

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BEL-RED CORRIDOR PROJECT
STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

July 26, 2007
4:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Conference Room 1E-113

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mike Creighton, Co-Chair; Terry Lukens, Co-Chair; Kurt Springman, Joel Glass, Doug Mathews, Sue Baugh, Steve Dennis, Norm Hansen, Earl Overstreet, Faith Roland, Ken Schiring

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Ptacek, Dean Rebhuhn, Pat Sheffels, Laurie Tish

OTHERS PRESENT: Matt Terry, Dan Stroh, Emil King, Department of Planning and Community Development; Kevin O'Neill, Kevin McDonald, Department of Transportation; Jennifer Young, Torsten Lieneau, CH2MHill

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. Welcome and Review of the Agenda

Co-Chair Mike Creighton called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. The agenda was approved by consensus.

2. Review of Minutes of June 13 Committee Meeting

Mr. Schiring pointed out that the date on the minutes should read "June 13" rather than "May 3."

Motion to approve the minutes as corrected was made by Mr. Dennis. Second was by Mr. Overstreet and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Final Environmental Impact Statement

A. Presentation

Senior Planner Kevin McDonald informed the group that the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) document was posted online the day of publication, which was July 19. The document is also available to the public in hard copy and CD at the Service First desk.

Jennifer Young with CH2MHill referred to the FEIS and noted that the executive summary in Chapter 1 has been updated to reflect the fact that a preliminary preferred alternative has been chosen. Chapter 2 has been revised to be a description of the preliminary preferred alternative. Also in Chapter 2 is a summary of how each element of the preliminary preferred alternative differs in terms of impacts from the alternatives analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Chapter 3 houses all of the public comments received and the responses prepared to them. There are four appendices containing additional analyses done since the DEIS was released. Appendix A includes transportation data; Appendix B includes a summary of all the public involvement work associated with the project since its inception; Appendix C is the building height analysis; and Appendix D is the great streams concept.

Ms. Young explained that under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) it is not required for the FEIS to repeat all the information in the DEIS; the FEIS is an abbreviated version and covers changes as well as comments and responses. The DEIS and FEIS together constitute the complete Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

One of the key findings of the FEIS is that the preliminary preferred alternative is feasible; no fatal flaws were found in the preliminary preferred alternative. All of the mitigation identified in the DEIS applies in the FEIS. The outlined transportation system supports the nodal development pattern, and in fact supports an additional node. The FEIS has stream corridor enhancement opportunities that are best for the West Tributary and Goff Creek, and includes more detail on the parks and open space system.

Ms. Young said the EIS is programmatic or non-project in nature. It evaluates the impacts associated with changing plans and programs. In the case of the Bel-Red study, the focus is on adopting new planning documents and changing the Land Use Code. The document will be used as the basis for comparing different alternatives in exploring different policy directions and emphases. It will also be used to assist in choosing a preferred alternative that will guide the redevelopment process. The document is not intended to authorize specific future development and transportation projects without additional SEPA analysis.

The preliminary preferred alternative combines features from each of the DEIS alternatives, including some features from the No Action Alternative. It is similar to Alternative 3 in that it assumes that by 2030 there will be 5000 units of new housing and 4.5 million square feet of new commercial space. All of the impacts for the preliminary preferred alternative were found to be within the range evaluated in the DEIS.

Mr. McDonald reminded the committee that the DEIS had a 45-day comment period during which time the document was made available in a number of different formats and read by a number of people. A total of 56 written comments were received, and 14 people testified at the DEIS public hearing on February 15. In all, there were 503 individual comments, and responses were written for each one and documented in the FEIS. The comments all deal with the major themes of land use issues, transportation system components, and elements of the environment.

Torsten Lieneau with CH2MHill said there are a couple of things in Appendix A that are different from the DEIS. He said there were several comments offered regarding the modeshare percentages documented in the DEIS, and clarifications are made in the FEIS. He explained that the modeshare percentages were based purely on trips that would gather a transit component, specifically trips from home to work, and were focused only on the Bel-Red corridor. Also, the text in the DEIS suggested that the model is able to predict pedestrian and bicycle trips, but it is not.

