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PROCEEDINGS
Chair: [Bangs gavel] Good afternoon, I'd like to
call order, February 7, 2018, Planning Commission. I'd like
5 to also give a special welcome to our newest Commissioner.
6 Welcome Commissioner Challacombe.
7 Member Challacombe: Thank you, madam Chair. It's
8 an honor to be with this learned group. It's a little
9 unusual though because usually in the past I'd sit on the
10 other side of the chair, so being on this side is a new
11 experience. But I'm excited, and I hope to be able to
12 contribute to this Board. Thank you.
13 Chair Sodaro: Thank you. Welcome. We're honored
14 to have you. I believe I'd like to ask for an agenda change
15 just due to Commissioners with conflict. I'm asking to move
16 the December 6, 2017 minutes out. Any objections?
17 [no response] Hearing none, so noted.
18 Thank you.
19 So, today's public hearing is a request for
20 amendments to Chapter 21, Revised Ordinance of Honolulu,
21 1980, relating to Planned-Development Resort and Planned
22 Development Apartment and IP-D Interim Planned Development
23 Transit Projects and Conditional Use Permits. I'd like to
24 welcome the Department.
25 Ms. Balassiano: Good afternoon, Chair and members

1 of the Planning Commission. My name is Katiia Balassiano.
2 I'm the Land Use Permits Division Chief at the Department of
3 Planning and Permitting. We are here before you, and you've
4 received our report. We support this amendment and also
5 have two recommendations to make today and so we've
6 identified in the report itself.
7 First of all, I'd like to say that the amendment
8 revises and clarifies who may apply for a Planned
9 Development Resort and Planned Development Apartment
10 permits. We've discussed this matter with Corporation
11 Counsel in the past and believe that the language reflects
12 the people who have come before us and is a little bit more
13 specific in regards to who may apply. In fact, it reflects
14 how we've been accepting and processing permits to date.
15 The other component that this does is specifies
16 who may add and remove lots from these types of permits.
17 And again in practice we have been receiving applications to
18 modify these Planned Development Resort and Apartment
19 Permits in this same fashion, but this amendment is explicit
20 in what can be done and how it must be done. So, the
21 addition or removal of lots will be done in the same manner
22 that these permits are generally issued.
23 So, again, we are in support of those changes
24 associated with Resolution No. 17-303. When we reviewed
25 this proposal it also came to our attention that the same
1. Applicability definition. Let's say, is used in the
Conditional Use Permit as well as Interim Planned
Development Permit. So, rather than just make the
change as Council had proposed, we'd like to for symmetry
purposes and for standardization purposes make sure that
this language is also reflected in our other permits that
use exactly the same language. So, that's the addition that
we'd like for the Planning Commission and ultimately Council
to consider. This hearing was advertised such that those two
additions could be considered as part of this meeting today.
If there are any questions?

Chair Soder: Commissioners, any questions of the
Department at this time? Yes. (referring to Member
Challacombe)

Challacombe: Good afternoon, Mayor.
Ms. Balassiano: Glad to have you here,
Commissioner Challacombe.

Challacombe: If I'm not mistaken, the
intent of this proposal is similar to Bill 62. I can't
remember the Ordinance number when it was approved. But the
overlapping—

Ms. Balassiano: It is somewhat similar in that
Ordinance. We also had recommended that there be an
explicit process for adding and removing lots to a
particular permit that has already been approved. And that
language came from the existing UDO having to do with
historic properties and the transfer of development rights.

So, when we had the opportunity to look at the
overlapping UDO Ordinance we made those changes, and now
we're doing it again here. Because we understand ownership
changes with time and this is useful in redevelopment. And
as long as the individual lots can comply with all of the
existing standards of the zoning Ordinance, we see no reason
9 to restrict people from doing this kind of thing.

Challacombe: So, if I understand this
correctly, using Bill 62 if it's not in the Waikiki Special
District, one could use that as a tool to create a Planned
Development outside of the district without having to go to
Council. However, under this Bill, this proposal, Council
approval would be required. So, is this just another added
tool in the toolbox for development purposes?

Ms. Balassiano: Yes.

