

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT- Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers, Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Thursday, February 13, 2014
12:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT FONG AT 12: 11 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Scott Sanchez – Zoning Administrator, Tina Chang, Marcelle Boudreaux, Kanishka Burns, Doug Vu, and Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

The Commission will consider a request for continuance to a later date. The Commission may choose to continue the item to the date proposed below, to continue the item to another date, or to hear the item on this calendar.

1. 2013.1791T (A. RODGERS: (415) 558-6395)
AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING CODE, CREATING A NEW BROADWAY ALCOHOL USE DISTRICT, ADDING NEW SECTION 249.66 TO ESTABLISH THE ART AND DESIGN SPECIAL USE DISTRICT AT 1111 EIGHTH STREET [BOARD FILE NO. 13-1120] - Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Chiu amending the Planning Code, by adding a new Section 789, to establish the Broadway Alcohol Restricted Use District on parcels with street frontage on Broadway, between Columbus Avenue and Montgomery Street; amending the Zoning Map, Sheet SU-02, to designate the Broadway Alcohol Restricted Use District; and making environmental

findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1. Preliminary Recommendation: Approval.
(Proposed for Continuance to February 20, 2014)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued Indefinitely
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

2. 2013.0518C (O. MASRY: (415) 575-9116)
2775 VAN NESS AVENUE - at the southwest corner of Lombard Street and Van Ness Avenue, Lot 030 in Assessor's Block 0503 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization** under Planning Code Sections 209.6(b) and 303 to modify an existing wireless telecommunications services (WTS) facility operated by AT&T Mobility. The proposed macro WTS facility would replace (6) panel antennas, with (9) panel antennas; with (3) of the antennas mounted on the uppermost portion of the east facing building facade. Related electronic equipment would be located on the roof and in the parking garage. The facility is proposed on a Location Preference 2 Site (Co-Location) within an RC-3 (Residential – Commercial, Medium Density) District, and 65-A Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
(Proposed for Continuance to February 20, 2014)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to February 20, 2014
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

3. 2013.1529Z (A. STARR: (415) 558-6362)
904 22ND STREET - **Zoning Map Amendment** - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map, to re-zone the property located at 904-22nd Street (Assessor's Block No. 4106, Lot No. 015) from RH-3 (Residential, Housing, Three Family) to UMU (Urban Mixed Use); and making environmental findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Recommendation for Approval
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of December 12, 2013)
(Proposed for Continuance to April 17, 2014)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to April 17, 2014
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

B. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine by the Planning Commission, and may be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this or a future hearing

[2013.1688Q](#)

(T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)

47-49 NOE STREET - the east side of Noe Street between Duboce Street and 14th Street on Assessor's Block 3538, Lot 043 - **Request for Condominium Conversion Subdivision** to convert a three-story, six-unit building within a RTO (Residential, Transit-Oriented Neighborhood) Zoning District, 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
 MOTION: 19077

4. [2013.1828Q](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
624-628 GUERRERO STREET - the west side of Guerrero Street between 18th Street and 19th Street on Assessor's Block 3587, Lot 005 - **Request for Condominium Conversion Subdivision** to convert a three-story, six-unit building within a RM-2 (Residential, Mixed, Moderate Density) Zoning District, 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
 MOTION: 19078

5. [2013.1192Q](#) (K. BURNS: (415) 575-9112)
1541 FILBERT STREET - south side between Van Ness Avenue and Franklin Street; Lot 022 in Assessor's Block 0527 - **Request for Condominium Conversion Subdivision** to convert a three-story over garage, six-unit building into residential condominiums within a RM-2 (Residential-Mixed, Moderate Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to February 27, 2014
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

6. [2013.1817C](#) (M. BOUDREAUX: (415) 575-9140)
1410 OCEAN AVENUE - north side between Miramar and Granada Avenues; Lot 007 in Assessor's Block 3197 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 737.62, to allow a change of use from a vacant retail space to district-serving canine day care facility, regulated as animal hospital, (d.b.a. iPlayBow) within the Ocean Avenue NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Zoning District and 45-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
 MOTION: 19079

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

8. (J. IONIN: (415) 558-6309)

ELECTION OF OFFICERS: In accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the San Francisco Planning Commission, the President and Vice President of the Commission shall be elected at the first Regular Meeting of the Commission held on or after the 15th day of January of each year, or at a subsequent meeting, the date which shall be fixed by the commission at the first Regular Meeting on or after the 15th day of January each year.

