



# MILWAUKIE

*Dogwood City of the West*

**To:** Design and Landmarks Committee  
**From:** Li Alligood, Assistant Planner and DLC Liaison  
**Date:** November 30, 2010  
**Subject:** Preparation for December 6, 2010, Meeting

---

Greetings! The December meeting is our last meeting of 2010 and will be at a different time and place—we will be in the **Conference Room of the Johnson Creek Facility** for next **Monday's meeting at 11:00 a.m.** The agenda is enclosed (see Enclosure 1).

### **Jackson Street Bus Shelter Discussion**

At the October 27 meeting, the Committee voted to support staff recommendation of the Cantilevered Glass Shelter. City Council approved the staff recommendation, and the shelters will be installed as soon as March 2011. Several components of the shelter can be customized for downtown Milwaukie, including the etched laminated patterns in the windscreen. Staff will present several windscreen designs for discussion.

### **Design Review Code Revisions**

Staff will present proposed code revisions codifying the current role of the Committee in the land use process, and clarifying notification requirements and procedures for public design review meetings. The revised code language is enclosed (see Enclosure 3).

### **Light Rail Streetscape Character**

In 2000, the City adopted Public Area Requirements for streetscape improvements in the downtown zones. The streetscape standards provide specifications sidewalk design, and also for street furniture such as benches, trash receptacles, bollards, fountains, and iron tree grates. These standards have been implemented where sidewalks have been rebuilt in downtown – the North Main block, the south block of Jefferson St between 21<sup>st</sup> Ave and Main St, and now on Jackson St. Thus far, the City has directed TriMet to assume that the light rail project would follow these standards as closely as possible in downtown Milwaukie.

At the recent public meeting on the urban design of light rail in downtown Milwaukie, there was a good discussion about whether the standard streetscape elements should be implemented by the project. Though there was no question that the level of quality must be as high as possible, there is room for discussion about whether the light rail project should implement the existing downtown streetscape standards, allow the project to implement modified standards, or adopt light rail-specific standards for street furniture.

The Committee is in a unique position to host a community discussion on this topic. We will discuss the Committee's interest in this idea and next steps.

Let me know if you have any questions. See you next Monday at 11:00 a.m.!

### **Enclosures**

1. December 6, 2010, meeting agenda
2. October 27, 2010, meeting notes
3. Draft proposed Design Review code revisions



# **MILWAUKIE**

*Dogwood City of the West*

## **Design and Landmarks Committee Meeting Agenda**

Johnson Creek Facility, Conference Room  
6101 SE Johnson Creek Blvd

11:00 a.m., Monday, December 6, 2010

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **MEETING MINUTES** 5 min.
  - a. October 27, 2010
3. **INFORMATION ITEMS—None**
4. **WORKSESSION ITEMS** 80 min.
  - a. Jackson Street Bus Shelter  
Windscreen design discussion (30 min.)
  - b. Design Review Hearings Procedures  
Review of proposed code revisions (30 min.)
  - c. Light rail streetscape character (20 min.)
5. **APPLICATION REVIEW ITEMS—None**
6. **OTHER BUSINESS** 5 min.
  - a. January 2011 meeting
7. **ADJOURN**

### **FORECAST FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

January 26, 2011	1. Officer elections
	2. Light rail streetscape character meeting (tentative)
February 23, 2011	TBD

**\*NOTE:** If you will be late or are unable to attend, please call the Planning Department cell phone at 503-710-2187.

1                   **Design and Landmarks Committee (DRAFT)**  
2                               **Meeting Notes**  
3                               **Wednesday, October 27, 2010**

4   **Members Present**

5   Becky Ives, Chair  
6   Patty Wisner  
7   Greg "Frank" Hemer  
8   Jim Perrault

9   **Members Absent**

10   None

11   **Staff Present**

12   Katie Mangle, Planning Director  
13   Zach Weigel, Civil Engineer

14   **1. CALL TO ORDER**

15       **Chair Ives** called the Design and Landmarks Committee (DLC) meeting to order at 6:36  
16       p.m.

17   **2. MEETING NOTES**

18       **a. September 22, 2010**

19           **DLC Member Wisner** noted the following correction:

20           Line 36 stated that a decision had been made at the November 9, 2010, meeting, which  
21           had not happened yet. She requested that the date be changed to November 9, 2009.