Challacombe: Okay. That's really great.
Any time we can give flexibility to developers to make
planned good projects, I'm certainly supportive. It's
something that I recall is that back in the 60s, the Hilton
Hawaiian Village and the conglomerate of the Sheraton, the
Royal Hawaiian and the Royal Hawaiian Shopping Center had
many, many lots and easements and driveways and they all put
it together to make these iconic developments in the Waikiki
area. Because they were able to do that under the old 60s
building code, and somehow we weaned away from that and now
we're going back. And, I think this is a great proposal.

Chair Soder: Any further questions at this time?

Member Tolentino: I have a few questions.

Chair Soder: Yes.

Member Tolentino: It's fairly similar. I just
noticed, you know the Planned Development for resort and
also apartment. Definition for resort is with the amenities
of having the pool and other amenities. Does this include
just a regular hotel? I know there's a difference between
hotel and resort.

Ms. Balassiano: It's for all of the projects that
apply for Planned Development Resort Permit. So, the number
and type of amenities is up to the applicant to put forward.
This could apply to a hotel without any amenities as well as
a hotel with amenities. And the same thing goes for Planned
Development Apartment.

Member Tolentino: Okay. So, I understand about
21 the 30 years, being previously owned or leased, possessing
22 that. But I want to move on to, why would an applicant would
23 have to apply to have his property removed? does this
24 automatically convert property?

Ms. Balassiano: No. It doesn't automatically
convert property. But we understand that when commercial
entities change hands and they wish to sell their holdings
they may no longer wish to proceed together. So, in
that situation the owners, lessees, developers, you know,
all of those people who were either involved in the project
to begin with or who are current owners or fall into the
7 categories you've got listed before they may apply to
have one of the properties removed from this unified permit.
So, it recognizes that entities on occasion choose to go
different ways and it doesn't mean that entitlements will be
lost when those entities part ways. In fact, it gives the
planning department the ability to review those proposals
and make sure that there are no entitlements that are lost. So,
it provides the explicit process for us to review that which
is introduced by the owners of these properties.

Member Tolentino: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Balassiano: Sure.

Chair Soder: Commissioner McMurdo.

Member McMurdo: If one of the owners opts out
after they receive the entitlement and the resulting areas
no longer contiguous or it doesn't meet any of the other,
are the entitlements stay in place, is that what you're
saying?

Ms. Balassiano: The underlying zoning—They must
comply with the underlying zoning.
1 Member McMurdo: Okay. Not with the—So, if it
doesn’t comply any more to the requirements of the PD-R, do
they lose the PD-R then?
2 Ms. Balsassano: I think that we would entertain
whatever proposal they’re coming in with. They might come
in with a stand-alone PD-R. It may have been brought to us
as one large project with many lots involved and then years
later, the group might come to us and say, you know, we want
to be two PD-Rs or we don’t need a PD-R for this part of the
property. We’re going to comply with the underlying zoning.
So, I think the ball is in the applicant’s court. What is
it that you would like?
3 Member McMurdo: They have to come back to you.
4 Ms. Balsassano: They have to come back, and we
need to make sure that there’s nothing lost that this
property remains whole, it remains conforming with the
underlying regulations.
5 Member McMurdo:
6 Okay, Thank you.
7 Chair Sokol: Additional questions?
8 Member Lim: I guess that raises the question
raised. If you don’t then qualify for one of the
requirements for a PD-R or PD-A because you’re not
(inaudible), doesn’t that void the permit?
9 Ms. Balsassano: Again, I think we would have to
look on a case-by-case basis. I think the intention of
these regulations is to provide flexibility to the various
property owners. I think that we would need to take a look
and see if the degree to which that existing permit is
impacted, whether it would need to go back to Council,
whether it’s something that could be addressed
administratively. I think it would depend, and I think it
would depend on the analysis that we conduct. I don’t think
that the intention is to void a permit and to put a property
owner at risk. That’s certainly not the intention.
12 Member Lim: You’re providing for the consent of
the original applicant to the PD-R or PD-A approval, and I
think that requirement. Because of the fact that these
projects get sold over and over sometimes, and it could be
15 years before this happens. I was thinking maybe it’s better
to have the fee owner authorization, the consent through the
fee owners rather than the original applicant who may be
gone.
14 Ms. Balsassano: I believe that’s how the language
is written, so, that it reflects existing owners. And it’s
all connected with a series of cars. So, it’s the owners,
lessors, developers or other designated representatives
including these people in lieu of individual owners consent.
So, the idea is that you could have many individual owners
in a particular apartment building, but that we would want,
let’s say, their board of directors, their condominium
owners, organization to be the entity that consents to this
change.
16 Member Lim: Okay. And the actual
recommendation—I see, developers or other representatives.
17 So, could any one of these?
18 Ms. Balsassano: It could be any one of these
19 people. We imagine that over time the governing entity
changes, it changes hands. Ownership changes.
10 Member Lim: Is this list of people who can consent
different from your fee owner authorization for a permanent
application?
15 Ms. Balsassano: These are the people who we
generally consult with.
17 Member Lim: The reason I asked the question is if
they aren’t the same, then why don’t just refer back to that
requirement. Because this is kind of a big list.
20 Member Lim: You know, 1% of the people who say
22 "yes" and 99% say "no". That’s not really a (inaudible).
23 Ms. B: Yes. And, I think that as we go forward
24 with more comprehensive changes to the Land Use Ordinance, I
think that we’re probably going to be looking for a way to
1 consolidate this larger list and make it applicable across
the Board for permits. So, this need not be repeated over
3 and over again with every permit that people apply for.
4 However, this is what we have right now and it was brought
to our attention by the Council that this particular
6 language should be revised. So, we needed to address the
7 request that is before us. So, again we took the
8 opportunity to think about how we currently do business and
9 believe it reflects, you know, the entities that we
currently accept applications from.
11 Member Lim: So, the LLO doesn’t have a fee owner
12 (inaudible) like blank, blank, blank. It doesn’t have that
13 kind of application?
14 Ms. Balsassano: No.
15 Member Lim: Okay.
16 Chair Sokol: In the same vein, kind of going
17 back, I think to understanding who’s the applicant is what I
18 read into Commissioner Lim’s line of questioning. I have a
19 question. So where that used to be singular, “the
20 applicant”. So, I guess, I’m trying to both understand
21 practically the process of opening the door to applicants.
22 So, is that then multiple people and/or agents of what is
23 currently the practice of the fee owner representation. So,
24 if we could have a like a string of applicants.
25 Ms. Balsassano: Yes, that’s correct.
Chair Sokaro: Okay. Caught into a catch-all of an applicant.

