



MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC, BICYCLE, & PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2020, 5:30 PM

Virtual Meeting. Public may view via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call-in information and instructions for the Zoom meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. *Members:* Chairperson Matt Kuepers, Vice Chairperson Daniel Theno, Ald. Craig Stevens, Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, Brighid Riordan, and 2 vacancies.

Present and Voting: Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck, Brighid Riordan

Present and Not Voting: Matt Kuepers

Excused: None

Absent: None

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Monday, November 16, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting agenda.

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to approve the agenda of the Monday, November 16, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Monday, October 19, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting minutes.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Brighid Riordan to approve the minutes of the Monday, October 19, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Galvin to install a marked crosswalk across East Mason Street at Goodell Street. (Ald. Galvin – District 4)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to refer to staff the request to install a marked crosswalk across East Mason Street at Goodell Street.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

2. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Lefebvre to review and potentially change the SPEED LIMIT 25 zone on North Webster Avenue from Pine Street to University Avenue. (Ald. Lefebvre - District 6)

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to postpone to the January 2021 meeting of the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission the request by Ald. Lefebvre to review and potentially change the SPEED LIMIT 25 zone on North Webster Avenue from Pine Street to University Avenue.

Yes- Brigid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

3. *Referred Back from Council:* To deny the request to establish a 3-WAY STOP condition at Western Avenue at Maryhill Drive and maintain the existing I-WAY STOP control (Maryhill Drive traffic stops for Western Avenue traffic). (Ald. Wery – District 8)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to deny the request to establish a 3-WAY STOP condition at Western Avenue at Maryhill Drive and maintain the existing I-WAY STOP control (Maryhill Drive traffic stops for Western Avenue traffic).

Yes- Brigid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Next meeting: Monday, January 18, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. Location TBD.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

I. Adjournment of the current Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, to adjourn the current meeting of the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- OK, then let's call to order the meeting of the paid Green Bay Traffic, Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission for Monday, November 16, 2020. Under item, we'll go Item B Roll Call. Just say, if you're here. Chairperson Keepers is here. Vice Chairperson, Dan Theano?

- Here.

- Alderman Craig Stevens?

- I'm here.

- Lieutenant Mike Sowieks?

- I'm here.

- Is that correct? Am I saying your name right, Mike, on it or did I not get that right here again?

- Sowieks.

- Sowieks, OK, Sowieks, got it, thank you. And then, Commissioner Riordan?

- Here.

- Here, OK. Looks like we're all here and we have Alderman Galvin with us I see, so. Your item's first up there when we get to it. So, we'll be to you shortly there, Bill. Approval under Item C, approval of the agenda for tonight. Do I hear a motion to approve the agenda?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion made and seconded, all in favor?

- Aye.

- It carries. The approval of the minutes, approval a Monday, October 19th, 2020 Traffic Bicycle Pedestrian Commission Meeting minutes. Do I hear an approval?

- It's approved, motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion made in second, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Motion carries. Let's go onto E, regular business. Initial request, consideration with possible action. Request by Alderman Galvin to install a mark crosswalk across E. Mason St. and Goodell St. Alright, Dave, do you wanna start or have the alders start?

- As you probably saw in the meeting packet, I just put in a little bit of background on this one regarding Goodell St. as back, it looks like about two years ago. I think it was the October, 2018 meeting, where there was a similar request to relocate the on Mason crossing to Goodell St. and the commission and ultimately council decided to receive a place that file, receive a place and file that request, sorry. But, this one is a little bit different in that there's no proposal to say, or change, or change anything at Mason and the but simply rather to install a marked crosswalk crossing E. Mason St. and Goodell St. The only thing I'll really add to this at this point in time is just more of a refresher/reminder that Section 29.102 Traffic powers and duties, Subsection 2a, it addresses the designation of crosswalk safety zones, safety islands, loading zones, and lanes

for traffic. And more specifically regarding crosswalks that the traffic engineer may establish, designate, and shell therefore maintain or cause to be maintained by appropriate devices, marks, or lines on the surfaces of roadways crosswalks at intersection where in the engineer's opinion, there is particularly a danger to pedestrians crossing the roadway and that such other places as the engineer deems necessary. Or in other words, it's basically put into my hands to make those determinations. So I haven't actually reviewed this. You know, the, the request came in. I really wanted to get the feedback of the alder, of course, in this situation to find out some more information. And of course, to get the, the opinions of our, these commissioners. So with that, I'd like to turn it over to Alderman Galvin.

