Works was concerned about was the stacking at the future stop light and staff had the applicant study it, assuming that all traffic would always go to that light from the proposed development and the development next to it. As a result, sufficient stacking was found at Fall Hill Avenue and Noble Way to make that movement.

Dr. Gratz said that in reference to the amount of school-age children that would be generated from this development, out of 198 units, 108 of them are three-bedroom units. He said one might expect that if someone has a three-bedroom unit, they will have a minimum of one child in the unit as well, which would put the amount of potential students past 100, not 62 as the application indicates. He said he thinks the projection of school-aged children is low.

Mr. Payne said all they can do is go to the people who do the analysis and go with that figure. Although he believes that Dr. Gratz has made a good point, one needs to remember that first-time homeowners, etc., use extra bedrooms as offices, etc.

Dr. Gratz asked what the price ranges would be for the townhomes and asked if there had been a market study done to determine that all these units would not end up as rental units.

Mr. Payne said he believes the days of someone coming in and buying up a bunch of townhouses to turn them into rentals are pretty much gone because it is much more difficult to obtain financing than it used to be. He said one of the goals of the City is to have different housing options and the applicant sees this project as a very good mix to meet that goal. He said they have not done any market studies but they are going to partner with a builder in regard to developing these townhouses and, based on where this project is located, being close to shopping, downtown and I-95, he believes the prices will begin in the \$300,000's.

Dr. Gratz said this project does not really appear to be a "mixed-use" project as mentioned several places in the documents. He said it has one commercial use mixed in with 198 residential units so, in his opinion, it is not actually "mixed-use".

Mr. Payne said he respectfully disagrees because they will be providing a potentially high-end luxury market and the units are planned within over 3 million square feet of commercial space that currently exists [at Central Park].

Mr. McAfee opened the floor for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ron Fraser (owner, 8 Briscoe Lane) said he has enjoyed being able to rent his home out for the past 9-10 years and is concerned as to whether or not any thought has gone into ensuring that they maintain the privacy of their property. He said he is concerned about the noise and traffic that will be generated from the proposed project. He said he would make an appointment with Planning staff to discuss his concerns in more detail.

Mr. Craig said a 25-foot landscaped buffer is required, which should provide some privacy between Mr. Fraser's property and the vehicle sales establishment.

Mr. Rupert Farley – 1305 Caroline Street - He said that although he was not in attendance this evening to object to the project, he wanted to let the City know how disappointed he is in allowing this type of development in the proposed area of the City. He said years ago he had served on a committee to keep this area of the City green and have less intensive uses.

There were no additional public comments.

Mr. McAfee closed the public comment period for this application.

Mr. Dynes made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning request (RZ2016-03 Hamptons at Family, L.P), with the conditions outlined by City Staff, but with one modification to Page Two on the Voluntary Proffer Statement. Specifically, Proffer 1. **LAND USE** A. (i). The word "proposed" is to be stricken from the language on the Voluntary Proffer Statement, and stricken from the GDP as well.

Mr. Beavers seconded the motion.

Mr. Dynes said he appreciates that the proposal includes sidewalks and encourages pedestrian friendly access, etc., and he considers this proposal the same or better than the previous development in this area, which the City Council approved recently. He said he is concerned that the City does not have the tools in assessing whether the proffers are appropriate. He said this has been an ongoing thing and now the General Assembly has gotten into it by rewriting the proffer rules. He said until our staff is able to provide the tools with which to access these things, it continues to be difficult to hold a developer to account on proffers when no proffer policy exists.

Mr. Gantt said in going along with the comment made by Mr. Dynes, he is concerned when we talk about the proffers at this point. He asked what type of tools do exist, because it appears to him that the City staff liked the comfort of the flexibility. The question becomes: Is it that what the City staff and the City Attorney are presenting we are not comfortable with? If so, then perhaps we need to figure out a way to resolve that, or is there some other way? With the recent action of the General Assembly, it may hamper us being able to talk about it regardless.

Mr. Dynes said that neighboring jurisdictions get, on occasion, three to four times the amount than what we are getting in this particular case. But the amount being offered by this applicant happens to be more than the City gets on average.

Mr. McAfee reminded Commissioners that there would be a presentation and discussion regarding the changes made to proffer policies by the Virginia General Assembly.

Mr. Pates said the Commission is now faced with the second phase of this project and he is not any more ready to support it than he was for the first phase. He said there continue to be a number of concerns with the project, which is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for commercial uses in this area and not 198 residential units. He said the applicant is able to construct 42 single-family dwellings as a by-right use. The City needs to look at the larger picture. He said that although he agrees that an additional car dealership is a good idea for this area, he continues to have problems with the residential use that is currently proposed. He said he does not believe multi-family units and a townhouse development surrounded by commercial uses is a good idea and he will not support the motion.

Mr. Gantt said the Planning Commission seems to continue to go round and round regarding what sort of progress and advancement it wants to see. He said this type of development creates pocket areas that many people enjoy. He said he has spoken to several people that say they do enjoy being able to walk to commercial facilities/areas that meet their needs. He said he is not sure why the City continues to stutter opportunity/growth.

There were no additional comments.

Mr. McAfee called for the vote.

Motion to recommend approval carried by a vote of 4 – 3 with Commissioner's Pates, Gratz and O'Toole voting no.

Mr. McAfee moved on to the General Public Comment Period.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

7. *A general public comment period is provided at each regular meeting for comments by citizens regarding any matter **related to Commission business that is not listed on the Agenda for Public Hearing**. The Chair will request that speakers observe the **three-minute time limit** and yield the floor when the Clerk indicates that their time has expired. No dialogue between speakers will be permitted.*

Mr. McAfee opened the floor for general public comment.

There were no speakers.

Mr. McAfee closed the General Public Comment period, and moved on to New Business.

NEW BUSINESS

8. **Code of Virginia, Section 15.2-2303.4.** "Provisions applicable to certain conditional rezoning proffers." – Kathleen Dooley, City Attorney.

Ms. Dooley explained in detail the new proffer reform legislation.

Mr. Pates asked how this new legislation impacts the City developing a Proffer Policy.

Ms. Dooley said that, as the Planning Commission is aware, the City had previously hired a consultant to help develop a Proffer Policy for the City but that process was interrupted by this new legislation. She said the City has had to back off of its original track with developing a policy and will now need to rethink and rework the policy while taking the new legislation into consideration.

Mr. Pates said that he saw no reason why the City shouldn't still move forward with the development of a policy that takes the new legislation into account.

OTHER BUSINESS

9. Mr. Erik Nelson, Deputy Director of Community Planning & Building provided an update on the Small Area Comprehensive Plan process. He said staff will continue to provide the Planning Commission with updates as the process moves forward.

Mr. Nelson reminded Commissioners of upcoming Neighborhood meetings at the following locations, starting at 7:30 p.m.:

September 19, at James Monroe High School (2300 Washington Avenue) to discuss Planning Area 6

September 20, at the Village of Idlewild Clubhouse (2280 Idlewild Boulevard) to discuss Planning Area 3

Another set of neighborhood meetings will occur in the same locations on November 15 and 16. These later meetings will summarize the completed research, including information from these citizen discussions, and present draft plans for these areas of the City.

10. **Planning Commissioner Comment - None**

11. **Planning Director Comment**

Mr. Johnston updated the Commission on recent City Council actions. He also informed Commissioners of potential projects/applications that may be coming forward in the near future.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned.



Roy McAfee, Chair