Mr. Lieneau said that from a network standpoint, the preliminary preferred alternative is almost identical to Alternative 3 in terms of the transportation network and transportation improvements, with a couple of exceptions. First, there were four intersections analyzed that were slightly different in terms of the assumed channelization; each is clearly identified in the FEIS. Second, in both the DEIS and the preliminary preferred alternative 130th Avenue NE is assumed to be a four-lane roadway; in fact, there is a component of that roadway that is assumed to be a main street with parking and other amenities. The analysis assumed the four-lane configuration as a worst case scenario in terms of traffic generation, even though the intent is for there to be less trips than modeled. The modeling did find that there will not be enough traffic to constitute a need for four lanes; a two-lane configuration will accommodate the demand.

Comments received caused the consultant team to add 11 new intersection to the analysis. There were 47 intersections analyzed in the DEIS; the FEIS analyzes 58 intersections. Most of the intersections added were included to generate data outside the Bel-Red corridor.

Mr. Lieneau noted that the land use for the transportation modeling was changed for the FEIS by reallocating the land uses within the study area; the overall intensity, however, did not change. Commute-type traffic volumes for the preliminary preferred alternative actually decreased by three percent compared to Alternative 3. That is the result of relocating some land uses closer to transit stations and closer to work destinations. The modeshare figures in the FEIS are identical to the figures in Alternative 3 of the DEIS. The No Action alternative had much higher SOV trips; the switch over to transit can be expected as reliable transit options are introduced to the area. The overall traffic increase compared to the No Action alternative was ten percent within the study area, which is one percent lower than for Alternative 3.

Only one new intersection analyzed in the FEIS was found to operate at a LOS E or F. The average intersection delay of the preliminary preferred alternative was found to be lower than for Alternatives 2 and 3. From a system perspective focused on miles traveled, hours spent on the road, and the average speeds in the corridor, the preliminary preferred alternative findings are all lower than Alternative 3 in all cases.

No change in ridership within the corridor was found in comparing Alternative 3 with the preliminary preferred alternative. Compared to the No Action alternative, however, there was an increase in AM peak ridership of 139 percent. There was also a small but insignificant increase in daily ridership compared to Alternative 3.

Mr. Lieneau stressed that the model is not sensitive to predicting human characteristics such as why someone would choose to drive through a neighborhood as opposed to using an arterial street. When looking at the numbers generated in the FEIS for the surrounding neighborhoods, it must be kept in mind that the numbers shown are fairly conservative, or higher than what would be expected. Models only consider roadway capacity. He noted that the city has already committed to looking at traffic calming and that some meetings have already occurred to discuss the potential for using devices in neighborhoods that could be impacted.

Mr. McDonald said the level of public involvement has been impressive. Including the current meeting, there have been 18 steering committee meetings, five community meetings, ten meetings with the business community, and 25 updates for the City Council and the city's boards and commissions. During the 45-day comment period, the public took the opportunity to write in with 503 separate ideas for what to include in the FEIS.

With regard to the building height analysis, which was done at the request of the steering committee, Mr. McDonald said the hope is that the analysis will help the steering committee decide which locations in the corridor, if any, are appropriate for taller buildings.

B. Discussion

Mr. Hansen asked what the process is for adjusting the outcome of the FEIS where there is disagreement with some of the content. Ms. Young said there is no formal process in place. However, the City Council will be taking various actions in the future related to implementation of the document, and concerns with the findings can be raised at that time. Mr. McDonald added that the implementation process will involve the Planning Commission, the Transportation Commission, the Parks and Community Services Board, and the Environmental Services Commission, as well as the City Council. There will be ample opportunity for the public to talk about the substance of the FEIS.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Schiring, Mr. McDonald said the positions taken by the steering committee will not be embodied in the FEIS document but will be clearly noted in the meeting minutes and in the actions taken and the transmittal document forwarding a recommendation to the City Council.

4. Committee Direction on Building Heights in Development Nodes

A. Presentation

Strategic Planning Manager Emil King said five specific locations were analyzed in the FEIS with regard to allowing taller buildings. He stressed that taller buildings in the corridor are not part of the underlying preliminary preferred alternative; to add them will require additional direction from the committee. A final recommendation for each of the areas will be sought from the committee on September 6.

