

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Good evening. My name is Edisa Bit-Badal, and I am the chair of the Planning Commission. On behalf of the entire Planning Commission, I would like to welcome you to the Planning Commission public hearing of Wednesday, August 22, 2012. Please remember to turn off your cell phones. Parking ticket validation machine for the garage under City Hall is located at the rear of the chambers. If you want to address the commission, fill out a speaker card located on the table by the door on the parking ticket validation table at the back, and at the bottom of the stairs near the audiovisual technician. Deposit the completed card in the basket near the planning technician. Please include the agenda item number, not the file number, for reference. For example, 4A, not PD 06-023. The procedure for this hearing is as follows: After the staff report, applicants and appellants may make a five-minute presentation. The chair will call out names on submitted speaker cards in the order received. As your name is called, line up in front of the microphone at front of the chambers. Each speaker will have two minutes. After the public testimony, the applicant and appellant may make closing remarks for an additional five minutes. Planning Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. Response to commissioners' questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance. The public hearing will then be closed, and the Planning Commission will take action on the item. The planning Commission may request staff to respond to public testimony, ask staff questions, and discuss the item. If you challenge these land use decisions in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at this public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the city at, or prior to, the public hearing. The Planning Commission's actions on rezoning, prezonings, general plan amendments and code amendments is only advisory to the City Council. The City Council will hold public hearings on these items. Roll call. Let the record show that all commissioners are present, with exception of Commissioner Kamkar and Commissioner Cahan. Deferrals. Any item scheduled for hearing this evening for which deferral is being requested will be taken out of order to be heard first on the matter of deferral. A list of staff-recommended deferrals is available on the press table. Staff will provide an update on items for which deferral is being requested. If you want to change any of the Deferral dates recommended, or speak to the question of deferring these or any other items, you should say so at this time. To effectively manage the Planning Commission agenda, and to be sensitive to concerns regarding the length of public hearing, the Planning Commission may determine either to proceed with remaining agendized items past 11:00 p.m, to continue this hearing to a later date, or defer remaining items to the next regularly scheduled

Planning Commission meeting date. Decision on how to proceed will be heard by the Planning Commission no later than 11:00 p.m. We have one item on deferral.

>> Thank you, staff has no additional reports except to draw your attention to the memorandum that was sent to you from the planning director which it itemizes the time line for deferral that has been requested by the appellant and the applicant. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you there is a memo as you stated submitted by the staff. Consent calendar. Actually do we have -- do we have a motion on deferral?

>> Commissioner Kline: Motion to defer 1A to October 24th.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: All approving say aye. Motion passes. Consent calendar. Staff.

>> Yeah, there are no items on consent calendar tonight.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you staff. Public hearing. Generally, the public hearing items are considered by the Planning Commission in the order which they appear on the agenda. However, please be advised that the commission may take items out of order to facilitate the agenda, such as to accommodate significant public testimony or may defer discussion of items to later agendas for public hearing time management purposes. Staff.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. The first item is file number PD12-020, ABC 120-004. The project is Planned development permit and determination of public Convenience or necessity, otherwise known as PCRN, request To allow for the offsale and onsale of alcohol, late night use for a new full-service restaurant, in a 3890 square foot ground floor commercial tenant space located in a mixed use building that's part of a larger residential development. Based on the analysis discussed in the staff report, staff concluded that all the required findings for the issuance of a planned development permit for the onsale and offsale of alcoholic beverages and the late-night use until 2:00 a.m. can be made with regard to the proposal. The location of the offsale of alcohol is in a bona fide

public eating establishment, a restaurant, and an existing tenant space in the mixed use development. There are no existing licensed offsale establishments within 500 feet or within 1,000 feet of the subject tenant space. In a memorandum from the San José police department it stated that they are neutral to the proposed planned development permit and that the site is not located in an area deemed to be over-concentrated with offsale outlets or in an area of high crime. I would like to note that on page 3 of the staff report under the recommendation we incorrectly stated that you need to make a recommendation to city council. However, we did ultimately determine that the public convenience or necessity findings can be made by the Planning Commission. Therefore, planning staff is recommending that the Planning Commission grant the public convenience or necessity for the offsale of alcohol and while the onsale -- and find that the project is in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act and approve the proposed planned development permit. This concludes staff report.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you staff. At this point I will call the applicant, is the applicant here? If the applicant is here please introduce yourself. Come forward and introduce yourself and you have up to five minutes.