22           **Ms. Wisner moved to approve the September 22, 2010, DLC meeting notes with**  
23           **the requested change. DLC Member Hemer seconded the motion. The notes were**  
24           **approved unanimously.**

25   **3. INFORMATION ITEMS—NONE**

26   **4. WORKSESSION ITEMS**

27       **a. Jackson Street Bus Shelter**

28           **Katie Mangle, Planning Director**, introduced TriMet staff **Young Park, Capital**  
29           **Projects Manager**, and **Bob Hastings, Agency Architect**. She also introduced **Zach**  
30           **Weigel, Civil Engineer**. TriMet was the general project manager for the Jackson Street  
31           project and Mr. Weigel was the City's project manager.

**Ms. Mangle** provided an overview of past DLC discussions about the Jackson Street bus shelter.

- The Committee recommended the Discovery Shelter for the Jackson Street project at their June 24, 2009, meeting.
- The company that produced the Discovery Shelter was going into bankruptcy and the Discovery shelter design, which was supposed to be delivered in December, was no longer available.
- The Committee's second choice in 2009 had been the Cantilevered Glass Shelter. That shelter had been custom designed for TriMet for use in the Portland region.
- Given the need to choose a different high capacity shelter, project staff proposed that the project select the Cantilevered Glass Shelter as an alternative design and requested the Committee's concurrence. Some elements of the shelter could be customized to reflect Milwaukie's unique character.

**Mr. Park** noted that there were some timeline-driven aspects of the project. The project was in its final stages. On December 5, 2010, buses would begin operation along Jackson St. Some type of temporary shelter would be necessary until permanent shelters could be installed. The type of permanent shelter chosen would determine what type of foundation/base would be poured for the shelter.

**Chair Ives** clarified that, regardless of the choice, the new shelter would be installed after the street was opened to buses.

**Ms. Mangle** agreed and stated that the new shelter needed to be chosen within the following 2 weeks. Once the new shelter was chosen, the proper foundation and infrastructure would be poured to accommodate the new shelter.

- The Committee had the option to recommend that the City choose a custom-designed shelter, which would take approximately a year to select, fabricate, and install. The other alternative, the Cantilevered Glass Shelter, could be installed in 3 months or so—approximately February or March 2011.
- **Mr. Park** noted that in order to install a custom shelter, the temporary foundation would need to be removed and a new foundation poured. Buses would need to be rerouted and there would be a disruption in service.

62 **Ms. Mangle** clarified that the new bus stops would be functional in early December  
63 2010. The permanent shelters would be installed either in February/March 2011, in the  
64 case of the Cantilevered Glass Shelter, or November/December 2011, in the case of a  
65 custom shelter.

66 **Mr. Hastings** presented drawings of the Cantilevered Glass Shelter. The shelter on the  
67 north side of Jackson St was larger, to accommodate greater rider demand, and the  
68 shelter on the south side was smaller.

- 69 • The Discovery Shelter had the attributes of a low, modern style; transparency so  
70 people could see in; and weather protection. The Cantilevered Glass Shelter was a  
71 kit of parts, so pieces could be added or removed as desired. The wind screens  
72 could be configured in many different ways and could have unique designs.
- 73 • The Cantilevered Glass Shelter was intended to be durable and the parts were easily  
74 replaceable. The canopy was a clear, tempered glass and was very strong. The wind  
75 screens were freestanding but supported themselves on the concrete, so they could  
76 be positioned wherever desired.
- 77 • Circulation for people getting on and off the bus was a concern, so the windscreens  
78 were located so as not to interfere with those movements. Many people get off of the  
79 bus and check the transit tracker display to determine whether they would wait inside  
80 or outside of the bus shelter.
- 81 • People did not like to be right next to others; they looked for ways to be adjacent but  
82 a little bit separated. Providing a variety of protected areas allows for rider comfort.
- 83 • Windscreen location could be very site-specific and could respond to the winds  
84 coming through downtown Milwaukie.

85 **Mr. Park** discussed the design of the shelter benches. He suggested using the same  
86 benches that had been planned for the Discovery Shelter. The benches could be  
87 installed in pairs or multiples.