Mr. King said the five areas analyzed were the areas east of 116th Avenue NE by Overlake Hospital; the area to the east of Lake Bellevue bordered by 120th Avenue NE, NE 12th Street and Bel-Red Road; the 122nd Avenue NE transit node; the 130th Avenue NE transit node; and the triangle near 152nd Avenue NE in the eastern portion of the corridor.

The components of building heights included in the FEIS were a view impact analysis; urban form/neighborhood character; how the locations of taller buildings fit into a broader context of city planning in Bellevue; a differentiated economic niche and competition with the Downtown core; and the relationship to an implementation strategy. Staff and the consultant team found some of the topics to be more technical in nature, while others have some level of subjectivity involved.

A total of 14 photo points were chosen for the analysis. Each vantage point selected is from public or quasi public places, which is in line with current Comprehensive Plan policy. The building heights analyzed were up to 150 feet as directed by the steering committee. Staff interpreted the direction to mean that within the center of the various nodes buildings would reach that height and then tier down toward the edges to a height of only 125 feet. Building heights in the triangle area were modeled to a maximum of 150 feet, and in the area east of Lake Bellevue the maximum height modeled was 125 feet. An additional 15 feet was included for mechanical and rooftop equipment consistent with the Land Use Code. In general terms, office buildings have higher floor-to-ceiling heights than residential buildings. A 150-foot building can be translated roughly into 13 residential floors or 11 office floors.

Mr. King explained that regardless where the committee comes down on the building height issue, the floor-area-ratio (FAR) for the area will remain the same. Accordingly, a taller building will not equate to more intensity or more land use, but will bring about more of an urban form and character. Structured parking is often not included in the FAR calculation.

Mr. King shared with the committee the existing conditions and massing conditions photos for each of the 14 photo points. For the Overlake Hospital node, taller buildings are partially obscured existing buildings as seen from City Hall plaza. In the area to the east of Lake Bellevue, taller buildings were visible but there were no significant view blockages. In the 122nd Avenue NE transit node, the taller buildings were visible from several public vantage points, and there were some impacts on ridgeline views. For the 130th Avenue NE transit node, the taller buildings were visible in site vicinity as well as from the western terminus of the 520 trail. From the 152nd Avenue NE transit node some view impacts were observed, especially from the Unigard quasi public park.

The existing buildings in the corridor range from one to two stories, and many of them have large floor plates. With redevelopment a wider range of uses will be seen along with more intensity and new architectural building types. Taller buildings could be developed in a manner that will relate to other buildings in the area, streets, private and public open spaces; that could be done through controlling massing, proportion, silhouette, fenestration and façade materials. Another element of urban form is human scale at the street level. If taller buildings are pursued, a human scale can be obtained by requiring stepbacks for upper stories, incorporating multiple entrances, and utilizing other development standards.

Mr. King said the arrangement of taller buildings can form a prominent piece of the identity of a community. Many cities use taller buildings in their downtown areas but carefully pick which, if any, other areas should have taller buildings. Some argue that taller buildings should be limited only to iconic or major public buildings; others assert that taller buildings play a key role in defining development patterns.

Mr. King noted that for the FEIS, the arrangement of taller buildings around transit stations in the Bel-Red Corridor would have a similar pattern to that of the Roslyn-Ballston transit corridor in Washington, D.C. He allowed that the intensity of Roslyn-Ballston is far greater than what is contemplated for the Bel-Red corridor.

With regard to retaining a differentiated economic niche for the corridor, Mr. King said the analysis looked at the downtown and other areas of the city, compared the FAR, existing amenities, roadway network and the urban fabric. The O-1, O-2 and MU districts in the downtown constitute about 70 percent of the downtown land area and substantially more of the potential development capacity. The analysis concluded that 150-foot buildings in Bel-Red would overlap slightly with some building types in the MU district of the downtown. Other areas studied were Factoria, Eastgate, the GC/OLB areas of the city, and the Medical/Institution district; no major competition issues were found.

In the final analysis, the FEIS concludes that allowing taller buildings in the Bel-Red corridor in and of itself would not increase competition with the downtown or other parts of the city, though there may be some overlap with the DT-MU district. The real differentiating factor is FAR, which is much higher in the downtown area.

