

**CASTRO VALLEY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
MINUTES FOR May 9, 2005**

(Approved as corrected May 23, 2005)

- A. CALL TO ORDER:** The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. **Council members present:** Andy Frank, Chair; Dean Nielsen, Vice Chair. Council members, Ineda Adesanya, Ken Carbone, Jeff Moore and Carol Sugimura. **Council members excused:** Karla Goodbody. **Staff present:** Tona Henninger, Ron Gee, Bob Swanson and Maria Elena Marquez. There were approximately 20 people in the audience.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF April 25, 2005

Ms. Sugimura moved, with a second by Mr. Nielsen, that the Council approve the minutes of April 25, 2005, as corrected.

The motion passed 6/0.

C. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS:

D. REGULAR CALENDAR

- 1. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, C-8399 – NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS -** Application for the continued operation of an existing facility (Cel Site), in a R-1-CSU-RV (Single Family Residence w/Conditional Secondary Unit and Recreation Vehicle) District, located at 20600 John Drive, east side 480 feet north east of end of Regent Way, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's designation: 084A-0235-001-03 and 084A-0240-001-02. **Continued to June 27, 2005.**
- 2. TENTATIVE MAP, PARCEL MAP 8604, BIRD -** Application to subdivide one parcel totaling 1.24 acres into two lots, in a R-1 (Single Family Residence) District, located at 3120 Huntington Court, west side, 479 feet west of Carlton Avenue, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's designation: 084B-0400-010-04.

Mr. Gee presented the staff report. Mr. Williams Bird, the applicant, stated that he wants to subdivide a lot that he owns in Castro Valley into two lots because he wants to build his house on the upper portion of the lot and then subdivide the other portion and said that this application was for two lots.

Mr. Carbone said that this is a very challenging site. He walked through the property two weeks ago and one of the things that came up at that time was about waste receptacles. He asked the applicant what is his overall plans and if he is looking at an area where it can be leveled off street parking.

Steve Phillips, a neighbor of the applicant, said that he lives on top of the road and said that the garbage company actually is traveling in that roadway.

Mr. Carbone asked if the garbage truck comes. Mr. Phillips said yes.

Mr. Frank asked staff that in the fire project soils and stability that this is considerably less in nature as previously presented to us and asked if that matter has been resolved. Mr. Gee said not necessarily resolved but the Planning Department is looking into that. Mr. Frank said that the second question is regarding John Drive in terms of drainage as well.

Public testimony was called for.

Bruce Christiansen, resident at 3144 Huntington Court, he just have not checked how far up the road way extension to the road way and where the houses are going to go. Mr. Gee showed a map to Mr. Christiansen.

Ric Duley, resident at 18797 Vineyard Road, stated that his mother lives on Huntington Court, and asked what changed from the past when this was originally subdivided into 3 lots, and asked why it suddenly it was deemed not feasible at the time and now suddenly you want to subdivide. Why it is not feasible now when a few weeks ago it was feasible.

Mr. Carbone told Mr. Duley that it is different, because we are going to 2 lots.

Mr. Frank told Mr. Duley that the County is reviewing the process.

Mr. Frank said this is a standard procedure and the Council reviews the process.

Public testimony was closed.

Mr. Carbone said that this is an opportunity to deal with this property, because everything that is being proposed subsequent to this is for extensive amount of lots which would increase traffic through Huntington Court, and he thinks that two lots as long as the drainage plans

Mr. Nielsen said that the previous proposed project had a series of very high retaining walls and drainage problems, this is a good compromise plan..

**Mr. Nielsen moved approval of Parcel Map 8604 with planning considerations.
Ms. Sugimura seconded. Motion passed 6/0.**

3. CASTRO VALLEY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – Report on the progress of the Castro Valley General Plan Update with opportunities for Board Members to provide direction to consultants and staff.

Ms. Lesley Gould, from Dyett & Bhatia Consultants, presented a report on the progress of the general plan update. The report focused on the results of the public

workshop conducted March 31, 2005. The focus is on residential neighborhoods. She said as much as specific feed back from everybody is welcomed. She stated that they had a general introductory meeting in July, and a big presentation in November, plus this first meeting in March, and are planning to do another one in June.

