



CITY OF  
**PALO  
ALTO**

# Planning & Transportation Commission Action Agenda: December 13, 2023

Council Chambers & Virtual  
6:00 PM

---

## Call to Order / Roll Call

6:00 pm

Chair Summa called to order the December 13<sup>th</sup> Planning and Transportation Commission meeting.

Administrative Associate Ms. Veronica Dao conducted the roll call and announced all commissioners were present except for Commissioner Reckdahl (absent).

## Oral Communications

Chair Summa invited members of the public to share their comments with the Commission on items not on the Agenda.

Ms. Veronica Dao announced there were no speakers for oral communications.

## Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chief Planning Official Amy French announced there were no changes from staff.

## City Official Reports

### 1. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Chief Planning Official Ms. Amy French thanked council for their hard work and representation as they closed out the last PTC meeting of 2023 and reported a change to the scheduled January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting to be held as a Special meeting on January 17, 2024. January 31<sup>st</sup> is a regular meeting and February 12<sup>th</sup> a tentative date for a special meeting with City Council. A Council meeting was held on December 11<sup>th</sup> with the Ellsworth Item. A Council meeting is scheduled for December 18<sup>th</sup> and then Council will be back in the New Year.

Senior Transportation Engineer Mr. Rafael Rius stated that the Charleston Road/Arastradero Road corridor project is still ongoing. They are expecting hardware to arrive for the project to

1 continue at Wilkie Way, where the polls have not yet been activated. Mr. Rius commented that  
2 transportation staff gave information to the PTC at the previous meeting regarding the El Camino  
3 Real repaving and bikeways project and are waiting for a formal response from Cal Trans by their  
4 deadline at weeks end.

5 Commissioner Akin asked for a follow up on his email regarding the Lincoln Middlefield  
6 intersection due to an accident three weeks prior.

7 Mr. Rius responded that he was unaware of the incident but would investigate the matter and  
8 provide an update. Staff have increased sightlines by adding parking restrictions as well as  
9 increasing the red curbs on each of the four corners. Additional pavement markings to highlight  
10 the yellow center lines, along with school zone markings and a special twenty mph school zone  
11 speed limit signs were added.

12 Commissioner Akin commented that there was interest in the neighborhood for turn restrictions,  
13 residents will be anticipating an update on the subject.

14 Vice Chair Chang requested Mr. Rius forward the collision report that Palo Alto Bicycle Advisory  
15 Committee (PABAC) receives. Mr. Rius stated that he would send the report for both September  
16 and October for PTC review as soon as it was available.

17

## 18 **ACTION ITEMS**

19

20 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 949 Scott Street [22PLN-00410]: Request for  
21 Planning and Transportation Commission Hearing Following the Proposed Director's  
22 Decision Approving a Variance application to Allow a New Single-Story, Single-  
23 Family Home with a Basement to Encroach into the Front, Side, and Rear Setbacks  
24 and Deviate from Standards for Below Grade Patio Side and Rear Setbacks, and  
25 Number of Parking Spaces. Zoning District: R-2. Environmental Assessment: Exempt  
26 from the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15303

27 Chair Summa asked the Commission for disclosures and there were none.

28 Commissioner Akin recused himself from the public hearing due to the proximity of his residence  
29 from the project.

30 Planner Garrett Sauls provided an overview of the application for variance for 949 Scott Street  
31 requesting to replace an existing one-story single-family home on a 1,500 square foot parcel with  
32 a new one-story single-family home located near the downtown area. The proposal will result in  
33 the removal of one street tree which will be replaced with two trees, one of which will be off site.  
34 The project also includes variance requests for front, side, and rear yard setback encroachment  
35 for primary home and basement, as well as below grade patio encroachment into side and rear

1 yard setback. A reduction in the number of required parking stalls, where normally two spaces  
2 would be required in the proposed setback. Currently there are no parking spaces provided.  
3 Boundaries to the existing parcel provided by staff were given to the applicants, which identify  
4 how current standard setbacks would be applied to the property based on the R2 zoning District.  
5 Public comments were made regarding the number of variances requested, the aesthetic design  
6 of the proposed building, how the structure will be used, the impact on the existing streets trees  
7 and parking within the area, as well as quality of life during construction, and consistency of the  
8 general plan as well as Senate Bill (SB) 330.

