

**CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, October 12, 2022 – 1:30 p.m.**  
**City Hall, Council Chambers, Vero Beach, Florida**

**PRESENT:** Chairman, Eric Price; Members: Christopher Bryant, Stephen McDonald and Frank Pizzichillo **Also Present:** Code Enforcement Officer, Melody Sanderson; Code Enforcement Officer, Jamila McGee; City Attorney, John Turner and Deputy City Clerk, Sherri Philo

**Excused Absences:** Ken Daige and Linda Hillman

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Today's meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE**

The Chairman led the Board members and the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

The Deputy City Clerk swore in staff and the audience present for today's meeting enmasse.

At this time, the Deputy City Clerk performed the roll call.

**3. PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

**A) Adoption of Minutes**

**1. September 14, 2022**

**Mr. Price made a motion to adopt the minutes of the September 14, 2022 Code Enforcement Board meeting. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**B) Agenda Additions, Deletions and Adoption**

Ms. Melody Sanderson, Code Enforcement Officer, who has been sworn in, pulled Case #22-CE-12717 – Sawyer J. Hartman and Angelique C. Cooper and Case #22-CE-12719 – Sandra L. Seeley and The American Pavers Contractor, Inc. from today's agenda. She reported that they came into compliance after receiving the Notice of Hearing. She then pulled Case #22-CE-12741 – Scott Caviness from today's agenda. She reported that the Notice of Hearing was returned as undeliverable and they are currently working on coming into compliance. She then pulled Case #22-CE-12751 – Mattress by Appointment LLC / Kevin Cook, Case #22-CE—12752 – Mattress by Appointment LLC / Kevin Cook, Case #22-CE-12753 – Mattress by Appointment LLC / Kevin Cook, and Case #22-CE-12780 – Susan K. Powell, owner, and David Decker and Michael McCauley, realtors with Dale Sorenson Real Estate, from today's agenda. She reported that they all came into compliance after receiving the Notice of Hearing.

**Mr. Price made a motion to adopt the agenda as amended. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**4. UNLICENSED CONTRACTORS/CITATIONS**

None

## 5. EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS

### A) Citation Appeals

None

### B) Non-Compliance / Compliance Reports

#### 1. Request for Board Order

##### a. CASE #22-CE-12712 / 0644J

**VIOLATOR:** Oliver R. Ducharme

**VIOLATION:** Land development code violation; carport/canopy installed without Code Compliance Certification from the City of Vero Beach Planning Department or a building permit from the Indian River County Building Department – Code Sections 60.21 (b)(1); 22-181; 22-106 (a)

**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** 546 19<sup>th</sup> Place, Vero Beach, Florida 32960

**(Failure to comply)**

Ms. Jamila McGee, Code Enforcement Officer, who has been sworn in, reported that the civil penalty has been paid and the property is not in compliance. She reported that the compliance date was September 1, 2022.

Mr. Bryant asked Ms. McGee for her recommendation.

Ms. McGee reported that they obtained approval from the City, however they still need to obtain a building permit. She said that they need more time to come into compliance.

Mr. Pizzichillo reported for the record that he is the President of the Homeowner's Association and he has spoken with Mr. Oliver Ducharme, but not about this matter.

Mr. Oliver Ducharme, property owner, who has been sworn in, said as soon as he learned that he violated the 10-foot boundary line, he immediately took the structure down. He did leave a five (5)-foot portion, which he is in the process of trying to get it engineered.

Mr. Bryant said that he did the work without a permit.

Mr. Ducharme said that he did, but he took down the part that was in violation. He said that he wants to get the five (5) foot portion engineered and if he can't he would take it down immediately.

Mr. Price asked what part has not been taken down.

Mr. Ducharme said that his house is 15-feet from the boundary line and he was told that he could not be within 10-feet of it so he immediately took down 10-feet and there is five (5) feet remaining, which has two (2) pieces of metal roofing with two (2) gates.

Mr. Bryant asked Ms. McGee if he was correct that Mr. Ducharme received approval from the City, but has not obtained a building permit.

Ms. McGee said that is correct.