Mr. Frank asked Ms. Gould if the intent is strictly to be residential this evening and when a commercial will be scheduled. Ms. Gould said that on May 11 they will be presenting the bulk of the recommendations, and that probably will come back to MAC in July.

Mr. Carbone said that the Council has its own concerns, we have similar rezoning behind the decisions that the Council makes. Also, some of a sudden...are you looking into general...based on the topic...Ms. Gould said they just want to take feed back from all the MAC members from a different point of view.

Mr. Carbone asked Ms. Gould if the focus is going to be on residential only. Ms. Gould said basically we have three sessions. Mr. Frank told representatives from Eden Hospital that the main commercial aspect will be discussed until July 2005.

Mr. Moore said he would like something to help quantify other than saying we want to see more parks.

Ms. Gould said that they are looking for locations ideas for potential sites, specific areas. Mr. Carbone said he thought schools were off limits after hours. Ms. Gould said this was one of the issues that was raised in one of the community meetings, that they are negotiating with the school district for funding school sites for public use for longer hours. Ms. Adesanya said the concern is with liability. After hours school districts are getting sued.

Mr. Frank said that it used to be like that years ago, the hours were from 2:30 to 5 p.m. on school site. You can negotiate but also you have to look at the limits of those negotiations because of liability issues. He said if you are going to open up areas, you have to reconsider that schools don't exist. If you are able to facilitate with the school district, that is great. Ms. Gould said that there are a few sites, very small, and that is one of the issues as far as concerned to maintain and operate very small sites.

Mr. Nielsen said that some of these school facilities are used for soccer, and they are not fully utilized. Mr. Frank said that the only area in West Castro Valley is the old church.

Mr. Carbone said that one of the things is cooperative between EBRPD. There is a lot of property by the lake that can potentially be utilized; the soccer field, lot of space. Maybe we are looking at a property that already exists, something can be done it already belongs to the EBRPD.

Mr. Frank said that there are not too many areas in the Castro Valley hills, center of Castro Valley not much property, north east of Castro Valley site, the Acorn property.

Mr. Carbone mentioned that there is a lot of Caltrans property; Mr. Nielsen said it could be used for senior housing also.

Mr. Moore said that if you are going to consider a parcel targeted for residential development, what is the retail value.

Ms. Gould said they started to identify sites in the Heyer district, you either go for an option, or actually purchasing the site really prepared to operate it; part of this whole exercise, where the funding comes from.

Mr. Frank asked what is the definition of a small park. Ms. Gould said it has to be small as a half acre. Ms. Adesanya said that personally she favors small neighborhoods parks with limited sizes.

Ms. Gould said that these are two different issues there. They are proposing 10 units, they are providing the open space than any other project would have for 10 units, they can really dedicate a park to really serve the community.

Mr. Carbone said he agrees on the conditions and asked how come the County did not notice there is nothing special for the community - you are taking something you are getting something - why it does not happen here. It happened in Five Canyons, in Palomares. Ms. Gould said that they can come back to the MAC with recommendations. Mr. Carbone asked what happened to a lot of conditions to put a development.

Mr. Moore said you pay \$ 11,000 a unit and that is the contribution.

Mr. Carbone said not to hand it over to HARD. Ms. Rivera said that the park dedication fees it is going to take a while.

Mr. Frank said if we have had other developments of 5, 10, 12 acres, no reason why for considerations density to provide open space. Ms. Gould asked if you are looking to be proactive. Be proactive is part of the general plan.

Mr. Nielsen asked how much money is there for park land purchases as far as the park district is concerned. You can offer to buy a piece of property. The direction we are heading is correct.

Ms. Gould said some times the community knows of some opportunities.

Mr. Moore said every community has a park, within a 10 minute walk supervised during day light hours or some statement like that. He asked how do you prioritize?

Ms. Gould mentioned the neighborhoods most underserved. They will bring back some data that they would recommend based on numbers and distance.

Public testimony was called for:

Nate Ocurey (?) Castro Valley resident since 1968, supports quality instead of quantity. He mentioned the Japanese Garden in San Francisco. He just does not mind walking 20 minutes, he also supports parks.

Ms. Adesanya mentioned parks smaller than half an acre. Mr. Carbone said there is nothing there for the kids to play. Mr. Nielsen said to preserve the creek.