(Continued from Regular Meeting of February 6, 2014)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Cindy Wu, President; Rodney Fong, Vice-President
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore
 NAYES: Sugaya

9. Commission Comments/Questions

- Inquiries/Announcements. Without discussion, at this time Commissioners may make announcements or inquiries of staff regarding various matters of interest to the Commissioner(s).
- Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Antonini:

I want to thank everyone, who during my absence due a couple of surgeries for flowers and cards and thinking of me, and to my fellow Commissioners and others on staff for carrying on during what I think was really a great job, and just briefly, the prostate surgery had been planned and the second one was unplanned, but it was discovered after I had some legs numbness, that I had a blockage in one of my carotid arteries and they said you better get surgery pretty quick. So, I said, I'm not arguing with that, so, compliments to both UCSF, Peter Carrol's team and prostate surgery are like best in the Country, and also to Kaiser for spotting the second one and taking care of that. But, I'm back and ready to go. The only thing I'd say is, when your body gives you signs, keep an eye on them because sometimes they are subtle and easy to dismissed, but it's always important to do all the tests, and there is a lot of talk about high cholesterol, but the good cholesterol should be the HDL and mine was not, something to watch. Just a word of wisdom. I did want to comment a little bit on some of the items that were before you during my absence, I'll try to keep this brief because it's supposed to be a short session today, and I don't want to be the longest item on the calendar. I thought the formula retail was absolutely fantastic what the staff is doing. Sorry that Sophie Hayward won't be with us, but she was certainly great during that. It's kind of shocking in a way because historically San Francisco Supervisors have legislated first and obtained details second, and in this case they are doing it this the right way. They are waiting to have studies done by the Planning Department before they pass judgment on formula retail – or further formula retail control modifications. Some great things came out of that, it made no sense to go by supervisorial district, as was well pointed out, the discrepancies between 7 and 4, because of Stonestown, and also the questions were raised by the public I think very appropriately is sometimes formula retail have the ability to hire people

