

PLANNING COMMISSION
July 22, 2025

Meeting Minutes

The Planning Commission of Monroe County conducted a hybrid virtual and in-person meeting on **Tuesday, July 22, 2025**, beginning at 10:00 a.m.

CALL TO ORDER by Chair Scarpelli

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL by Jessica McKinney

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Joe Scarpelli, Chair	Present
Ron Demes, Vice Chair	Present
George Neugent, Commissioner	Absent
Eric Anderson, Commissioner	Present
Rosemary Thomas, Commissioner	Present
Douglas Pryor, Ex-Officio Member (MCSD)	Absent
Christina Gardner, Ex-Officio Member (NASKW)	Absent

STAFF

Devin Tolpin, Senior Director of Planning and Environmental Resources
Mike Roberts, Assistant Director of Environmental Resources
Cheryl Cioffari, Assistant Director of Planning
Barbara Powell, Planning Policy Advisor
Peter Morris, Assistant County Attorney
Dirk Smits, Planning Commission Counsel
Jessica McKinney, Senior Planning Commission Coordinator

COUNTY RESOLUTION 131-92 APPELLANT TO PROVIDE RECORD FOR APPEAL

County Resolution 131-92 was read into the record by Mr. Dirk Smits.

SUBMISSION OF PROPERTY POSTING AFFIDAVITS AND PHOTOGRAPHS

Ms. Jessica McKinney confirmed receipt of all necessary paperwork.

SWEARING OF COUNTY STAFF

County staff members and public attendees were sworn in by Mr. Dirk Smits.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

None.

DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Commissioner Demes made a motion to approve the June 25, 2025 meeting minutes. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

MEETING

AGENDA

Items 1 and 2 were read together.

1. AN ORDINANCE BY THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AMENDING POLICY 1302.1.4 AND POLICY 1302.1.5 OF THE MONROE COUNTY 2030 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO AMEND THE REQUIREMENT FOR A COMMUNITY MEETING, AS REQUESTED BY THE BOCC AT THEIR FEBRUARY 19, 2025, REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS; PROVIDING FOR TRANSMITTAL TO THE STATE LAND PLANNING AGENCY AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENT TO AND INCORPORATION IN THE MONROE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (FILE NO. 2025-037)

2. AN ORDINANCE BY THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AMENDING SECTIONS 102-158, 102-159, 110-3 AND 110-70 OF THE MONROE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE TO AMEND THE REQUIREMENT FOR A COMMUNITY MEETING, AS REQUESTED BY THE BOCC AT THEIR FEBRUARY 19, 2025, REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS; PROVIDING FOR TRANSMITTAL TO THE STATE LAND PLANNING AGENCY AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENT TO AND INCORPORATION IN THE MONROE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (FILE NO. 2025-038)

(10:05 a.m.) Ms. Barbara Powell, Planning Policy Advisor, presented the staff report. This is amending both the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations to reduce the processing timeline for both County initiated and private applications for changes as well as other types of development orders. The timeline comparison between what is proposed and what is in practice currently saves anywhere from one to three months, depending on timing of meetings, and location requirements for FLUM or zoning amendments. The Comp Plan amendments for Policy 1302.1.4 would revise the language from between 45 and 120 days prior to the required public hearing, which is the Planning Commission Hearing, to prior to the Development Review Committee. It was added that the community meetings could be heard by electronic means rather than at a location close to the project site. In practice, most meetings are open to Zoom, and the language needs to reflect what the actual practice is. The other change was to the Comp Plan which says advertisement would be 10 days before the community meeting while the Land Development Code says 15 days, so the Comp Plan was changed to 15 days. Policy 1302.1.5 goes to the private applications to amend the code or Comp Plan. That

requirement currently is three months prior to any required public meeting, so it was also changed to prior to the Development Review Committee, and made the 15 day change as well.

