

**Arlington Redevelopment Board**  
**Monday, April 4, 2022 7:30 PM**  
**Meeting Conducted Remotely via Zoom**  
**Meeting Minutes**

This meeting was recorded by ACMi.

**PRESENT:** Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Kin Lau, Melisa Tintocalis, Steve Revilak

**STAFF:** Jennifer Raitt, Director of Planning and Community Development and Kelly Lynema, Assistant Director

---

The Chair called the meeting to order and notified all attending that the meeting is being recorded by ACMi.

The Chair explained that this meeting is being held remotely in accordance with the Governor's March 12, 2020 order suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law G.L. c. 30A, Section 20. This order from Governor Baker allows for meetings to be held remotely during this time to avoid public gatherings.

The Chair introduced the first agenda item, 2022 Annual Town Meeting – Zoning Warrant Articles. The Chair explained that since the Public Hearing meetings have closed there will be no public feedback period, only Board deliberations for each proposed Article. The Chair said that she and the Planning and Community Development Department reached out to the Select Board for their review and the Select Board declined to comment. Ms. Raitt said that all of the articles include the feedback received during the Public Hearing meetings.

The Chair introduced Article 28: Enhanced Business District/ Development Standards for Business Districts and asked the Board for their thoughts. Mr. Lau asked to clearly state that permission is required by the Board. Mr. Benson said he would like to address the wording regarding corner lots. Mr. Benson also suggested adding another standard that gives the Board more flexibility than just regulating the façade. He suggested the article include street activation standards. Ms. Tintocalis questioned the scope of this article. Mr. Revilak said that he supports this article and thinks this will help encourage attractive spaces as commercial parcels are redeveloped. The Chair said the requiring some transparency and other items with change of use would put an undue burden on some of the applicants and may stifle development. Ms. Raitt said that the new changes do not apply to signs or a change of use. Mr. Benson suggested adding under Applicability that the section is not applicable for sign approvals. Mr. Lau motioned to recommend action for Article 28 Development Standards for Business Districts as amended, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced proposed Article 29: Street Trees. Mr. Lau said he supports this article. Mr. Benson said he is also supportive and suggested some changes to the wording. Mr. Benson said that the town has heat islands along the main corridors. The Town has made a commitment for both adaptation and mitigation of climate change and trees do a bit of each. Trees also provide shade along the main corridors. Ms. Tintocalis said that she also supports this article. Trees increase walkability and in and attractiveness of our main corridors and help with climate change. Mr. Revilak suggested a wording change and said that there were concerns about the Town's ability to properly care for street trees. Since hiring a full time Tree Warden the Town has improved caring for trees. Mr. Revilak said that he supports the article since street trees provide shade, help with stormwater, and heat island mitigation. The Chair said that she also supports this article for the same environmental reasons noted by other Board members and because it works towards goals identified in the Master Plan. Mr. Benson moved to recommend action for Article 29 Street Trees as amended, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

Mr. Benson reviewed the proposed changes to Article 30: Solar Energy Systems. Mr. Benson said that section 6.4.4 regarding Neighboring Properties was added since the article was not intended to prevent neighboring areas from

construction or planting trees. The Chair asked Mr. Benson about the 50% roof area requirements as that 50% of roof area is already listed in 6.4.2 A as an exemption. Mr. Lau said that developers look for minimized risk when considering projects. When a decision is up to the Board, this may create a hurdle and increase risk, therefore it may deter some development. Mr. Lau said he supports this article. Mr. Benson said he is very supportive, and this article fits in with the Town's Net Zero Action Plan. Ms. Tintocalis said she is supportive of this article and appreciates the work crafting this article. Ms. Tintocalis said that the Net Zero Action Plan is only as good as the implementation that comes along with it. Mr. Revilak said he supports this article. This will further the use of renewable energy in town and help the town with meeting our goal of zero emissions by 2050. Mr. Benson moved to table this discussion until later this evening after deliberations, Mr. Lau seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 31: Administrative Amendments, five changes have been identified and are intended to bring clarity to the zoning bylaw. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 31, Mr. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 32: Zoning Board of Appeals Rules and Regulations. Mr. Benson said that this is the right thing to do. Mr. Lau said he supports this article. Mr. Revilak said that the ZBA should be able to create and amend their own rules and regulations like other boards. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 32, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 33: Half Story. Mr. Benson thanked the ZBA for bringing this issue to the Board's attention. Mr. Revilak said he applauds the Chair of the ZBA for bringing this amendment forward. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 32, Mr. Benson seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 34: Porches. Mr. Lau supports this article and said that it clarifies the definition and will be easier to enforce. Mr. Benson said that the ZBA and Building Inspector are appreciative of these changes. Mr. Revilak said that this is a useful clarification. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 34: Porches, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 35: Yard Encroachment. Mr. Benson said that he appreciates ZBA Chair bringing this issue to the Board's attention. Mr. Revilak said that it is appropriate to add this change to the bylaw.

Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 35: Yard Encroachment, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced the next amendment, Article 36: Large Additions. Mr. Benson said that he appreciates ZBA Chair bringing this issue to the Board's attention. Ms. Tintocalis said that the ZBA is doing a good job bringing these updates to the Board's attention. Mr. Revilak noted that the proposed change effectively brings the language in the bylaw to match the way this provision has been interpreted and it is a useful clarification. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 36: Large Additions, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 37: Unsafe Structure. Mr. Lau said he supports this article and the change in wording. Mr. Benson appreciates that this issue was brought to the Board's attention. Mr. Benson said that this change is needed and that determinations have been made in the past made by a third party, not the ZBA. Mr. Revilak thanked the ZBA Chair, Christian Klein, for bringing these issues to the Board's attention and is glad that the Board and ZBA are working collaboratively. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 37: Unsafe Structure, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 38: Two Family Construction Allowed by Right in the R0 and R1 Residential Zones. Mr. Lau said

that this amendment does not encourage affordable housing, include parking restrictions, or set limits on size. All dimensional, density, and parking requirements will remain the same. Mr. Lau said that due to more efficient appliances we are using less water than in the past increasing the life expectancy of our wastewater infrastructure. Mr. Lau said he would like to have this issue voted on by Town Meeting. Mr. Benson said that the Board received a lot of letters regarding this article, and he would like to address some of the concerns. There should be no loss of open space because there will not be changes to the open space requirements. It should not affect the value of people's homes since the 180 existing two family homes in town have not lowered the value/sale price of neighboring homes, that there will not be more teardowns because in the R2 districts small homes are being replaced with larger two-family homes but in the R1 and R0 districts small homes are already being torn down to build larger one family homes. Our neighborhoods are changing so we must determine what those neighborhoods should be and if we should help provide an opportunity to have some more housing options. Mr. Benson said that he read the all of the letters with arguments against and he is not persuaded by them. Mr. Benson said he would like to limit the size of each unit to 1,850 square feet of heated living space. 1,850 square feet is the State's starter home metric in MGL c. 40R. By putting a limit on the size of two family homes, this might allow for some more affordable housing options. This will not create affordable housing but it may allow some people to live in Arlington who cannot afford to live here.

Ms. Tintocalis asked about the status of the Housing Production Plan. The Chair said that the Select Board has tabled discussing the plan at this moment. Ms. Tintocalis said that she would like to take a pause and understand how to strategize and complete a housing package with the Housing Production Plan. This is for creating housing options but maybe we can turn our efforts to meet the MBTA Communities requirements and tie in our efforts, so they are in sync with the Housing Production Plan. Ms. Tintocalis said that she is concerned about the size of each unit but thinks that there is a different mechanism for that. Mr. Revilak said that there are older homes in Arlington which are going to be replaced and we should consider what will replace those homes. Mr. Revilak said that the duplexes should be less expensive than the typical new single-family homes in Arlington, which sell for one million dollars. New homes will be up to code and will be more energy efficient than existing older homes. Smart growth policies create housing near public transportation and work centers to alleviate the need for personal transportation: a major contributor to climate change. Mr. Revilak said smart growth policies work and would like to have more of that in Arlington. He supports this article.