>> Good evening. My name is Jarrod Taylor representing Patxi's pizza, a high quality pizza restaurant. Thank you for your time and staff's help in reviewing this application. We agree with the staff report. You may have been to some of our other locations in the city. It's a fast-growing very small pizza chain that really focuses on high quality pizza and in conjunction with the sale of pizzas and other food items the kitchen of course is open at all times. We do propose the sale of a full line of alcoholic beverages for onsite consumption. Of course pizza being a popular takeout item, you know when you come to potentially purchase one of our high-quality pizzas for takeout, we have found in the past that some guests wish to be able to grab a micro-brew or a good bottle of wine to take with them. Really the offsale component is a very small portion of our sales. It's really to provide that convenience for the guest, so they don't have to make another stop on the way home from work they can just stop, grab a pizza, grab a beer and head home. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you, it seems like there's no questions from our commissioners. Thank you.

>> If I may I just would like to state that the property owner is here in support of our application as well just so the record can show.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you very much, sir. At this point, we do not have any more speaker cards on this matter. The applicant, of course, had more than two minutes left in his time so if you would like to continue you can. If not I will entertain a motion to close the public hearing. And all approving say aye. Staff.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. Staff has no additional comments.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Commissioner Abelite.

>> Commissioner Abelite: I would like to go ahead and, make a motion to consider the use of a final EIR and addendum thereto, in accordance with CEQA, and approve a planned development permit and determination of public convenience or necessity request to off sale and on-sale of kilogram chronological for a new full service on 38.5 acres for the reasons cited, stated in the staff report.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Do we have a second? Second by Commissioner O'Halloran. All approving, please vote by light. The motion was approved, all those who were present approved the motion. Thank you. Staff, item 3B.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. This is filing number PDC 08-067. A planned development rezoning to allow for the development of up to 103 multifamily residential units on a 3.52 gross acre portion of a larger 12.9 gross acre site. As discussed in the staff report the planned development zoning for the 103 multifamily residential units is consistent with the goals and policies of the San José 2020 general plan and the site plan use designations. Most specifically the project is consistent with the housing and growth management major strategies as it will add residential units within an area already served by urban services and one that is surrounded by similar existing multifamily residential units. Additionally, the product type proposed is designed consistent with the intent of the residential design guidelines and the new four story building will be located at the rear of the site with adequate

setbacks on all sides and a multilevel parking garage that is well screened and wrapped by the residential units themselves. Also tonight I handed to you a letter from an adjacent neighbor that was recently received. And I would also secondly like to state that the public hearing notice for this item incorrectly stated that it was located on the south side of Summerside drive. However, the address listed and the map that was attached were correct. Finally, based on the analysis and the initial study for the project, the city concluded that the planned development rezoning would not have a significant effect on the vitamin and the mitigated negative declaration includes mitigation measures that would reduce any impacts to less than significant. All of these mitigation measures are included in the development standards for the zoning. Therefore, planning staff is recommending that the Planning Commission find the project in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act and recommend to the city council approval of the proposed zoning on the site. This concludes staff report.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you. Is the applicant here? Would you please come forward introduce yourself and you have up to five minutes.

>> Madam chairman, members of the commission, my name is Marvin bamberg. I'm with MBA architects representing the owners, multiple owners of this property. Mr. Richard Gregerson who is my client from peninsula West is here this evening also. He has a good history in this project and both of us can help answer your questions. The staff report I thought was quite thorough. I really have nothing else to add, and in the interest of saving time I won't bore you with a presentation but if you have questions I'm more than happy to entertain them.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you sir. At this point it looks like we do not have any more questions but there is a speaker card so you have another five minutes to come back and respond to the speakers.

>> Thank you.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: We do have a speaker card on this item and I will ask Sim Tai Chang would you please come forward and speak. If there are any other members of the audience who would like to speak they

would need to fill out a green card as I mentioned at the beginning of the meeting and you need to give the green card to the staff. Sir, would you restate your name for the record.

>> I'm Shin Tai Chang owner of the town house 52 meadow court. I strongly object to the rezoning plan. Number one, four-story building right behind my town house and other neighbors town houses and it makes a passage road right by our backyards for hundreds of cars to exit from the garage all day. This would totally change the current open, quiet, clean, bright and sunny environment of our houses and have dramatic impact on their life and property values of the people of deer meadow community. Two, some in the apartments is no qualified for any significant expansion. It has very bad track record and reputation managing its apartments complex and serving its residents. Its overall rating is only 1.6 out of 5. So while they should focus on is to improve the existing conditions and is not to demolished the swimming pool and the sports facility, is not to make more units to get things worse. Three, the proposed plan view significantly degraded their safety and the traffic condition of the greater neighborhood in this area. This area already has the highest population density in San José, with many problems. Anyway, the developers tried to benefit self as a great cost to the innocent neighbors, we ask the Planning Commission to protect our interests. Will you take whatever action necessary to stop this disaster construction plan. Thanks. Also I have my complete statement print out and can give it to you.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: You may give it to staff. Thank you so much sir. We do not have any questions for you. Next speaker is Jeff learned, and next is Mr. Harry Gonzales would you please come forward and form a line. So Mr. Learned would you please restate your name for the record.