Mr. Carbone said Castro Valley commercial needs to stay whether they get developed now or in the future. Ms. Adesanya strongly recommends mixed use. Mr. Frank said that it works in communities. Mr. Carbone asked how we can expand those commercial areas.

Nate Ocurey said that he supports multiuse. Consideration for consolidating gas stations are fine, mechanic shops scattered everywhere, more community oriented businesses, car related things, would be a good thing.

Mr. Frank said if you are talking about community centers to open it up to general use the whole area, you do not have to travel to the shop center, as long as you have some retail there. Nate Ocurey said that if we are going to have more houses, no place to go buy.

Ms. Adesanya said that we are not replacing existing housing for commercial.

Mr. Carbone said that there is a spot out there that is not zoned for commercial, if we can tie that, it would benefit that site.

Mr. Frank said that anytime you have commercial, it would encourage high density and also encourage transport back and forth through the community. It would generate traffic and eliminate some of the congestion in terms of parking. Mr. Carbone asked Ms. Gould if she considered looking at the retail spaces down the Norbridge area, that future development based on what we are looking at the housing element and re-designating the parcels potentially along the freeway. How would you zone in such a way a possible number of streets behind BART and asked if the Blvd. retail district was close enough.

Ms. Gould said they are assuming it is part of the downtown plan, there is a lot of commercial on Castro Valley Blvd. between 10 minute walking distance, and it was looked at the strategic plan. It was before the Planning Commission on May 2, as a preliminary review and it is a proposal to subdivide the group of properties that add Lake Chabot Road near Keith Avenue and to subdivide it for 10 parcel for single family dwellings.

Mr. Carbone said this is a scam what really happens, that changes including PD's are being granted to developers and getting privileges without the trade off of benefits to the community. For these considerations, the Planning Commission Board should hold the MAC's decision. Ms. Rivera said that it was on the

agenda, the preliminary review. Ms. Rivera said that a person who owns a property still can apply. One of the council members asked why it went to the Planning Commission for review and consideration before coming to MAC.

Mr. Carbone said that you can see this thing is shoveled through the back door. It is unfortunate and unfair, this is just a scam. Ms. Rivera told Mr. Carbone that staff will get back to him. Mr. Carbone said that he has the full plan and he thinks this is a direct connection with Buzz Sorensen. Mr. Carbone asked if Mr. Sorensen can come and make a presentation. Ms. Rivera told Mr. Carbone that she will ask Mr. Sorensen.

Enhancement to Residential Neighborhoods: Ms. Gould asked Council members what do they think the priorities are. Mr. Moore said that regarding zoning issues, we always get day care on residential facility .It is a good use to explore.

Mr. Frank mentioned a good example are 2 areas on Heyer and Center streets, because it is easy for people and it makes sense. There are a lot of locations that do not make sense, that can not get parking. Those sites all makes sense, sidewalks are improvement.

Community Planning Strategies: Ms. Gould said you are going to continue to have inter residential, community character, resources, etc. We talked about this the last time, they moved the projections to Castro Valley, they did a lot of analysis to develop these projections, it is about 9900 households that they are projecting that you would add in the next 20 years, it means about 100 units per year over the next 20 years. It is in line with what we have been doing.

She said they prepared this map in the packet that shows potential areas for new residences under existing zoning. They have done a very detailed analysis to calculate under existing zoning, what units could be added without changing any zoning in the community. The map shows vacant lots, single family lots, basically very substandard, and then it shows what we call single family lots, which is the vast majority of lots in Castro Valley. They all will be subdivided, they could not add any more units, and also the planed developments, they are all divided up, they could be secondary units.

Mr. Frank told Ms. Gould something to think about, talking about the median size lots, there are lots in the community on main thoroughfares like Lake Chabot, Redwood Road, Center Street, and others where you can have commercial, day care, in terms of uses, because of easy access, would she open up to zoning for consideration. Ms. Gould said one of the things you are looking at is you have environmental resources, there are areas that you might want to consider.

Mr. Carbone asked if there is any chance of salvaging any of the parcels to ...He said they are not getting any answer and asked how far we stayed from the creek.

Staff could not provide accurate information, everybody seems to have a different there is a number of things that came up, that we really did never could get an answer to these things.