- 88 • Typical bus shelters had openings in the front. Typical prevailing wind was expected  
89 to be from east to west, and wind screens would be oriented to accommodate those  
90 patterns.

91 **Ms. Mangle** stated that once the shelter design was chosen, more site-specific wind  
92 pattern analysis could be conducted.

93 **Mr. Park** continued his presentation. The dimensions of the Cantilevered Glass Shelters  
94 were comparable to the dimensions of the Discovery Shelters. The small shelter (with  
95 either design) was about half the size of the large shelter.

96 **Ms. Mangle** noted that in both designs, the lighting was integrated into the structure. On  
97 the Cantilevered Glass Shelters, the columns would be internally lit at night and use LED  
98 lights, which were energy efficient. There would be pedestrian-scale lighting along the  
99 street, and the shelter would have a glow.

100 **Mr. Hastings** added that illumination greatly affects the feeling of safety and security for  
101 riders. The glass roof was treated with a shade co-efficient to cool the waiting area  
102 during the day.

103 **Chair Ives** asked if the wind screens would have a design.

- 104 • **Mr. Hastings** responded that there would be a design of some kind; likely not  
105 pictorial, but a pattern of some sort. Too much pattern could block vision of what is  
106 going on inside or outside of the shelter. The wind screens were easily replaceable if  
107 they were vandalized.

108 **DLC Member Perrault** clarified that the custom-patterned wind screens could be  
109 fabricated for installation in February/March.

110 **Mr. Hemer** clarified that the Cantilevered Glass Shelter was modular and it would be  
111 easy to repair or replace parts as needed, and asked whether the plinth wall would still  
112 be installed, and if the columns needed to be gray.

- 113 • **Ms. Mangle** replied that the plinth wall was no longer needed because the  
114 Cantilevered Glass Shelter was more adjustable than the Discovery Shelter, and  
115 would be installed directly into the concrete.
- 116 • **Mr. Hastings** stated that the columns were stainless steel covered with a  
117 polycarbonate mesh with lighting behind it; it was expensive but very durable. The  
118 rafters were made out of stainless steel as well. The stainless steel could be cleaned  
119 more easily than paint. There was a structural steel assembly that would be painted,  
120 and the Committee could choose a color.

121 **Mr. Hemer** asked whether the honey locust trees to be planted adjacent to the shelters  
122 would drop seeds onto the shelter.

- **Chair Ives** noted that she had suggested zelkova trees as an alternative to the honey locust trees.

**Ms. Mangle** reviewed the customizable components of the Cantilevered Glass Shelters: the wind screen patterns; the color of the steel structural beam; and the type and placement of benches and leaning rails.

- The wind screens are laminated plastic with silk screened designs baked into the center of the plastic panels. The design could be colored or neutral.
- The steel structural beam could be painted the color the Committee had chosen for the Discovery Shelter roof.
- The Committee could choose whether and where leaning rails would be installed and the style and number of benches.

**Ms. Mangle** requested Committee support of the staff proposal to choose the Cantilevered Glass Shelter for the Jackson Street project.

**Ms. Wisner** stated that she felt the shelter design was acceptable as long as the prevailing winds were considered in the placement of the wind screens.

**Mr. Hemer moved to support the staff recommendation for the Cantilevered Glass Shelter. Mr. Perrault seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.**

**Ms. Mangle** stated that staff would investigate design options for the benches and windscreens, and communicate with the Committee via email over the coming month. A special meeting could be set to discuss these options, if desired by the Committee members.

#### **b. Design Review procedures discussion**

**Ms. Mangle** provided an overview of previous discussions about the City's design review procedures and the role of the Committee.

- The Planning Department was in the midst of a "development review tune-up", which would update the City's development review procedures and processes. There was some duplication of staff effort and confusion about public notice requirements in the design review process.

