

City Council Chamber
200 Old Bernal Avenue, Pleasanton, CA 94566

DRAFT

Wednesday, July 22, 2015

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of July 22, 2015, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Allen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Allen.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Jennifer Wallis, Associate Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Jack Balch, David Nagler, Greg O'Connor, Gina Piper, and Herb Ritter

Commissioners Absent: None

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. June 24, 2015

Commissioner Balch noted that in the first and second paragraphs of page 10, Mr. Tassano referred to two slides regarding traffic count options and requested that the respective slides be inserted following those paragraphs.

Commissioner Piper referred to the second sentence of the third full paragraph on page 14 and commented that it was not clear whether Mr. Frost was speaking about his own credentials or those of the Commissioner who provided a Wikipedia definition of "structure."

Commissioner Piper noted a typographical error in the fourth paragraph of page 42 and requested that the second “more” be deleted from the sentence to read as follows: “Commissioner Nagler addressed Commissioner Piper, stating that from what he has heard from her, it is more ~~the more~~ the interpretation that a road is a structure....”

Chair Allen requested the following changes:

- Modify the first sentence of the fifth paragraph on page 35 to read as follows “Chair Allen stated that she too has struggled with this and that she argued with herself on both sides.”
- Modify the second sentence of the first paragraph on page 36 to read as follows: “She indicated that she was almost there in terms of saying she could live with the vagueness in Measure PP ~~and that it was~~ since roads were not defined.”
- Modify the second sentence of the second paragraph on page 36 to read as follows: “She further stated that there are a couple of people ... their intention was to preclude roads like Oak Grove and roads that ~~go up~~ can be seen by the general public.”
- Replace the second “that” with “this” in the third paragraph on page 36 to read as follows: “Chair Allen stated that she truly believes that the intent of most people would be that ~~that~~ this road would be all right; but the language that is written....”

Commissioner Balch moved to approve the Minutes of the June 24, 2015 Meeting, as amended.

Commissioner Piper seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Balch, Nagler, O’Connor, and Piper

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Commissioner Ritter

RECUSED: Commissioner O’Connor on Item 6.a.

ABSENT: None

The Minutes of the June 24, 2015 were approved as amended.

b. July 8, 2015

Commissioner Ritter moved to approve the Minutes of the July 8, 2015 Meeting, as submitted.

Commissioner Piper seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Nagler, O’Connor, Piper, and Ritter

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Commissioner Balch

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: None

The Minutes of the July 8, 2015 were approved as submitted.

3. **MEETING OPEN FOR ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON ANY ITEM WHICH IS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

There were no members of the audience wishing to address the Commission.

4. **REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Adam Weinstein advised that there were no revisions to the Agenda.

5. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved, or adopted by one motion unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from the Planning Commission or a member of the public by submitting a speaker card for that item.

There were no items for consideration under the Consent Calendar.

6. **PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS**

- a. **P15-0290, Alok Damireddy Ventures, LLC**
Application for Design Review approval to construct three apartment units and related site improvements behind the existing dwelling located at 4745 Augustine Street. Zoning for the property is RM-1,500 (Multi-Family Residential), Downtown Revitalization, and Core Area Overlay District.

Jennifer Wallis presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Commissioner Balch inquired if the window that will remain as shown in the revised place for the first building will be a frosted window.

Ms. Wallis replied that it is a window for the restroom, which is typically at a higher level so people are not going to be looking down and out of it. She added that it is currently not required to be frosted but could technically be frosted.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Alok Damireddy, applicant, stated that he is the President of this company and would like to defer his comments to after hearing the opposition's testimony.

Ed Cintrone, neighbor, stated that he is the third generation of the family who has lived in the next-door house that has been there for 100 years, and they have always had a view of the ridge. He indicated that the he is not opposed to the back unit of the proposed project, but the two-story front unit is an eyesore that eliminates quite a bit of light, looks down at the two bedrooms and a bathroom of his house, and completely

blocks his view of the ridge. He noted that this huge unit is so close to the back of the existing house and inquired what the distance between the two structures is, adding that there are no other units fronting the street that are that close. He indicated that there are only two homeowners on this whole street and he is one of them; all the others are renters who come in and out and will not always be looking at this big structure 24/7.

