

MINUTES OF MEETING
ALAMEDA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 3, 2006
(APPROVED APRIL 17, 2006)

FIELD TRIP:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Frank Imhof, Chair; and Glenn Kirby, Vice Chair.

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Commissioners Ken Carbone; Richard Hancocks; Mike Jacob; Alane Loisel and Edith Looney.

OTHERS PRESENT: Steve Buckley, Assistant Planning Director.

The Commission convened at 224 W. Winton Avenue, Room 111, Hayward, California, at the hour of 1:30 p.m., and adjourned to the field to visit the following properties:

1. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2225 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-7679 – OGBEIDE** ~ Petition to reclassify one parcel containing approximately 22,016 square feet (0.46 acres) from the R-S-D-35 (Suburban Residence, 3,500 square feet Minimum Building Site Area per Dwelling Unit) District to a P-D (Planned Development) District, so as to allow demolition of two existing dwellings and construction of six town-homes, each on its own parcel, located at 574 and 578 Blossom Way, north side, approximately 250 feet west of Western Boulevard, Cherryland area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel Number: 429-0019-045-00.
2. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2227 - ROBERTS** ~ Petition to reclassify one parcel containing approximately 154,887 square feet (3.55 acres), from the R-1-L-B-E (Single Family Residence, Limited Agriculture, 5 acre Minimum Building Site Area, 300 feet Median Lot Width, 30 foot Front Yard) and 'A' (Agricultural) Districts to the R-1-L-B-E-S-U (Single Family Residence, Limited Agriculture, 5 acre Minimum Building Site Area, 300 Median Lot Width, 30 foot Front Yard, Secondary Unit) District, located at 2740 Park Way, west side, approximately 500 feet east of Kilkare Road, Sunol area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 096-0543-021-00, 096-0543-022-00, 096-0543-023-00, 096-0543-024-00, 096-0543-028-00, 096-0543-032-00 and 096-0543-033-00.
3. **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-8961- LANGON** ~ Petition to convert 20 existing apartment units into 20 condominiums, on one site containing approximately 0.79 acres, in a R-S-D-15 (Suburban Residence, 1,500 square feet Minimum Building Site Area per Dwelling Unit) District, located at 1579 – 165th Avenue, northwest side, approximately 1,300 feet northeast of East 14th Street, San Leandro area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel Number: 080-0071-012-03.



4. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, C-8465, SMITH / VINEYARD MEMORIAL CEMETERY** ~ Application to allow a cemetery and related uses and structures to be developed on a portion of a 110-acre site, in an 'A' (Agricultural) District, located on North Livermore Avenue, west side, approximately ½ mile north of U.S. Highway 50, Livermore area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 903-0008-004-01.

5. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2181 – 2181st ZONING UNIT AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-7473 – PAYVAR** ~ Petition to reclassify from the R-S-D-3 (Suburban Residence, 2,500 sq. ft. Minimum Building Site Area per Dwelling Unit) District to a PD (Planned Development) District allowing twelve residential units; and to subdivide one site measuring approximately 31,476 sq. ft. (0.72 acres) into twelve lots, each resulting lot to contain one unit, for a total of twelve units, for a property located at 15703 Liberty Street, south side, 290 ft east of Tanager Avenue, unincorporated Ashland area of Alameda County, designated County Assessor's Parcel Number: 0080-0046-008-02.

6. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE-2206-01 - PROPOSED SALE OF EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT'S WINDFELDT RESERVOIR PROPERTY** ~ Request by the Real Estate Section of East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 for the disposal of a 1.36 acre property located south of Second Street, Fairview area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel Number: 425-0160-009-00.

REGULAR MEETING: 6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Ken Carbone; Richard Hancocks; Frank Imhof, Chair; Mike Jacob; Glenn Kirby, Vice Chair; Alane Loisel and Edith Looney.