The relationship to the implementation strategy is very important. The steering committee has discussed the various infrastructure, urban amenities and environmental enhancements that should happen in the corridor. The thinking is that all development will need to contribute to the package of improvements in some way. Allowing for taller buildings may be a component of the land use incentive package.

B. Discussion & Preliminary Direction

Mr. Glass asked how incentives for height could be achieved if the FAR remains constant. Planning Director Dan Stroh said the sense of staff and the consultants is that height itself is a significant additional amenity because of the view potential it opens up. FAR and height could both be used as incentives, but that could significantly overstep what was studied in the FEIS. Studies in downtown Seattle showed height alone to be a sufficient incentive.

Mr. Dennis asked if the amenities under consideration are related to the specific site or involve payments into a fund for off-site improvements and amenities. Mr. Stroh said the implementation strategy has not evolved to the point yet of being able to say for sure. There are a variety of supportive amenities that need to happen in order for development in the area to take off. Some can be achieved through the FAR and some through height bonuses, but how it should all play out is yet to be determined.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Roland, Mr. Stroh said with the FAR contemplated for the corridor will mean structured parking; it will not be able to accommodate the development program envisioned without structured parking. There are tradeoffs associated with going either way, though the costs are much higher for underground parking, so it may be that the implementation strategy should contemplate spending the money somewhere else by allowing for above-ground structured parking.

Mr. Hanson commented that the taller a building is, the more open space there will be around it. On the other hand, the taller a building is, the more parking is needed. Mr. Stroh explained that here the FAR is the same, the amount of square footage within the structure will be the same, therefore the amount of required parking will be the same as well. By holding the FAR constant, allowing for more height will not lead to a need for more parking spaces and therefore will not consume more land. It is just a matter of urban form.

Mr. Schiring pointed out that when consideration was given to drafting a tree ordinance for the entire city, it was quickly discovered that one size would not fit all; some neighborhoods want trees because they are intricately tied to their character, while other neighborhoods favor views over trees. For the Bel-Red corridor, it is possible that one set of amenities will not work in all areas. For the area along 156th Avenue NE, the amenities may need to be crafted so as to keep heights down.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Overstreet, Mr. King said a very detailed approach was taken in forming the model. The typical floor plate for office is 20,000 to 25,000 per floor; for residential floor plates average between 8000 and 12,000 square feet per floor. The model was built on an attempt to replicate the mix of buildings that could occur in the various areas.

Mr. Mathews pointed out that if height is to be used as an incentive, the areas in which the incentives are desired should have the lowest base heights. Mr. Stroh agreed. He said the question before the committee is what the upper height limit for each node should be.

Mr. Glass asked how tall the Overlake Hospital/Group Health buildings will be. Mr. King said the hospital buildings are allowed to reach 200 feet in height.

Mr. Mathews suggested that the hospital campus and surrounding area would be the right place to allow taller buildings given its proximity to the freeway and the existence of a fair number tall buildings already.

Ms. Baugh asked staff to offer their opinion on what size building would look right in the hospital node. Mr. Stroh said the sense of staff is that the area could probably accommodate more height.

Mr. Hansen suggested that if each node were allowed the same height the result could be an inability to know where downtown Bellevue ends and where the Bel-Red corridor begins. Higher buildings may bring with them some amenities, but they may also institutionalize the various areas and make them less cohesive. In order to keep neighborhood character, the building heights should be kept on the lower side.

Preliminary direction: It was moved and seconded to recommend setting the height limit for the hospital node at 150 feet. The motion carried with 10 in favor and one vote against.

Turning to the area to the east of Lake Bellevue, Mr. King noted that the FEIS analyzed building heights of up to 125 feet. He pointed out that the area is not currently being considered a transit

node, though depending on where the hospital station is ultimately located it may be within a node.

Mr. Lukens suggested that the issue of height in that node needs to be completely tied to whether or not the area is within a transit node. If it is in a node, taller buildings would be appropriate, but if it is not, the height should be something else.

Mr. Dennis suggested that since the area to the east of Lake Bellevue is on the edge of the area, allowing more height there would have more of an impact outside the corridor at the street level.

Ms. Baugh said she could not visualize tall buildings there.