Dana Cintrone, neighbor, stated that the privacy issue is one aspect, but the fact that they are being enclosed and their view that has been there forever is being obscured are a little hard to handle, based on the fact that this new building was never meant to be there. She noted that another aspect is parking in one's own designated parking spot. She pointed out that theirs is a unique little street on which even renters park and which has no street parking available during the Alameda County Fair or some other special events. She added that parking would then be on Old Bernal Avenue which has only a few spots, so parking will become a hardship with this proposal. She suggested that there be only two instead of three structures and that they be placed in the back. Finally, she stated that there is talk about renting to low-income people, but she pointed out that these units will rent for \$3,000-\$5,000 a month, which is the owner's prerogative and over which there is no control.

Francisco Matos, Architect/SF, project architect, stated that he is very happy to be able to present this project to the City and that they made a real effort from the start to address the height concerns. He noted that he and his client have worked with Planning staff to reduce the height of the building with the intent of minimizing the building's impact, but at the same time complying with the City General Plan to bring housing to the Downtown.

Mr. Cintrone stated that he wanted to echo his wife's comments about their street, noting that Harrison Street and Augustine Street are probably the two narrowest streets in Pleasanton. He pointed out that there are other apartments down the street with cars parked out on the street, and vehicles have to pull over to allow another car to go by. He added that there are speeders in the morning trying to get children to school. He indicated that this is really tough, and adding more cars is asking for trouble as it is just too narrow of a street.

Mr. Damireddy stated that he is pretty sensitive to the neighbors' privacy concerns, noting that this lot has a density of about five units, and he is intentionally proposing a total of only four units. He further noted that the property currently has no parking, and he is proposing six parking spots as per the Zoning Code regulations. In response to Mr. Cintrone's question regarding the distance between the buildings, he stated that the setback between the existing home and Building 1 is five feet and two inches. He addressed Commissioner Balch's question regarding a frosted window in the restroom and indicated that it could be arranged. He stated that he has been a long-time resident of Pleasanton, that he likes the Downtown and would like to have the units so people can come in and enjoy the Downtown as well. Finally, with respect to rental rates, he noted that they are much lower than the stated \$3,000 or \$4,000 a month, and added that one of his tenants is in the audience and can speak to that.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Allen asked Ms. Wallis to talk about what the original proposal was and what was done to protect the neighbors' view and privacy concerns in terms of removing a window so it would not be looking into the neighboring home.

Ms. Wallis displayed the slide showing the original and proposed structures, and referring to the drawing of the original proposal, pointed to the double window on the upper right-hand corner on the north elevation, which would be in the bedroom of Building 1; and then pointed to the double French doors with single windows on each side on the bottom left-hand corner on the west elevation on top of the balcony. She then referred to the revised plans showing that the window has been removed from the upper right-hand corner of the north elevation, leaving only one window on the west elevation, which had to be enlarged to meet building, light, and ventilation requirements.

Chair Allen inquired if this new design would then preclude someone from looking into the neighboring home.

Ms. Wallis replied that it was the assumption as the neighbors' home lines up with the existing home on this site so it would be farther back; the balcony is towards the center of the property, and somebody standing on the balcony would not be able to look directly around this building and down onto this house. She added that the only other location that people potentially could look out would be from the bedroom window or as they are walking up the stairs into their front door.

Mr. Weinstein stated that Ms. Wallis and other staff worked extensively with the applicant to revise the initial iteration of the project that was submitted, which actually was a three-story building where Building 1 is right now. He added that the buildings are substantially reduced in mass from what was initially proposed.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if that three-story configuration would have met the height requirement.

Mr. Weinstein replied that the height requirement is 40 feet. He stated that there are policies in the Downtown Specific Plan that suggest that buildings should be two stories in height at max, and this building at 20 feet here is well below that 40 feet maximum height.