Ms. Balassiano: That's correct.

Chair Sokaro: Okay.

Ms. B: That's how we currently deal with it.

When there's multiple property owners and multiple lots involved, we'd like to get the consent of everyone involved.

So that's why it's more accurate to say the owners.

Chair Sokaro: And is there a change of who can consent or not? I think that's one of the questions that Commissioner Lim was seeking clarification on.

Ms. Balassiano: No. There's no change.

Chair Sokaro: Okay. And, I'm trying to understand the withdrawal process due to some of the line of questions that have come up. So, if the conditions of the permit that's granted can't be satisfied with the remnant applicant and then the pull out applicant, that means that the permit was issued when they were all in one group holds, despite a minority person wanting to come out if the new process can't be—or the new outcome. I'm just thinking while nothing is built, it's easy. But if there's physical improvements that were contemplated other than being one group of applicants and then one person wants out, I'm just trying to understand what happens then when the others can't satisfy the requirements due to physical improvement that was contemplated on them all. Or are we just kind of entering a new chapter.

Ms. Balassiano: The idea is—

Chair Sokaro: You issue a new permit or—

Ms. Balassiano: Again, I think you know this allows the applicants to propose to us that which they want to do, but our analysis is that whatever proposal comes before us, no individual property should be left in a worse condition than when they started. We do not want them to—they need to have all of the necessary entitlements and no one should be allowed to remove themselves or be forced to remove themselves without being able to conform with zoning. So, if they went a different permit, a stand-alone permit. Again, if they want to come in and say, in fact, what we need are two Planned Development Resort Permits instead of one and the Planned Development Resort Permit allows for quite a bit of flexibility. So, if there are waivers that are needed, I think we would examine those requests, depending on what came in. But the purpose of the review is that the properties should be separate that they can stand-alone and have the necessary zoning that allows them to conform for financial purposes.

Chair Sokaro: So zoning aside, what about the conditions that come with the permit. Do they have to privately settle who fulfills those conditions? I mean,

Chair Sokaro: I'm thinking—

Ms. Balassiano: There may be private agreements between the parties that the city is not privy to.

Chair Sokaro: So, zoning aside, lot of the permits come with conditions—

Ms. Balassiano: Yes, that's right.