- Thank you, Dave. My concern is, as I understand, I've brought some things before this committee in the past about on Mason, specifically. I think the last thing was a traffic control pedestrian signal. And I, I, to be quite frank, I don't even know where that ended up, but I think it was just put on the shelf again, probably due to costs. But I've noticed several times people trying to cross E. Mason St. at Goodell. That street if you continue on for another block north of there, intersects with a large city park. I've seen children trying to cross over to that park. I've seen other pedestrians trying to cross and you know, quite frankly, as a Lieutenant Sowieks could tell you, most motorists don't understand what it means to yield to pedestrians where they cross. And it's also my understanding and I could be wrong in this, but I think you have to have a marked crosswalk in place for it to be a violation of someone doesn't stop at the cross it'll work. People are trying to cross at these intersections. So I'm looking to get them crosswalk in there: one, to make it a little bit more obvious to people and two, if it's necessary for enforcement. And we have it there and we can start taking some enforcement action to try and again, educate motorists that they need to yell, yield to pedestrians if they're trying to cross. It's a very dangerous intersection in my opinion, just because I've watched kids. That's the main thing that worries me: kids trying to cross, they hesitate. They don't know motors are just flying by if one stops. There's always a concern about one of them being rear-ended by someone that's not paying attention. The speed limit there is 30, but I think we're all pretty much aware that not too many people are going 30 miles an hour as they go through there. Thank you.

- All right, any thoughts, Dave, on how you'd like to proceed?

- Sure, I'll, I'll share my screen if you don't mind. A couple things to, to note. OK, so I'm going to zoom out just a little bit, so you kind of get the context of this. So the Mason intersection is actually where I've got the, the hand right now. And so this is just one intersection on the other side of the East River. So zooming in a little bit as the alder had stated that there's a park north of Mason St. So this is it over here. I think it's Meyer Park, maybe, maybe wrong on that name, but certainly the city park could be a destination if it's been reported that there's kids crossing there, it wouldn't surprise me. The other thing I think to also notice is that if you go one block to the south down to Cass Street, again, you're down here at the Optimist Park. and we also have a trail on this side or the west side of the East River. And obviously we do want the East River trails on the other side, but. So I could see that this is probably, you know, there's gotta be some pedestrian activity, both north and south, which would produce some crossings of Mason street. So that's one point. The other thing I was going to mention just more or less in response to the alder's statement about marked versus unmarked crosswalks and the enforceability of them, and correct me Lieutenant Sowieks, if I'm wrong in this, but a state statute clearly defines marked and unmarked crosswalks an illegal, I guess, stipulations behind them and both are enforceable, and both had, can have similar citations issued for noncompliance by motorists and pedestrians alike, because, you know, pedestrian has some responsibility. Of course, in this case, not to dart out into the street and make it impossible for a motorist to stop. So in this case, I'll actually show you what the street view looks like at this intersection. And we do have the presence of sidewalk on both sides. So this is

