

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



Meeting Minutes Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing

**Thursday, March 3, 2022
1:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT TANNER AT 1:01 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Michael Christensen, David Winslow, Liz Watty - Director of Current Planning, Rich Hillis - Planning Director, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

SPEAKER KEY:

- + indicates a speaker in support of an item;
- indicates a speaker in opposition to an item; and
- = indicates a neutral speaker or a speaker who did not indicate support or opposition.

A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

The Commission will consider a request for continuance to a later date. The Commission may choose to continue the item to the date proposed below, to continue the item to another date, or to hear the item on this calendar.

1. 2019-022850ENV (D. LEWIS: (628) 652-7543)
1101-1123 SUTTER STREET – Certification of the **Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR)** –
The project site is composed of the eastern half of the block bounded by Larkin Street to the

east, Polk Street to the west, Sutter Street to the north and Hemlock Street to the south (Assessor's block/lot 0692/001 and 0692/019). The proposed project would rehabilitate the existing three-story building at 1101 Sutter Street and demolish the existing one-story plus partial mezzanine building at 1123 Sutter Street for the construction of a new 14-story, 152-foot-tall building. The proposed project would provide 221 residential units, 4,146 square feet of commercial use, 4,069 square feet of childcare use, and 55 vehicular parking spaces. The buildings at 1101 and 1123 Sutter Street are both historic resources for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act. The project would use the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program and provide affordable housing units onsite. The project site is located within the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District and the 65-A and 130-E Height and Bulk Districts.

Note: The public hearing on the draft EIR is closed. The public comment period for the draft EIR ended on October 5, 2021. Public comment will be received when the item is called during the hearing. However, comments submitted may not be included in the Final EIR.

Preliminary Recommendation: Certify

(Continued from Canceled hearing on February 17, 2022)

(Proposed for Continuance to March 10, 2022)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to March 10, 2022

AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

2. 2019-022850CUA (K. GUY: (628) 652-7325)
1101-1123 SUTTER STREET – south side between Larkin and Polk Streets; Lots 1 & 009 in Assessor's Block 0692 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.1, 121.2, and 303 to allow development of a lot exceeding 2,500 square feet, and to allow non-residential uses exceeding 2,000 square feet within the Polk Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) and the 65-A and 130-E Height and Bulk Districts. The proposed project ("Project") would renovate and incorporate the existing building at 1101 Sutter Street into the development, demolish the existing building at 1123 Sutter Street, and construct a new 14-story building reaching a height of approximately 152 feet. The Project would contain a total of 221 dwelling units (including 44 dwelling units provided as on-site affordable units). The Project also includes a 4,069 square foot childcare center, 4,146 square feet of ground-floor commercial uses, 55 vehicle parking spaces, and two carshare parking spaces. The Project is utilizing the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program to achieve a 50% density bonus thereby maximizing residential density on the Site pursuant to California Government Code Sections 65915-95918, as revised under Assembly Bill No. 2345 (AB 2345). The Project requests one incentive related to the width of parking and loading entries, as well as five waivers related to exposure, height, bulk, rear yard, and setbacks on narrow streets. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

(Continued from Canceled hearing on February 17, 2022)

(Proposed for Continuance to March 10, 2022)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to March 10, 2022

AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

3. 2022-000457CWP (L. LANGLOIS: (628) 652-7472)
UPDATES TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION POLICY: PROCEDURES FOR IN-KIND AGREEMENTS
 – Request for consideration to **Adopt Amendments** to the Planning Commission Policy: Procedures for In-Kind Agreements that was adopted by the Planning Commission in 2010. The intent of this amendment is to update this Commission policy to be consistent with the Department’s current standards and practices and to clarify language regarding eligibility and for recommendation of in-kind agreement projects.
Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt
 (Continued from Regular hearing on February 10, 2022)
(Proposed for Continuance to April 21, 2022)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued Indefinitely
 AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