Chair Sokaro: So, how does then the solution for the conditions occur? I mean, because we're kind of speaking of hypothetically worst. I can think through like a puzzle where it all shaken out. I guess, what's confusing me, if the conditions can't be satisfied, and let's say the zoning can't be satisfied, does that put the Department in a position of denying the withdrawal?

Ms. Balassiano: I think we would have the opportunity to deny the withdrawal. I mean that's the whole point of having a permit come to us. It's a discretionary approval. So, we would have to make sure that each of the properties, you know, end up complying and if there are conditions that haven't been met, then there may be future conditions of approval.

Chair Sokaro: So, I have a question real quick, Director. Thank you. So, in the process of them coming back to you, where you said may be two different permits are proposed to keep the split applicants whole, is that an approval, is that a different approval process than if they had come through originally on their own PD-R, PD-R?

Acting Director Sokoglu: I think what I try to do is I understand, I think what the Planning Commission questions are asking. So, may be I can give some examples and that might be helpful. So, in one case you have an original PD-R with multiple lots, may be one owner and it's part of the conditions of approval. It says you need to create a road widening, which means you have to subdivide out the portion that's now going to the road. So, now you have the City and County who's now part of the PD-R because that land was included in the PD-R. City and County don't want to part of that PD-R. So, that would be an example of asking to be removed from the PD-R. In that case it's possible that the Administration would say that's a minor enough so that based on the application that we would exclude out that remnant lot that was now created. It's now going be part of the roadway, would no longer be part of the PD-R. That's a very simple ease housekeeping administrative type of withdrawal. But you may have another one where it's a significant lot. Let's say it's 2 acres out of a 12-acre project, and they now believe whatever. There was a divorce that was part of the settlement. Define divorce as however you went it, and they want to be no longer in the PD-R. Depends what was granted for that site plan and that
development rights for the whole project and how much of it could be that we may recommend it or not. It could be that Council level. So, again it depends on the nature of the change. All this does, and I'm being overly simplistic is in a way this is a housekeeping measure. Because as we envision the joint development originally, it was at the beginning of development, pre-development, and you really had only one person or one entity or bunch of entities that said, this is the vision we have for it. This is the way we want to go through it as one whole project. But now we're finding out that as projects get developed they get sold in many kind of pieces from individual lots to a time shared unit. And, so the code needs to recognize that and be able for development to continue to evolve, respond to market opportunities, and we're just saying one way of helping with that without creating a requirement that was primarily based on the project plan. It doesn't really address right now well. What happens after the project has matured and needs to continue to evolve and meet new needs. So, this has been, in a way, I'm overly simplifying it. It's like a bookkeeping accounting, bookkeeping measure, just to allow things to go on. Someone has said, well—And when they did that multiple project, when they started releasing

used to build a higher building or more density—

Mr. Sokugawa: Exactly. So, the ideal solution from our standpoint is, it can without and still be whole, and the original PD-R would still be whole.

Right. So, they fulfilled all their parking on their side. They fulfilled all their density. They didn't go over. They beat the height limit, whatever happens to be, may be the only reason why they went with a PD-R is because they had internet connected circulation system or whatever. That would be simple, but that's probably—

Member Lim: 10 acres can now develop what was intended to be the original PD-R?

Mr. Sokugawa: It would have to be again on a case-by-case—if they're separately whole, then there's no point unless one of them wanted to take the other's development rights, then, you know, they would have to settle that. And if they couldn't settle that, then we would require coming back to us for some kind of action, whether it's a zoning variance or a PD-R modification or two new PD-Rs through City Council. Again, it depends on the nature of the separation.

Member Lim: So, let's say if someone got into a fight about it and the 2-acre parcel owner wants out of it now, under this because they're the owner, they can apply for this withdrawal?

those rights to different parties, those documents should've been clearly written to say what happens in any kind of future entitlement request. That would be a private matter is what we're saying between the original developer and the subsequent owners. So, if you have a time share unit and there wasn't enough information in your time share documents that said what happens in the event that somebody on another lot, what's part of your PD-R wants to do something that you don't have a right to it that you're being represented by your AGO or whatever. That's what you have to then question privately. But the City is proposing we not make all of those subsequent owners be part of the application. And, so to Commissioner Lim's question about the fee simple. That's a valid question but what happens if you have the fee simple owner gave away the ground lease for 99 years. So, that's you know, how much influence do they care really or do they want to have. Because they gave away the ground lease rights to somebody else. So, you know, it's a fair question but also it could be difficult if the fee owner has no interest in the development rights of today or tomorrow for that matter because they've given away those rights to somebody else.