A meeting participant, Carl Wagner, interjected twice during Mr. Revilak's comments. The Chair asked Mr. Wagner to leave the meeting after his second warning.

The Chair said that this is an interesting proposal that aligns with a lot of the goals the Board has discussed about housing choice and environmental impact. The Chair echoed Ms. Tintocalis' suggestion to create a more comprehensive connected housing policy. This amendment would be a net positive for the town, but changes may be more impactful as part of an interconnected policy change in addition to a comprehensive education piece for members of the public. The Chair said that public education to dispel some of the identified unfounded concerns is required to make this a successful article in front of Town Meeting. The education and public outreach plan with the ADU article that was presented last year helped inform both the Board and members of Town Meeting. The Chair asked the Board if they would consider a size cap as a condition of this article. Mr. Lau said he could go either way. Mr. Lau said he would like to have linkage to affordable housing with a percentage of sales going toward affordable housing. Mr. Lau said that the limits will help control the size of new construction. Mr. Benson said that linkage is not legal in this instance. Ms. Raitt confirmed. Mr. Benson said that they are trying to have a type of housing built in town that is no longer built, starter home size. Mr. Revilak said he thinks the suggestion of a size limitation is reasonable and he would support that.

Ms. Annie LaCourt said that she would reluctantly include size limitations if it made the Board more comfortable. She would like to see this article go to Town Meeting.

Mr. Benson suggested the placement of the of the size limit be placed as a footnote under in the use table and should read "By deed restriction, neither unit shall exceed 1,850 of heated living space." This will be a special category and the restriction would be in perpetuity. Mr. Revilak suggested changing the footnote to say, "By deed restriction neither unit of a two-family dwelling or duplex dwelling shall exceed 1,850 square feet of heated living space." Ms. Tintocalis said in terms of affordability the modification to include size limits will not make a significant impact. She also said that she would not like to bring this to Town Meeting without the outreach, analysis, and a strategy. Ms. Tintocalis said that she is not inclined to support this article at this time. Mr. Benson said that he agrees that this will not create a deep decline in pricing and the larger the square footage the more expensive a unit will be. Mr. Benson said that this should take a small bite out of the price. Ms. Tintocalis said some of the effort needs to be put in with the hard work where it will make a difference in terms of diversity of the population.

The Chair said she would like to make sure that Ms. LaCourt is comfortable with the changes to the article she submitted. Ms. LaCourt said that she is concerned about the deed restriction and sees Ms. Tintocalis' view of taking the time to see the whole picture but would like to proceed to submit this article to Town Meeting. The Chair said that she is supportive of the policy change but like Ms. Tintocalis would like to see a comprehensive plan backed by research, documentation, and visuals to help members of the public understand the strategy. Mr. Lau said he would like to move this article if only to start the debate in Town Meeting. This is a potential spearhead to get everyone involved and talking about this issue. Mr. Benson said he also is in favor of moving this article forward and will ask Ms. LaCourt to work with the Board to make the best case for Town Meeting. This may allow for a few of annual small home teardowns to be replaced with two medium sized homes instead of one very large home. The Chair said she would like to point out that if the Board moves this article forward the outreach and presentation of the article will be Ms. LaCourt's responsibility, not the Board's. Ms. LaCourt said she was very clear about that. Mr. Revilak said he concurs with Mr. Lau and Mr. Benson that the alternative to this article is the status quo and this is a better alternative. Mr. Benson moved to recommend action on Article 38: Two Family Construction Allowed by Right as amended, Mr. Lau seconded, approved 3-2 (The Chair and Ms. Tintocalis voted no).