Commissioner Ritter noted that it sounds like the issue with the neighbors' concern is mostly Building 1. He inquired if there are any restrictions for the applicant to build a second story on the existing house as well.

Ms. Wallis replied that there are currently no restrictions to build a second story due to the parking requirements and Conditions of Approval that require the existing home to maintain a maximum of two bedrooms; hence, the applicant could technically add onto the first home, but they could not add bedrooms.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if that is the reason the applicant is doing Building 1 instead of making their existing house bigger.

Ms. Wallis said yes.

Mr. Weinstein added that there is also a policy in the Specific Plan that promote retention of the existing streetscape as well, and so keeping the one single-story single-family residential building in the front of the project site is something that achieves that policy.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if that policy is mandatory or recommended.

Mr. Weinstein replied that it is actually in the Downtown Design Guidelines.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired, for clarification, if the applicant would have been able to add a bedroom to the original house if he did not build the first building behind the house, as they could have the same number of bedrooms in total.

Ms. Wallis said yes.

Commissioner Balch inquired whether that was discussed as an option when staff was working with the applicant on the revised plan.

Ms. Wallis replied that it was just discussed with respect to reducing the massing down to two stories but was not necessarily in relation to the total number of bedrooms or units.

Commissioner Ritter stated that it sounds like the applicant wants to rent it out as a rental unit and keep it separate from the house.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that this is probably the only option he can think of that would preserve the view towards the center of the property.

Commissioner Balch noted that the street view would have changed, and the desire is not to change.

Commissioner Piper inquired if the applicant could just do a one-story unit, punch out the back to make the house larger with more bedrooms and add a garage, and then keeping the integrity of that whole front unit intact as one single-story larger home.

Ms. Wallis replied that was potentially possible.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if that was considered by staff when the project came forward, trying to preserve the viewscape by some options other than a two-story building there.

Ms. Wallis said no, not specifically so.

Commissioner Balch stated that he can count eight bedrooms on the entire parcel: two in the initial house, one in Building 1, and two in each of Building 2 and 3. He asked staff if that was correct.

Ms. Wallis replied that they are separate bedrooms and that the bedrooms in the existing home will be reduced from three to two.

Commissioner Balch noted that there are six on-site parking spaces, so one person is definitely parking on the street perceivably.

Ms. Wallis said yes.

Chair Allen noted this would be the case if all bedrooms were used by independent people. She added that she was surprised to see the zoning requirement of 1.5 cars for a two-bedroom unit but that one and two bedrooms are probably being blended and ends up using 1.5 as the average.

Commissioner Balch commented that it could be a child.

Ms. Wallis stated that parking requirements in the Downtown Specific Plan Core Area actually have reduced parking requirements than elsewhere in the City because housing units and walkability are being encouraged in the Downtown.

Commissioner Piper referred to the applicant's statement that there is currently no existing parking on-site and inquired if that is accurate and if that is because there is a whole huge lot to park in.

Ms. Wallis replied that there is a driveway but no garage or covered parking; there would just be open parking in the back. She added that there is no parking on the street as well.

Commissioner Piper commented that there certainly is a lot of space for parking currently. She then stated that she appreciates Ms. Cintrone's statement about low-income because these are certainly not low-income units, which she believed was the intent here. She commented that what the applicant probably meant was that these would be smaller units and, therefore, would fetch a smaller amount of rent. She asked staff if that was correct.

Mr. Weinstein said yes, that it is a conjecture. He explained that there is this concept called "design for affordability," and what staff has typically seen in the City in looking at rents versus apartment sizes is that there is a correlation between apartment size and cost. He noted that it is not always direct and not always consistent for every single apartment built in the City, but generally, the smaller the unit, the cheaper the rent will be.

Commissioner Piper noted that Downtown Pleasanton is an exception.

Mr. Weinstein replied that smaller units in Downtown will typically be less expensive than bigger units.