Mr. Swanson said that the State Water Resources Board, along with 15 County people, you got your creek, your riparian area, and then a boundary creek. The new law in the State of California requires a 100 foot flooding from any structure, so...you can have maybe a driveway in some long areas, you have to have on any structure away from the riparian area. The Fire Marshall comes and says: "your structure is too close to the riparian area, you are going to have to clear up a 100 feet". Ms. Gould said that the County has a lot of general resource potential policies including creek protection policies. You don't have a very specific detailed ordinance that has a detailed definition of riparian and set backs.

Mr. Frank said that was the question that was asked. The Council will deal case by case basis. You do not know the things that apply and do not apply, you do not know exactly how the calculations are done and if there is anything specific, the builder, the engineer, anybody to understand. We need to have an ordinance to outline a map, it should be laid out. Ms. Gould said that having the general plan is not an ordinance, but having this in the General Plan, it could become like an over lay in the General Plan. This is an environmental sensitive area.

Mr. Carbone said that he would support that. It is hard for them to get a direction and give the correct recommendation.

Ms. Rivera said that ROSA is a document which includes the canyon lands and the creek and is being worked on right now. It is a public draft out with regard to the creek policies. One of the policies is that there will be a group to look into further developing some guidelines.

Mr. Nielsen said that it is kind of arbitrary a creek clearance between structures.

Natural Hazards, Existing land use, Existing zoning.

Ms. Gould said that in general, the conclusion here anticipated by the regional board agencies, accommodating into existing zoning, there are opportunities that exist under vacant lots for potential subdivisions and secondary units. You can meet the gross needs in 20 years without doing any massive changes in zoning. You have quite a bit of opportunity in downtown, and you have already started to make that up, mixed used, it is proper density high area because people can walk to downtown business and you can work in housing element, we need to comply with what State mandates for housing and identify sites housing for low typically means more multiple higher density housing types. The conclusion is that you have the capacity, you need the standards for what type of development in much more detail for those development standards. She presented some guidelines and photos for suggestions. She said they made an inventory of inter residential

development subdivisions, smaller subdivisions about 12 units, and you have just a few sites in that scale. The new homes and existing homes, lot of opportunities for that still happening in Castro Valley. You have some sites further not so high in the hills where you are getting the small lots, small homes for single families. These are all the types of inter residential that can occur in different zones throughout Castro Valley. The key issue is what types really fit in the neighborhood as they evolve and what types are inappropriate. She wanted to mention the specific standards and get a sense of whether you agree or disagree, as we have as a recommended type of standard. One is eliminating lot larger minimum wide sizes, really dealing with environmental sensitive hazard area. You have a provision code BE over lay that has been applied in areas that do have these type of conditions. She thinks there are some other areas that are not in areas like the creek for example. You have larger lots around the development of deep lots allow Castro Valley to maintain its character, because you do not see the houses behind, so you maintain the character of the neighborhood by just allowing the house in front, but you don't have too many set backs to ensure that you have privacy and minimizing the bulk of the house behind, because when you put the house behind you have a potential privacy issue with all the surrounding property owners.

Mr. Frank referred to adjustments in terms of floor area to land area and light, you might take that into considerations for the neighbors, what type of home you would be building and the lot size.

Mr. Carbone asked if the Council is going to be very specific on those type of things. He told Ms. Gould that she selected some nice homes, he can provide many examples of homes that are terrible, box homes, two story, no style, those selected by Ms. Gould are really nice examples. Also, he asked how many homes do you allow around these deep lots as you are calling them, and how many homes is acceptable and how wide is the roadway.

Mr. Frank said that the core issue is that you can deal with PD's private streets and then you can deal with private streets and private roadways, so you have the open space, the problem is when you shift from a regular subdivision to a PD. Forget the core issue, how you get into that development, that is why we have the problems with density requirements in terms of massive homes size lots that do not make any sense, and then you have complaints from neighbors, you just get away from the core issues.

Mr. Moore said he personally agrees with the designed guidelines and to continue developing with new design guidelines. Mr. Frank said the real problem is when some projects that got out of control.

Mr. Carbone mentioned a property that was so elevated from the road way that the standard guidelines allowed from the house built on a 10 foot, 35 feet tall right against the street. The majority of Castro Valley homes are old.

Mr. Moore said that there are so many standards. Ms. Adesanya mentioned something like a mapping document that is part of the general plan zoning ordinance, and asked if that is something that will help the Council dealing with compatibility.