The Chair introduced Article 39: Increased Floor Area Ratio for Mixed Use Structures, submitted by Xavid Pretzer. The Chair explained that there have been changes to the originally submitted article. Ms. Raitt said that all FAR numbers in the table for each district have been doubled from the current maximums, but not higher than three, per the Board's suggestion. Mr. Lau said that he is in favor of increasing the FAR. This will support having ground floor retail with housing above that helps activate the businesses. With the cost of construction and land this is a good change. Mr. Benson said that he supports this amendment, that the Board recognized that the low FAR puts a damper on development. Along with creating more affordable housing, this is a win for increasing the Town's tax base, activating businesses, and the street scape. This does not change the height limitations so we will not have skyscrapers and there will still be the same set back requirements as before. Mr. Benson said this is the way to move forward with the commercial districts. Ms. Tintocalis wanted to discuss how this works with the analysis of use and design review. Ms. Tintocalis questioned if there has been enough analysis and a thorough review of the uses. Ms. Tintocalis said that she is uneasy without some setbacks and context. Ms. Tintocalis used the proposed storage facility on Dudley Street as an example. The Chair noted that is a little different since this is not the industrial zone, there are already zoning setbacks in the bylaw for mixed-use.

Mr. Revilak said that he is supportive of this change, at least one of the Master Plan recommendations would be furthered by this article, by promoting the development of higher value mixed-use buildings by providing redevelopment incentives. We put our best foot forward to set up initial dimensional regulations but the FAR turned out to be too low. The Chair

concurred with Mr. Revilak's statement. The Chair asked if members of the Board would address Ms. Tintocalis' comments. Mr. Lau said that Mr. Revilak's statement was correct. The FAR set in 2016 for mixed-use developments is just too low. Ms. Tintocalis said that increasing the FAR would make projects more feasible. Mr. Lau said that this is something that the Board was supposed to do but this petitioner beat the Board to it. This is one of the goals that the Board discussed at the annual retreat. Ms. Tintocalis asked if the Board has incorporated other mechanisms to ensure that these developments are well designed. The Chair said that that is the Board's responsibility as part of the Environmental Design Review Special Permit review and approval. Ms. Tintocalis asked if the Board can consider including another layer of design review. Mr. Lau said that larger projects hire more expensive and experienced architects. Smaller developments may not have the capital to hire more experienced architects. The Chair said that this creates more opportunity with large developments which will encourage mixed-use. Mr. Benson said that the height limitations depend on which business district and the size of the building, and this amendment only applies to mixed-use projects. Mr. Benson also pointed out that the architects on the Board have done a great job of requesting revisions during the EDR process. Mr. Benson said that he believes that the funds have been requested for FY23 to create design guidelines. The Chair wanted to note that the department thoroughly reviews each project and recommends improvements before projects are presented to the Board. Mr. Revilak said that there is also a height buffer depending on the proximity to a R1 or R0 district. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 39: Increased Floor Area Ratio for Mixed Use Structures, Mr. Benson seconded, approved 4-1 (Ms. Tintocalis voted no action).

The Chair introduced Article 40: Expand Business Districts. Mr. Lau said he is on the fence regarding this article, he would like continuous zoning on Mass. Ave. but the Board should look at the entirety of Mass. Ave., not spot zoning. Mr. Benson said he agrees with Mr. Lau's statement. Mr. Benson noted that some the property owners are opposed. Mr. Benson also has questions about the parcel that is zoned R5. The Board is looking at more rational zoning for all of Mass. Ave. The 1970s zoning is the opposite of what you would like to create for a commercial corridor. Ms. Tintocalis said she appreciates the applicant's idea but mixed-use can come in both horizontal and vertical mixed-use and does not have to be on one lot. We need to discuss other pieces that fit into a complete quality redevelopment aligned with the community's goals. Mr. Revilak said that it is a small district, but the proposed parcel rezoning makes sense. Mr. Revilak said that he would feel better if the Board received more letters of support. Some of the hesitation we have encountered will also be encountered in other parts of town. Mr. Revilak is torn. The Chair said that she has a hard time supporting this based on how torn the Board is. Changing the zoning map is not something to take lightly; a more comprehensive view is desired by the Board. We are not interested in engaging in spot zoning. Planning for the MBTA Communities requirements should provide a larger zoning review. Mr. Lau said that he does not think he will support this article for action. Mr. Benson said he agrees with Mr. Lau and added that he is not sure that we want to prohibit larger apartment buildings because there are some benefits to having a mix on Mass Ave. If the Board had completed a review, there might have come up with a different conclusion with different parts of the Avenue. Mr. Revilak said that he thinks that the apartments are a separate issue, he hopes that the Board will work on this further in a year or so. Mr. Lau moved to recommend no action on Article 40: Expand Business Districts, Mr. Benson seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 41: Apartments Parking Minimums. Mr. Benson said he favors this article but had two wording revisions. The study showed that one parking space per apartment building unit is more than adequate, which also allows for more units to be built and therefore more affordable units. We are not changing the rules for public housing for the elderly and the table should be adjusted to reflect that. Mr. Lau said he also supports this article, echoes Mr. Benson's comments. Parking has been a hindrance for developing mixed-use development along Mass Ave. This is a good step towards a balanced approach. Ms. Tintocalis said she supports this article. Mr. Revilak said that this article moves towards