looking more, so you can see there's a sidewalk here. You've got a curb ramp here. So that's the northeast corner, northwest corner over here. Similar situation where you have sidewalks and a curb ramp. And even when you look at road signs here, you can see there's the, the playground symbol. So that shows that you have a park in the distance. So looking at Mason Street itself, you can see over here, some of the signage, You can see the bridge to cross East River. You can see semis on Mason street. So as we know, it's a busy street, one of our busiest arterial major arterials in the street. Looking to the south, you can see both sides, again, you have sidewalk and curb ramps. So technically both crossings are the east and west approaches of this intersection. and of the street would constitute a legal, unmarked crosswalk. However, unmarked crosswalks are really not that conspicuous, I guess you'd say. So signage and markings in this case could be a consideration. I think it would be wise to possibly refer this to staff, to study, to see what the site conditions look like, see what kind of markings and, you know, with the markings, we would normally put the signage with it, just to kind of see what sort of options we may have, because Mason Street, as we all know, is kind of tight right away. And as you can tell here, you can see the sidewalk abuts right up to the curb line. And sometimes we have problems getting signs installed just because of, you know, width issues. You know, we don't want these signs to be encroaching into the roadway and potentially getting hit by trucks and things like that. So perhaps, maybe inappropriate recommendation would be to refer the staff for study, just to kind of see what we have. And one last thing I just wanted to remark on is that let's just presume that this does come back, and if it would come back, it could come back as early as January. Presuming we're canceling December's meeting, that we're pretty much done with our marking season this year, as in near freezing temperatures. And as I'm looking outside right now and the view in the alley street way here at the city hall, we have snow. So our painting season's pretty much over and something like this would not be able to be installed until spring. That's all.

- Alright, thanks, Dave. So I was like wanting to refer to staff in my estimation. So do I hear a motion to, for the staff for study?

- I'll make that motion to refer to staff.

- Second?

- Second.

- Motion made and seconded, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Chairman?

- Yes?

- Oh, go ahead, make your announcement.

- No, go ahead.

- I was just going to add on that, that park area along the river, north of East Mason, part of the East River trail goes through there. So that's, that's one of the complicating factors too.

- OK, good observation. Alder Galvin, does that take care of it for now for your request?

- Right, and, and also Dan has it right there. He said, I've seen people that because the trail has had problems south of Mason Street on the east shore, east side of the river, people haven't been going that way. So they've been tooling down towards Goodell Street to cross Mason and take the west side of the East River Trail into , which I think may potentially increase the amount of usership in that area. So it's something to consider.

- OK, Dave, you've got all your notes there, so.

- I do, thank you.

- All right, you're ready for staff, OK?

- Thanks much.

- Thank you, we'll move onto Item 2, initial request, consider with possible action of request for all to review and potentially change the speed limit 25 zone on N. Avenue to Pine St to University Avenue. Dave?

- Yes, I did have an opportunity to speak with Alder Lafaye on this item. I did remind her that all changes or review, actually changes I should say, to any speed zone, any modifications by state statute requires a study be done and so, unless she had any other issues with it or wanted to withdraw or anything, which she did not, that if commissioner so desired that this would have to get referred to staff for study for a speed zone evaluation. Also, too, I mentioned snow. That also has an impact on our counting and on our speed evaluation program, meaning I cannot set out the counters in this type of weather. So unless I've got some really good days or some long streaks that are out there, presumably the next time I can really set something out might be in spring time. So if this does get referred to staff or study, it may not be coming back for at least another six months.

- OK, well that's just the timing of the year, unfortunately you know, once the end of snow and cold puts an end to it. So.

- Right.

- Oh, go ahead.

- Yeah, the other thing too, that I thought was a little unique on the item was how far south the alder was looking at extending the speed zone. I know Pine Street has a traffic signal at it, but it's also a local street for the most part. And a lot of times, especially in urban areas, you will find changes in speed limits at or near say intersections with other streets of similar character. So in this case, I would say you're just looking at just a few more blocks to the south as in Walnut street, you know. Walnut street or Webster or something like that would probably, or I should say Mason Street, not Webster, would be probably maybe a little bit more logical locations to say have a change in speed zone. But when I had spoken with her, she had made mention that it seemed like the character of the street changes a little bit more to residential at Pine Street. So north of Pine Street, you really don't have any residences, but south of there. You have more residential property. I'm presuming most of those are rentals, but nonetheless it is residential. So that's what she noted was the character change of the roadway. So I do see that, but oftentimes I like to look for some opportunities say close by. So I know that in the last discussion we had relative to North Webster Avenue and the speed zone changes, some of that discussion occurred about north of that area. So, you know, I just kind of want to maybe avoid some complications, like we had last time on that. So if the commission wants us to look further, say further south to like Walnut Street or even say as far as Mason Street or even the corporate limits, because I believe at the corporate limits that the speeds don't actually change as once you get into Alloway. So it really wouldn't be to me far outside the reach of what the commission could do in this case to say A, we approve of the study, or at least moving forward with the study down to Pine Street. But maybe we also want to look further south and make a determination, whether there needs to be a change to that entire corridor. Because if you really look at it from a roadway, width perspective, number of lanes, sidewalk, amenities, things like that, you really have a very similar looking roadway. So I just wanted to throw that out there for discussion potentially.