Commissioner Piper noted that it makes sense. She then stated, for the record, that it is quite a narrow street and that when she drove by the subject property, she actually did have to pull over in order to allow another car to pass so.

Commissioner Balch stated that he is not hung-up on the parking issue – seven bedrooms with six on-site parking with one person parking directly on the street; but he is toying with the idea of looking into punching out the back and reducing the massing on Building 1 to promote harmony in the neighborhood. He noted that he does not think it is required but that he can see it as a possibility.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he does not have a problem with the parking either, but wished there had been a little more investigation into preserving the view within the property. He indicated that he understands the applicant meets the requirements but he is trying to be sensitive to the neighbors to keep the views while preserving the same number of bedrooms. He added that he is generally not in favor of continuance for these things but that he would certainly be open to it for this project if it has not been considered.

Chair Allen stated that she is exactly in the same place: parking is fine, but clearly there are options that are worthwhile to explore and should be explored. She added that she believes it is worthwhile to take the time to look at other options since there is no precedent of three units on these buildings that she has seen on Augustine Street as she drove by; this is a different design than what the City has had before and potentially sets a precedent that could cause some long-term impacts in other situations.

Commissioner Ritter stated that Building 2 looks fine, but he has a little bit of struggle with Building 1 and how it connects or attaches next to the existing house. He noted that it looks like it was not designed together, and from a flow standpoint, it just sort of pops out. He indicated that he wants to support the applicant in getting that space so he could rent it because it is per the Code and they actually have the right to do that on their own property, but he would like to have a little better integration between the existing house and Building 1.

Commissioner Piper stated that her thoughts are similar to those of the rest of the Commissioners. She indicated that she would like to see a change on Building 1 to be sensitive to the neighbors and their views for many, many, many years. She added that she was fine with the parking because it is conforming, although she assumes and feels in her heart that parking spaces are being lost, not gained, with this plan, as residents are being added, and with units that small, her experience has been that people use the garage as storage, so they are not actually parking in the garage and but on the street.

Commissioner Balch stated that he thought about the garage storage as well and inquired if the garages are all connected.

Mr. Weinstein replied that he believes there are no dividing walls. He noted that Condition No. 11 requires that the parking spaces in the garage be maintained for parking and would need to be enforced by the property manager. He added that this is a standard condition that is imposed on projects where there might be a parking constraint and the potential for garages to be used for storage.

Commissioner Piper noted that she sees that in almost every CC&Rs that she reads, but it is just not the reality.

Commissioner Nagler stated that he does not have anything to add to what has already been mentioned. He indicated that the Commissioner's direction to ask for more work to be done is appropriate. He added that it struck him, as he was going through this, that Building 1 begs the question of how set the Commission is on the requirement of maintaining the street view as compared to maintaining the neighbor's view. He noted that it is a trade-off and that he is fine with it if it requires more deliberation.

Commissioner Balch commented that it would be interesting to know if the Commission is willing to possibly sacrifice a parking spot to preserve a view.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he would not have a problem with that. He noted that there are a lot of Downtown properties that have two- and three-bedroom homes with one-car garages. He stated that as far as maintaining the street views, the Commission is talking about the possibility of a second story and finding no change in the street view. He added that the street view changes by putting a second story directly behind the home as it is only five feet behind the home.

Commissioner Balch commented if the street view is going to be lost anyway, it might be well to lose it a lot and get what is needed to please more people.

Commissioner Nagler commented that if the Commission is agreeable that the number of total units proposed is acceptable, that is, four units with two bedrooms each, extending the existing building and remaining a one-story building by definition would make parking pretty difficult because there is only so much of a footprint that is extended to the rear. He indicated that he is not sure if it is even the Commission's place to suggest this, but clearly the problem would be solved if the existing home were torn down and a front unit were built that replicated Building 2; Building 1 would become a mirror image of what is being proposed as Building 2, and four two-bedroom units each with a total of six parking stalls would be maintained. He reiterated that he is obviously not proposing that the Commission adopt this, but again, if this item is going to be continued, then this is an idea to be considered.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired, for verification purposes, if the proposal is for the front house to have two bedrooms, the first building to have one bedroom, and the two buildings in the back to have two bedrooms each, for a total of seven bedrooms. He noted that the existing home currently has three bedrooms, and if the first building behind was eliminated and the building in the back remained with four more bedrooms, there would still be seven bedrooms, even with the elimination of a building, and there would still be the separate unit.