Mr. Bryant suggested that they allow 90-days to come into compliance.

**Mr. Price moved that the Board finds there is a violation, the violation continues, and that the Board issues a Board order to correct the violation within 90-days from the date of the Board order or continuing civil penalties in the amount of \$50.00 per day shall commence on the original compliance date of September 1, 2022, until corrected and that the initial civil penalty has been paid. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

- b. CASE #22-CE-12717 / 3560M**  
**VIOLATOR:** Sawyer J. Hartman and Angelique C. Cooper  
**VIOLATION:** Land development code violation; fence installed without City approval or a building permit from the Indian River County Building Department – Code Section 60.21 (b)(1)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** 2260 Cordova Avenue, Vero Beach, Florida 32960  
**(Failure to comply)**

This item was pulled from today's agenda.

- c. CASE #22-CE-12719 / 3561M – Repeat Violation**  
**VIOLATOR:** Sandra L. Seeley (owner) and The American Pavers Contractor Inc., Elias Mendoza (agent)  
**VIOLATION:** Land development code violation; pavers installed without City approval or right-of-way permit – Code Section 60.21 (b)(1)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** 2531 Victory Boulevard, Vero Beach, Florida 32960  
**(Failure to pay \$500.00 civil penalty)**

This item was pulled from today's agenda.

- d. CASE #22-CE-12732 / 0652J – Repeat Violation**  
**VIOLATOR:** Caleb J. Seeley  
**VIOLATION:** Inoperable vehicles, trailer and vehicle/boat parts – Code Section 38-32 (a)(1)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** 1799 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Vero Beach, Florida 32960  
**(Failure to comply; Failure to pay \$150.00 civil penalty)**

Ms. McGee reported that the civil penalty has not been paid and the property is not in compliance. The compliance date was September 9, 2022.

Mr. Caleb Seeley, property owner, who has been sworn in, said that he understood that he was in violation. He referred to the previous citation (Case #21-CE-11795), which states that there as an inoperable grey Dodge pickup truck with no plate, a Ford F150 with a flat tire, and a 32-foot boat stored in the driveway. He said that he paid the fine for this and the notice

states that he did not. He said all his neighbors believe that they should be allowed to store boats in their front yard and that is what he is here to battle. He said that his neighbors were willing to stand with him, but he was not going to bother them today.

Mr. Price explained that the Board cannot change the laws. He said boats are not allowed to be stored in the front yard.

Mr. Bryant said the boat would have to be from the front edge of the house to the back.

Ms. McGee explained that his front yard is not big enough to store a boat.

Ms. Sanderson explained that from the right-of-way there is a 25-foot required front yard and the boat could not be in that area.

Mr. Price asked if the boat could be stored in the back yard.

Ms. Sanderson answered yes.

Mr. Price asked Mr. Turner if Mr. Seeley wanted to change the law as to where boats could be stored, what would he do.

Mr. John Turner, City Attorney, explained that if he wanted to have the restrictions changed on the distances that would be a matter for the City's administration. He said that Mr. Seeley would have to request a change in the Land Development Code.

Mr. Jason Jeffries, Planning Director, who has been sworn in, asked what Code section was cited.

Ms. Sanderson answered Code Section 74.82.

Mr. Jeffries said so it was in the City Code, not in the Land Development Code.

Ms. Sanderson said that is correct.

Mr. Jeffries said then this would be a request to the City Council. He noted that there are a lot of references in that section of the Code that refers to the Land Development Code so it could get complicated and involve the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Price asked if he wanted to pursue this, what would he do.

Mr. Jeffries said that he would need to speak with the City Council.

Mr. Seeley asked in order to correct this situation does he just need to pay the \$150.00 fine. He was told that he would also need to move the boat.

Mr. Seeley said that he would move the boat to his designated driveway. He said that he has a corner lot and when he purchased the home it only showed one (1) section as the driveway and he doesn't want to park the boat where he parks his car.

Mr. Jeffries explained that a corner lot has two (2) front yards and they both have to meet the setback. He reported that the Planning and Zoning Board would be looking into doing some revisions to the zoning districts. He explained that there were a lot of issues in the way that the rules were written that restricts what people can do, especially with corner lots so that is

something they are going to be looking into. He noted that this has to go through the legislative process and it is ultimately up to the City Council if they are going to change the rules.