- The City's goal was to streamline the process, utilize the Committee as effectively as possible, utilize City resources as effectively as possible, and make sure design review was effective and resulted in better projects.
  - Currently, the Committee was an advisory group to the Planning Commission for design review. It did not have a formal role in historic resources review, but staff practice had been to bring those applications before the Committee as well.
  - Currently, the Committee is only involved in design review as part of a minor quasi-judicial application.
  - Staff direction was to look at all alternatives, from recommending abolishing the Committee to recommending the Committee become a commission. Staff was recommending a middle ground, which was to suggest making the Committee an advisory committee to the Planning Director. That option would allow the Committee to get involved much earlier in the process, would free the Committee up to have more creative conversations about the application, and would reduce duplication of staff effort.
  - There was no design review process in place for commercial buildings outside of downtown; those projects went straight to a building permit. As part of the tune-up project, the City would create a development review application. The next step would be to adopt design standards for residential and commercial development.
- Mr. Hemer** agreed that the Committee would have more influence if they were involved from early on in the project, perhaps at 20% design rather than 70% design.
- Chair Ives** agreed and added that the Committee should retain the ability to influence projects that come before it.
- Ms. Mangle** clarified that as an advisory group, the applicant would be required to meet with the Committee but that it would be a public meeting rather than a public hearing. The Committee would make recommendations to the Planning Director rather than the Planning Commission.
- As an advisory group, meetings with the applicant could happen earlier in the process and could be more informal.
  - Committee members have expressed frustration at seeing projects so late in the design process and its limited ability to make adjustments to the design.



182 **Ms. Wisner** clarified that as an advisory group, the applicant would meet with the  
183 Committee earlier in the process and asked what the role of the Committee would be in  
184 later stages of the project.

- 185 • **Ms. Mangle** stated that the role of the Committee would depend on the complexity of  
186 the project. Some projects might need only one meeting with the Committee; some  
187 might need additional meetings.

188 **Ms. Wisner** clarified that the Committee would no longer recommend findings and  
189 conditions to the Planning Commission.

- 190 • **Ms. Mangle** explained that the meetings would be informal and the Planning staff  
191 would integrate the Committee's suggestions into the staff report for the Planning  
192 Commission. Staff would not prepare findings for the Committee. This would allow  
193 staff to more comfortably meet the State's 120-day land use decision deadline.

194 **Ms. Wisner** noted that she found the staff findings very helpful because she looked to  
195 the Planning Department to be the experts regarding the criteria to be met. Staff sends  
196 up the red flags about what the Committee should review. She questioned whether the  
197 Committee would be able to do its job as well without that level of information.

198 **Mr. Hemer** noted that the Committee is currently advisory to the Planning Commission  
199 but did not have the final say about whether to approve a project. Meeting with  
200 applicants earlier in the process would allow the Committee to provide more input  
201 regarding color, details, and other design features.

202 **Ms. Wisner** expressed concern that the role of the Committee in the design review  
203 process had not yet been defined and suggested that the Committee remain an advisory  
204 committee to the Planning Commission but add a meeting earlier in the process.

205 **Ms. Mangle** noted that the City could strongly suggest a meeting with the Committee  
206 early in the process, similar to the suggestion to meet with the NDAs.

- 207 • The other issue with the process was that design review decisions are generally  
208 decided at the Committee meetings even though the code did not contain provisions  
209 for public notifications of those meetings.

210 **Chair Ives** suggested that when a downtown property owner came to the Planning  
211 Department with a proposal for a new building, their first stop should be the Committee.

Staff should suggest items to present to the Committee so it can comment on the choices.

- Felt rushed by the need to remain within the 120-day clock when the applicant did not present the materials needed for the Committee to make its condition.

**Mr. Hemer** noted that if the Committee remains advisory to the Planning Commission, they were required to follow the Downtown Design Guidelines and did not have the ability to make comments about specifics of the project. If it was involved earlier in the project, comments and input could be more wide-ranging.

**Ms. Wisner** noted that the design guidelines are flexible and gave the Committee the responsibility for ensuring that new design was sensitive to Milwaukie's character. Members could use good judgment and discernment to shape projects under review.

- Agreed that the Committee should come in earlier in the process, but would not want to be deprived of staff findings. The findings educated the Committee about the application and allowed them to perform their roles more effectively.

**Ms. Mangle** suggested there may be a simplified version of the findings to provide an outline of how the application met the design standards and guidelines.

**Mr. Hemer** suggested that a Committee member should attend Planning Commission hearings where design review applications are scheduled and explain the Committee's recommendation to the Commission.

**Chair Ives** asked if there was a timeline for making changes to the design review process.

- **Ms. Mangle** stated that the decision about the procedures would need to be made very soon, but there would be another opportunity to review the procedures with the downtown code "refresh" project in 2011. Small clarifications and changes could be made with the development procedures project, such as public notification requirements for Committee meetings.