Commissioner Nagler noted that this would be the architect's task, and because there could be a variety of issues, he believes the item should probably be continued.

Commissioner O'Connor agreed that he does not want the Commission to be designing this but that he would like the applicant to further explore what to do to maintain the view.

Chair Allen stated that what she is hearing is that the Commission wants to give staff the flexibility to try and maintain the view while retaining the goals of the applicant, with the option of potentially swapping a parking spot, and the concept of moving the first building from a single-story to a two-story with a good nice design.

Mr. Weinstein advised that it would be good to establish some sort of timeline as well.

Commissioner Balch proposed 60 or 90 days.

Commissioner O'Connor that would give the applicant sufficient time to work with staff.

Mr. Weinstein replied that 90 days might be appropriate.

Commissioner Balch moved to continue Case P15-0290 and directed the applicant to work with staff to address the neighbors' view concerns and to bring back the proposal to the Planning Commission within 90 days.

Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Balch, Nagler, O'Connor, Piper and Ritter

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: None

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

No discussion was held or action taken.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION/INFORMATION

a. Future Planning Calendar

Downtown Parking

Commissioner Balch stated that at a recent Commission meeting when the Downtown parking survey or the Downtown parking element was brought up, he had asked when the last time was that staff did the survey, and staff had replied that it was getting a little long in the history. He asked the Commissioners if they would support asking staff to re-conduct a Downtown parking survey.

Mr. Weinstein explained that it would need to be a City Council priority and that it is still something the Commission could recommend to the Council as a priority.

Commissioner Balch asked staff to remind the Commission when the time comes to recommend priorities so the Commission can consider recommending this as something it would wish to look at doing.

Mr. Weinstein said yes. He added that another thing to keep in mind is that the City is going to be hiring a consulting firm to look at developing a new parking supply in Downtown and elsewhere, and as part of that, there will be some kind of study about the demand for parking currently in Downtown to ascertain where the appropriate locations are for parking and how the existing demand can be met. He added that some of the concerns Commissioner Balch is expressing could be addressed in that study as well.

Lund Ranch II Project

Commissioner Balch stated that he was not at the last Commission meeting, but the Commissioners were talking about what they would like to see come before the Commission when the Lund Ranch II project comes back for consideration. He indicated that he understands that staff probably has a laundry list of things to be brought back to the Commission, but he is formally requesting that staff also give the Commission an example of how much 11,000 cubic yards of dirt is.

Commissioner Piper requested verification that the next Planning Commission meeting is on August 12th, which is actually three weeks away.

Mr. Weinstein replied that is correct.

Commissioner Balch indicated that he will not be at that meeting.

Commissioner Piper inquired if the Agenda for that meeting will include the Lund Ranch II item.

Commissioner Balch said no.

Mr. Weinstein confirmed that the Lund Ranch II item is scheduled for the second meeting in August, August 26th. He indicated that there is currently at least one item scheduled for the August 12th meeting: the Ponderosa Centerpointe project at Valley Avenue and Busch Road for 27 single-family residential units and a Conditional Use Permit for changes in operation at an existing school on the site.

Commissioner Ritter stated that at the last Commission meeting where not all the Commissioners were present, he mentioned that for the Lund Ranch II project, granted that his vote is an opinion, he would hope that staff would come with something based on the feedback at the last meeting at which the proposal was considered, to maybe modify or change where the Commission could get more than a 3-2 vote because it is also going before the City Council, who will be deciding the net end.