Member Lim: Director, in the instance that you mentioned, may be let's withdraw 2 acres of a 12-acre PD-R, theoretically the density from the 2 acres could've been.

Mr. Sokugawa: Yes.

Member Lim: Even if the 10-acre owner doesn't want him to.

Mr. Sokugawa: Well, then the question as Katrina said, what would the City do with that.

Member Lim: Right. That's the question.

Mr. Sokugawa: But at least we're clarifying that situation and somewhat providing guidance on what to do with that.

Chair Sokuro: So, is the withdrawal 11 process—Because we're kind of referring to an umbrella, but the withdrawal process could be another PD-R application?

Mr. Sokugawa: Yes. Well, if they try to withdraw, we would say well, you can't without having something to take its place.

Chair Sokuro: Is that an administrative review?

Mr. Sokugawa: No. I mean, well the call might be, but if you need a new PD-R that would go to Council. If it's a major modification it would go to Council.

Chair Sokuro: So, the consultation and forums, the process essentially to withdraw because it needs to make everybody whole.

Mr. Sokugawa: Well, the withdrawal itself may not make everybody whole. But the process—

Chair Sokuro: But you wouldn't give the
1. withdraw—
2. Ms. Soluggawa: Yeah—
3. Chair Sodaro: Because I’m trying to understand the
4. nullification of the permit—
5. Ms. Soluggawa: Right. You cannot unilaterally
6. withdraw. You’d have to be with a companion whatever else.
7. Chair Sodaro: Simultaneous, Okay.
8. Ms. Boll: Often what we have is a request for a
9. determination. So, before an actual permit comes in we get,
10. you know, a letter 2-pages from an applicant that asks for
11. guidance in regards to how to proceed. This is what I want
12. to do, what kind of permits do I need and that often gives
13. an opportunity for some discussion back-and-forth to say,
14. here is your options.
15. Ms. Soluggawa: And just to make it more
16. complicated, people may not want just went a divorce, they
17. want to marry somebody. And, I mean in this situation
18. that they want to do more development kind.
19. Automatically that will help. The law requires
20. that they may require a 343, a supplemental environmental
21. document. So, again, that will help tease out issues and
22. what the permitting requirements were based on what the
23. proposed action would be.
25. Member Chalacome: Director Soluggawa, in your

1. career how many withdrawals of the major projects in Waikiki
2. have you seen?
3. Ms. Soluggawa: Since I don’t regulate them
4. personally in my history, but from my history zero.
5. Member Chalacome: Okay. I remember two in my 33
6. years. Just to give a perspective.
7. Chair Sodaro: Thank you. Any other questions?
8. Ms. Soluggawa: Sorry. But the PD-R provides
9. projects with amenities. So, you know, it’s inherit almost
10. for everybody to stay in the marriage, so to speak, because
11. you’re getting benefits from that.
12. Member Chalacome: That was my point.
14. Chair Sodaro: I think the sentiment is that it
15. helps enable multiple owners who don’t want to step into a
16. joint entity. We’ve seen special—
17. Ms. Soluggawa: Exactly—
18. Chair Sodaro: We’ve seen special ordinances come
19. through for Waikiki because of the nature of the holdings
20. there. I think, we’re all thinking about the—we’ve opened
21. the door to divorce. So, we’re trying to understand that
22. back and process. So, thank you, Katia. If
23. there’s no further questions from Department, I’d like to
24. open it up to public hearing. We have two testifiers signed
25. up. Mr. Jerry Gibson. Please also state your name for the