with less training and willing to train them and as a result they may be more inclined to hire some people from disenfranchised and underserved groups and I think Arnold Townsend was particularly eloquent in his presentation of that and I also think setting the bar at a higher level, like 50 or 11 is certainly a case to be made for that and giving special consideration to San Francisco's native born companies is certainly important. One thing that was not brought up, but I brought it up at many hearings in the past, is when we don't have a really popular formula retail in San Francisco, people will travel outside of San Francisco to shop there. We lose the tax revenue, we lose the jobs that will not go to people who are not San Franciscans often if it is located out of here - a classic example at this point I hope we'll get one in the future is an Ikea. I mean my staff almost entirely live in San Francisco, but every time they getting furniture, they are always running to Emeryville or somewhere where they can go to Ikea, because they like the product, and you can't stop people from making choices, but I thought that was wonderful. Another hearing that I thought was really very good, was the hearing on the 280 extension removal, the railroad yard, the DTX, the Caltrain electrification and the Transbay Terminal, and a couple things came out, which I thought were really important, we do need a loop track. Reversing the trains in the station makes no sense. In fact, it seemed to me we disallowed a project some years ago, I think it was Jack Myers Project, specifically because it interfered with the path of the track, so, I'm not quite so sure why a loop track is still being, not part of the package from the very beginning. I think you need a comprehensive plan. That's what's so important. You can't consider all of these things as individual items. You have to make them all work together. To that end, I think a lot of people spoke about the need to use the rail yard possibly for affordable housing. If we can do some there that makes sense. Basically you have to use that site to finance some of the rest of this, because nothing comes from nothing. You gotta be able to utilize these lands that have been re-created to produce the revenue, because I think they have a 3.2 billion dollar price tag on the extension alone. You are talking about a lot of money and it doesn't come out of the sky. Another item was on housing and it was a little bit disappointing to me to hear one of our supervisors, I can't remember who it was, make a remark that if we eliminated the buses for tech workers they'll move down the peninsula, it's sort like that's not the kind of attitude we should have in San Francisco. We should welcoming to all people, even those who may have more talent, may have more income, maybe more independent are not reliable on the City for their benefits so, we should be taking the opposite approach, we should be asking them to get their companies to move up here rather than them to move out of San Francisco. So, I think that's a really important thing and I thought the housing discussions were really good. The one thing that didn't come up is utilizing some of our unused lands. Up to about 1970's we built housing almost everywhere and we sort have stopped, and there aren't lot sites left, but I live on the west side, and there are places by Laguna Honda, there are places on the edges of Twin Peaks, there a lot of opportunity sites where -- the kind of housing for families with children, the one individual houses can be build, you won't build a bunch of them, but you build enough, a few hundreds of them or maybe a thousand, that will stem some of the competition for what is out there right now, and divert these people from converting rental units, to some degree, if they find housing that is appropriate for them. Another idea would be, if this is land owned by the City, if we donated this land to the builder on the condition that the builder reduce the prices to 25-30 percent below market, I think that's a good trade. Because you know, that would be the condition of this kind of land donation, but it would still be market rate housing, but it would be price controlled and I think that would be a really good use of some of these lands. So, the only other thing I wanted to comment on is 300 Post and I was glad to hear that that was approved. I didn't quite follow the whole discussion about the legislative piece. I know there was a reason some people -- some of the commissioners had talked about an SUD possibly, but either way, whether it was done in the format it was proposed or the SUD, that is going to be a precondition, but I guess it's on the plate of the supervisors now, because I didn't really understand the CEQA arguments on that one. Finally on PDR facilitation, I think that was an excellent discussion too, and I think I was questioning, I don't need an answer right now, but why it had to all be above 20th Street, I mean, some arguments were made, there was more transit, we don't want any parking connecting with these, and I think well, you got to be realistic, do one job at a time. If you want to keep PDR, you may have to some of it, which have enough parking for their employees. I think space is a lot cheaper below 20th

Street and I'm not opposed to what's being proposed and I think blending it with office it makes a lot of sense because it will make it work financially, because you will have that component of office, which you will probably be able to command enough to allow for the lower rents for PDR. I think we should be going actively pursuing some of these companies. In fact, I eat a lot of Columbus salami, not just the salami, but the turkey and the cheese, maybe that's one my problems. They proudly say, founded in San Francisco although they are in South San Francisco, and that will be the kind of company, you say, let's make a deal and let's move to move into Bayview, or move into some place in the City, and you don't have to say founded in San Francisco, you can say, you are actually in San Francisco. I think that's important and also a very good piece today by Chuck Nevius and it's talking about radical ideas of helping the homeless. One thing I saw on 60 Minutes, which many of you might have seen, was a discussion about this one hundred thousand homes and what they are doing in Nashville and other cities, is they're actually spending less to house homeless in individual units rather than putting them in shelters or not doing anything with them. They feel it costs them less than what they are doing now. It's certainly food for thought and I wonder how the City is aware of that program and if anybody can comment on that, not right now, but I'm very interested in it. Thank you all for bending your ear for a few minutes now. Hopefully the rest of the hearing will be a little smoother.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

10. Director's Announcements

Director Rahaim:

Good afternoon Commissioners, several of you had asked, the last couple of weeks, about the Mayor's Executive Directive and the response that the Department, as well as, DBI gave to the Mayor. I think Jonas is now passing out copies. We had sent these to you earlier as well. I thought it might be useful to talk about it a couple minutes because; we can certainly calendar it for a robust discussion at a future date. I thought it was useful to talk about it for a couple minutes because several of these items do relate to the Commission as well, and I know you are interested in all of them. As you recall, the Mayor's Directive had three tasks associated with it and what we have done, the two Departments have done, is present a series of short-term solutions that do not require legislation that are almost entirely procedural. We also prepared as a group the Task Force that Tom Hui and I co-chaired, also prepared a series of medium-term and long-term presentations which are separately been transmitted to the Mayor's Task Force which is meeting for the first time on February 25th, that Task Force will be considering a whole range of policy and legislative matters to address this issue of affordable and moderate income housing. With respect to the memo that we sent to the Mayor, that you have dated February 3rd, I thought it would be useful to hit some of the highlights and I'm happy to answer any questions. Although since it's not calendared today we can't have a full blown discussion. The very first item on priority processing we have already sent a memo to staff and revised what is called the Directors Bulletin that identifies projects for priority processing and projects that are entirely affordable or have at least 20 percent on-site or 30 percent off site affordable units will be -- always rise to the front of the cue, if you will, when they come to the Department. Our rough guess is that we'll save 3 to 6 months depending on the project and where is located on the processing. Second item, the Ombudsman, that we mentioned last week during the budget discussions, that we are proposing a position in the Department that is strictly focused on housing. That will of course require the approval of the budget later this year, but that position will focus on both processing of projects through all Departments, as well as, the kind of policy issues, maybe two different people doing do that, but it's a new full time position devoted just to housing. We will be highlighting another item that involves the Commission. The idea that's been put forward to ask the Commission to consider a policy that encourages property owners to maximize density on their sites. That is something, that of course will be brought before for you for your consideration. The Mayor's Executive Directive and the discussions we had with the Task Force raise an interesting issue about illegal units, this No. 6 on the second page. What the proposal is that

we've given the Mayor, is that, to back up, current practice is that when somebody is proposing to remove an illegal unit, the practice has been to encourage the removal of the unit because it is illegal. The new practice will be to take whatever steps we can that are reasonable to make that unit legal. Rather than eliminating the unit. And so we will be working with DBI on that. We have alerted staff to this fact. The default will no longer be to let go of the unit. The default in terms of our practice will be to work with the project sponsor and the property owner to actually make the unit legal. If it cannot be made legal because of cost, because of life safety issues, we would bring that before you as an elimination of a unit, even though it is technically an illegal unit as it is today. That is a change of policy that you will, see as well as, the Department's practice will change to accommodate that change of policy. On the next page, just a couple of highlights, the Housing Element EIR, completion of that will allow us to move forward with a number of housing policies, housing initiatives, so we are anxious to complete that review, as well. We will be working with other Departments to concurrently review projects, as you know most projects, especially new construction require many different agencies to approve them. Rather than have sequential review, we will review projects concurrently. That sometimes creates some problems, if one department wants to change things, but that is the reason for the Ombudsman in the Planning Department to make that that doesn't happen, so this will also save time in the review process as well. A couple of other items to highlight, under Task 2, which specifically addresses the Discretionary Review for loss of housing units, this proposal will essentially bring any unit that is being proposed for elimination to the Planning Commission as a Mandatory DR. Right now, there are certain types of units that do not come to you, this would change that, and essentially allow -- if the building is more than two units it would come to you as a Mandatory Discretionary Review, so you will be seeing some more of these than you today, in your current practice. Finally, under Task 3, the Department -- both departments will review notices from the Rent Board on any projects and proposals for elimination of units or evictions. The proposal at the request of the Mayor is that the Department of Building Inspection will actually go out and review these projects and these buildings for any code violations. There are some issues to work out in terms of the notices and such. The first step will be for the Rent Board to actually give notice to both the Planning Department and to DBI when those evictions happen. That's a quick summary. I probably can answer simple questions, but we are happy to get a calendared hearing as well, for a more robust conversation on this.