The changes are similar in the Land Development Code. In Section 102-159, electronic means was added and the change from 45 to 120 days to be prior to Development Review Committee. In Section 110-3, the pre-application conference for a community meeting for major conditional use permits was changed to electronic means and the 45 to 120 days to be prior to Development Review Committee to review a major conditional use or development agreement. To further clarify the language in the Land Development Code on major conditional uses, the community meeting language was added stating the applicant will coordinate with the Planning Director or their designee regarding the date, time and location of the proposed community meeting. All meetings are to be held on a weekday evening, at a location close to the project site or by electronic means prior to the Development Review Committee that reviews major conditional use permits, and then struck references to the, or 60 days after required community meeting, when it's referring to the Development Review Committee, and removing the language 45 to 120 days prior to Planning Commission. The estimated time line for this amendment is to be at the August 20, 2025, BOCC meeting for the Comp Plan Transmittal, and then it will get married up November 12, 2025, in the Comp Plan and LDC adoption. The proposed language would gain a month in timelines from the hard timelines of 60-day review by the State at the transmittal and proposed amendment stage. Once each of these are adopted the Comp Plan has a 45-day review period by the State, and 60 days for the Land Development Code to be reviewed, a final order issued, and published in the Florida Administrative Register. Once it's published, there's a 21-day appeal period for the Land Development Code. The hard deadlines for advertisement and State review are still embedded in the process with at least three opportunities for the public to comment prior to the first BOCC meeting. So the community meeting still exists, it's just the time frame windows that were in the old language have been lessened giving more flexibility to the staff and applicant.

Commissioner Demes asked if the word "eliminate" had been modified in the first whereas for Policies 1302.1.4 and 1302.1.5 to "shorten" or "reduce" as he feels shorten or reduce is more along the lines of why this is being done. Ms. Powell agreed that could be done. Ms. Tolpin confirmed that he was referring to the first whereas in the resolution.

Chair Scarpelli asked if there were further comments or questions from the Commissioners. There were none. Chair Scarpelli then asked for public comment.

Mr. Stuart Schaffer of Sugarloaf Key representing Last Stand stated that he has a policy concern with this proposal, and a legal concern/question. At the February BOCC meeting this item was introduced on the agenda and was called "Discussion and direction regarding approval process timeline for Comp Plan and Land Development Code text amendments." The agenda backup made clear that this applied only to County-initiated text amendments and not every single item that has a community item and a Planning Commission meeting. This originally stemmed from concerns the BOCC had when they were considering the whole ROGO issue last year and they were frustrated that ROGOs were running out, they were passing resolutions requesting more ROGOs, and they were very frustrated that it would take a year to get those new rules into the code and effect, and they were worried about running out of ROGOs. At that BOCC meeting,

after public comment was closed, Ms. Emily Schemper then asked that this new schedule apply to all proposals requiring a community meeting and a Planning Commission meeting. Her goal was consistency, stating it would make it easier for her staff to keep the schedules straight for all of these different timelines for different proposals. The effect of the change is to accelerate the approval process for everything that requires a community meeting and Planning Commission meeting. This would include map amendments and any applicant-requested proposals including major conditional use permits. Mr. Schaffer believes the benefits of Planning staff having the schedule be the same for all proposals is far outweighed by the need for citizens to have adequate time to prepare and provide comments to the Development Review Committee and Planning Commission on developer proposals. This wasn't supposed to accelerate the timeline for developer proposals. He requests the Commission approves the accelerated schedule only for County-initiated text amendments and map amendments as that would be okay, but not for applicant and developer proposals which would give much less time for comments.