- I have a question.

- And maybe avoid what we had happened last time.

- I have a question.

- Yeah, go ahead.

- Dave, did she state why she brought this forward?

- There wasn't a specific request on why to be quite frank. I mean, it never really came up in discussion. I think it's probably partially due to because we changed it north of there, so.

- Sure, I'll give you my thought process on it. So, you know, I made the request to change the other part of Webster and I did travel, you know, from University to Main, 'cause that was all redone as well. But I felt when you went over that river at 35 miles an hour, you get someone doing 40/45. You have all those buildings right there and no side streets. I figured if you go over that river because you know, you go over before, you can see what's in front of you. I didn't feel like it would be safe at 35 through there. And so I drove where she's saying to Pine. Right now, that road I feel is horrible. It's not a smooth street at all. So I didn't want to push it to 35 any farther than where we stopped at on University. So I think until we look at getting that road replaced between Pine and Main, that I think it should stay at 25 miles an hour correctly.

- Yeah, those are great points. And certainly we will take into consideration road condition and the crust curve, I guess we call it, or the profile of that bridge to make sure that, you know, it's even going to be compliant with such a speed zone. Because vertical curves in engineering speak, we can look at how tight the curve is, how high it is, and things and determine what maximum speed is, is actually stable over it, so. If this gets referred to staff staffer study, it's certainly something that we would take into consideration. Really it was no different than what we did with the railroad tracks in the new section of, of Webster Avenue. That was something that was looked at and, you know, we drove it and, you know, and, and drove it at the speeds that were being proposed. And we felt that it certainly was comfortable to do that. So we would certainly take a similar approach to the bridge. And then, you know, as you're stating, you know, the roadway condition may not be.

- Yeah, the surface just seems horrible.

- 35, so we, you know, we would, we would definitely travel it at that just to see if it's seems like it's a safe ride.

- Sure.

- I do agree though, Dave, I think it's a very strange place to change speed limits at Pine Street. It doesn't make sense to me.

- I agree with both of the previous comments, but we probably should study it.

- Yeah, I think let's refer it to staff and then maybe extend it like Dave was saying, maybe take a little bigger look at it than what she's, what she's suggesting or Alder Lafaye is suggesting would be, would be my thought. How far's?

- Does the Lieutenant, the Lieutenant have any comments? He drives that more than we do so.

- Oh, I haven't driven in a while. I would agree that, you know, Webster's kind of a rough compared to the parts that were redone. You know 25, I get the residential part between, especially between Mason and Pine Street, there's a lot of rentals and apartment complexes and a lot of pedestrian traffic as well during the summer. I don't know necessarily how much traffic you get. Probably enough, right at the corner. They have the CVS by Webster and Main Street. So, I guess the most logical would be to keep the south from Mason, I mean Main Street 25. If anything changed at Main Street north.

- I would agree. I spend a lot of time there. I wouldn't, I wouldn't speed it up at, after Main. I just think it's a lot, a lot of pedestrian traffic is what I see too.

- By getting a traffic study we'll know all that, right, Dave?

- Yeah, yeah.

- Pedestrian wise?

- Correct, yeah. The one thing I really wanted to add too, is that I'm going to have to take into consideration as well, that it's not a good practice to be changing speed zones often within a short segment. It's standard practice to try to minimize the number of changes, just so you know, you can get some compliance out of it. So I will certainly add to my study, look at the different speed zones that exist on its entirety, just to kind of get a flavor of how much we're changing it, because we really should be looking at minimizing the amount of changes of speed zones and how long each of those speed zones are. And to be quite frank, I, I would probably actually modify my recommendation to really look at from the southern corporate limits so that I can take that all into factor. I mean, I will take it up all the way through, into the E. Shore Drive, but I do know that that was some of the contention at the last one. I don't know if it's a contention, but you know, there was definitely some, some discussion about that. And I think that if we're going to make the right recommendations, I think we need to look at North Webster in its entirety.