Ms. Rivera said that there has to be consistency when a project goes to process for the general plan and the process is still at that guideline level.

Ms. Gould said it is a combination of designed guidelines make more specific. If you apply those guidelines, a lot of jurisdictions have design reviews as a part of the process that the Planning Commission goes through, and then you need more specific guidelines and a process to actually apply specific development proposals. Right now they are at the developing stage. Mr. Moore asked what policy we need to have, we are dealing here at the zoning level. Ms. Gould said this is really the same issue you see this coming. You are getting the 12 units subdivisions and can be very successful to have the house setbacks behind. Ms. Adesanya mentioned that parking is a problem and asked why not allow parking and then the residents actually taking the visitor parking.

Mr. Carbone said he agrees with Ms. Adesanya because some of the homes end up supporting 5 bedrooms three bathrooms, then a house only requirements is to have...that supports two potential, these houses could possibly house two to three children which makes five per home.

Ms. Gould said that people is parking in the front yards.

Mr. Frank said people is parking in the red line areas they can get in and get out, if there is more parking there are still some problems. They don't park in the lawn area.

Ms. Gould referred to private streets that is what is happening throughout this community because these are long deep lots. Tentatively, what we are seen, you have three or four units on private streets, some of them have more, typically cities counties will have very detailed standards for these private streets. A maximum number of lots that can be served per private street, typically four units you have to go to four private streets.

Mr. Frank said he agrees with standardization and landscaping. Ms. Gould said that is what the policy is about.

Ms. Gould explained lot coverage and floor area ratio. Discussion ensued among council members regarding floor area ratio. Council members opposed to gated streets and also discussed fence heights. Parking and landscaping issues were also discussed. One of the council members said that parking should be increased. Condo conversions guidelines were among the issues discussed.

Mr. Frank said that multiple arrangements put to better use than a residential area. Mr. Moore said modifications that enhance the development in the future, to have the ability to have the zoning in place.

Kreg Eacret, Program Manager from Eden Medical Center stated that as they reconfigure and look at the future, they have some concerns about limitations, he said he would like to have a formal set of conversations with the consultant and County staff as this unfold, looking at a pretty significant deadline. He said they are stepping carefully but quickly at some possibilities in some of these issues.

Mr. Moore asked Ms. Rivera if that would come through Planning or through the Consultant. Ms. Rivera said it would be through Planning.

Mr. Eacret said at no level want to be part of the process that endorse community issues, so they want to be as transparent and forthcoming as they could be.

Mr. Moore said he can see the potential of the problem, we are talking about same design guidelines that have set backs, the houses adjacent to the hospital, there is going to be an impact. Mr. Eacret said your work with zoning in the surrounding area, they are negotiating specific zoning requirements for their property line were not codified, because there was no zoning for the medical districts.

Mr. Carbone said the proposal presented for the future project that the considerations to height limitations versus what exists already, and he has not seen any of that.

Mr. Nielsen told Mr. Eacret they are doing a good work in letting everybody know what they are doing. Mr. Moore told Mr. Eacret to be aware that they are adjacent to a hospital, there will be future impacts on the residents.

Discussion ensued among council members regarding zoning regulations, future impacts to the adjacent neighborhood.

Mr. Eacret said there are buffers between different users, transitions zones, enormous building, single family houses in hospital back yard.

Ms. Gould said that they definitively will take a look at it. She explained the land use strategies.

Mr. Frank said there will be modifications, not parcel specifics. He hopes it will be forthcoming, areas better utilized in terms of open areas, Center Street that go towards Edwards Lane.

Ms. Gould explaining the colored areas in the map that will have some subdivision, what the policy is about how to be developed if there is no surplus

anymore, is it definitely residential, is there high density, or considered for park maybe there are other uses supportive of the hospital, there should be an area where to identify the larger vacant lot big areas. We are trying to identify what should be the overall policy. Mr. Carbone asked how narrow the road will be.