Ms. McGee reported that the violation they are referring to was a previous citation. This violation is for storing boat parts in the front yard and the boat not being registered. The storage of the boat in the front yard is a separate violation.

Mr. Pizzichillo asked what needs to be done.

Ms. McGee said the boat would have to be registered and it could not be stored in the front yard. She reported that the inoperable vehicles that were on the property have been removed, however there are still boat parts being stored there that are unsheltered.

**Mr. Price moved that the Board finds that there is a violation, the violation continues, and that the Board issues a Board order to correct the violation within 30-days from the date of the Board order or continuing civil penalties in the amount of \$150.00 per day shall commence on the original compliance date of September 9, 2022, until corrected and to pay the initial civil penalty of \$150.00. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

- e. **CASE #22-CE-12741 / 3575M**  
**VIOLATOR:** Scott Caviness  
**VIOLATION:** Vehicle restrictions – Code Section 74-82 (c)(2-6)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** 906 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Vero Beach, Florida 32960  
**(Failure to comply; Failure to pay \$50.00 civil penalty)**

This item was pulled from today's agenda.

- f. **CASE #22-CE-12751 / 3283M – Repeat Violation**  
**VIOLATOR:** Mattress by Appointment LLC / Kevin Cook (agent)  
**VIOLATION:** Land development code violation; sign violation – Code Section 60.21 (b)(8)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** right-of-way Blue Heron Lane and Royal Palm Boulevard  
**(Failure to pay \$100.00 civil penalty)**

This item was pulled from today's agenda.

- g. **CASE #22-CE-12752 / 3284M – Repeat Violation**  
**VIOLATOR:** Mattress by Appointment LLC / Kevin Cook (agent)  
**VIOLATION:** Land development code violation; sign violation – Code Section 60.21 (b)(8)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** right-of-way 24<sup>th</sup> Street and Royal Palm Boulevard  
**(Failure to pay \$100.00 civil penalty)**

This item was pulled from today's agenda.

- h. CASE #22-CE-12753 / 3285M – Repeat Violation**  
**VIOLATOR:** Mattress by Appointment LLC / Kevin Cook (agent)  
**VIOLATION:** Land development code violation; sign violation – Code Section 60.21 (b)(8)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** right-of-way 24<sup>th</sup> Street and Indian River Boulevard  
**(Failure to pay \$100.00 civil penalty)**

This item was pulled from today's agenda.

- i. CASE #22-CE-12766 / 3289M – Repeat Violation**  
**VIOLATOR:** 1835 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue LLC / Frederick J. Piumelli (agent)  
**VIOLATION:** Land development code violation; bathroom constructed without a permit from the Indian River County Building Department – Code Section 60.21 (b)(1)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** 2215 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Vero Beach, Florida 32960  
**(Failure to comply; Failure to pay \$150.00 civil penalty)**

Ms. Sanderson reported that the violation cited was a Land Development Code violation for a second bathroom being installed in a commercial building without obtaining permits from the Indian River County Building Department. No request for a hearing on the citation has been received so their right to contest the citation has been waived and deemed admitted by the violator. The case was issued by a complaint by the tenant on September 6, 2022, that the odor of sewage was throughout the building and that is when it came to her attention that this was done without permits. The citation was issued on September 6, 2022, with service by certified mail with the compliance date of September 20, 2022. This is the third time there has been repeat violations for work being done without permits. She reported that the civil penalty has been paid. Present for today's hearing is legal counsel for the property owner and legal counsel for the tenants.

Mr. Barry Segal, Attorney representing the property owner, said they understood that work was done without a permit. He reported that this was done to accommodate the tenant moving into the property early. His client has engaged an architect to come up with a modified plan for the layout to get it permitted. He also retained a plumber and an engineer for the purpose of obtaining permits to correct the work that needs to be done if it does need to be corrected. He asked that the Board allow 90 to 120-days to come into compliance because the permitting process through the County right now is at a snail's pace. He understands that the tenant's attorney is present and requested to have the chance for rebuttal. He was not sure what would be relevant to the permitting matter as it has no relevance to what they are asking.