Mr. Glass said buildings of up to 125 feet in the area would only be appropriate if the same height were to be allowed across the street.

Mr. Mathews said he would favor a lower height for the area as well. Mr. Dennis voiced his support for a height of only 60 feet.

Preliminary direction: It was moved and seconded to recommend a height of up to 60 feet for the area east of Lake Bellevue, unless a transit station is located there, in which case heights up to 90 feet should be considered. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. King explained that for the 122nd Avenue NE node a height of 150 feet was analyzed for the core; for the periphery, a height of 125 feet was analyzed.

Mr. Dennis said his bias is toward tall, pretty buildings over short, squatty buildings. Mr. Creighton said he likes the variety of building heights that the Pearl District in Portland. Ms. Baugh agreed.

Mr. Mathews said he could support 125 feet and stepping down to around 90 feet, but could not support starting at 150 feet.

Mr. Glass said he would be in favor of allowing up to 150 feet through incentives for opening the stream corridors.

Mr. Hanson voiced support for scaling the area down to allow for some visual differentiation between the area and Overlake. Ms. Roland agreed. She said 125 feet in the core of the node and 90 feet on the node perimeter would work for the nodes along NE 16th Street to distinguish the neighborhoods.

Mr. Creighton said regardless of the maximum height selected, it will be achieved only by providing amenities. It may be that a given building will only get to 120 feet because of the associated tradeoffs.

Mr. Dennis commented that areas with buildings up to 150 feet tall will match only a very small part of the downtown. Taken collectively, the Bel-Red corridor will look very different from the downtown as it redevelops. Some of the development within the corridor will be outside the various nodes and as such intensity will be considerably lower.

Mr. Overstreet held that because property sizes are larger in the corridor, going to 150 feet would open up the area and make it feel less dense. That would be a good thing.

Mr. Springman observed that the additional height will yield views of the downtown and the mountains that will not be found in other places. That will create character for the

neighborhood. The additional height offers a great way to create new and interesting view values for the area.

Ms. Baugh pointed out that many of the highrise buildings in the downtown are in fact 300 feet or more tall, and they have a much higher FAR. Even at a maximum of 150 feet in the Bel-Red corridor, the tallest building will be half the height of most of the downtown buildings.

Preliminary direction: It was moved and seconded to recommend building heights up to 150 feet in core of the 122nd Avenue node, and up 125 feet on perimeter of the node. The motion carried with eight votes in favor; there were three no votes.

Mr. King said 150 feet was analyzed as the maximum height for the 130th Avenue NE node, dropping down to 125 feet in the perimeter area. He noted that the area south of Bel-Red Road was not included in the height analysis.

Mr. Lukens said the whole idea behind the nodes is to concentrate density and intensity. That concept has been agreed to by the group. Two stories will not make much of an overall difference when it comes to views. The nodes are the places where the tallest buildings should be.

Mr. Overstreet pointed out that the topography of the 130th Avenue NE node is different from the other nodes previously discussed. Buildings of 150 feet would have a far more dramatic and negative impact on the area. He said he would be inclined to look at something less than 150 feet for the node.

Mr. Dennis said the node is not located in a hole, though it is downhill from the others. Building height of 150 feet in the 130th Avenue NE node will not look the same as the others even if it is the same as the Safeway site. The node is, however, heavily impacted by the creeks, and any package of incentives should target stream enhancements in exchange for additional height.

Mr. Glass voiced his support for the added height. Mr. Mathews concurred.

Ms. Roland pointed out that the 130th Avenue NE node includes the notion of a main street character, which may not be compatible with taller buildings. Mr. Hanson concurred, suggesting that too tall buildings on either side of a main thoroughfare tend to create a tunnel effect. Mr. Springman said that is only the case when the towers are brought right to the edge of the sidewalk.

Mr. Overstreet said he likes the idea of using enhancements to the stream system as an incentive but wondered if something other than height could be the carrot. Mr. Creighton suggested that building height is just one of the incentive tools in the toolbox.

Mr. Stroh said pedestrian amenities are included on the list of amenities for which bonuses could be offered. He added that the tunnel effect at the street level can be reduced by requiring buildings to step back above a certain height.