9 Dan Rhoads with Young and Borlik, along with Andrew Young, presented the project updates  
10 originally submitted in December 2022, explaining the three rounds of revision since the project  
11 conception. New concerns filed through an appeal provided an opportunity to revisit  
12 considerations implemented in the project. The task has been to design a modern single family  
13 home, implementing current standards and codes, maintaining safety, energy efficiency while  
14 providing adequate living space and off-street parking. On August 2, a meeting with the Urban  
15 Forestry Division regarding the removal of the street tree determined two replacement box trees  
16 would be placed at the request of the Urban Forestry. Transportation Division expressed  
17 concerns that the proposed parking space was not large enough for a full two-car garage while  
18 neighbors were concerned that the space was too big, a conclusion was reached that an oversized  
19 one-car garage would be sufficient to meet the needs of all parties. An investigation conducted  
20 by the City's firm, Paige & Turnbull, found that the property was ineligible for historic registry,  
21 easing concerns raised on that issue.

22 Commissioner Hechtman inquired if the project required a review by the Architectural Review  
23 Board (ARB). Mr. Sauls responded that ARB did not need to review the application. Once  
24 approved by the City, it would move through the administrative building permit process due to it  
25 being a one-story home.

26 Vice Chair Chang inquired about the 300-foot proximity of one of the trees in which the radius  
27 circle encroaches the basement, and what the tree ordinance requirements are for that. Mr.  
28 Rhoads explained that the ordinance is ten times the diameter of the radius, the arborist reported  
29 they would be using the back property line fence would be the tree protection fence and would  
30 provide a buffer around any potential structural roots.

31 Vice Chair Chang asked if the ordinance would change the requirements for the percentage of  
32 the roots that could be removed. Mr. Sauls commented that 25% was the rule of thumb used by  
33 arborists and Urban Forestry.

34 Vice Chair Chang inquired about SB330 and asked if it requires preservation of number of units  
35 and not bedrooms. Mr. Sauls commented that his understanding was that the number of units  
36 was the threshold change for SB330, and this project is being designed as a 1:1 ratio and does  
37 not quantify a loss of housing.

38 Chair Summa opened Public Comment.

1 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

2 Andrew Martin, a Palo Alto resident, provided comment regarding his concerns for converting a  
3 single-family home into a housing unit and losing the small neighborhood feeling desired by  
4 current residents, as well as the diminishing value of the neighborhood. Mr. Martin was not in  
5 favor of the proposed changes to incorporate a garage because the basement would then  
6 become the living space. He would be in favor of the project if a family could use the property as  
7 a home by omitting the garage. No family is going to want to enter the home from the garage  
8 and live only in the basement.

9 Mr. Rhoads addressed the concerns of Mr. Martin by stating that the proposed plan was to create  
10 a family home to accommodate other family members when visiting and to have the opportunity  
11 to reside next to the family when their children grow up. The plan would encompass a modern,  
12 single-family home with off-street parking while embracing current codes to provide fire  
13 sprinklers, fire resistant construction, with energy efficiency and improves the neighborhood.

14 Chair Summa brought the discussion back to the Commission.

15 Chair Summa commented on the constrained property and expressed concerns of the requested  
16 tree removal is for a protected tree. Mr. Sauls responded that the Urban Forestry Department  
17 reviewed the application and were aware of the arborists report, which is on page 7 of the plan  
18 set, which concluded that the Chinese Elm tree was not a protected tree, but growth could impact  
19 the tree. Chair Summa stated she didn't believe the arborist report was included in their packet  
20 and while the tree might not be a protected tree by type, she believed it was protected by size.

21 Commissioner Hechtman thanked staff for the presentation as well as Mr. Martin for his  
22 correspondence submitted regarding his concerns and was in favor of moving forward with staff's  
23 recommendations; he expressed his approval of attention to design, the modification process  
24 considering space constraints, and acknowledging the right of the homeowner to use the space  
25 as they desire.

26 Vice Chair Chang commented that while the Commission was not allowed to make decisions  
27 based on the use of someone's property, this proposal does require additional variances for the  
28 basement. She noted concern if special privilege was being given while the code specifies that  
29 granting of the application shall not affect substantial compliance with regulations or constitute  
30 a grant of special privileges in the vicinity and in the same zoning district as the subject property.

31 Commissioner Templeton commented that it was difficult to find a reason not to move forward  
32 with the proposal stating that replacing the current old structure with a new modern, efficient  
33 building would enhance the neighborhood in a positive manner and acknowledged the  
34 frustrations of the objectors.