Ms. Sanderson asked is there a contract in place or are they in the process of finding someone.

Mr. Segal said they have obtained an architect, an engineer, and a plumber. The next step would be to hire a contractor. He felt it would be premature to hire a contractor until they know the scope of the project. He said they are expeditiously working to get this matter resolved.

Mr. Price asked was the bathroom installed.

Mr. Segal answered yes.

At this time, Ms. Sanderson submitted photographs into evidence marked as Exhibits A through F (on file in the City Clerk's office).

Mr. Pizzichillo said that he looked at the photographs and the piping is located near the air-conditioner. He did not know if it was legal the way it was set up.

Mr. Segal said there are steps being taken now to come up with the actual proper structure so that when it is completed it would be in compliance with the Code and the permits would go through and they could put this issue behind them.

Mr. Mike Kirwin, Attorney representing the Indian River School of Real Estate (tenant), said Mr. Segal questioned if this was relevant to their extension request for the permitting and the issue from his client's standpoint is that this is not a new issue. They have made dozens of complaints to the landlord that goes back to January of last year. He said that his client has not been able to occupy the space because of the smell. They have complied with every requirement that goes under their lease, which is a subject of litigation.

Mr. Price explained that they need to keep this specific to this case.

Mr. Kirwin said this is specific to this case. This is a matter that the landlord has known about and they are asking for an extension of 90 to 120-days and his client cannot operate in this space. The smell is so bad that they have had to send employees home, they have lost business, they have had to cancel classes, etc. They need this to be resolved as soon as possible.

Mr. Price questioned so you are asking for a shorter compliance date.

Mr. Pizzichillo said this is a health hazard and a person renting a space has the right to peace and enjoyment. He said this has to be fixed.

Mr. Price asked who requested the second bathroom.

Mr. Kirwin thought it was required by Code. He said the tenant was supposed to take occupancy last November, but the work was not done. The work was finally done in January, which they believe was done by unlicensed plumbers who did not follow the Code and did the work without a permit.

Mr. Bryant asked who was the architect, plumber, and engineer that has been retained.

Mr. Segal said that he does not have the name of the firms who are doing the work, but they are all licensed companies.

Mr. Pizzichillo said they are in the year 2022 and this originally came up in January. He asked Mr. Segal if he has a reason for this.

Mr. Segal said there are a lot of issues between the parties and he did not think it was proper for him to share communications between the clients. He is present to tell the Board that his client is taking this matter very seriously and is getting this matter resolved. Their position is that they have retained the experts necessary to complete the work and they are asking for 90 to 120-days to comply and the reason they are requesting the extension is because it is out of

his client's hands. His client has a vested interest in getting this completed as soon as possible because that is where their rent money comes from and currently the tenant is not paying rent.

Mr. Bryant suggested that the Board allows 75-days to comply. He said they have had ample time to take care of this.

Ms. Christine McLain, tenant, who has been sworn in, said everything they asked to be done to the bathroom was not done. She said the smell of sewage was very bad so they had to move their classes to Ft. Pierce. She said rent is being paid, but it is being paid in escrow. She said this should have been taken care of immediately. She said this is not their first rodeo. They knew they had to pull permits before putting in this bathroom. She felt this should be taken care of as soon as possible. The smell is horrible.

**Mr. Price moved that the Board finds that there is a violation, that the violation continues, that the Board issues a Board order to correct the violation within 75-days from the date of the Board order or continuing civil penalties in the amount of \$150.00 per day shall commence on the original compliance date of September 20, 2022, until corrected and that the initial civil penalty has been paid. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

- j. CASE #22-CE-12780 / 3293M**  
**VIOLATOR:** Susan K. Powell (owner) and David Decker and Michael McCauley (realtors) Dale Sorensen Real Estate  
**VIOLATION:** sign violation – Code Section 38.09 (1)(1)  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** 839 Camelia Lane #8, Vero Beach, Florida 32963  
**(Failure to pay \$50.00 civil penalty)**

This item was pulled from today's agenda.