Mr. Schaffer also asks that the Commission seek legal advice from Mr. Peter Morris whether this amendment is legal under State law. Section 28 of newly enacted SB180 says that Monroe County cannot adopt or propose more restrictive or burdensome amendments to its Comp Plan or Land Development Code before October 1, 2027. It's a horrible new statute but it's there and in effect. Acceleration of the meeting schedule is surely a more restrictive or burdensome amendment. He would be interested in Mr. Morris's view on this. There was no further public comment. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Demes stated he knows certain things are subjective and when it comes to law he respects counsel's comments, but honestly thinks this is less restrictive than more restrictive and that all would benefit from this. However, he is interested in what counsel says about the legality. Mr. Dirk Smits, Planning Commission Counsel, agreed that it's easier to do less than more, but this would also divide the Commission against the citizenry by treating the government better than the citizenry. One rule for one party and another rule for another party would not be right. He does not find this to be more restrictive at all, rather less restrictive. Commissioner Anderson agreed with Commissioner Demes, that it is less restrictive. Chair Scarpelli stated he had originally had almost the same concerns as Mr. Schaffer on accelerating the timeline, but after speaking with staff it seems that the community meeting is getting lost in the ether of when things are happening. He believes scheduling these things closer together will get people more involved more earnestly. The community meeting is the first advertisement to the public of any type of change happening. Then there are comments from the Development Review Committee which is more helpful, and Planning Commission is really where the public gets involved. Chair Scarpelli is more concerned about the "or" by electronic means and believes it should be "and."

Mr. Peter Morris, Assistant County Attorney, believed it is a legitimate plausible hypothetical layout, but when you try and write code and comp plan text to future proof against all scenarios, you can get wrapped around the axle to abate all foreseeable problems which is not always practical operationally. By that same token, if you have a community meeting that's dual in a physical location and also streamed, it becomes difficult because it's not really a public meeting held by Monroe County. It's required by the County but it's facilitated by staff, and that thrusts the County further into the role of the guardian ad litem of scheduling procedures. With regard

to the physical location there has been a lot of sort of guerrilla warfare where individuals or entities opposed to a particular amendment have strategically complained about the reasonableness of the physical location chosen. There's a lot of brinksmanship that gets played in regard to the physical location which is unfortunate as it is to offer a scoping session for the community to get to know the background at a high level of a proposal. This obviates that brinksmanship.

Ms. Devin Tolpin, Senior Director of Planning and Environmental Services added that using the word "and" requires a hybrid situation which is much more difficult technically. It is generally the Department's practice to give the applicant the opportunity to either hold the meeting in person at a location near the project site or by electronic means. Most have been taken place by Zoom over the last couple of years. Some have been in person, but it is generally up to the applicant to decide. Adding the "or by electronic means" is really just adding language to make the public aware of the public option that already exists today. Commissioner Demes stated, though he considers himself prehistoric, trying to get people to come to a meeting is very difficult. This gives flexibility for people to attend that normally would not be able to attend. Electronic means outweighs the in-person meeting, and hybrid meetings get too complex. Of all of the community meetings, there's not that many that show up. But, at the same time, when there is a contentious issue, it behoves the applicant to have the in-person meeting or it may not bode well when they get to the Planning Commission or the BOCC.

Motion: Commissioner Thomas made a motion to approve Item 1. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. There was no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Commissioner Demes made a motion to approve Item 2. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. There was no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

3. AN ORDINANCE BY THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ELIMINATING POLICY 301.7.2 OF THE MONROE COUNTY 2030 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN WHICH COULD ALLOW FOR SEGMENTS OF US1 TO BE EXPANDED UP TO FOUR LANES, AS REQUESTED BY THE BOCC AT THEIR FEBRUARY 19, 2025, REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS; PROVIDING FOR TRANSMITTAL TO THE STATE LAND PLANNING AGENCY AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENT TO AND INCORPORATION IN THE MONROE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (FILE NO. 2025-047)