>> Yeah, my name is Jeff learned. And I'm a local homeowner. I own some property over at the summerton condominium right around the corner from this. And one of my main objections is the market's already saturated, there's plenty of living quarters for everyone and the market's already taken a turn for the worse. My property value I'm underwater right now and I can only seeing that get worse if there's additional areas for people to live. More apartments it's just going to make matters worse for me financially. In addition to that the apartment complex in question is already well-known as kind of a high crime area. There's always police there, there's always trouble and I can only imagine if it gets more crowded that this is only going to become worse. I don't

really see any benefit to the rest of the neighbors if this happens. And the other issue I have is the parking. If they're going to have all these additional units they're going to have to supply additional parking. If you go down Summerside drive down there there's people double parking all the time, the street is full of cars, sometimes I have to sit there for a couple of minutes just to drive through there because there's so much congestion. I can only see that getting worse as well, I see no benefit, it's only going to hurt the local area, it's going to hurt homeowners and I'd really like it if you guys reconsider.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you sir. Seems like we do not have questions but thank you for your time. And next speaker please, come forward and state your name.

>> Yes, Harry Gonzales. I'm a resident there at deer meadow court, back side. Like the gentleman was saying it is pretty congested now. If they build this much unit it's just going to get crazy. I live in the back side, the quiet side of deer meadow. It's kind of nice. Having the pool there and the playground. And people playing basketball. I mean if you put more units the kids has no place to go. I mean just playing and all that. I mean it's just going to be more congested, more headache, people just going to park all along Lucretia. To me, it's going to be terrible. I bring my two boys up there on deer meadow, it's going to be good. It's going to be crazy. I got this notice two days ago, I didn't write, that's 80 came down here or took a day off just took some time off to let you hear what I'm getting ready to say. That's bit, it's just a bad idea. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you so much sir, appreciate it. And at this point I'm going to ask the applicant to come forward. You have five minutes to either continue your presentation or to answer, also, some of the concerns that came before us.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll have to say, I had a very difficult time hearing the first speaker. I'm not exactly sure what his points were. I'm going to be unable to address them. Since I could not understand it.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: He submitted them in writing so if you would like to review them quickly, you can do so as well. We can give them to you.

>> It will take me longer than my five minutes you realize. Let me comment on the few things mentioned by the other speakers. There will be plenty of parking on this site, it will all be concealed. We're building this project in what is known as a Texas doughnut. The residents will be wrapped around it. You'll access the parking by driving through the driveways each side and into this concealed parking garage. It's multi-level, a small part of it is below ground. The -- several above-ground levels, will terminate with a plaza on the top of that with a recreation facilities for this particular complex will be located. There will be a clubhouse there, there will be a pool there. The site currently, if you notice the shape of this, is a T, inverted T. The east and west parts of the T which are at the bottom are developed. Each one is identical to the other and there is 144 units in each one. They're built over parking garages as the staff report indicates. As a part of this project we are building pool complexes and tot lots within the centers of both of those complexes. Traditionally the upper part of this site which is where we're proposing this project was the recreation facilities for both of these complexes. It includes a large pool, large clubhouse, a lot of tennis courts and open space, which I understand the neighbors were happy to have the open space although nobody much uses those facilities anymore and that's why the developer felt it's a better use to develop something on there that could use the property. The current tenancy in this property do not use these large facilities. The other comment that I heard that was mentioned was the poor market conditions. We have -- we're optimistic that they'll get better but there's no guarantee that we're going to build this project immediately. Certainly the market conditions will dictate whether this project goes forward or not. We're just asking for the zoning at this particular time. We feel it's a good use for the site. It's an infill project. All the city services are there already. Mr. Gregerson has years of experience in running this operation. If you have any particular questions about what is currently there.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you sir. We do have a question for you from Commissioner O'Halloran.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Thank you, Madam Chair. Had a couple of questions related to the comments that were in the letter. You mentioned that the sports facilities aren't being used as they once were. Are they going to be replaced in any way in the new plan?

>> That's what I indicated, yes. Both of these existing projects have central courtyards which will have new swimming pools and tot lots built within them.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay.

>> So each will be a stand-alone project. We have already got a permit for putting an office in each one and they will be independently operated.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: I noticed there was a daycare center in one, is that correct?