Mr. Weinstein replied that staff can continue exploring that and that he did discuss that specific issue with Assistant City Manager Brian Dolan, who is managing this proposal. He indicated that the direction staff will wind up going in is retaining the existing staff recommendation, the intention behind which was to split the pain between the various neighborhoods. He noted, however, that there are lots of options to balance and issues that surround the Lund Ranch II project, and all of them have merit: some with more environmental merit than others, while others might be more protective of the existing

neighborhoods. He pointed out that the Planning Commission, as an independent body, should feel very free to explore and endorse any recommendation for the project that it deems fit, which might also be completely different than staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Ritter stated that the City Council will be doing the same thing, and his opinion is that this should just go straight to the City Council; he will state his opinion then, and the net result would still be the same. He added that he would hate to see City residents going through the whole thing before the Commission, and then do it again for the City Council, when the Council has the ultimate vote anyway.

Mr. Weinstein explained that the application needs to go back to the Planning Commission because of the 2-2 split-vote, and there is no way to avoid having it come back to the Commission.

Commissioner Nagler stated that one of the central items discussed at that Commission hearing was if there were to be a road up the hillside to connect into the Sycamore heights area, how might that road be constructed: retaining wall vs. no retaining wall; thousands of cubic square feet removed vs. not thousands of cubic square feet removed; and so forth. He indicated that it may be instructive if the Commission could have a couple of alternative drawings, plans, and conceptual ideas about how a road might connect between Lund Ranch II and Sycamore. He added that it may not persuade anyone's vote but it could be informative if the Commission knew what kind of retaining wall was required to minimize the amount of cubic feet of dirt that would need to be moved.

Mr. Weinstein noted that it is a good point to get some images and at least some conceptual plans for that roadway, and showing the extent of retaining walls and grading and so forth might be helpful. He indicated that staff can try to work with the applicant's team on that. He noted, however, that, as can be imagined, the applicants are a little reluctant to do a lot of design work for that road since that is not the option that they are endorsing.

Chair Allen noted that at the last meeting, she asked a very specific question regarding whether there be access from Sunset Creek Way to the Lund Ranch site that did not exceed 25 percent, and the answer was no. She indicated that what she really should have asked and intended to ask was if there was any possibility of access anywhere from the Sycamore Sunset Creek general vicinity into Lund Ranch that would not exceed 25 percent.

Mr. Weinstein replied that staff can bring some answers back regarding that as well.

b. Actions of the City Council

Mr. Weinstein stated that at yesterday's City Council meeting, the Council approved a Youth Commission recommendation that would ban smoking in City parks and public trails. He noted that the Youth Commission did a really fantastic job with the presentation.

Commissioner Balch stated that smoking at the golf courses is still permitted.

Mr. Weinstein confirmed that smoking cigarettes at the golf course is still allowed.

c. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No discussion was held or action taken.

d. Matters for Commission's Information

League of California Cities Conference

Chair Allen stated that she received a brochure on this year's conference sponsored by the League of California Cities at the San Jose Convention Center. She indicated that she attended last year and heard from experts in the field on matters such as housing element strategy, water use strategy, building design, and other areas of interest. She noted that it was also an opportunity to network and asked the Commissioners to check it out and see if this is something they would be interested in. She added that the City will cover registration, meals, and mileage reimbursement. She asked staff to provide the Commissioners with copies of the brochure.

Mr. Weinstein stated that the League of California Cities is an awesome organization and encouraged the Commissioners to attend the conference.

American Planning Association California Chapter Conference

Mr. Weinstein stated that the American Planning Association (APA), which is sort of the pre-eminent Planning association in the United States, is also having its conference in Oakland this October and is something the Commission is also encouraged to attend. He indicated that it is a good opportunity to see what is happening in the State, as well as best practices and how other cities are dealing with some of the problems Pleasanton is dealing with in terms of affordable housing, urban design, transportation.

Chair Allen requested staff to send out a memo to the Commission confirming that conference fees would be refunded and if there is a minimum amount of time the Commission would be expected to attend in order to get reimbursement.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 8:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Weinstein
Secretary