11. [2021-001049DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
1548-1550 LEAVENWORTH STREET – east side between Pacific and Jackson Streets; Lot 025 in Assessor’s Block 0183 (District 3) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2020.1005.5942 to construct a fourth-story horizontal addition to an existing three-story two-family residential building within a RM-3 (Residential-Mixed, Medium Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).
Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Approve with Modifications

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued Indefinitely
 AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

B. COMMISSION MATTERS

4. Commission Comments/Questions

President Tanner:

While I'm waiting to see if anybody has any comments or questions, I just want to wish everybody a happy Women's History Month. So, hopefully March is going out, starting well for everybody and I am very grateful to see the rain today. Although, we're just getting little drops or drizzle, but hopefully we get some more rain as you know the drought is continuing to challenge all of us.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

If there are no Commission comments or questions, Commissioners, if you would indulge me, I wanted to suggest that in recognition of the recent events in Eastern Europe, I would suggest that we might consider adjourning in opposition to the unnecessary and tragic loss of life and in support for peace between two sibling nations.

President Tanner:

That's a wonderful suggestion. Certainly the least that we can do as a Commission. Thank

you for reminding us, Jonas, of the tragic events that are continuing to unfold right now in Ukraine.

Commissioner Moore:

I'd like to support that position as it also reflects the City's attitude. City hall is lit up in support of the Ukraine. I'm not sure if you saw it last night, there was a picture in the paper showing the colors of the Ukrainian flag are completely engulfed in City Hall and it looks very, very beautiful as sad as this event. And I think is an appropriate way of recognizing of what is going on.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Thank you, Commissioners. I appreciate that.

5. [2021-009977CRV](#) – **Remote Hearings** – Consideration of action and adoption of findings under California government code section 54953(e) to allow remote meetings during the COVID-19 emergency; continue remote meetings for the next 30 days; direct the Commission Secretary to schedule a similar resolution at a Commission meeting within 30 days.

SPEAKERS: Sue Hestor – Status of March 24th hearing
Georgia Schuttish – Appropriate distancing in Room 400, time for public comments

ACTION: Adopted

AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

RESOLUTION: [21085](#)

C. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

6. Director's Announcements

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Good afternoon, Commissioners. As you know, we are heading back to the office next week. Most staff, or all staff for a minimum of two days a week. So, that happens starting on Monday, but I just again wanted to highlight those who have been coming into the office over the past two years because a handful of our staff have been doing that throughout the pandemic. Our office management team, folks from IT team, and Reception and dealing with mail, our Enforcement team has been going out doing site visits, and the staff that provide the public with information and taking permits in this building down at the Permit Center. So, I just want to again, I know we have thanked them in the past, but thank them for all of their work during the past two years. And for everybody really for keeping things going over these past couple of years. I know it's been challenging, but relatively successful. So, thanks to our team for doing that. And that's all I have.

President Tanner:

I don't have any questions, but I'll just second that it's been great to see the staff keep performing admirably. And we're very excited that folks are coming back. I know there's probably a lot of mix emotions about it but I'm very excited to see that and see also so many City leaders and industries committing to coming back in March. And I am hoping that it's all for the best for our city and for our workforce. So, thank you all of your hard work during

this time.

Commissioner Moore:

I just wanted to say for those Commissioners who were not there two years ago, there was another herculean effort because the Department moved from one building to the other. Packed up and run and moved into a completely new unknown environment. And that was one of the most amazing feats that happened and it was just incredibly well done and thank you to everyone for that.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Can I just make -- Ms. Watty is here too and we're changing some of our, the way we've taken-- that we do pre-application meeting. So, Liz if you're here, do you want to talk about those changes that are coming up?

Liz Watty, Director of Current Planning:

Sure, happy to. Thanks for the time. Starting next Monday, since we will all be coming back to the office, we are also updating our pre-application procedures. As you guys know, when we all went into sheltering from home and working from home, we asked applicants to conduct their pre-application meetings entirely remotely so that everyone could stay safe. We have received a lot of feedback from members of the public and community organizations where they really want to get back to an in-person option at least for pre-application meetings. So, we're easing our way back into getting fully back to in-person as part of the conversation you all just had. So, starting next Monday, we are allowing applicants to do either - either remote, in-person, or a hybrid system. Should they choose to do any element of remote, they'll need to follow all of the remote protocols that we've had in place over the last two years, including a local or a toll-free phone number to call in. So, there's a little bit of flex period of time starting Monday through the end of fiscal year, end of June. And starting July 1, our plan is fully back to in-person pre-application meetings. So, I just wanted to let members of the public know that we are going to start easing back in on Monday with a full in-person pre-application requirement kicking back in July 1. And that's all. Thank you.