- Does it make sense with the, the road and the condition it's in to, to go back to her and just ask her the reason? I mean, to me, why we would be looking at this? I mean, is that something that you can do or is that something we can do?

- Oh, absolutely, absolutely. I mean, I, I talk with Kathy enough and I'll definitely bring it up and ask her why. I mean, I don't know if that is going to play any change into what we do here tonight. I mean, I guess it's up to you. I mean, if you really wanted to postpone the item, you could do that and then that'll give me a time to talk with her and then, you know, I can just bring the additional information back if that's what the commission wants to do. And to be quite frank, we don't need to make a decision because there really is not going to be any action on this until we have some favorable weather in order to conduct the study the proper way.

- I just always liked to avoid doing a lot of work about something when there's, when we don't know that there's a problem or is there a problem? You know, I know those studies are, are intense, right? And, I don't know.

- And if it, if it would help too, like we got some special deployments, especially for seatbelt enforcement and I can make a request for officers working that deployment can specifically target their efforts in that specific area. So I could certainly do that in the time being, and maybe that will alleviate some of the concern.

- Yeah, I mean, we're not going to have a meeting in December so we could postpone it 'til January and get more information, Dave, on, as Bridget is saying, and Lieutenant Mike, I think the more information we have, the better decision you make, so.

- I just kind of struggle with that downtown area. I feel like, especially where we're talking and I, I know this is anecdotal, but speeding up doesn't seem like it's going to solve the problem with drivers, not paying attention to pedestrians. And I, so I, I struggle with that from a philosophical standpoint, but.

- OK, thanks, all.

- I struggle with this one because of the, the surface of the road isn't the best, so.

- Alright.

- Dave, can I speak?

- Yes?

- Where, where in the priority list is a reconstruction of that roadway? Do you know off hand?

- Well, my knowledge would have to refer back to the five-year Capital Improvement Program. I do not recall seeing North Webster in any of our five year CIP. I may be wrong, but I don't recall seeing it in there. So that would mean it would be over five years old.

- Mr. Chairman, I would move that we postpone any action on this request until the January meeting.

- OK. motion made, do I hear a second?

- Second.

- Motion made and seconded, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Motion carries. We're on Item 3, refer back and council to deny the request to establish a three-way stop conditioned at Western Avenue and Mary Hill Drive and maintain the existing one way stop control. Mary, Mary Hill Drive traffic stops for Western Avenue traffic.

- OK, Dave, you wanna give us the golden low down there?

- Yeah, what I understand is from the last council meeting, the item was pulled when the traffic report was being reviewed. And it's my understanding that the alder wanted some people to Zoom in and potentially comment on what they're observing out there. I'm presuming it's a speeding issue, but it was my understanding that when he pulled that that was more or less they wanted. I don't think they knew maybe perhaps at the meeting that occurred and everything, and that they wanted an opportunity to speak on this. But I'm kind of seeing tonight as that opportunity. And I don't see anyone. I don't see Alder Weary or any other citizens on, on the Zoom meeting. I don't know, Matt, did you get any requests for, or invitations to Zoom in that may be on your, that are pending right now?

- No, there are no residents or the alder in the Zoom waiting room.

- OK, well, I guess we're giving them the opportunity right now and I, my position has not changed. And I guess it's really up to the commissioners, whether you want to postpone this again, and maybe, maybe someone will show up.

- That's what I was asking. What are our options, Dave, with this one? I don't know if I've had one where it's come back and somebody wants to talk about it or constituents want to talk about it, but nobody's going to talk about it. So for, so.

- We've had it happen before. And typically what the commission does is just sticks with their initial recommendation. I mean, unless there's some new information that Alder Weary or the constituents has brought forward to any commissioners that is unknown to the rest of us. I mean, if that's the case, let's have a discussion. Otherwise I stick, I stick to my recommendation and I would think the commissioners are doing the same.

- Yeah, I don't know why we would do anything different than what we did last time on this one, so.

- I make a motion to still deny it, so.