35 Commissioner Lu was in strong favor of any neighbors who would request a similar variance on  
36 similarly small lots to have basements which provides better access the usability of their

1 property. Commissioner Lu stated the variance did not result in risk to the environment and  
2 would vote to move forward with the project.

3 Commissioner Hechtman asked for further interpretation on how the state law findings interpret  
4 the language of privilege as mentioned by Vice Chair Chang.

5 Mr. Yang explained that the variance process is to allow findings where exceptions are present  
6 that most people cannot have, in cases where there is something unique about the property. In  
7 this case it's the size of the lot. Privileges involved are the ability to use this lot for a dwelling unit,  
8 which would not be possible with strict application of the development standards.

9 Vice Chair Chang spoke about the findings and her concerns in terms of a current non-  
10 conformance becoming even more non-conforming. Mr. Yang explained that there were two  
11 separate concepts, a legal non-conforming structure where rules apply to something built and  
12 the rules change so it no longer complies with the rules where changes made if it reduces the  
13 amount of non-compliance. A variance based on the unique properties of the lot is a second  
14 concept used if the existing use is conforming to the existing structure.

15 Vice Chair Chang commented that with SB9 approaching, similar situations would occur and was  
16 in favor of addressing the issue legally rather than setting a precedent while not aware of the  
17 ramifications.

18 Chair Summa stated that due to the delicacy of a variance being a special privilege, an alternative  
19 would be to combine the two properties which would be a better solution ending with the same  
20 result and would not set a precedent for other property owners.

21 Mr. Sauls provided data for relevant Palo Alto parcels affected gathered by geographic  
22 information system (GIS) database concluding after filtering for specific criteria, only two parcels  
23 that were 180 square-feet or less developed as a single-family home.

24 Chair Summa asked if there was interest from the property owners or predecessor in having  
25 made this change. Mr. Sauls indicated that the issue was regarding adjacent parcels 935 and 943  
26 where the parcels merged, while maintaining separation from the proposed property.

27 Ms. French confirmed that the proposed property existed in its current state before 2001 when  
28 the city completed the survey.

29 Chair Summa asked if there was discussion with the applicant about achieving the proposed goal  
30 without the use of a variance and merging the lots.

31 Mr. Sauls stated staff did not discuss merging the adjacent parcel with this parcel.

32 Chair Summa commented that while it would not be fair to ask the applicant to investigate other  
33 avenues, acknowledging the specificity of each project would be unique in each request.

34

1 **MOTION**

2 Commissioner Hechtman motioned to move staff’s recommendations as the variance is site  
3 specific.

4 **SECOND**

5 Commissioner Lu seconded the motion.

6 Chair Summa commented that she is sympathetic to the objections of the neighbors, the PTC has  
7 no legal way to act on those objections.

8 **VOTE**

9 Ms. Dao conducted a roll call which carried 5-0-2

10 **MOTION PASSED 5-0** (Summa, Chang, Hechtman, Lu, Templeton) **2-** (Reckdahl absent and Akin  
11 recused)

12 **Commission Action:** Motion by Commissioner Hechtman, seconded by Commissioner Lu. Motion  
13 Passed 5-0-2 (Reckdahl absent and Akin recused).

14 **The PTC took a brief break and returned with all members present.**

15

- 16 3. Recommendation on an Ordinance Amending Palo Alto Municipal Title 18 (Zoning)
- 17 Chapters 18.14 (Housing Incentives), 18.76 (Permits and Approvals), and 18.77
- 18 (Processing of Permits and Approvals) to Implement Housing Element Program 1.3
- 19 Creating By-Right Zoning Approval for Specific Housing Element Inventory Sites

20

21 Ms. French introduced Coleman Frick, newest staff member of the Planning and Transportation  
22 Commission.

23 Planner Coleman Frick presented the staff report for Implementing Housing Element Program  
24 1.3 specific to By-Right zoning. The program applies to lower income opportunity sites reused  
25 from past cycles and eligibility is based on a proposed development. Sixteen total sites with 20%  
26 affordability, a key requirement. The proposed ordinance would require amendments to Chapter  
27 18.4 (Housing Incentives), Chapter 18.76 (Permits and Approvals) and Chapter 18.77 (Processing  
28 of Permits and Approvals) which would create a new ministerial review process for eligible by-  
29 right projects. The standard process for multi-family review outlined in the code would include  
30 ARB recommendation after multiple meetings and a director level decision where the newer  
31 streamlined review process allows projects that meet objective criteria to enter the process using  
32 one ARB Study. Staff would review the By-Right process to determine the proposed