OTHERS PRESENT: Chris Bazar, Planning Director; Steven Buckley, Assistant Planning Director; Bruce Jensen; Senior Planner; Karen Borrmann and John Bates, Public Works Agency Liaison; Brian Washington, County Counsel's Office; Nilma Singh, Recording Secretary.

There were approximately 37 people in the audience.

CALL TO ORDER: The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR: None

|||||
OPEN FORUM: Open forum is provided for any members of the public wishing to speak on an item not listed on the agenda. Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. No one requested to be heard under open forum.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. **APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES** - March 20, 2006. (Not available)

2. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE-2206-01 - PROPOSED SALE OF EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT'S WINDFELDT RESERVOIR PROPERTY** ~ Request by the Real Estate Section of East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 for the disposal of a 1.36 acre property located south of Second Street, Fairview area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel Number: 425-0160-009-00.

3. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2199 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-7584 -NEWPORT AVALON INVESTORS, LLC** ~ Petition to reclassify from a PD (Planned Development) District to another PD (Planned Development) District, to allow the subdivision of one site into 10 parcels, located at 255 Happy Valley Road, south side, approximately 125 feet east of Pleasanton-Sunol Road, Pleasanton area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's designation: 0949-0010-001-07. (Continued from December 20, 2004, February 7, May 2, July 18, October 3, December 19, 2005, and February 6, 2006; to be continued to June 5, 2006).

4. **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-6864, ONE STOP DESIGN, INC.** ~ Petition to subdivide one parcel into five lots, located between 25129 and 25165 Second Street, south side, approximately 903 feet west of Winfeldt Road, Fairview area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's designation: 0425-0150-006-00. (Continued from January 18, March 7, May 2, June 20, July 18, August 15, September 19, October 17, November 21, December 19, 2005, and February 6, 2006; to be continued to May 1, 2006).

5. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2202 and TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, PM-8560 - HOPSON** ~ Petition to reclassify two parcels totaling 1.96 acres from the R-1 (Single Family Residence) and R-1-B-E (Single Family Residence, one acre per 1976th Zoning Unit) Districts to the R-1-B-E District (allowing for a 30,000 square foot Minimum Building Site Area for parcels 2 & 3), and to allow subdivision of one site into three lots with the existing dwelling to remain, located at 22750 Valley View Drive, east



side, approximately 850 feet north of Kelly Street, Hayward area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 417-0140-028-00 and 417-0151-001-00. (Continued from April 18, 2005 and February 6, 2006; to be continued to May 1, 2006)

6. **MODIFIED TRACT MAP, MTR-7118 – COURTNEY** ~ Petition to allow modification to TR-7118 to subdivide one site containing 4.60 acres into 19 parcels in a PD-ZU-1762 (Planned Development, 1762nd Zoning Unit) District, located on Page & Miramar, east side, corner south of Page Street, San Leandro area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 080A-0197-001-06. (Continued from September 19, October 17, November 21, December 19, 2005 and January 23 and March 6, 2006; to be continued to May 1, 2006).

7. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2204 and AGRICULTURAL SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, S-1978 – BRAUN/THOMPSON** ~ Petition to reclassify from the 'A' (Agricultural) District to a P-D (Planned Development) District with an Agricultural District base-zone, and allowing one secondary dwelling unit, on one site approximately 3.21 acres, located at 8855 Pleasanton-Sunol Road, west side, approximately 1.8 miles north of the intersection with Highway 84, Sunol area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel Number: 0096-0320-003-00. (Continued from July 18, August 1, September 19, October 17, November 21, December 19, 2005 and January 23, 2003, and March 6, 2006; to be continued to June 5, 2006).

8. **2230th ZONING UNIT and PARCEL MAP, PM-8910 – LAMB SURVEYING INC./CAMPBELL** ~ Petition to reclassify one parcel from R-1-L-B-E (Single Family Residence, Limited Agricultural Uses, 5 acre Minimum Building Site Area) District to a P-D (Planned Development, allowing one acre parcels) District, and to allow subdivision of one lot into four parcels, located at 1365 Hilliker Place, east side, corner south of Las Positas Road, Livermore area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 099-0015-026-06. (Continued from January 23 and February 21, 2006; to be continued to April 17, 2006).