(10:32 a.m.) Ms. Barbara Powell, Planning Policy Advisor, presented the staff report. This is also a BOCC-sponsored amendment. The Board has expressed concerns about traffic congestion and failing or near-failing segments of U.S. 1. At the regular November 19, 2024 meeting, BOCC directed staff to process amendments to the Comp Plan to allow for expansion of bridges on U.S. 1 of up to four lanes, and to request a meeting with FDOT to discuss whether additional lanes would improve traffic conditions in the Keys. At that time it was just limited to bridge expansion located within unincorporated Monroe County. The December 11, 2024, fiscal analysis report that was commissioned by the County in response to additional ROGOs included

information based on different road scenarios and increases ROGOs, ranging from 220 to 8,000. At that meeting, the BOCC did not direct staff to eliminate the prohibition of additional lanes on the non-bridge roadway segments of U.S. 1 at that time. On January 6, 2025, Commissioner Rice and County staff met with FDOT District 6 Secretary Stacy Miller along with FDOT staff. During that meeting it was explained that widening the number of lanes to four of bridge structures alone would not solve the day-to-day traffic congestion on U.S. 1. FDOT would need to conduct a more thorough survey and study to address the factors of just turn lanes, business access, intersections, time of day, et cetera, and would not determine whether or not additional lanes would alleviate traffic congestion. FDOT would only perform such a study in association with specific infrastructure projects through the Project Development and Environmental Study, the PD&E. The process in PD&E takes into account local regulations and, therefore, FDOT can't perform a study to consider widening the number of lanes to four lanes if the Monroe County Comp Plan prohibits four lanes. Further, if FDOT were to contemplate additional lanes, they would evaluate that over a ten to twenty year period.

As of the February 19, 2025, BOCC meeting, Growth Management Director Emily Schemper presented an overview of the January 6, 2025, meeting. After hearing the presentation, BOCC directed staff to amend the Comp Plan to remove the prohibition on four laning any segment of U.S. 1 as opposed to bridges only. There were community and DRC meetings, but between DRC and Planning Commission, FDOT had a joint public information meeting on June 26 to inform the public that the PD&E studies for Long Key Bridge and Seven Mile Bridge project were put on hold or paused, and that FDOT would focus on rehabbing the structure in lieu of replacement at this time. FDOT did not have a date when the PD&E study would resume, but stated that all information gathered thus far would be maintained in assessing future decisions, and FDOT will continue its outreach. What began the discussion was the Long Key, Seven Mile and Snake Creek Bridge replacements, with two of the three being put on hold. Getting into the language of the Comp Plan amendment that's been proposed, it's simply to remove Policy 301.7.2 that states, "In recognition of the physical and environmental constraints that may affect the widening of U.S. 1 to four lanes, Monroe County shall coordinate with FDOT on these portions of U.S. 1 that are shown as two lanes on the future traffic circulation map to maintain them as two lanes for the planning horizon. This policy shall not be construed as to prohibit the addition of a third lane to be used as a two-way turn for those segments with a demonstrated public safety risk if a third lane has been demonstrated to be the safest alternative." So that's the proposed Comp Plan amendment, to remove that and renumber those below.

Chair Scarpelli asked for comments or questions from Commissioners. There were none. Chair Scarpelli then asked for public comment.

Mr. Stuart Schaffer stated that the Sugarloaf Shores Property Owners Association opposes deleting the Comp Plan provision that prohibits adding lanes to the Overseas Highway. There is a long list of problems with four laning the highway. This will not, in the end, reduce U.S. 1 traffic due to the widely accepted concept of induced demand. This will lead to more development and more vehicles on the highway. It will not long-term reduce traffic at all, just add lanes and cars. The danger of having to cross two or now four lanes with very few traffic lights up and down the highway is dangerous for drivers, bike riders and pedestrians. There will be loss of sidewalks, bike paths and green space. More vehicles will mean more stormwater

runoff. The cost of imminent domain actions is a serious issue in Islamorada. There will be a huge disruption caused by an unnecessary long-term construction project, as this will take decades. If this project is approved, at FDOT's insistence, the County will be ceding total control of the decision making and design of the whole project to the State. Mr. Schaffer asked if the Commission was comfortable recommending still another State preemption of local control because that's what this proposal is. FDOT said they won't design or analyze anything unless they get control. A better idea for how to spend taxpayer money to improve traffic on the highway is to upgrade public transportation. Mr. Schaffer also stated that we've been hearing that this is to reduce hurricane evacuation times, but that's a red herring. This is really all about opening the door to more and more development in the Keys. If we limit development in order to protect the Keys environment, water quality and quality of life, we wouldn't need four lanes to get out in a hurricane. Mr. Schaffer asked the Commission to reject this proposal. If they decided against the interests of Keys residents to approve the proposal, please recommend to the BOCC that any resolution approving this proposal include a specific request that FDOT's analysis cover the concept of induced demand.