1 development's eligibility, having to comply with all objective standards in the comp plan as well  
2 as the objective standards in the code, with a referral to ARB for one study session. This program  
3 applies specifically to designated lower income housing opportunity sites that are being recycled  
4 from previous housing element cycles. There are sixteen sites that have been noted as being  
5 impacted. Any proposed development would have to meet all the eligibility criteria. California  
6 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review is not needed for eligible development proposal. Staff  
7 recommends a motion to review and recommend City Council adoption of the draft ordinance to  
8 implement Housing Element Program 1.3 creating By-Right Zoning for approval for specific  
9 housing element inventory sites making conforming changes to Title 18.

10 Commissioner Akin referred to packet page 55 and asked for clarification of the definition of prior  
11 uses in housing elements of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process. Mr. Frick  
12 responded that prior housing elements refer to the most recent housing element for non-vacant  
13 housing and the vacant housing goes back two prior elements.

14 Commissioner Akin asked for clarification of lower income after finding three inconsistent  
15 definitions in the code. Mr. Frick commented that any site designated as one of the lower income  
16 opportunity sites within the Housing Element inventory of the fifth cycle and current cycle.

17 Commissioner Akin asked if the California Department of Housing and Community Development  
18 (HCD) definition of lower income as 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) was specifically used to  
19 determine lower income. Mr. Frick responded that the opportunity sites were based on State  
20 criteria with income thresholds and others are based on density.

21 Commissioner Akin referred to 16.65.020 where there is a 60% limit for lower income and sought  
22 clarity in determining future eligibility.

23 Mr. Yang confirmed that in this case the AMI threshold is 80%.

24 Vice Chair Chang inquired if the site originally designated to accommodate 80% or lower, as well  
25 as 20% of the units, were both referring to the 80% AMI.

26 Mr. Yang confirmed 80% was referring to AMI.

27 Vice Chair Chang asked if the by-right would accommodate the 80-120 range for moderate  
28 income.

29 Mr. Yang commented that it was his understanding that the site would not include moderate  
30 income but would further research the usage of lower income in the housing element law.

31 Vice Chair Chang was in favor of confirming the clarification in the ordinance and inquired about  
32 the reusing a prior element low income site as a By-Right site only if it is upzoned.

33 Mr. Yang explained the state law indicates if a reused site is suitable for low income, the approval  
34 site needs to be zoned through a particular standard and qualifying sites must be approved. The  
35 site would only contain a percentage of lower income housing such as 10%, 15% or 20% when

1 lower income housing is referenced, and needed to be in the current housing element inventory  
2 list to be eligible.

3 Chair Summa opened public comments.

4 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

5 There were no public comments.

6 Commissioner Hechtman inquired if staff had a map of the city indicating the sixteen sites and  
7 inquired if staff had calculated the range of units developed in the next cycle based on the  
8 minimum range and the maximum.

9 Mr. Frick presented a diagram of the site map and Ms. French commented that staff collected  
10 the data available on the spread sheet, but the range would need to be tallied.

11 Commissioner Hechtman referred to 18.14.050 and suggested better clarity on the preface to  
12 reflect that all the requirements need to follow the ordinance, as well as clarification for wording  
13 regarding prior housing element to mean most recent, so as not to cause confusion.

14 Mr. Yang commented that the state law was not clear on wording for prior element and state law  
15 interpreted it as immediately prior.

16 Commissioner Hechtman commented that language from state law was the best option and  
17 inquired if the planning director would make the final decision in the ministerial and by-right  
18 review process in subpart B and subpart C, while abiding by state law and remaining flexible if  
19 state law changes.

20 Mr. Yang confirmed that the planning director would make the final decision in the review  
21 process and that ordinances would not change unless the State's timeline change, adding that  
22 different application types have different processing timelines.

23 Commissioner Hechtman recommended that staff consider clarifying that the Director's ability  
24 to defer to ARB for an informal review does not extend the timeline of the process, and is in favor  
25 of staff's recommendation on the item.