9. **2231st ZONING UNIT and PARCEL MAP, PM-8909 – LAMB SURVEYING, INC./WATERMAN** ~ Petition to reclassify one parcel from R-1-L-B-E (Single Family Residence, Limited Agricultural Uses, 5 acre Minimum Building Site Area) District to P-D (Planned Development) District, and to allow subdivision of one lot into four parcels, located at 1339 Hilliker Place, east side, approximately 320 feet south of Las Positas Road, Livermore area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing

Assessor's Parcel Number: 099-0015-025-04. (Continued from January 23 and February 21, 2006; to be continued to April 17, 2006).

Commissioner Carbone made the motion to approve the Consent Calendar as recommended by staff. Approval of March 20th Minutes was continued to the next hearing. Commissioner Loisel seconded the motion, which carried 6/0/1. Commissioner Looney was excused.

Commissioner Looney arrived a few minutes late.

REGULAR CALENDAR:

1. **Motion to Reconsider Action Taken at 7/18/05 - AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, C-4158, REPUBLIC SERVICES – VASCO ROAD LANDFILL** ~ Application to extend the term of the Conditional Use Permit for this facility ("Permit") from 2008 to December 31, 2022; and to formalize permission to continue to conduct waste diversion and materials recycling operations that have been ongoing for a number of years on the site. The Vasco Road Landfill (VRL) (formerly Vasco Road Sanitary Landfill) is an existing permitted landfill in an A (Agriculture) District, located at 4001 North Vasco Road, east side, approximately 1 mile north of Dalton Road, Unincorporated Livermore area, designated as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 99B-4901-2-3; 99B-4926-1-1, 1-2, 2- 4, and 2-5; and 902-6-2-2. (Continued from August 1, September 6 and 19, October 17, November 21, December 5, 2005, February 6 and 21, and March 6, 2006).

Mr. Jensen presented the staff report. Commissioner Kirby noted that there was one less condition than originally approved and asked if there were other changes in community host fee formula. Staff replied that there were no changes and the community monitoring condition is not included in this permit. Mr. Bazar added that all parties involved have agreed to not include the community monitor fee and, in response to Commissioner Kirby, confirmed that Sierra Club had been included in negotiations leading up to the agreement.

Public testimony was called for. Arthur Boone representing Sierra Club, Bay Chapter Solid Waste & Recycling Subcommittee, said that the language is not what they want. Their two issues were the mechanism of how the City gets its money and the value of community monitoring.

Don King, 3850 N. Vasco Road, said his two concerns, noise in his house and the water line, have been resolved and he concurred with the staff report.

Richard Ward, 3884 N. Vasco Road, said his property is directly across from the entrance, and he was also satisfied with the agreement as it has addressed his issues/concerns. In reference to the community monitoring, Mr. Ward explained that since he is the most affected neighbor, he has been and will be regularly discussing his concerns with management. He also agreed with the agreement and thanked all involved.



Steve Stewart, City of Livermore, thanked staff for the work on the agreement. Although the City staffs the committee for the Altamont community monitoring, they do not think a similar monitoring program is necessary for the Vasco Landfill.

Tom Harper, property owner at 2757 N. Vasco Road and a member of the Sierra Club, Open Space Committee, said he also supports the agreement and urged the Commission for a support.

John Pomidor, Attorney representing City of Livermore, pointed out that the agreement was satisfactory to most of those involved. He also thanked Mr. Jensen for his work and concurred with Mr. Stewart on community monitoring.