- I second it.

- OK, motion to deny the request to deny them is what you're saying? Did I get that right? OK.

- Right, is that right? I think it is.

- I think so.

- Yeah, I mean all you're doing is you're making same motion as you did the initial time. 'Cause it's literally, if you look at the wording of the item itself was really, it says denied the request. You're approving the denial is what you're really doing. So if that's your intention, I'll make sure that that it's clearly stated that way in the motion.

- All right, why don't we have a motion to approve the denial, then?

- That motion to approve the denial.

- Made and seconded, all in favor?

- Aye.

- OK, motion carries. Informational next meeting Monday, January 18, 2021. Wow, that seems like a long ways away. But, not so far and typically we, for most of the members here, we, as you know, we usually skip the December meeting unless we get a hot button, hot bottom item that comes up, Dave, that needs to get

addressed in December, which I don't know if that's ever happened. That's kind of how we leave it. If something really needs attention, we do it. But if not, our next meeting would then be the Monday, the January 28th. So I would, unless anybody's got any, anybody wants to meet in December. I don't think anybody, I think everybody would like to the month off, so.

- Matt, I think we've done this in the past. We've adjourned until January, but we've left it up to you as the chair to call a meeting if something comes up.

- Yeah, yup.

- The only thing I would add to this is that I did do a check of the termination of 90 day trials and we do have a number of them that are coming from the August meeting, I believe it is, or September, whatever three months back for December, it would be, but there are a number of them that are terminating. So I guess technically we're not supposed to have anything longer than 90 days, but it would go an extra 30 days. So you'd be at 120 days for the January meeting for those explorations. So I guess potentially there's a need to, but I'll be quite frank, you can, you can make it such that if you want me to just have those on and we literally meet for five minutes on a Zoom call, we can do that.

- Can we just make a motion now to extend it for another 30 days?

- We're not supposed to, we're not supposed to make extensions, no. That's actually part of the rules that we have, and 90-day termination trials are supposed to be the maximum. I'll be frank with you, I mean I'm probably guessing that of all the December meetings that we've canceled, that this has happened before. And certainly no one has died or perished because of that decision, but I'll, I'll leave that up to the commissioners. I'm simply advisory here, so I am.

- Well, I have one comment or question for December. Can anybody meet during the day? I can. So instead of doing a 5:30.

- Yeah, it's possible. You know, I'm thinking like Dave said, this has had to happen because I don't remember having a December meeting and I've been on the same, quite a long time. So we can go to 120 days. I don't, I think that's the way to go, Dave. I mean, unless it's a real quandary for rules and all that good stuff.

- No, I, in looking at the items that are on that list, I believe there were all parking related, and to be quite frank, when we're doing 90 day trials, all the signs are up. So really technically nothing changes. The

enforceability at home remains the same. It's really just a matter of making that temporary condition permanent. And you know, so far right now I've heard nothing back from any of those items, meaning that everything's moving forward with them in an inappropriate manner and an acceptable manner. So I really don't think that we'd have much issue going to January.

- Alright, that would be.

- If we don't meet, we're just not taking any action, I mean

- Correct.

- I'm good with that unless somebody else has a, not good with that at this point. Alright, nobody's got any comments. Let's just schedule for January 18th and Dave, I assume. I mean, I don't know what the world's going to be like in two months, but put on a Zoom at this time, unless something really changes in the world in the next 60 days, which I don't know. The vaccine seems like it's getting close, but we're still a ways away from that yet, so. Let's plan on a Zoom meeting January 18th is our next meeting, so. So is there anything else you want to cover tonight, Dave?

- I think I'm good. OK, if you're good, commissioners, anybody else or?

- Well, everybody enjoy your holidays.

- Merry Christmas.

- Yes, Merry Christmas.

- We just need a motion to adjourn yet.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- This meeting is adjourned and seconded, all in favor?

- Aye.

- OK, motion carries. Happy holidays to all, too, be safe. Be smart with the COVID situation, and keep masking and your six feet and washing those hands, as you've heard over and over. Alright don't fatigue, but you gotta get through it. So, happy holidays all!

- You too, Matt.