President Tanner:

Can I ask for that requirement to come back in-person? I'm just curious about the motivation for that. It would seem that there could be some efficiency from folks not having to come in or there is something that gets lost when folks are not seating and across the table from one another in those pre-application meeting. Maybe it's just the apparatus that host the virtual is challenging.

Liz Watty, Director of Current Planning:

A lot of the feedback that we've had from community folks is that they really miss having that in-person interaction, especially at the project site, which is typically the requirement, at the project site or within a close proximity. So, that's the direction that we have. Certainly, the pre-application requirement is a Commission policy, it's not codified. So, if this is something, as we approach July, that the Commission wants to take a different approach or receive feedback from the public of meeting in hybrid option in perpetuity. But it has been a bit of a struggle with the Department enforcing all of the rules for remote pre-application meetings. It's been a lot of struggles with folks identifying what is a local phone number, etc. So, being able to kind of take that off the table and just get back to requiring people to

show up in person seems like a streamlined way to maintain this requirement, but again, it's your policy.

President Tanner:

Yeah, I think it's something that we can take a look at. I'm mainly thinking from the perspective of a neighbor who can't come at that specific time. You know, how, is there an option for recording or for some type of interaction for the interested member, the community, but who, that time or the location makes it infeasible. Maybe they're commuting home or things like that. So, definitely something we could kind of keep looking at but certainly understand like having the option to be in person. I am certainly happy that it would go that direction to have that option.

Commissioner Moore:

The one thing I would add, also examine in terms of social equity and accessibility, technology in particular. You need to have a reasonably well functioning computer, including all of the proper light, etcetera to effectively participate in an online. And again, I have not been in that situation, but I'm sure staff has been very closely looking at that because we really need to keep that in the forefront of how we'll move forward. And that maybe indeed hybrid is the best because then people can go either way.

President Tanner:

So here we can take notes on how this new version unfolds and then we can use that to see what might be best for the future. So, thank you for the update.

7. Review of Past Events at the Board of Supervisors, Board of Appeals and Historic Preservation Commission

Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs:

Good afternoon, commissioners, Aaron Starr Manager of Legislative Affairs.

Land Use

- 220009 Planning Code - Landmark Designation -1801 Green Street (aka Golden Gate Valley Carnegie Library). Sponsor: Historic Preservation Commission. Staff: Bishop.

First on the Land Use agenda this week was the landmark designation of the Golden Gate Valley Carnegie Library located at 1801 Green Street in Cow Hollow. The library is significant for its association with patterns of social and cultural history in San Francisco, specifically with the Carnegie Library Grant Program. It is also an example of an institutional building designed by master architect Ernest Coxhead. The building displays the distinctive characteristics of the Neoclassical style as associated with the City Beautiful movement.

This library has been on the Department's work plan since 1999, when six other Carnegie-built libraries were also added. In November of last year, the HPC initiated landmark designation for 1801 Green Street, and in December recommended it for landmark designation to the Full Board.

At the hearing this week there was only one public commenter who expressed concerns over the language used to call out the character defining features of the property. The committee members expressed full support of the designation and recognition of the

significance of the property. At the end of the hearing the committee unanimously recommended approval of the Landmark Designation.

- 211021 Planning Code - Landmark Designation - 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building. Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: LaValley.

The Committee also considered the landmark designation for 447 Battery Street. Faithful listeners of the Board Report will remember that this was originally heard at the Land Use le in November of last year when was tabled by Supervisor Peskin.