Nanette Leuschel, representing Ralph Properties II, who owns five parcels around the landfill, spoke. They were not involved in the process and, as such, had been unaware of the pipeline until Friday but were in support of the agreement. Only one of the five parcels and only one dwelling will be supplied with water and they would prefer supply to Parcel APN 99B-4901-001-02, on the west side, instead of 99B-4901-024. Using the overhead projector, she pointed out and described the parcels. Planning Staff explained that the water hook-up are for parcels and not individual homes and Mr. Bazar added the agreement was not to provide benefits to the neighbors but to mitigate the potential effect on water supply. Commissioner Kirby said that he was not in support of increasing the number of hook-ups.

Scott Gordon, representing Vasco Landfill, thanked staff for their work on the agreement and urged an approval.

Public testimony was closed. The Commission discussed the Harper property and the possibility of changing the Ralph properties as requested by Ms. Leuschel. Commissioner Jacob requested clarification on Condition 111.4(b), the fee amount in 111.4(a) and correction to the last line, to read "...Condition 111.4.b". Mr. Jensen replied that the fee would be approximately \$750,000. Commissioner Jacob further recommended a sub-paragraph (c) which could include the entirety of sub-paragraph (b) with the inclusion of community monitoring specified percentage to give the City a tool to monitor and to mitigate the project impacts. Commissioner Kirby concurred adding that it would allow the Sierra Club to negotiate with the City but limited to the \$750,000. Commissioner Loisel stressed that the money be used for the water supply and would not be in support for another use. Commissioner Jacob questioned the possibility of whether another property owner, apart from the eight identified in Condition 112, could petition to pay for hook-up charges for an extension of the water line. Mr. Jensen replied that it was not the intent of the condition to allow another owner, other than those listed, a hook-up but if recommended, the language could be strengthened. Mr. Bazar suggested that perhaps City of Livermore could provide a response.

Mr. Pomidor replied that property owners will have to apply for an out-of-service-area agreement with the City and findings will have to be made and a consent be obtained from LAFCO. Regarding Ms. Leuschel's request, he explained the increased cost will have to be considered. Mr. Jensen pointed out that Measure D prohibits the extension of the waterline if it

|||||
is going to induce growth, and thus it was important the water line serve only the existing properties that need it.

Commissioner Hancocks made the motion to move staff recommendation for an approval. Commissioner Kirby seconded. The Chair made a substitute motion to include that bordering property owners could apply for an agreement to the City for water hook-ups and incurring the costs. Commissioner Loisel seconded. Mr. Pomidor pointed out that the cost would increase significantly for a larger pipe. Commissioner Kirby re-stated that he would not support an increase in capacity. The substitute motion was dropped. The original motion carried unanimously.

2. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2207 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-7614, UTAL** ~ Petition to reclassify three parcels containing approximately 1.17 acres from the P-D (Planned Development, 1779th Zoning Unit) to a P-D (Planned Development) District, allowing subdivision into 10 parcels intended for single-family dwellings, located at 18911 and 18919 Lake Chabot Road, approximately 234 feet northeast of Keith Avenue, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 084B-0502-045, 084B-0502-055 and 084B-0502-046. (Continued from June 20, July 18, September 6 and 19, October 17, November 21, December 19, 2005, January 9 and March 6, 2006).

Mr. Buckley presented the staff report and Mr. Bazar added that Public Works staff is also available for questions.

Public testimony was called for. John Thorp complained of lack of notification and the agenda which was posted on the website did not include this item. As such, he requested a continuance. Mr. Buckley confirmed that the matter had been re-posted and re-noticed ten days prior. Another member of the public confirmed that he had printed the agenda off the website and it did include this application.