- k. CASE #21-CE-12038 / 3369M**  
**VIOLATOR:** Sheri Lizbeth Anderson and Adam J. Searle (owners) and Adron Fence Co. / Ross A. Chambers, (agent)  
**VIOLATION:** right-of-way encroachment; fence installed on City right-of-way (Greytwig Road and Indian River Drive) – Code Section 71.03  
**VIOLATION ADDRESS:** 316 Greytwig Road, Vero Beach, Florida 32963  
**(Request from Code Enforcement Officer for the Board to find the property in compliance as of September 14, 2022, and to issue a Board order finding compliance, ceasing the continuing penalties and to pay continued penalties and costs. The initial civil penalty of \$50.00 has been paid.)**

Ms. Sanderson reported that this case came before the Board on December 8, 2021, and the Board allowed 45-days to correct the violation. The civil penalty has been paid and the property was found in compliance on September 14, 2022. She asked that the Board finds the property in compliance as of September 14, 2022, ceasing the continuing penalties as of September 14, 2022, and to issue a Board order to pay the accrued civil penalties and costs.

Mr. Bryant asked what are the accrued penalties and costs.

Ms. Sherri Philo, Deputy City Clerk, reported that the accrued continued penalties was approximately \$15,000.00.

Ms. Sanderson reported that the fence was required to be removed from the right-of-way, which took some time and once that was completed as a condition of the Code Compliance Certification they were required to have a landscape buffer. The Planning Department sent an email to the fence company and to the homeowner reminding them that they needed the landscape buffer. Plants were purchased and placed along the fence a few at a time and when the last plant was planted they were in compliance.

Mr. McDonald asked when was the fence completed.

At this time, the Deputy City Clerk swore in Ms. Sheri Anderson.

Ms. Sheri Lizbeth Anderson, property owner, who has been sworn in, said they did everything they were supposed to do. She said there was no indication that they were going to be fined \$50.00 a day for not planting plants. She said they planted the plants a couple at a time because the plants were not available. She thought it was insane that they were being charged for not planting plants. If she was told that she was going to be charged for not planting plants she would have planted the plants very fast.

Mr. Price said the Board tries to tell everyone to be sure they contact the Code Officers when they come into compliance so that it could be confirmed.

Ms. Anderson said that she spoke with Mr. David Gay, Chief Surveyor for the City, and he told her not to worry about putting all the plants in at once, that it was not a big deal.

Mr. Price explained that all the Board can do is find the property in compliance. If she wants a reduction in the fine then she would need to go before the City Council.

Ms. Sanderson reported that the applicant completed the removal of the fence on February 23, 2022, which was well after the compliance date. When the fence was removed an email was sent by Mr. Jeffries to the fence company and to the homeowner. She then read the email into the record (on file in the City Clerk's office).

Ms. Anderson said that she does not remember receiving that email.

Ms. Sanderson said the email was sent on May 11, 2022, and the Code Compliance application also states that there was a landscape requirement.

Ms. Anderson said they met with Mr. Matt Mitts, Public Works Director, Mr. Jeffries, and Mr. Gay on their property in January to figure out exactly where they were going to move the fence and to figure out the covenant of removal. She said then it took about two (2) months.

Mr. Bryant asked if she notified Ms. Sanderson that there was an issue.

Ms. Anderson said that she thought the fence company would do that.

Ms. Sanderson reported that when the case was initiated the City's survey department marked where the right-of-way was and where the fence needed to be moved. She said City staff did meet with Ms. Anderson and verified with her where the right-of-way was located.

Mr. Pizzichillo asked if he was correct that stakes were put in where the fence could have been placed.

Ms. Anderson said there could have been, but she never understood that was where the fence was supposed to go. She is a homeowner, not a fence contractor.

Mr. Pizzichillo said that he heard that the City put up some type of marking on where the fence should go.

Ms. Sanderson said when the fence was noted a request was made to the survey department to verify the location of it and that is when they marked the right-of-way.

Mr. Pizzichillo asked how did they mark the right-of-way.