two of recommendations from the Master Plan, by establishing parking ratios that reflect the actual need for parking and being able to modify parking requirement for multifamily housing and mixed-use developments. Mr. Revilak said he was on the ZBA while reviewing 1165R Mass. Ave. that ultimately required one space per unit which is the same as what is required in our zoning bylaw for two and three family homes. The Chair said that she also supports this article. The Chair asked Mr. Fleming if he has any objections to the changes made to his proposal. Mr. Fleming said that he is okay with the changes. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 41: Apartments Parking Minimums, Mr. Benson seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 42: Open Space Uses. Mr. Benson said that he supports this article since all these uses will still require a permit. Mr. Benson asked about the need to include the phrase for or not for profit. Ms. Raitt said that the wording is similar in the bylaw. Ms. Tintocalis said that in this case it is best to be explicit because it is unusual. Mr. Revilak said he is supportive, that this is an extension of what was allowed during the pandemic this article makes sense. The Chair said that she favors taking away the red tape for this use. Mr. Tintocalis moved to recommend action for Article 42: Open Space Uses, Mr. Lau seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced Article 43: Zoning Map Amendment Requirements. Mr. Benson reviewed the wording changes made to this article after the public hearing. Mr. Benson said that this provides clarity when a change to the Zoning Map is filed. Mr. Lau said that he also supports this article, that it clarifies the process and makes it easier. Mr. Revilak said that the bylaw should be clear and he hopes this adds some clarity. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action for Article 43: Zoning Map Amendment Requirements, Mr. Benson seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced the next article, Article 44: Restaurant Uses. Mr. Lau said that he is on the fence regarding this article, increasing the area of a restaurant impacts the area and should have a review. Mr. Lau said he is not sure what the cut off size should be. Mr. Benson said that a line must be drawn somewhere but Mr. Benson does not see the justification for a space near 4,000 square feet. Mr. Benson agrees with Mr. Lau and is not in favor of this article. Ms. Tintocalis does not see 4,000 square feet as being excessive or egregious in terms of the impact in the neighborhood so Ms. Tintocalis would support this. Mr. Revilak asked about the other permits required for a restaurant to open. Ms. Raitt confirmed that other permits are required from Inspectional Services, The Health Department, and the Select Board. Mr. Revilak said that he agrees with Ms. Tintocalis, that this space is not terribly large. The Chair said that she agrees that the number/size feels a bit arbitrary. If we are going to make changes, she would like to better understand why 4,000 square feet is the determined size. Ms. Tintocalis said that of all the industries restaurants are the most regulated. If we mean what we say about activation, to create an environment that becomes more of a destination, this is a supportive action for a classic kind of economic development. Ms. Tintocalis said that people are attracted when it is busy and sometimes more difficult to park. This might also encourage walkability in the area. Ms. Tintocalis said that the Board recommended action on the FAR increase without analysis and she thinks the Board can consider allowing 4,000 square feet by right. The Chair said that if she were to support this article, she would like the size to be in line with retail spaces at 3,000 square feet. There are a lot of ways the Board can work with an applicant if they take a larger space in town. Mr. Benson said that there is no evidence that the permitting is impeding restaurants coming to town. Before the pandemic there were all types and sizes of restaurants in town. Mr. Benson said that he can recall two restaurants that came before the Board for special permits. The Board asked for minor changes and was able to approve the special permits quickly. Mr. Benson said that he does not think that the Board has been an impediment to the process. Ms. Tintocalis agreed with the Chair that the size selected for the article is arbitrary and that it should align with the retail piece. Mr. Revilak said he also agrees with aligning with the retail piece. The Chair asked Mr. Fleming if he would agree to change the size limit for restaurants to 3,000 square feet to align with retail use. Mr. Fleming said that he reluctantly agrees to the change, that the size of the space requiring permits for