Arlene Utal, applicant, described the project in detail adding that at the last hearing, the Commission had voted unanimously that the project is exempt from CEQA. With a power-point presentation, she further described the elevation; the existing conditions; the single entrance off Huber Drive; and introduced representatives of Sedway, who had prepared a financial analysis report. The County then independently hired Keyser Marston to do another independent analysis, which concurs with Sedway's conclusion. In response to discussion on commercial uses with access off Lake Chabot Road, Public Works requires up-dating the intersection, which would entail dedication of 12-14 feet of the property to improve the line-of-sight. The cost of these improvements would be approximately \$750,000 and filling in the property. Saving the existing building is not an option as it does not meet the codes and encroaches 15 feet onto the adjacent property. The swim cub is temporarily closed but she had contacted the Club regarding spill-over parking. The Club confirmed that it has had not received any written complaints. The traffic study concludes that there will be no impact on Huber Road. Fire Department has recommended red curb and no parking signs along Huber Road and other sub-standard streets regardless of the

|||||
result of this application. In response to Mr. Thorpe, Ms. Utal confirmed that she had received notification of today's hearing.

Terry Margerum, Senior Managing Director, Sedway, summarized the financial and market feasibility reports. In reference to market feasibility, the study had looked at the spending power of this area. Since there are existing similar resources to support the need (pages 10 & 11), it would not be financially feasible but create a significant negative value. Keyser Marston also agrees with their conclusion. Commissioner Hancocks asked if the study had included retention of the existing building for a commercial use and Commissioner Looney asked if a mixed use had been considered. Mr. Margerum replied that rehab costs would be approximately the same as replacing it. Two scenarios were considered: a 10,000 square foot commercial use and an 8,000 square foot commercial use with 2 residential units.

John Bates, in response to Commissioner Carbone, confirmed that up-dating the signal light would depend on the use and with a continuing use, an up-date will not be required.

Kimberley Player, Sedway representative, confirmed that Al's Market was considered in the study and concluded that it is capturing the demand. There is less demand for the subject site based on the spending market and the existing supply.

Mark Armstrong representing the property owner, Lake Chabot Partners, pointed out that Sedway confirms that renovation costs would not make it feasible to retain the building as it would need substantial up-grading both exterior and interior. Both reports also confirm that commercial use is not viable at this site. He urged the Commission to look at a residential use.

Jeff Howard stated that the site is a blight and Huber Drive, a sub-standard street, needs side walks and curbs. His main concern was access and other future residential proposal on Keith Avenue, if approved, would add potential customers for the mixed use and add additional traffic.

Kenneth Owens, 3246 Keith Avenue, said he has lived in this area for a long time and was unaware of any accidents resulting from existing/entering the site from Lake Chabot Road or Huber Drive. His concern was safety for children, lack of sidewalks and crosswalks with only a stop sign, speeding cars down Keith Avenue and additional traffic resulting in increased fumes. He felt that a commercial use would be better than ten homes.

Grey Silva, 20406 Redwood Road, said he has lived in this area for about 35 years and supported the proposal. The existing grocery stores, for example, Safeway, Albertsons and others, have super-sized their capacity to meet the growing demand, and as such, the use of this site as a commercial location has decreased. Since this site was no longer commercially viable, it was appropriate for a residential development with a park within walking distance.

Melba Akehurst felt it was not appropriate to impact the existing twenty neighboring property owners to the benefit of the developer. She supported the original plan which included entrance/exit from both Huber Drive and Lake Chabot. The intersection of Keith and Lake Chabot has a sight-distance issue. Using the controlled intersection is the safest. The proposed

sidewalks will affect her property as she has only one foot front yard.

Rich Mican, 3261 Keith Avenue, said he works for the Fire Department and opposed access to Huber Drive which is already narrow. Fire Department has recommended the minimum requirements if the project is approved, and would prefer access from Lake Chabot Road, especially emergency vehicle access. Any traffic improvement would benefit the community since a residential development will increase traffic. He disagreed that the property would have to be filled-in in order to provide access from Lake Chabot Road. He urged a denial for the project as proposed as it would only improve the property and not the community.

Craig Ragg stated that he owns the property on the south and his main concern was the vacant status. Although the new owners have installed a fence around the property, the building is an eyesore and a nuisance with illegal activities and graffiti.

John Thorpe indicated that the previous owner did have plans for commercial use. The existing building is structurally solid and does not have to be demolished. He did not support the proposed project.