26 Commissioner Lu inquired about the different requirements for vacant versus non-vacant sites.

27 Mr. Frick commented that the more a property is recycled through the elements the less the  
28 State considers it a viable opportunity site, and the non-vacant site was due to the difficulty in  
29 changing a zoning use to redevelop the property.

30 Commissioner Lu asked if there were other options for the ordinance for the By-Right approval  
31 process, or if state law only allows for an ARB review.



1 Mr. Yang commented that the State law directive was clear, the only possible option is to refer  
2 to the ARB.

3 Chair Summa commented that given the lack of opportunity to make changes due to State law  
4 and agreed that vacant and non-vacant prior sites were counterintuitive, and was in favor of the  
5 referral of applicants to the ARB, as they would benefit from their suggestions.

6 Chair Summa allowed for a public comment that had not been previously submitted.

7 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

8 Yugen Lockhart provided public comment regarding the State's requirements for development  
9 that the City has been issued, which has forced people to rush development. Palo Alto is about  
10 community spirit, and rentals and resident owned properties both provide that. High rise  
11 apartments provide a more transient spirit within the tenants. The economy is in flux and the  
12 State issued many requirements based on pre-covid numbers, which are now skewed due to the  
13 number of people choosing to work from home. Transportation also needs to grow to  
14 accommodate pedestrians, bikes and cars.

15 **MOTION**

16 Commissioner Hechtman motioned to move staff recommendations with consideration to the  
17 minor changes to the language of the ordinance described by various commissioners during this  
18 hearing.

19 **SECOND**

20 Vice Chair Chang seconded the motion.

21 **VOTE**

22 Ms. Dao conducted the roll call.

23 **MOTION PASSED 6-0** (Summa, Chang, Hechtman, Lu, Akin, Templeton)1- (Reckdahl absent)

24 **Commission Action:** Motion by Commissioner Hechtman, seconded by Vice Chair Chang. Passed  
25 6-0-1 (Reckdahl absent)

26

27 4. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 420 Acacia [23PLN-00059]: Recommendation on  
28 Applicant's Request for Approval of a Vesting Tentative map to Allow for a Condominium  
29 Subdivision to Create 16 Units on a Single 35,573 Square Foot Parcel. The Subdivision map  
30 Would Facilitate Construction of the Previously Approved 33,833 Square Foot Mixed-use  
31 Development Project (23PLN-00058). Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the  
32 Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act in Accordance with CEQA

1 Guidelines Section 15332 (in-fill Development). Zoning District: Split Zoning Designation  
2 of RM-30 and R-1 (Multi-Family and Single-Family Residential). For More Information  
3 Contact the Project Planner Claire Raybould at [Claire.Raybould@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.Raybould@cityofpaloalto.org)

4 Chair Summa asked the Commission for disclosures. Commissioner Lu disclosed that he lives 1000  
5 feet from the site. Mr. Yang confirmed that did not find reason for that to be a conflict and  
6 Commissioner Lu could remain.

7 Senior Planner and Architectural Review Board (ARB) Liaison Claire Raybould presented the  
8 Vesting Tentative map for 420 Acacia Avenue, requesting a single lot subdivision of an existing  
9 35,573 square foot parcel for a sixteen-lot condominium subdivision which requires a waiver  
10 from the private street width, which was also required and approved as part of the Streamlined  
11 Housing Development Project Review. The existing parcel is code compliant with no changes  
12 needed to the parcel size, however condominium subdivisions require private streets per Title 21  
13 to be a minimum width of 32-feet. Key considerations include the subdivision map findings for  
14 approval found in Attachment B, and the waiver requesting a minimum street width of 22-feet  
15 with the understanding that the development itself has already been reviewed and approved.  
16 The project is exempt from CEQA in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (Class 32  
17 exemption for infill development) and covers the whole of the action. Staff recommends PTC  
18 recommend approval of the vesting tentative map to City Council, based on the findings and  
19 subject to conditions of approval as outlined in Attachment B.

20 Architect Josh Vrostos, on behalf of Acacia Camino Investors and Dividend Homes, thanked staff  
21 with special mention to Ms. Raybould for their efforts and expressed his enthusiasm to start the  
22 first project in Palo Alto.

23 Commissioner Akin referred to Packet Page 60 and inquired why the condition of approval to the  
24 California Olive Emerson plume was not included in the proposed conditions but was included  
25 and discussed in the ARB staff report and was a recommended condition of approval.