retail space is also an arbitrary number and that is not questioned because it has been on the books for decades. Mr. Benson said that the number is not arbitrary, sometimes history is a good guide to show what works or not. Ms. Tintocalis moved to recommend action on Article 44: Restaurant Uses, as amended, Mr. Lau seconded, approved 4-1 (Mr. Benson opposed).

The Chair introduced the last article to review for the evening, Article 45: Appeals. Ms. Raitt said that Doug Heim, Town Counsel, has three concerns about this article, first the preemption by State law, second it is not consistent with the Town Manager Act (Individuals who have complaints with Inspectional Services Department can contact the Town Manager to request additional action), and third, this puts the ZBA in a difficult position because the appeal would not be an appeal of the decision of the Building Inspector or the interpretation of the zoning bylaw but rather that a complainant disagrees with the Building Inspector's decision not to take civil action. This is ultimately a matter that the ZBA does not have any authority over. Mr. Benson said that the petitioner contacted him because he expressed the most concerns during the public hearings. Mr. Benson said that he and the petitioner came up with some alternatives. This amendment would give the Building Inspector a lot of time to take action and allow having the order reviewed by the ZBA. Currently the Building Inspector gives a violation, gives a deadline to abate, then the next step is going to court because the order to abate has not been followed. This amendment would give a way to get to the ZBA. Mr. Benson said he asked Town Counsel who said that the Building Inspector can go to the Town Manager, sue the violator for nuisance, and that the Building Inspector could also bring the case to the Select Board. Mr. Benson said that the ZBA does not have authority to bring a lawsuit so it seems that the remedy is to go up the administrative ladder in Town or to go to court. Mr. Lau said that if the Building Inspector does not follow regulations the next step is to go to the State Building Inspector and the Town Manager. Mr. Lau said that creating this article is not necessary, as it is repetitive. Ms. Tintocalis said that she does not support this proposed amendment for the reasons Town Counsel listed. Mr. Revilak said that he agrees with Ms. Tintocalis. That there is a remedy through the Town Manager Act and Mr. Revilak would be concerned about creating new avenues for litigation. Mr. Benson said he is unsure if the State Building Inspector can follow up on an issue raised about a local Building Inspector. Mr. Benson asked if the Board members would change their minds if a case is not resolved and not brought to litigation by the Town. Ms. Tintocalis said that she does not support this proposal at this time. The Chair said that she is not comfortable putting the ZBA in this position and where the Board is unsure of the law regarding the authority from the State Building Inspector. Mr. Lau moved to recommend no action for proposed article 45: Appeals, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair returned to Article 30 to reopen discussion regarding solar installation. Mr. Benson proposed additional amendments which he walked through. The Watertown ordinance was used as a guide when crafting this article and does not have the smaller roof size percentage. Mr. Lau, Ms. Tintocalis, Mr. Revilak, The Chair and said they are supportive of the amended article. Mr. Lau moved to recommend action on article 30, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced the second agenda item, Meeting Minutes (3/7/22, 3/14/22, and 3/21/22). Mr. Lau moved to approve the 3/7/2022 meeting minutes as amended, Mr. Benson seconded, approved 5-0. Mr. Benson moved to approve the 3/14/2022 meeting minutes as amended, Mr. Lau seconded, approved 5-0. Mr. Lau moved to approve the 3/21/2022 meeting minutes as amended, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.

The Chair introduced the third agenda item, Open Forum. Seeing no members of the public waiting to speak the Chair closed the Open Forum portion of the meeting. Mr. Lau moved to adjourn, Ms. Tintocalis seconded, approved 5-0.