MINUTES
Urban County Planning Commission Public Hearing Continuation

September 7, 2017
3:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, 2nd Floor Government Center

I. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 2nd floor LFUCG Government Center, 200 East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky.

Planning Commission members present: Headley Bell; Will Berkley; Patrick Brewer; Mike Cravens; Larry Forester; Karen Mundy; Mike Owens; Frank Penn; Carolyn Plumlee; Carolyn Richardson; and William Wilson, Chair. No members were absent.

Planning staff members present: Jim Duncan, Director; Chris Woodall; Jimmy Emmons; Traci Wade; Janice Westlund; Chris Taylor; Meghan Jennings; and Stephanie Cunningham. Other staff members present: Andrea Brown and Tracy Jones, Department of Law.

II. *Imagine Lexington* 2018 Comprehensive Plan Update Goals & Objectives Public Input Hearing Continuation – The Planning Commission will discuss the input from the public hearing, and vote on the proposed Goals & Objectives of the *Imagine Lexington* 2018 Comprehensive Plan.

a. Chair Comments – Mr. Wilson stated that, at the end of the public hearing, he had asked his fellow Commission members and Mr. Duncan to summarize what they had heard through the public comments; Mr. Duncan indicated that the staff would need an opportunity to consider some of the thoughts and opinions that were expressed. Mr. Wilson said that the staff would begin the proceedings today by summarizing any tweaks that were made to the draft Goals & Objectives based on the public comment; then the Commission would have an opportunity to react and vote on the draft.

b. Staff Presentation – Mr. Woodall stated that it had been interesting for the staff to hear the opinions of both the public and Commission members at the hearing, quoting Ms. Plumlee's comment: "We all have two ears, but we hear differently." After the hearing, the staff agreed with Ms. Richardson and Mr. Forester that the community was passionate about the issues, and spoke from a genuine desire to make Lexington a better place.

After the public hearing, the staff followed Mr. Wilson's lead and gathered to take stock individually of what they heard from the public. Mr. Woodall said that one clear message was that a vibrant economy is key to Lexington's success; the staff agreed that providing jobs and maintaining a framework for economic development efforts is vitally important to achieving the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Based on that need, which was expressed early in the public input process, the Goals & Objectives call for identifying, providing, and sustaining readily available, publicly-controlled economic development land, in direct response to this need. The staff also believes that recently approved text amendments to the P-2 and ED zones will help to remove barriers to developing hundreds of available job production acres.

Mr. Woodall stated that the staff also heard from agricultural interests, who believe that it is necessary to maintain agricultural resources from a public health and environmental standpoint, but also as an economic driver for Lexington. The staff believes that, by continuing to reinforce infill and redevelopment policies and maintaining the Urban Service Boundary, the community can continue to protect this valuable resource.

With regard to housing, Mr. Woodall said that the staff heard concerns that the community would not be able to meet the needs as indicated through the recent Housing Demand Study. Based on data, research, analysis of vacant land, redevelopment opportunities, and future growth scenarios, the staff believes that the community can accommodate the demand, with a wide variety of housing options that are affordable at all levels; however, development cannot continue in the same fashion, but must be more conscious, efficient, and intense. It will be important to consider the impacts of more intense development, and how it can be leveraged to enhance existing neighborhoods, particularly historic features. Based on suggestions from the public input, staff is proposing a change to the draft Goals & Objectives to ensure context sensitivity to historic properties.

From the Planning Commission's discussion at the end of the public hearing, the staff heard many references to flexibility. Mr. Woodall said that the staff believes that the study proposed in the Goals & Objectives has the potential to drastically shift the decision-making process for the expansion question, while identifying key agricultural assets for long-term preservation. The resulting process would be outcome-based, emphasizing quality development.

Mr. Woodall stated that the staff is recommending changes to Theme C, Goal 2, Objective A, separating it into two parts, elevating the publicly-owned economic development land concept to its own goal to prioritize its importance, and reinforcing that the Comprehensive Plan can be revised between five-year update cycles should an extraordinary circumstance present itself.

Mr. Woodall explained that the next recommended revision, to Theme E, Goal 2, Objective B, is in response to concerns from Planning Commission members and the Fayette County Neighborhood Council, who were opposed to the initial proposed wording, which was, "Require intense and sustainable development of all types within the Urban Service Area to accommodate future growth needs and safeguard rural land." The staff's edits were designed to address those concerns, by ensuring that all developments are economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable.