Mark Pringle representing Lake Chabot Partners, felt that a residential project would be the most appropriate as it has similar uses on three sides with a park within walking distance. The economic study and the peer review concluded that this site would not support a commercial use. The traffic study for the area also indicates that there was and will be more traffic exiting on Huber Drive with a commercial use than with a residential use. He urged an approval.

Jeff Morgheim, property owner at 18809 Huber Drive, said traffic was his main concern and further described the different widths of Huber Drive. Currently, there are no curbs. If approved, the existing community needs to be taken into consideration. A commercial use could be successful if operated properly.

In response to Commissioner Looney, Ms. Utal stated that the intersection improvements were part of the conditions of approval in the August, 2005 staff report (page 3). Originally, the project did include egress and ingress from Lake Chabot Road but the County did not support it as it would provide access from Lake Chabot for Huber Drive residents. In response to the Chair, she confirmed that it would be a private road with No Parking signs. Any commercial development will have more traffic than a residential one.

Public testimony was closed. Commissioner Carbone pointed out that CVMAC had unanimously denied the project; the property had been identified as part of the Housing Element inventory, then removed and preserved as neighborhood commercial, which is also recommended by Redevelopment Agency and in the General Plan. Commissioner Jacob asked if the roadway improvement requirements as contained in the memo dated March 17th, 2005, would be consistent with a commercial project. Mr. Bates replied that there could be different traffic points but similar safety concerns. Commissioner Jacob felt that this was a prime location for infill housing. Although the Traffic Department has recommended traffic/safety mitigations, he would support additional improvements for Huber Drive. Commissioner Kirby indicated his

||||| support for neighborhood commercial and felt that this project was not compelling to approve a reclassification. Commissioner Hancocks said an approval will allow additional homes with access through Huber Drive, a sub-standard street; eliminate neighborhood commercial and reward commercial property owners who allow their properties to deteriorate and become a blight; and, as such, did not support the project. Commissioner Loisel said her concern was access onto Huber Drive. Widening Huber Drive would result in eliminating front yards of the existing neighboring lots. In response to the Chair, Mr. Bates confirmed that the widest part of Huber Drive was 44 feet. Commissioner Carbone asked for the extent of improvements if a commercial use was retained. Regardless of the use, Mr. Bates replied visibility, access and access control, accidents and safety will be taken into consideration. Commissioner Hancocks asked if these improvements would be required if the use remained commercial with interior changes to the existing structure. Ms. Borrman indicated that it would depend on whether or not the project is referred to Public Works. Mr. Buckley confirmed that there would be no discretionary action unless construction over 1,000 square feet was proposed.

Commissioner Carbone made the motion to deny the project and Commissioner Hancocks seconded. Motion carried 5/2 with Commissioners Imhof and Jacob dissenting.

The Chair announced a recess.

3. **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-8961 – LANGON** ~ Petition to convert 20 existing apartment units into 20 condominiums, on one site containing approximately 0.79 acres, in a R-S-D-15 (Suburban Residence, 1,500 square feet Minimum Building Site Area per Dwelling Unit) District, located at 1579 – 165th Avenue, northwest side, approximately 1,300 feet northeast of East 14th Street, San Leandro area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor’s Parcel Number: 080-0071-012-03.

Mr. Buckley presented the staff report and in response to Commissioner Looney confirmed that no comments have been received from City of San Leandro.

Public testimony was called for. John Langon, applicant, thanked staff for his work. Currently, fifteen units were rented and five units were vacant, and half of the tenants have expressed ownership interest.

Public testimony was closed. Commissioner Loisel made the motion to move staff recommendation for an approval and Commissioner Looney seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

STAFF COMMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE: None.

CHAIR’S REPORT: The Chair reminded the Commission of the PRHC Workshop on Thursday, April 6th at 6 p.m. He thanked staff for the refreshment provided at the Commission’s meetings.