26 Ms. Raybould commented that it was a condition of approval for the development itself because  
27 it relates to the physical improvements of the site and was not included in the approval of the  
28 vesting tentative map because it did not include any earth work, or anything related to that.

29 Vice Chair Chang inquired about the two units provided as below market rate as Palo Alto  
30 requires 15% below market rate.

31 Ms. Raybould answered that when it becomes a fractional unit and is less than half, it becomes  
32 paid in lieu, if it's more than half it's rounded up.

33 Vice Chair Chang asked about the protected trees discussion which was not included in the  
34 packet. Ms. Raybould stated she meant to pull that from the ARB staff report and explained there  
35 are a number of protected trees on the site that are over 15" in diameter breast height that need  
36 to be removed due to the whole rear of the site being a C3 storm water Municipal storm retention

1 area and conflicts with the bio retention area. They are replacing the trees removed, and due to  
2 the canopy tree requirements they are also required to pay in lieu fees.

3 Chair Summa expressed concerns for removal of protected trees from the site and hoped that  
4 there would be a sufficient number of replacements.

5 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

6 Yugen Lockhart, resident and property owner, expressed his appreciation for the project for  
7 building a sense of community for the residents and to ensure the project had no major changes.  
8 Mr. Lockhart was in favor of the plans for drainage as it was a concern and has a direct impact to  
9 his property.

10 Vice Chair Chang inquired what the affordability level was for the two units below market rate.  
11 Ms. Raybould commented that the two units are in the moderate range. The range is negotiated  
12 based on the number of and types of concessions requested.

13 Vice Chair Chang inquired about the waiver and approval process of a waiver.

14 Mr. Yang commented that the waivers are required to relate to the physical dimensions of a  
15 project and if there is a development standard that physically precludes the project from being  
16 built, the city is required to approve the waiver.

17 Vice Chair Chang was supportive of the map reviewed by traffic and fire.

18 Commissioner Hechtman is appreciative of having Dividend Homes in Palo Alto and praised their  
19 high-quality work and inquired if approval by the California Department of Real Estate is required  
20 and if so, did that need to be a condition of approval for the map.

21 Mr. Yang commented that the city is not allowed to require that as an approval of the map.

22 Commissioner Hechtman asked for clarity as to what the intention of the original plan was and if  
23 staff streamlined the process for a condominium map approval.

24 Ms. Raybould responded that the intention of the units was not to be rentals, requirements for  
25 a vesting tentative map included all entitlements be complete prior to approval. Projects have  
26 been allowed to move forward concurrently; Council decided on entitlements during review and  
27 before the tentative map. The Director has the authority to combine all elements if he chooses.  
28 It comes down to the applicants choice of moving concurrently through the process. If there is  
29 an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and staff would have to make findings of overwriting  
30 considerations, that would be another reason to run everything through Council in one shot.  
31 Applicant chose to move forward concurrently due to the project and waivers already being  
32 approved by the ARB.

1 Commissioner Hechtman commented that the plan intended to be a condominium project and  
2 the process utilized enabled it to move through the Streamlined approval process and was  
3 supportive of the staff recommendation.

4 Chair Summa was in favor of staff recommendation and thanked staff for the presentation and  
5 moved for a motion.

6 **MOTION**

7 Commissioner Akin motioned to move staff recommendation.

8

9 **SECOND**

10 Vice Chair Chang seconded the motion.

11 Speaking to her second, Vice Chair Chang stated she seconded the motion because the project  
12 has already been approved.

13

14 **VOTE**

15 Ms. Dao conducted the roll call which carried 6-0

16

17 **MOTION PASSED 6-0** (Summa, Chang, Lu, Akin, Hechtman, Templeton) **1-** (Reckdahl absent)

18

19 **Commission Action:** Motion by Commissioner Akin, seconded by Vice Chair Chang. Passed 6-0-1  
20 (Reckdahl absent)

21

22 **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

23 Commissioner Templeton wished everyone Happy Holidays.

24 Chair Summa thanked staff and her colleagues for a very productive, pleasant year and the  
25 opportunity to serve with this precise group and spoke about the passing of Commissioner  
26 Reckdahl's mother (Joan Marie Reckdahl) and encouraged everyone to view her obituary as she  
27 was an amazing woman.

28

1 **ADJOURNMENT**

2 8:21 pm

3