The final proposed edit, to Theme E, Goal 1, Objective D, was in direct response to public input regarding the potential impacts of infill and redevelopment on historic neighborhoods. The original draft included language about providing context-sensitive development, and maximizing development, there were no Goals or Objectives that combined the two concepts or related new development to historic features. Mr. Woodall said that the staff believes that, by adding the words, "in a manner that enhances existing urban form and/or historic features," the draft could accommodate those concerns.

Mr. Woodall reiterated that, following the Commission's vote on the Goals & Objectives, the draft will move to Council for their consideration; Council will then have 90 days in which to make a decision. In 2018, the staff and the Planning Commission will begin work on the remaining phases of the Comprehensive Plan.

c. <u>Commission Discussion</u> – Mr. Wilson opened the floor for the Commission members to ask questions and/or discuss the draft Goals & Objectives, as well as the proposed changes. He allotted the members three to four minutes to summarize their thoughts.

Mr. Owens asked, with regard to the proposed changes to Theme C, Goal 3, for a definition of "publicly-controlled" economic development land. Mr. Woodall answered that the language refers to a situation in which the government would control the land, provide infrastructure, and ensure that the property has appropriate zoning in order to be shovel-ready. Recruiters would then seek economic development interests to locate there, and the government would retain ownership of the property. Mr. Owens asked who would "identify and provide" the land. Mr. Duncan responded that the government would spearhead the project, through its economic development officials; the Planning Commission would not be expected to participate in that process. Mr. Owens opined that the proposed new language was confusing.

Mr. Brewer asked if government control would mean condemnation and takeover of property through eminent domain. Mr. Duncan answered that the property would likely be purchased from a willing seller, or via an opportunity that the government had to obtain land from a quasi-public agency or its own land that could be repurposed. Mr. Brewer asked how much land the government currently has that could be made shovel-ready, and if it was realistic to presume that LFUCG could afford to buy land, given that there is not funding available for existing projects. Mr. Duncan responded that the government does not have existing industrial land, but it has properties that could be considered for feasibility to repurposing. Mr. Brewer stated that he was concerned about elevating this issue to a Goal, because there are too many questions as to how it might be done. Mr. Duncan noted that the Division of Planning would look to the economic development team for guidance.

Mr. Berkley stated that Commerce Lexington purchased, developed, and sold the land in the Bluegrass Business Park, which was the community's most recent industrial development. He said that the language of the proposed Goal appeared to preclude entities such as Commerce Lexington from participating in the process. Mr. Duncan answered that the intent is for the government to create a mechanism to ensure that the land will not sit idle as patient capital, and will be used to attract the kind of jobs that the community needs. The project could include a partnership with some other agency, such as Commerce Lexington, that could help with recruiting and financing.

Mr. Penn asked if the University of Kentucky would qualify as a quasi-government entity with property that could be used. Mr. Duncan responded that the University could provide land for the project, provided that it was not constrained in the same fashion as the property that they currently have available, which has design restrictions and is lease-only. Mr. Penn stated that the University owns a lot of land, not all of which currently has infrastructure, and he would like to know if that land is considered quasi-government owned. In response, Mr. Duncan said that the University is its own state entity.

Mr. Cravens asked if "shovel-ready" meant that land would be zoned and ready for economic development uses. Mr. Woodall responded that the Division of Planning would have some control over zoning and recommendations for use of the land, agreeing that appropriate zoning would be part of the consideration.

Ms. Mundy asked if the proposed language would include land that could be in the Urban Service Area, to which Mr. Duncan responded that it could.

Mr. Brewer asked if the ability to amend the Urban Service Area boundary between Comprehensive Plan already existed via state statute; and if, so, why it would need to be restated in the Goals & Objectives. Mr. Woodall answered that KRS 100 provides that ability, and that the staff added it to the draft in hopes of addressing concerns about the community's ability to respond to extraordinary economic development opportunities. Mr. Brewer said that he was still confused as to why the language was necessary, and asked for an explanation from the Law Department. Ms. Jones stated that, based on concerns from the public and the Planning Commission, the staff added the language to emphasize the ability to move forward if an opportunity presents itself. She added that including the language does not adversely impact the Goals & Objectives.