1. record, sir.
2. Mr. Gibson: Good afternoon. Makes Chair, members of
3. the Planning Commission. My name is Jerry Gibson. Area vice
4. president for Hilton. Thank you for your time today.
5. I really appreciate it. Hilton’s for land use ordinance
6. amendments for pros and resolution 17-303 relating to
7. approved development request PD-R and Planned Development
8. Airport PD-A projects. Hilton operates the Hilton
9. Hawaiian Village Resort in Waikiki for the owner, Park
10. Hotels and Resorts, Incorporated. The PD-R permit option has
11. provided the needed flexibility to redevelop the Hilton
12. Hawaiian Village resulting in a better, more creative resort
13. design that contributes to the stability function and
14. overall ambiance and appearance of Waikiki and that has made
15. Hilton Hawaiian Village Waikiki landmark and favorite
16. destination for visitors. Hilton believes that the proposed
17. amendments are important to the continued redevelopment and
18. revitalization of Waikiki through the PD-R and PD-A
19. projects. An PD-R projects like the Hilton Hawaiian Village
20. continue to be redeveloped and evolve over time, the ability
21. to add or remove lots increases flexibility.
22. Further, as the demand for visitor accommodations
23. continues to grow, the ability of smaller landowners to work
24. together on a PD-R or PD-A project is vital to more
25. creativity, meeting lodging needs and rejuvenating

1. deteriorated areas. Hilton agrees with the position of the
2. Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) on Resolution
3. 17-303 as set forth in the DPP’s report dated January 10th,
4. 2018 and appreciates this opportunity to provide testimony.
5. Any questions?
6. Chair Sodaro: Seeing none, thank you, sir.
7. Mr. Gibson: Thank you very much.
8. Chair Sodaro: I’d like to call Kelse McCallan to
9. the stand. Please state your name.
10. Mr. McCallan: Thank you. Kelse McCallan for the
11. record. Chair and Commissioners, we appreciate you
12. scheduling this public hearing today. I’d like to draw your
13. attention to just two components of the proposed land use
14. ordinance change that’s outlined in 17-303. One, that this
15. affords the ability for multiple small lot owners to hui
16. together and apply to the PD-R and PD-A process. So, it
17. democratizes, in essence, if you will, within the designated
18. district the ability for other small land owners to partner
19. with either larger landowners or with each other.
20. That’s a good thing. And, secondly, as written 17-303
21. preserves public oversight whether it is an application to
22. apply for the PD-R process or an application for withdrawal
23. from the existing PD-R. The mechanism relevant to those
24. activities and the public’s oversight in the zoning variance
25. in a PD-R application or PD-A application remain constant.
1 So, to the Director’s point, should there be a resulting
2 need for a zoning variance that full course play out or
3 should there be a need for a new ED-R application that many
4 months sometimes many long processes with public oversight, an
5 input from the community, from the council, and from the
6 honorable commissioners is preserved. So, thank you for
7 your consideration in this measure.
8 Chair Sodaro: Any questions? [no response]
9 Thank you very much.
10 Member Mc Mundo: Can we find out who he
11 represents?
12 Chair Sodaro: Oh, sure thing. Mr. McClellan come
13 back. Do you represent anyone?
14 Member McClellan: Do you represent yourself or—
15 Mr. McClellan: Oh, thank you. For the record,
16 I'm Nekai McClellan with the McClellan Group, and I work
17 with Park Hotels and Resorts. Thank you.
18 Member Mc Mundo: Thank you.
19 Chair Sodaro: Thank you, Commissioner. Anyone
20 else in the audience seeking to testify this afternoon? [no
21 response] Seeing none, may I ask for a motion to close
22 public hearing.
23 Member Tencino: So moved.
24 Member Mc Mundo: Second.
25 Chair Sodaro: Thank you. Public hearing is now
26 closed. Commissioners, we can turn to discussion.
27 Are there any last minute questions of the
28 Department before I call for a motion? [no response] Seeing
29 none, any Commissioners like to offer a motion?
30 Member Mc Mundo: Like to move that we approve this
31 request for amendments.
32 Member Lim: Second.
33 Chair Sodaro: Thank you. So, the motion on the
34 floor is to approve as recommended by DPP, Resolution
35 No. 17-303. Any open questions or discussions for everyone?
36 [no response] Seeing none. Okay, here we go. No
37 discussions. With that, I'd like to take a vote. All those
38 in favor.
39 All Commissioners: Aye.
40 Chair Sodaro: Any opposed? [no response]
41 Hearing none, matter passes as recommended. Thank you,
42 Department. Department, any housekeeping for us, Gloria?
43 Hearings Reporter: None.
44 Chair Sodaro: None. Thank you so much. Motion
45 to close.
46 Member Lim: So moved.
47 Chair Sodaro: Thank you. [Bangs gavel]
48 [meeting adjourned approximately 2:15 p.m.]