Ms. Jordan Mannix-Lachner, Executive Director for Last Stand, stated there are a couple of reasons that Last Stand is concerned about this amendment. First, it would effectively cede local control to the State. Once that happens, decisions about the Keys' main street would no longer be ours to make. FDOT's visions and priorities for the County won't always align with the communities' needs and vision. Four laning will also change the community character in a way that nobody is asking for. Many areas don't have the physical or environmental capacity to accommodate four lanes and doing so would require displacing fragile ecosystems from losing green space, paving over wetlands, increasing stormwater runoff into those wetlands, pushing businesses and homes right up against a more dangerous highway, cyclists and pedestrians would be at a greater risk, more people would die trying to cross the street, and communities would be literally divided by four lanes. The construction would be disruptive for years, even a decade. Getting an asphalt company down here is a miracle even if they've signed a contract. FDOT's recent project on South Roosevelt took three times longer than was planned without adding anymore lanes. Adding lanes induces demand, invites more traffic, and encourages more development. That's not a side effect but seems to be the point. There's a growing perception that this amendment is less about solving traffic and more about opening the door to more development. Is that what we really need, and when is enough enough? The congestion seen now isn't an accident. It's a symptom of unmanaged roads and over development. Four laning won't fix that, but feeds it. While a couple of small segments might qualify new development because of slightly improved levels of service, it will only benefit a couple of developers and the rest of the residents and our environment will pay the price. The idea that it will improve hurricane evacuation is not true unless the whole Keys and the Eighteen-Mile Stretch are also widened which is not feasible. It will create new bottlenecks which will contribute to accidents that could actually delay evacuation where four lanes turns to one at rush hour or during school with hundreds of speeding cars slamming on their brakes to merge back into one lane. It feels dangerous and not like the Keys, rather like a metropolitan suburban rush hour nightmare. If we really want to help hurricane evacuation we would not be ushering in new development, and if we really wanted to help with traffic we'd be investing in public transit, which is what the Comp Plan actually calls for. Rather than change the Comp Plan, follow it. It was based on robust planning, best practices and community input. Public transit reduces congestion, is better for the

environment and is safer, rather than choosing an option that's more disruptive and less likely to succeed, cedes local control, increases stormwater runoff, reduces public safety, takes away bike lanes and roadside parks, squeezes U.S. 1 businesses, cuts communities in half, degrades quality of life, eliminates green space, costs billions, and will literally pave paradise. The list of cons is long, specific, hard to deny and annoying to say. The supposed benefits are vague and highly debatable. For those reasons Last Stand urges the Commission to deny this amendment.

There was no further public comment. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Thomas commented that she had been appalled the Eighteen-Mile Stretch hadn't been four-laned when it was redone, and does not like ceding authority to FDOT who have planted things along the road where you can't see around them, and it seems like a waste of money. She agrees with what the speakers said and thought they had said it very well.

Commissioner Demes stated that he sees a couple of sides to this issue. Driving his wife to a medical appointment there was zero traffic without slowing down on Big Coppit and getting into town. He allowed 45 minutes and it took 15. Coming to this meeting he got behind someone going 20 miles under the speed limit. The closest he got in the short passing zones was about 12 cars back. On a daily basis he believes it is more dangerous to not be able to pass very slow people that don't pull over than having four lanes to at least get by somebody more readily. Hurricane evacuation may be one or two times a year, but traffic is every single day. He believes it's dangerous because people take chances. FDOT can take a working system and make it a mess, especially with the crosswalks in Key West. However, he believes the benefits of this proposal outweigh the negatives.