Mr. Cravens said that he disagreed with the staff's conclusion that the community can accommodate its housing needs, adding that he would like to have seen the same type of goal added to emphasize that the Urban Service Area could also be adjusted to accommodate residential development if necessary. Mr. Woodall reiterated that it is the staff's position that the community can meet its housing needs as identified through the Housing Demand Study. Mr. Cravens argued that housing should have been given the same consideration as economic development, since available land is likely to run out sooner.

Mr. Berkley said that staff refers to the circumstances under which the Comprehensive Plan could be amended as "extraordinary," but that term is not included in the proposed language, which reads, "…identify, provide, and sustain readily available land." He opined that he did not agree with the use of the word "extraordinary" unless it is also used in the corresponding Goal. Mr. Duncan answered that the government presently owns land that could potentially be repurposed for economic development land, in addition to other property that is currently within the Urban Service Boundary that could be designated for such uses. In those instances, the USB would not need to be expanded in order to meet that Goal. Once all efforts have been exhausted to create a business park within the USB or on land that is government-controlled, and the changes to the P-2 and ED zones are not attracting businesses so that land is available for recruitment, it could be determined an extraordinary circumstance. That designation does not necessarily have to indicate the recruitment of a large employer to the community.

Mr. Owens asked if land added under such extraordinary circumstances would have to be contiguous to the USB. Mr. Duncan responded that some of the land controlled by the government is not contiguous to the USB, and he did not believe that it would be appropriate to "lasso" it to the USB in order to make it contiguous. He added that the government should not have to annex its own land into the USB in order to use it for economic development; however, if private land is to be converted for ED use, contiguousness should be considered, rather than adding or expanding rural activity centers or satellite areas.

Mr. Bell stated that he has been impressed with the idea of *Imagine Lexington*, and that the staff is recommending to follow that theme to make Lexington the best it can be. He added that he is also impressed with the staff, their willingness to listen to different opinions, and their commitment to find opportunities to meet needs without expanding the USB.

Mr. Brewer asked, with regard to Theme E, Goal 1, Objective B, how the community could "ensure all types of development are environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable." Mr. Woodall responded that the specifics of that Goal could be fleshed out in the Elements of the Comprehensive Plan, including metrics for those three categories of sustainability that the staff and the Planning Commission could use in evaluating proposed developments. Mr. Brewer opined that those goals are noble, but not necessarily realistic. He added that the staff should be cautious about setting out objectives if they are not achievable. Mr. Duncan noted that the staff does not consider it irresponsible to view the Goals & Objectives as aspirational statements for what the community should be, rather than a "check-off" list. Should the Council adopt the Goal, then the staff would consider identifying those specifics; then, through Implementation, would identify necessary Ordinance changes and metrics to use.

Ms. Mundy agreed that it can be good to have lofty goals. She is concerned, however, about patient capital, and the development of an exchange program to encourage property owners to sell that land. She noted that property owners cannot be forced to sell, just because an area needs to be developed. Mr. Woodall noted that the staff, in looking at concepts such as redevelopment of commercial corridors, would be identifying redevelopment barriers and opportunities, and working with property owners, rather than attempting to force anyone to sell. Mr. Duncan added that the staff heard the Commission's concerns about personal property rights, and at no time has suggested that there should be aggressive means to force a property owner to sell. Rather, the staff's intent is to look at the government's role, and attempt to help break down barriers to redevelopment.

Mr. Forester asked if any consideration was given to Mr. Baesler's comments from the public hearing, and the expansion of the USB in the Athens-Boonesboro Road area. Mr. Duncan answered that the staff worked with Mayor Baesler and others who would like to have property added to the USB to hear their concerns. Ultimately, the staff recommended that neither the USB nor the Rural Activity Centers should be expanded at this time, believing that the community's growth can be accommodated without expansion.