>> I think in the existing lot that will be removed there is an existing daycare center.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Are there plans to relocate?

>> I can't answer that -- no plans to relocate that.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: In the letter it was also claimed that the construction period will last for two years. Is that your plan or is that correct or incorrect?

>> That's a pretty rough approximation. Until we get plans from contractors it's pretty hard to estimate how long.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: It.

>> It won't.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: It wouldn't be significantly less or more than that?

>> That's a pretty good approximation.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: We don't have any further questions for you. Thank you so much.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: At this point I'll entertain a motion to close the Public Works hearing. All approve please say aye. Thank you. Staff.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. I did want to just point out a couple of things from the development standards for the project. First in regards to parking, they're not asking for a parking reduction for this site. They are parking at the regular zoning ordinance standards. So by bedroom unit so the same thing that would be in any other zoning district. Secondly, the number of units is far below what they could actually do on the site given the general plan designation that would allow it to go up to 50 units at the acre. It's somewhere around 30 units to the acre as proposed. The neighbors' concern about the height of the building, the development standards do recommend that there's a 25-foot setback on all sides. However the conceptual site plan shows about 55 feet currently. With a approximately 48-foot tall building and this would be consistent with what we typically do when there's height differences of a one to one ratio of one foot of setback for every foot of height. So the setbacks given the conceptual site plan could be increased. But the requested 25 feet is consistent with the typical development standards of a multifamily zoning designation in the zoning ordinance. And as far as open space, the applicant was correct in stating that they do have an approved site development permit to replace that open space within the courtyard areas of each of the existing apartment units and this proposed development would have its own open space on the podium. So all the open space would be able to stand on its own. This concludes staff report.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you staff. Commissioner O'Halloran.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question for staff. Can you address one of the issues that was brought up in the letter about the parking garage exit presumably you had conversations in the development review process. Can you address how you looked at that, and what staff's consideration is?

>> Thank you. The parking garage exit for the project as proposed is pretty close to the front of the building. Because it's located sort of in the rear of that inverted T. It is going to be closer to some existing residents on the periphery of the site. But it is moved as close to the front of that T as possible. And there is one on either side. So not all cars will need to go in and out of just the one driveway. So there are two options. But for the particular speaker, that garage entrance is closest to his unit.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay, thank you. I also have some questions about maybe for my education and the rest of the commission, about when staff determines a negative dec versus a mitigated negative dec and the threshold for significance. My understanding here if it were not for these mitigations then there would be significant impacts. And the significant impacts that I can see, these are where I had questions about staff's thinking and the thresholds. On the raptors, the tech says that there's no rare endangered species, et cetera, there haven't been any nests or raptors sighted but in the end there remains a potential for raptors to nest in this area. Was there something particular about this site that made you think there was a significant impact or basically anyplace that would have mature trees that would trigger a significant impact here?

>> Thank you. I do believe that a majority of sites with large trees do have that potential for an impact. And so it has been the city's threshold that we include that as a mitigation measure when there are large trees. And the mitigation is to provide a report prior to any demolition or any construction or demolition on the site.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay so it's the number and size of mature trees?

>> Correct, that's my best understanding. I don't have any environmental staff here with me tonight to corroborate that finding but it is my understanding.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: And removal of 20 or more nonnative tree species is considered to be a significant impact. Where is the threshold there and is there a difference between native and nonnative in determining whether it is significant or not?

>> That is again a city threshold and there is a table for native versus nonnative so obviously native is a greater impact and they have higher replacement ratios.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: So five would that be a significant impact or is that in a table somewhere?

>> I believe that we consider anything over 20 trees to be an impact.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: How many?

>> 20 trees, 20 large ordinance size trees to be an impact under our threshold.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay. And then finally the other significant, potentially significant impact was apparently related to temporary construction noise. And is that because of the length of construction, or the magnitude of this project? Because presumably other projects that have temporary construction noise aren't necessarily significant impacts. What was the thinking there?

>> It's the proximity of existing residences for this particular project.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay so the temporary impacts even though they're temporary they're still considered significant?

>> Correct.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay. Okay.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Madam Chair, if I may help the commission understand, from your questions you can see we take a very conservative approach to how we look at thresholds of significance. So staff did a fine job explaining under these circumstances why we have mitigations. These are very standard mitigations that we use for construction, in particular. As well as trees, et cetera. So it's other cities may not have are this type of approach. But we do tend to be a bit more on the conservative side to make sure we've got adequate mitigation.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: How often do we see mitigated negative decs on projects during the year?