Preliminary direction: It was moved and seconded to recommend building heights up to 150 feet in core of the 130th Avenue node, and up 125 feet on perimeter of the node. The motion carried with seven votes in favor; there were four no votes cast.

Mr. King said the Uwajimaya/Angelos Nursery triangle area within the 152nd Avenue NE node was analyzed for building heights of up to 150 feet.

Mr. Schiring suggested it would be awkward for the committee to make a recommendation for the 152nd Avenue NE node given that it lies within the city limits of Redmond. Redmond is considering taller buildings for the node. A number of residential communities are impacted by the area. The area serves as a gateway to the neighborhoods, and it should be kept a gateway and not made into a wall. Buildings in the area should not be allowed to be more than three stories tall.

Mr. Glass agreed that the buildings should step down from what will be allowed in Redmond, though the step down should not be so dramatic that the Bellevue side will not relate at all with the Redmond side.

Mr. King said the triangle area is split by a zoning line with Office along 156th Avenue NE and Community Business to the west. With under-building parking, Office allows building heights of up to 60 feet, while Community Business allows building heights up to 45 feet.

Ms. Roland pointed out that the argument made for allowing additional height in the other nodes has been to achieve better views and asked why the same argument has not been made for the 152nd Avenue NE node. It would be inconsistent to consider a lower building height for the area. Mr. Lukens pointed out that the area is not in fact in a node. The area to the east of Lake Bellevue, which is also not in a node, was recommended to be 60 feet, which may also be appropriate for the 152nd Avenue NE area.

Preliminary direction: It was moved and seconded to recommend 90 feet as the maximum allowed height for the portion of the Uwajimaya/Angelo's Nursery triangle that is within the 152nd Avenue NE transit node. A maximum height of up to 60 feet would be allowed outside the node. The motion carried with eight votes in favor; there were three votes against.

5. Implementation Principles

This agenda item was not discussed.

6. Workforce / Affordable Housing Policy Direction

Mr. Stroh reminded the committee that in June there was a presentation by the director of A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) providing some context for the issue of workforce/affordable housing. He defined affordable housing by relating it to different salary levels and job types, and he shared with the committee a variety of land use incentives and zoning strategies used by other jurisdictions to help achieve affordability.

Mr. Stroh said the draft principles included in the meeting packet could be part of the proposed implementation strategy. He noted that the vision endorsed by the committee calls for a variety of housing types to meet the needs of a diverse population of varied income levels. The challenge is not unique to the Bel-Red corridor, but what is done in the corridor should be integrated with a communitywide strategy. The timing of any strategy for affordable housing within the corridor should coincide with all implementation strategies for the corridor. Finally, it must be recognized that the issue is complex and will require a multi-pronged range of tools.

Motion to adopt the principles as set forth was by Mr. Lukens. Second was by Ms. Baugh.

Mr. Lukens said as a Councilmember he was one of the principle architects of the city's affordable housing program that has since met a different fate. He agreed that providing affordable housing is very complex, so much so that it would not be appropriate to try to deal with the issue with the information in hand; the best the committee can do is highlight the issue for the Council to deal with.

Mr. Mathews pointed out that the city is not currently meeting its GMA requirements for low-income housing. He added that the Bel-Red corridor represents quite possibly the last opportunity to make any impact at all in the near future.

Mr. Roland agreed that the committee does not have a sufficient base of information on which to reach lasting conclusions. The corridor does present an excellent opportunity to achieve affordable housing, however, and the committee should do all it can to encourage it.

The motion carried unanimously.

7. Continued Committee Discussion of Concept Plan Map

This agenda item was not discussed.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for September 6.

9. Public Comment

Mr. Jim Pipers, 80 Cascade Key, said he is a member of the Overlake Hospital Medical Center board. He pointed out that the mapped location for the transit repair facility is an ideal place for Children's Hospital to locate should it decide to come to Bellevue. It would be a pity to have the site become industrial and preclude Children's from coming to Bellevue.

Mr. Bill Byers with Crescent View Investments said the willingness of the committee to explore additional height has afforded him the opportunity to refine the project focused on the Angelo's Nursery site. He urged the committee to continue to exploring the ideas, especially for the triangle area.

10. Adjourn

Mr. Creighton adjourned the meeting at 6:06 p.m.