Commissioner Anderson does not believe it is feasible to have four lanes from Florida City to Key West and does not see that happening. Even if you could do most of it, if there's one place that narrows down to one lane, what will that do to the four lanes going into one at that location. Commissioner Demes added that on a daily basis, he thinks it's safer overall. It will create a bottleneck for people who wait until the last minute to evacuate for a hurricane.

Chair Scarpelli stated that he is from New Jersey and you can never build your way out of traffic, and gave examples of experiences in the State of New Jersey. Crossing the highway trying to make a left, it will be five lanes not four or have a median of some sort in areas. This doesn't address the worse part of U.S. 1 which is in Islamorada, the biggest pinch point. Chair Scarpelli asked why public transportation wasn't being looked at more than expanding this highway. The existing public transportation system has long waits and is unreliable. He does not see how this proposal will make anything better.

Mr. Peter Morris, Assistant County Attorney, added that induced demand mentioned by one speaker goes to the transportation planning concept where expanding road capacity counter-intuitively leads to more congestion rather than less. He discussed the New Jersey area road expansions as he had lived in West Orange as a kid. Those are case studies often used to demonstrate the concept of induced demand in transportation planning. From Mr. Morris's recollection, when the County was heading toward the legislative decision on the future of ROGO and how many allocations to divvy out, when roadway expansion came up there was kind

of a tension in terms of what expanded roadway capacity theoretically could have regarding easing hurricane evacuation clearance time versus day-to-day traffic. These are heavy policy-freighted decisions, not legal issues.

Chair Scarpelli thought that, if anything, more center median turn lanes should be looked into to make it easier to make lefts. That could help considerably with making minor changes because that would eliminate sudden stops on U.S. 1 which generates more accidents than the congestion. Commissioner Demes added that this would allow for three lanes and center turn lanes or more passing lanes in certain areas. Increased technology would go further in more urban areas. Chair Scarpelli interjected, reading, "This policy shall not be construed so as to prohibit a third lane," so it is allowed as written. Commissioner Demes added that he sees the ride share program going away because people have to use it and it needs to be funded. He doesn't see anything in the works to make it happen. Ms. Devin Tolpin interjected that the Transportation Committee has generated a priority list of projects including a bus stop improvement plan that is in the final stages. It is worth mentioning that the draft arterial travel time and delay study has been completed, and is tentatively set to go before the BOCC in September. The draft shows that all segments of unincorporated Monroe County do have an adequate level of service. Commissioner Anderson asked if the resolution would allow for the center turn lane or four lanes. Chair Scarpelli clarified that the original policy allows for a third lane so that can already be done. Ms. Tolpin added that the current policy has a prohibition on four lanes, so the proposed amendment eliminates that prohibition. Commissioner Anderson added that this would be up to FDOT. Ms. Tolpin clarified that FDOT will not perform the PD&E study to determine if the County would benefit from the four laning of roads while the prohibition is in place, which is why the BOCC instructed staff to process this amendment.

Motion: Commissioner Demes made a motion to recommend approval. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Commissioner Demes, Yes; Commissioner Thomas, No; Commissioner Anderson, No; Chair Scarpelli, No. Motion failed 1 to 3.

Motion: Commissioner Demes made a motion to recommend denial. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Commissioner Demes, No; Commissioner Thomas, Yes; Commissioner Anderson, Yes; Chair Scarpelli, Yes. Motion passed 3 to 1.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Commissioner Demes commented on use of the words "assure" and "ensure" in the Comp Plan and Land Development Regulations. The use of assure is used where ensure should be used. Assure is basically giving confidence or removing fear, removing fear or saying with confidence. Ensure, which is the intent, is to make sure something happens, and that's what we want to do. Using assure doesn't mean that. Let's use the right "sure."

GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

None.

RESOLUTIONS FOR SIGNATURE

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The Monroe County Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 11:06 a.m.