Mr. Cravens stated that the land to which Mr. Baesler referred was expected to be brought into the USA in 2007 and 2013. He said that the staff "handed down" the draft Goals & Objectives to the Planning Commission, with the recommendation to not expand the USB, and the Commission was never given an opportunity to discuss it. The land in question, near the I-75 Athens-Boonesboro interchange, is the site of a school that is currently under construction; in addition, a church would like to locate there, but cannot because the property is outside the USB. Mr. Cravens opined that, without an expansion of the USB, there will be nowhere to build new churches, and the land in that vicinity could accommodate several thousand houses. He asked why the Commission was not given the opportunity to discuss the need for expansion. Mr. Duncan answered that the staff believes that the work sessions that were conducted over the summer provided an opportunity to discuss the staff's recommendations. Mr. Wilson noted that he believed that this Goals & Objectives process was probably the most inclusive of any Comprehensive Plan to date, since over 11,000 people responded. Mr. Cravens said that it was difficult to discuss the issue when someone "throws a paper down and says 'no expansion,' and that's where you have to start from." He opined that the Commission would be required to own a plan that the staff wrote, whether they agree with it or not. Mr. Wilson noted that the staff's position was based on significant facts and information about why they felt that expansion was unnecessary. Mr. Cravens stated that he felt like the development community "did not get a fair shake."

Mr. Wilson thanked the staff for putting forth a "reasonable and reasoned" draft, noting that it is not perfect, but, if properly executed, he believes it can help the community move forward. He said that he was very much in favor of supporting the staff's recommendation for the draft Goals & Objectives, including maintaining the Urban Service Boundary for now, but noting that he would support the addition of new economic development land, at the proper time. He opined that land is available, but is not competitively priced, which is creating economic issues for the community by forcing businesses to locate in surrounding counties. Mr. Wilson stated, with regard to the proposed study of the Urban Service Boundary, that, if the right people are assembled, the group can help to set the triggers for inclusion of additional economic development land, which is one of the most important issues at this time. Mr. Wilson encouraged his fellow Commission members to support the staff's recommendation as well.

Mr. Penn stated that this was his third Comprehensive Plan process; during each one, he has sought to help create a plan that both the Planning Commission and the staff could follow. Now, he is also looking for a plan that is measurable, particularly with regard to the amount of land that is being absorbed on a yearly basis. The third phase, Mr. Penn stated, will require "a leap of faith," due to concerns about the PDR program and the proposed study, which will create essentially a land reserve. He said that the metrics and triggers developed during the study need to inform the next Comprehensive Plan, so that the staff, the Planning Commission, and the community will know exactly how much land is used and how much is available for development. In addition, the staff and Planning Commission will need to devote just as much time to the implementation phase of the Plan as they have to the Goals & Objectives, in order for the Plan to be effective and sustainable going forward. Mr. Penn stated that he would vote in favor of the proposed Goals & Objectives, trusting that "the very best people in our community…the best thinkers we can find, will be willing to serve on these trigger committees."

Mr. Wilson stated that the Commission could continue their discussion, but he would like to have a motion on the table.

<u>Motion</u>: A motion was made by Mr. Penn and seconded by Mr. Owens to recommend approval of the draft Goals & Objectives as presented.

Discussion of Motion: Mr. Cravens stated that he objected to Mr. Penn's motion, since the Commission had not completed their discussion. Mr. Wilson noted that, according to parliamentary law, it was the prerogative of the Chair to call for a motion; in fact, the Chair could require that no discussion took place until a motion was made and properly seconded. However, the custom of this Commission has been to allow discussion prior to the motion.

Mr. Berkley stated that he would like more information about the proposed study process, because he was concerned about the timeline. The staff sent out a proposed revised timeline, which noted that it must be incorporated into the 2022 Goals & Objectives in order to become policy. Mr. Berkley opined that, since the study is mentioned in the current Goals & Objectives, it should not be necessary to wait until the next Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Woodall answered that, if any expansion was to be proposed when the thresholds and triggers are met, the USB could not be expanded without revising the Goals & Objectives, since they specifically refer to maintaining the Urban Service Boundary and the Rural Activity Centers. Mr. Berkley asked what would happen if Council does not approve the funding for the study. Mr. Duncan responded that, if Council chooses to adopt this proposal as part of the Goals & Objectives, they would likely be prepared to incorporate the funding for the study. The staff would start laying the groundwork immediately to get the necessary funding; if no funds are made available, the staff would undertake the study process themselves, although several other projects would need to be postponed. The staff would prefer to hire an outside consultant, because the community is often more responsive to information that is not presented by government employees. Mr. Duncan noted that there would likely be a role for staff in the process even if a consultant is hired. Mr. Berkley stated that this issue is too important to proceed without a roadmap.