**Mr. Hemer** suggested the Committee meet twice per year as a Historic Resources Commission.

- **Ms. Mangle** noted that the Committee does not currently have any role in historic preservation applications, although she did not know why.

- The Committee could act as both the Design and Landmarks Committee, in an advisory design review capacity, and the historic resources commission, as a decision-maker on historic preservation applications.

- **Ms. Wisner** noted that if they were members of a commission, they would have additional personal reporting requirements.

**Ms. Mangle** stated that she appreciated the discussion, and felt there was more work to do. She would not recommend any change to the Committee's role right now. The Development Review Procedures code amendments would be limited to clarifying the existing process. Staff would send the proposed Committee-related code changes to the Committee before the application moved forward for adoption by City Council.

## 5. APPLICATION REVIEW ITEMS—NONE

## 6. OTHER BUSINESS

### a. Next meeting

The November 24, 2010, meeting was cancelled.

**Ms. Mangle** suggested the Committee members attend the November 15, 2010, light rail design meeting in lieu of the regularly-scheduled Committee meeting.

The next meeting was to be scheduled via e-mail for early December.

## 7. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

---

Becky Ives, Chair

**DRAFT CHAPTER 19.1000**  
**REVIEW PROCEDURES AND ADMINISTRATION**

November 9, 2010

2. All exhibits, materials, pleadings, memoranda, stipulations, and motions submitted by any party and reviewed or considered in reaching the decision under review.
  3. The minutes from the original hearing and a detailed summary of the evidence.
- E. The decision of the designated appeal authority for the appeal of a Type III decision shall be the final local decision.

#### **19.1009.6 Remand from the Land Use Board of Appeals**

City of Milwaukie decisions remanded by the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) shall be heard and decided within 90 days from the date of the remand following the procedures of Section 19.1009.

#### **19.1010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETINGS**

The Design and Landmarks Committee shall conduct a design review meeting when required by Section 19.312 for applications in the downtown zones. The meeting shall occur prior to the final hearing before the Planning Commission. Design review meetings provide an opportunity for the Design and Landmarks Committee to hear public comment, evaluate the proposal against relevant approval criteria, and vote on a recommendation to forward to the Planning Commission.

##### **19.1010.1 Responsibility of City for Design Review Meetings**

The city shall:

- A. Schedule land use applications for design review before the Design and Landmarks Committee at the earliest available scheduled meeting. If the Design and Landmarks Committee is unable to schedule a design review meeting with sufficient time for the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing in compliance with the 120-day rule, one of the following shall occur:
  1. The applicant may waive the 120-day requirement per Subsection 19.1001.6.C in order to accommodate Design and Landmarks Committee review of the application.
  2. If the applicant does not waive the 120-day requirement, the Planning Director shall prepare the design review recommendation in lieu of the Design and Landmarks Committee. The Planning Director's recommendation shall satisfy the requirement of Subsection 19.312.7.H.
- B. Provide public notice of the design review meeting per Subsection 19.1010.2.A and B below.
- C. Prepare minutes for the design review meeting that include the Design and Landmarks Committee recommendation and the reasons for the recommendation.

##### **19.1010.2 Design Review Meeting Notice Requirements**

- A. When a design review meeting is required by Section 19.312, the City shall mail written notice of the design review meeting at least 10 days prior to the meeting. The written notice shall be mailed to:
  1. The applicant and/or applicant's authorized representative.
  2. The owner(s) of record of the subject property.
  3. Owners of record of properties located within 300 feet of the perimeter of the subject property.

- B. The public notice shall meet the requirements of Subsection 19.1006.3.D and E.
- C. At least 5 days prior to the design review meeting, notice of the meeting shall be posted on the site by the applicant, and shall remain posted continuously until the meeting. The city shall provide to the applicant at least one sign and the instructions for posting. An affidavit of the posting shall be submitted by the applicant and made part of the file.