Ms. Sanderson said it was marked with a stake with a ribbon attached.

Mr. Pizzichillo said then they put the fence up beyond the stakes.

Ms. Anderson said the right-of-way was marked after the fence was put up. She said that someone called the City after the fence was installed and the City then went out and marked the right-of-way, which is when they were found in violation. In order to ensure that they were not moving the fence to an improper place again they wanted to go through all the proper channels, which is why they met with the City and with the County. She had no idea that the fence was on the right-of-way.

Mr. Ross Chambers, of Adron Fence Company, who has been sworn in, introduced himself to the Board.

Mr. McDonald asked Mr. Chambers if he met with City staff in February.

Mr. Chambers said that his company did not meet with the City. They were waiting for easement releases so they could leave the fence where it was, which he assumed never happened. They then had to move the fence.

Mr. McDonald asked when was the fence moved.

Mr. Chamber reported that the final inspection was approved on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. McDonald said the City was not told that this occurred.

Mr. Chambers said that he didn't because he thought the homeowner was still interacting with the City. He said they were already disappointed with the City because the fence was approved to go where their customer wanted it and they installed it where it was supposed to go and then they found out later that the City wasn't allowing it. He said stakes were put up and they were being told they shouldn't have done what they were told they could do.

Mr. Price said they could have just removed the fence to bring it into compliance and then put up a new fence with permitting.

Mr. Chambers said as the owner of Adron Fence and the owner of the property they were trying to mitigate costs. He said the customer got what she expected from the beginning and they properly permitted the fence.

Mr. Price said that he was just thinking in hindsight.

Mr. Chambers said taking down a fence is not free. He said they did what they were contracted to do and the customer was happy. The only one who was not happy was the City.

Mr. Price explained that the Board cannot do anything other than find this case in compliance.

Mr. McDonald said they could reduce the penalties.

Mr. Price said the Board cannot reduce the penalties.

Mr. Turner said that is correct.

Mr. McDonald said they could go before the City Council. He felt that they had a good case.

Mr. Price explained that this case was decided a long time ago and the Board allowed 45-days to comply.

Mr. Pizzichillo said they have the right to appeal to the City Council and if that doesn't suffice they have a Court of order they could take this case to. They can appeal this decision to the City Council and if they want to go beyond that it is their prerogative as an American.

Mr. McDonald suggested that they put together a get timeline prior to bringing it before the City Council.

Mr. Turner explained that the Board order from the Code Enforcement Board has been filed and constitutes as a lien on the real estate. This Board does not have jurisdiction to address that problem. The only body that can address this is the City Council. There is an application to request a lien reduction that has to be completed and there is an application fee. Then the matter would be set on an expeditious basis to go before the City Council. It is up to the City Council as to what they want to do. He reported that the application can be obtained from the City Clerk's office.

Ms. Anderson asked who is responsible for the fine.

Mr. Price answered the homeowner.

Mr. Price asked if the easement was permitted.

Mr. Jeffries did not recall.

Ms. Sanderson reported that an easement was granted to the property owners. She said they were able to purchase a Park from the City at a discounted price.

Mr. Jeffries noted that a permit might have been issued, but it did not allow for the fence to be placed in the right-of-way. He noted that it is the property owner's responsibility to know where their property lines are located.

Mr. Chambers said that he did not disagree, however it was also the City's responsibility to properly permit projects that are sent through their departments. He said ultimately they received something from the City that was not allowed.

Ms. Sanderson reported that the Planning Department disputed that.

**Mr. Price moved that the Board finds it is in compliance as of September 14, 2022, and cease the continuing penalties as of September 14, 2022, and to pay the accrued civil penalties and costs. Mr. Pizzichillo seconded the motion and it passed 3-1, with Mr. McDonald voting no.**

**6. OLD BUSINESS**

None

**7. NEW BUSINESS**

None

**8. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

None

**9. CLERK'S MATTERS**

None

**10. ATTORNEY'S MATTERS**

None

**11. CHAIRMAN'S MATTERS**

None

**12. MEMBER'S MATTERS**

None

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

Today's meeting adjourned at 2:29 p.m.

/sp