Amendment to Motion: Mr. Berkley moved to include an amendment to the motion on the floor to add a new Objective to Theme E, Goal 4, to read: "To ensure that the long-term land needs of the community are being met, the Planning Commission shall review and revise the Comprehensive Plan's Goals & Objectives two years from their adoption by the Urban County Council. This shall include technical evaluations of land inventory, land use efficiency, housing prices, demographic and development patterns, economic development, infill and redevelopment, and corridor utilization within the Urban Service Boundary since the adoption of these Goals & Objectives, and be prepared to amend the Comprehensive Plan to allow for expansion of the Urban Service Boundary, assuring that the Comprehensive Plan remains an up-to-date and workable framework for development." Mr. Berkley's motion was seconded by Mr. Cravens.

Discussion of Amendment: Ms. Plumlee opined that the amendment to the motion was redundant, unnecessary, and too wordy. She said she believed that "simplicity was the way to go."

Ms. Mundy stated that the proposed amendment would provide accountability through technical evaluation, to which Mr. Penn referred in his remarks.

Mr. Penn stated that he was referring to the concept of accountability in his remarks. He opined that the activities outlined in the proposed amendment might be better suited to the implementation phase, or it could result in the creation of a new Comprehensive Plan every two years. That does not equate, in his opinion, to long-term planning, and it is completely out of place as part of the Goals & Objectives.

Mr. Brewer stated that he fully supports the intent of having metrics that can be consistent and agreed upon by all parties. He believes that there needs to be more discussion of the study, who will do it, who will be on the appointing committee, and how it will be measured, prior to voting on the Goals & Objectives. Mr. Brewer added that he did want to undertake the Goals & Objectives process every two years, and he would not be comfortable voting on the motion at this time.

Mr. Owens stated that most of the issues discussed in Mr. Berkley's motion should be covered in the study, opining that re-assessing these issues every two years would "defeat the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan itself" and constantly leaves the door open for expansion of the USB. He said that he could not support the amendment to the motion.

Ms. Richardson stated that there are so many unknowns to the study that the level of detail in the amendment to the motion could provide some necessary direction. She said that she believes that the community is at a crossroads, and considering these issues every two years would not be unreasonable given the importance of the subject. She added that she does not believe that evaluating the metrics every two years should not preclude or replace long-term planning.

Mr. Cravens stated that he would support the amendment to the motion. He believes that some of the assumptions that were made about the amount of vacant land were flawed, and that evaluating the metrics every two years could help to alleviate those concerns.

Director Comments: Mr. Duncan stated that Theme F, Goal 2, Objective A, reads, "Establish a continually updated series of metrics to mark progress implementing the 2018 Comprehensive Plan." The staff contends that that Objective is a version of what was proposed in the amendment to the motion, and agrees that it is necessary to report to the Commission often with those updates. Any level of detail that the Commission would like to enumerate as part of those regular reports could be included in the Elements of the Plan, once the Goals & Objectives are adopted by Council.

Mr. Berkley said that he did not agree that Theme F, Goal 2, Objective A would address the issues outlined in his amendment to the motion, since they do not specify what action would be taken if the thresholds are not met, and would require waiting five years until the next Comprehensive Plan to re-evaluate the question of expansion.

Action: Mr. Berkley's motion failed, 5-6 (Berkley, Cravens, Forester, Mundy and Richardson in favor; Bell, Brewer, Penn, Plumlee, Owens, and Wilson opposed.)

Discussion of Motion: Mr. Cravens stated that this was his third Comprehensive Plan, as well, and he could not support the proposed Goals & Objectives. He said that he was born in Lexington, and he was concerned that the proposed Goals & Objectives could negatively impact the character of the city by requiring increased density, which "puts people too close together," and would not be in keeping with the nature of past development. He expressed concerns that increasing the number of units per acre could also "take out all the R-1 zones," and "force my grandsons to live three stories up in a box and ride a bicycle around downtown," even though "80% of the market wants to own single-family homes." Mr. Cravens opined that the focus on infill and redevelopment could eliminate potential locations for churches, schools, and needed services for residents as well, forcing them to travel further to reach everyday destinations. He said that he believed the proposed Goals & Objectives were "wrong, wrong for Fayette County," and he was "not happy with them."