#### **19.1010.3 Rules of Procedure**

- A. Design review meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the bylaws and rules of procedure adopted for the Design and Landmarks Committee by City Council. Provisions referenced in Subsections 19.1010.4-12 apply to all design review meetings.
- B. At the commencement of a design review meeting, a statement shall be made to those in attendance that:
  - 1. Lists the applicable approval criteria.
  - 2. States that public comment must be directed toward the applicable approval criteria or other criteria in the Zoning Code or Comprehensive Plan that the person commenting believes is applicable to the proposal.
- C. The design review meeting is not a public hearing, but shall be organized in the following manner:
  - 1. The applicant shall have an opportunity to make a presentation on the proposal.
  - 2. The public shall be allowed to comment on the application.
  - 3. The Design and Landmarks Committee shall deliberate on the application and presentation and shall make findings and a recommendation on the application per Subsection 19.1010.12.
- D. An abstaining or disqualified member of the committee shall be counted for purposes of forming a quorum. If all members of the committee abstain or are disqualified, the Planning Director shall prepare the design review recommendation in lieu of the Design and Landmarks Committee. The Planning Director's recommendation shall satisfy the requirement of Subsection 19.312.7.H.

#### **19.1010.4 Challenges to Impartiality**

- A. A party to a meeting may challenge the qualifications of a member of the committee to participate in the recommendation. The challenge shall state by affidavit the facts relied upon by the challenger relating to a person's bias, prejudgment, personal interest, or other facts from which the challenger has concluded that the member of the committee cannot participate in an impartial manner.
- B. The challenged person shall have an opportunity to respond orally and in writing to the challenge. The challenge shall be incorporated into the record of the meeting.

#### **19.1010.5 Participation by Interested Officers or Employees**

No officer or employee of the city who has a financial or other private interest in a proposal may participate in the recommendation on the proposal.

#### **19.1010.6 Ex Parte Contacts**

Committee members shall reveal any relevant pre-meeting or ex parte contacts at the commencement of the design review meeting. If such contacts have impaired the member's impartiality or ability to vote on the matter, the member shall so state and shall abstain from

voting. In addition, parties who had the communication with the member have the right to rebut the substance of the communication at the commencement of the meeting on the matter.

#### **19.1010.7 Abstention or Disqualification**

Disqualification for reasons other than the member's own judgment may be ordered by a majority of the members of the committee who are present and voting. The member who is the subject of the motion for disqualification may not vote on the motion.

#### **19.1010.8 Burden and Nature of Proof**

The applicant shall bear the burden of proof and persuasion that the proposal is in compliance with applicable provisions of this code. The applicant and any opponents may submit a set of written findings or statements of factual information which are intended to demonstrate the proposal complies or fails to comply with any or all applicable standards and criteria.

#### **19.1010.9 Continuance of Meeting**

A. A design review meeting may be continued if the Planning Director determines that there is sufficient time to hold a continued meeting before the Design and Landmarks Committee and a public hearing before the Planning Commission within the required 120-days or if the applicant waives the 120-day requirement per Subsection 19.1001.6.C. as necessary, and in the following circumstances:

1. At the request of the applicant.
2. By action of the Design and Landmarks Committee if a continuance is found by the Committee to be necessary to receive pertinent reports from other agencies or departments.
3. By the Design and Landmarks Committee if the applicant does not object.

B. Design review meeting continuance proceedings shall be per Subsection 19.1008.10.

#### **19.1010.10 Design Review Recommendation**

Following the close of the public portion of the design review meeting, the Design and Landmarks Committee shall prepare a written report to the Planning Commission that recommends either approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the application.

A. The written recommendation shall contain the following:

1. The applicable approval criteria against which the application was reviewed.
2. A statement of the facts that were relied upon to determine whether the application satisfied or failed to satisfy each applicable approval criterion.
3. The decision to recommend approval or denial of the application, and, if the recommendation is for approval, any recommended conditions of approval. Recommended conditions of approval shall ensure conformance with the applicable approval criteria and development standards and mitigate the anticipated impacts, if any, of the proposal.

B. The recommendation of the Design and Landmarks Committee will be forwarded to the Planning Commission, which shall consider the recommendation and integrate it with the land use application process applicable to the proposal.

C. Design and Landmarks Committee recommendations are not appealable.

**19.1010.12 Record of Proceedings**

The City shall prepare and maintain minutes of all proceedings in accordance with the bylaws adopted for the Design and Landmarks Committee.

DRAFT