D. OPEN FORUM –

Phil Hunt, representing Coldwell Banker, wanted to ask the Council about the possibility of some redevelopment in Castro Valley Blvd. and John Drive. He mentioned a property that is on the market for sale, is underdeveloped for the commercial and it comes as no surprise. He said there is a tremendous shortage of warehouse space in Castro Valley. This piece of property is rather complex zoning described in the zoning is low density. He does not know how to describe the zoning for this particular piece of property, but right now there is rental business there, United Rental in one building, this is the same piece of property owned by the same owner that is now for sale. It is a very large piece of property and it would make a rare location for 10,000 square feet warehouse. He asked the council if they have a general plan and what would they like to see happen. The potential buyer would like to develop this property, it would make a great location for something.

Mr. Frank told Mr. Hunt this is a three phase question, that it affects the general plan, the specific plan, and redevelopment. Mr. Frank said that at this meeting there will be a discussion of the Castro Valley General Plan and we would invite you at that time to participate. It can be taken out for consideration. Mr. Frank told Mr. Hunt to go to Redevelopment and find out when he can address that issue before them. The Council is going to take a look at it.

Mr. Nielsen said he thinks it is not that complicated. The retail and commercial space in Castro Valley is at a premium We are very protective of the lumber yard and the street right behind Castro Valley Blvd. It bothers him to put a warehouse there.

Mr. Hunt said that a 10,000 square feet warehouse business at this point we are what would work best there...retail is premium with the rental in the front. If there was another retail center back there it will affect traffic.

Mr. Carbone said that he personally feels that there is a deficit in the area..we are fortunate some of the other oriented business that utilize some kind of storage..There is a number of business outside the area.

Mr. Frank said that it depends on the building for commercial retail, we need to provide feasibility of usage in that area, like in Dublin or in San Leandro, they have the retail that they need to work in conjunction with other type of businesses. Any other business might be something to take into consideration. Mr. Frank told Mr. Hunt that whatever he does in that direction he still has wait to the General Plan and the Specific Plan, and also to talk to the Redevelopment people, go to the meetings, and try what is going to be best.

Tim Green, resident at 17932 Beardsley Street, said that they are proposing to subdivide parcels currently anywhere from 5,000 to 7,000 square feet. He has an acre parcel split into one approximate 18,000 square feet and ...involve with the rest of the square footage. Basically without a tremendous amount of grading involved, because it backs up to the water shed.

Discussion among council members ensued regarding subdivisions, square footage allowed, road way width and the impact on the surrounding neighborhood, drainage, lot width, shape of lots, regular frontage, etc. One of the council members asked Mr. Green if there were drainage problems in the area, Mr. Green said no.

Jay Sethi, resident at 3213 Keith Avenue, concerned because he has one third of an acre lot his house in front, he wants to subdivide it into two lots and asked if it was possible. Mr. Frank told him that he had to look at the size of the project. Mr. Sethi said that actually his neighbor has a bigger one and the smaller one in the back and if it was possible for him to do the same. Mr. Frank asked him what conforms in the area as a generic and to find similarity, this has happened over here, this is how we conform the road way and the other things that we brought up previously. Mr. Nielsen told Mr. Sethi that the Planning Department can help him.

Mr. Carbone told Mr. Sethi that the big problem is his lot size, definitely enough lot size. He told him to just get a comparison and learn a little bit. Mr. Frank told Mr. Sethi to get a copy of the plot and do the calculations. Mr. Carbone told him that a planner will be able to help him. Or he will need to hire an engineer or an architect to take a good look at it.

Mr. Sethi said that he asked somebody to draw a map for him. He said that on the left hand side of the house there is an easement. Mr. Sethi went to talk to the Fire Marshall, he looked at the map, he measured that, he installed the fire sprinklers in the back of the property.

Mr. Frank told Mr. Sethi that the best thing to do is want to seat down and talk to an engineer because the Council deals with this on a day to day basis, and to discuss it further with the County.

Mr. Sethi said that considering this situation, what variance would apply? Mr. Frank told him that it would depend. There is a point of no return, and to find out what he is really talking about, to look at different properties and compare his situation. It takes a little bit of time to do it.

Mr. Frank said that the reason for the Open Forum is to have a generic conversation and the Council does not get into specifics.

F. CHAIR'S REPORT – None.

- H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:** There were no committee reports.
- I. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, COMMENTS AND REPORTS -** None.
- I. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS, COMMENTS AND REPORTS –** None.
- J. ADJOURN:** There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

NEXT MEETING DATE: May 23, 2005