Mr. Owens stated that the main takeaway from the public hearing was "flexibility," and he agreed with the staff's definition and plan to provide flexibility going forward through the proposed study. He said that the study would require a leap of faith for the community, but he believed it would be worth it. Mr. Owens added that land has always been expensive in Fayette County, and he believes that will continue, with or without expansion of the USB. He opined that there was sufficient ED and P-2 land to accommodate the community's economic development needs, and he would not be opposed to the creation of a public/private partnership to provide additional land if it is deemed necessary.

Mr. Owens said that he did not believe in redundancy in government documents, so he would like to move to remove the last sentence of the preamble, which states, "As always, the Planning

Commission may consider making recommendations to amend the Goals & Objectives in the interim." He said that he was willing to leave that language in Theme C, Goal 3.

Amendment to Motion: A motion was made by Mr. Owens and seconded by Ms. Plumlee to remove the aforementioned sentence from the Preamble to the Goals & Objectives.

Discussion of Motion: Mr. Berkley asked if the staff could speak to the weight of the Preamble in the Goals & Objectives before the Commission voted on the motion on the floor.

Mr. Duncan reminded the Commission that the Preamble was carried forward from the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. At that time, the Preamble was added by the Urban County Council, with the intent of providing a sort of executive summary and clarification of what the Goals & Objectives represent. He noted that the Mission Statement could do that as well. There should be no information in the Preamble that contradicts or is different from the language of the Goals & Objectives.

Mr. Berkley asked if Mr. Owens' motion was out of order, since he is not opposed to leaving the language in the Goals & Objectives, but wants to remove it from the Preamble. In addition, the Preamble outlines a five-year cycle for review of expansion. Mr. Duncan responded that the Commission has had the authority to review expansion outside of the five-year cycle for decades. State statute lays out the process for amending the Comprehensive Plan; it does not need to be restated in the Goals & Objectives for the Commission to have that authority.

Mr. Owens asked if the Preamble originally included the last sentence, or if the staff had added it as a result of discussion at a work session over the summer.

Mr. Berkley asked if that statement in the Preamble was in conflict with Theme C, Goal 3 of the revised proposed Goals & Objectives, which reads, "Identify, provide, and sustain readily available, publicly controlled economic development land to meet Fayette County's need for jobs, amending the Comprehensive Plan as necessary." Mr. Owens' motion appears to be asking to remove that same language from the Preamble, although he indicated that he did not have a problem with it remaining in the Goals & Objectives; Mr. Berkley opined that striking the language from the Preamble could then be considered improper. Mr. Duncan responded that the language does not need be included in either the Preamble or the proposed Goal in order to provide the Commission the authority. Removing the language from either section would not create a conflict.

Ms. Richardson asked if the motion was to recommend approval of the proposed revised Goals & Objectives, and if a vote had been taken. Mr. Wilson answered that the Commission had not yet voted on the Goals & Objectives; the current discussion related to a proposed amendment to the motion.

Mr. Owens stated that, in his opinion, the difference between the last sentence of the Preamble and Theme C, Goal 3 was that the proposed Goal includes language to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains an up-to-date and workable framework for economic development.

Mr. Cravens stated that the Commission had already debated about the Preamble; he believed that the language in the Preamble referred to the entire Comprehensive Plan, while the proposed Goal specifies only economic development land. The Commission decided at a work session that it would not hurt to leave the language in both locations.

Action: Mr. Owens' motion failed, 4-7 (Brewer, Penn, Plumlee, and Owens in favor; Bell, Berkley, Cravens, Forester, Mundy, Richardson, and Wilson opposed.)

Chairman Wilson declared a brief recess at 4:37 pm. The meeting reconvened at 4:47 pm.

Mr. Duncan stated that the staff wanted to make clear that some of the language proposed in the revised Goals & Objectives was in direct response to input at the public hearing or Planning Commission comments. The staff believes that the motion on the floor, by calling for the adoption of the Goals & Objectives, assumed that the revised language was included. Mr. Duncan noted that the Commission could make changes to that language, or remove the revisions entirely. He added that Theme E, Goal 1, Objective B had been revised in direct response to concerns from Mr. Cravens.

Action: Mr. Penn's motion to recommend approval of the Goals & Objectives as presented by staff carried, 7-4 (Berkley, Cravens, Mundy and Richardson opposed).

III. Other Business – None.

IV. Adjourn – There being no further business, Chairman Wilson declared the meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.