11. Review of Past Week's Events at the Board of Supervisors, Board of Appeals and Historic Preservation Commission

LAND USE COMMITTEE:

Landmark Designation for 660 California Street. This property is commonly known as Old St. Mary's Rectory. The designation will change from an "unrated" building to a "contributory" building. The HPC recommended making this change on Nov. 20, 2013. **This week the Land Use Committee made the same recommendation to the Full Board.**

FULL BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

- **Supervisor Wiener's technical amendments to the Transit Impact Development Fee was approved on first reading.** On December 12, 2013, this Commission considered and recommended approval of the proposed ordinance. The proposed ordinance clarifies language regarding fee exemptions, by eliminating project-specific references to redevelopment areas. The existing language would expand to cover all projects subject to a development agreement, redevelopment plan, owner participation agreement, interagency cooperation agreement, or similar document. The ordinance also amends the method and timing of calculating the fee to make it consistent with other development impact fees charged by the City.

INTRODUCTIONS:

140122 Ordinance recognizing Small Business Month in May 2014; amending the Planning Code and the Building Code to retroactively waive fees for the month of May for certain façade improvements. **Supe. Katy Tang**

- **140126** Resolution referring the initiative measure known as the “Waterfront Height Limit Right to Vote Initiative,” to the Port of San Francisco, Planning Department, City Administrator, Controller, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Municipal Transportation Agency, and Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, to report on the measure’s potential impacts, if passed, on the City’s future housing (including affordable housing), infrastructure, transportation, and open space needs, as well as the City’s tax base. **Supe. Scott Wiener**
- **140127** Landmark Designation Nomination— Resolution of intent initiating the nomination of the Giant Sequoia tree at 3066 Market Street for landmark tree status pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810(b), acknowledging the temporary designation of such tree pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810(d), and authorizing other official acts in furtherance of this Resolution. **Supe. Scott Wiener**

Board of Appeals – None

Historic Preservation Commission – None

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT – 15 MINUTES

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. However, for items where public comment is closed this is your opportunity to address the Commission. With respect to all other agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

SPEAKERS: Jordan Engle – Broadway Corridor – Liquor License Moratorium

F. REGULAR CALENDAR

12. [2013.1648C](#) (K. BURNS: (415) 575-9112)
1945 HYDE STREET - between Russell and Union Streets; Lot 002 in Assessor’s Block 0123 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 710.44 and 790.91 to establish a Restaurant (d.b.a. Union Larder) which will operate as a Bona Fide Eating Place in a vacant commercial space. The property is located within a Neighborhood Commercial Cluster District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: + Jay Esopenko – Project description
 + Kathleen Courtney – Additional conditions, garbage, noise, traffic and parking
ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended by Staff
AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
MOTION: 19080

- 13a. [2011.1373CV](#) (D. VU: (415) 575-9120)
4126 17TH STREET - north side between Douglass and Castro Streets; Lot 028 in Assessor's Block 2623 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1(h), 303, and 317(d)(2) to demolish the existing single-family dwelling and construct a three-unit residential building at the front, and a single-family dwelling at the rear of the approximately 5,549 square feet lot. The project site is located within a RH-3 (Residential – House, Three-Family) Zoning District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: + Adam Phillips – Project description
 + Brad Terrell – Project description
 - Bill Lowe - Opposition
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
 MOTION: 19081

- 13b. [2011.1373CV](#) (D. VU: (415) 575-9120)
4126 17TH STREET - north side between Douglass and Castro Streets; Lot 028 in Assessor's Block 2623 - **Request for a Variance** from the rear yard (Planning Code Section 134) and exposure (Planning Code Section 140) requirements to allow a single-family dwelling at the rear of the lot - The project site is located within a RH-3 (Residential – House, Three-Family) Zoning District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: After Closing the Public Hearing, the ZA indicated an intent to Grant

G. PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting with one exception. When the agenda item has already been reviewed in a public hearing at which members of the public were allowed to testify and the Commission has closed the public hearing, your opportunity to address the Commission must be exercised during the Public Comment portion of the Calendar. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a commission from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at public comment. In response to public comment, the commission is limited to:

- (1) responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
- (2) requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
- (3) directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a))

ADJOURNMENT – 1:14 P.M.