>> Laurel Prevetti: Oh, most of -- we very rarely issue a plain negative declaration. Like maybe once in a calendar year. All the other negative declarations will be mitigated negative declarations. And typically the initial study will have the discussion about why we came up with those conclusions, and all of that information is available online for the commission.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Thank you for the education. One more question related to mitigation. In the development standards there's a section on page 4 that has environmental mitigation. It has biological resources relating to the raptors, and noise, but I don't see anything related to the tree mitigation. Is that just an oversight or should there be something there in the development standards specifying the tree mitigation?

>> Thank you. That actually, the trees for this particular project are standard mitigation measures that we include in all our projects for tree removals. There was actually nothing significant about the tree removals on this project. But as discussed in the initial study, the project will include a standard measure. So it's something that we always include when you remove trees.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay.

>> A standard sort of ratio, there were no significant trees being removed.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Sorry there was one more.

>> Sure.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: In the environmental checklist under noise it says mitigation measures will be incorporated into the proposal for temporary concrete crushing during construction. I didn't see those. Did I miss them? What those mitigation measures specifically for the concrete crushing would be?

>> Just one second, let me look it up.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay, thanks.

>> Thank you. I did find the section you were talking about and it does look like that mitigation measure should have been included in the bulleted list and it wasn't. So that is something that we can add in.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay do we have to do that tonight or will that --

>> We can do -- staff can do that as part of our transmittal to council, include that mitigation measure that was missed.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Okay, thank you. Thank you, that's all Madam Chair.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you for your questions and comments. I will at this point do we have any more questions I do not see any more lights up or names. I will entertain a motion. Commissioner O'Halloran.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: Thank you. Madam Chair, I'd make a motion that we approve staff recommendation, for PDC 08067, planned development rezoning from the RM planned development zoning district to the A(PD) planned development zoning district to allow for the development of up to 103 multifamily

attached residences at an existing multifamily residential complex on a 3.52 gross acre portion of a 25.8 gross acre site located on the south side of Summerside with the drive between McLaughlin and Lucretia, with the -- with the addition of the concrete crushing mitigation. And the recommendation as staff made it for --

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: You're doing great for your third meeting.

>> Commissioner O'Halloran: I've only been here three weeks, I've never done a motion before, so excuse me.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: No, you stated it as it should be, thank you. Do we have a second? We have a second for the motion with the additional amendment to the motion recommended by staff. Would you all please vote by light. The motion was unanimously approved by all those Planning Commissioners here with the exception of Commissioner Kamkar and Cahan who are not present. This item is going to go to the city council for all those residents who were here. You still will have another opportunity to have your voices heard. So this is not final for you. Thank you. And I'm thanking the staff for this item as well including the commissioners. At this point, we will move forward with petitions and communications. Public comments to the planning commission on nonagendized items. Please fill out a speaker's card and give it to the technician. Each member of the public may address the commission for up to three minutes. The commission cannot take any formal action without the item being properly noticed and placed on the agenda. In response to public comment, the commission is limited to the following options: Responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public or requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. Staff, do we have any speakers?

>> Laurel Prevetti: No, we have none.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you. Item 5. Referrals from City Council, boards, commissions or other agencies.

>> Laurel Prevetti: We have none.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you. Item 6 is good and welfare. 6A report from city council.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you. Last night the city council considered a number of land use items. They approved essentially all of them including a rezoning for the matrix casino. One of the items that came before you was the ability for a gas station at union and Woodard to sell alcoholic beverages. Council denied their ability to do the offsale. However they did extend the hours of operation to 24 hours. Planning Commission had, when you adopted that permit, you had said to 3:00 a.m. Council gave them 24 hours. We will be updating the resolution and permit to reflect council's direction. They will be hearing that next week. So thank you.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you staff. Item 6B is commissioners' report from committees. B 1 is Norman Y. Mineta San JosÉ international airport noise advisory committee. Commissioner Cahan is not here. She will perhaps give us a report in a couple of weeks. 6C, Review and approve synopsis from August 8, 2012. Do I have a motion on this item? Do I have a second? And all approving please say aye. 6D. Subcommittee formation, reports. Outstanding business. Do we have a report? I -- next time. Thank you. 6E is Commission calendar and study sessions. Staff.

>> Laurel Prevetti: I just wanted to remind the council that if you have retreat ideas to please go ahead and e-mail them to me. I have received some ideas from the commission. So thank you very much. Probably at our next meeting we'll review a draft of that agenda so that way if you do have anything else, please let us know and we will add additional refreshers and other updates so that way you can stay current with the profession. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you. And at this point, the meeting ends. Have a wonderful evening.