The HPC recommended approval of Landmark designation in August 4, 2021 of last year after receiving a Resolution initiating designation from the BOS. The HPC found that 447 Battery Street, constructed in 1907, was culturally and historically significant for association with the San Francisco coffee industry, a significant commercial sector in San Francisco during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century, and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires. The HPC also found that the building was not, repeat, not architecturally significant and recommended that the “three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint” be removed from the list of character-defining features.

After Peskin reactivated the landmark designation ordinance for 447 Battery it was brought back to LUT this week and was unanimously recommended to full BOS for approval consistent with HPC’s recommendation.

- 211207 Housing Development Incentive Program for Homeowners Sponsors: Mar; Melgar. Staff: Small.

Next the Land Use Committee held a hearing on Supervisor Mar’s Resolution to Develop an Incentive Program for Homeowners. The purpose of the program to help middle-, moderate-, and low-income homeowners expand their houses to duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes—including ADUs. This help is intended to be technical and financial assistance from preparation through construction, including city-backed loans or grants or free access to design and technical professionals.

Kimia Haddadan from Planning presented how the proposed program is in line with the draft Housing Element policies and a representative from ASIAN Inc. presented on the ADU Pilot program recently completed that was sponsored by Sup. Mar in partnership with ASIAN Inc.

There was not a lot of public comment, but some of the commentors suggested that the program should be grants not just loans.

There were some questions from the Supervisors about replacing the Sensitive Communities Map with the Urban Displacement Map. The former is no longer active, and the latter has better and more updated data. The Committee then voted to recommend the Resolution to the Full Board.

Planning Staff is following up with Sup. Mar’s office to coordinate with MOHCD on how to fund and implement the program.

- 211299 Planning Code - Group Housing Definition. Sponsors: Peskin; Walton and Mandelman. Staff: Starr.

Next the Committee considered Supervisor Peskin's ordinance that would amend the definition of Group Housing. Commissioners, you heard this item on February 10 and recommended approval with modifications.

At the hearing Supervisor Peskin made a motion to amend the ordinance to include a significant portion of the Commission's recommended modifications. Of note, he did not include the recommendation to create a carve-out for Student Housing so that they could have full kitchens.

During public comment, there were a lot of speakers, and their testimony was like that at the Planning Commission. Some commentators talked about the need to for the proposed amendments, while others expressed concern that this would eliminate a viable housing model from the city. Representatives from USF also spoke about the need for a carve-out.

In the end the Committee did vote to amend the ordinance to include Supervisor Peskin's modifications; however, they needed to continue the item because the amendments were deemed substantive.

- 211092 Planning Code - Automotive Uses; Housing Density. Sponsor: Mayor. Staff: Starr. Item 6

Lastly the Committee considered the mayor's ordinance, too cleverly named Cars to Casas. You heard item on December 9 of last year and voted to recommend approval with modifications. Those modifications included:

1. Eliminate the RH zoning districts site eligibility provision.
2. Allow parcels where the last legal use was an Automotive Use to also be eligible for this program.
3. Reduce the Legacy Business eligibility criterion from the past ten years to four years.
4. Clarify that this program can be combined with the State Density Bonus Program.
5. Require a monitoring component to understand how many units have used the program and where they are located.
6. Perform community outreach before and after adoption.
7. Consider a different shorthand title.
8. Amend the Legacy Business eligibility to also consider Legacy Business applications that have been submitted but not yet reviewed/approved.

Prior to the hearing the sponsor included most of the Commission's recommendations, except the elimination of the shorthand title.

During the hearing, the presentation was given by yours truly with an introduction by Andres Power from the mayor's office. There were about 20 commentators, it was about evenly split between those in support and those in opposition. During the hearing the Supervisors had questions about adding rent control and increasing the inclusionary amounts. They also needed additional clarification regarding the removal of the CU to convert Automobile Service Stations. Supervisor Peskin had proposed amendments intended to ensure his interim controls that require maximize density in certain district

would not be impacted by this ordinance. Supervisor Melgar's comments were mostly supportive and said that she hoped this program would bring more inclusionary units to her district. Because Peskin's amendments were not ready, and because there was a desire to explore increased inclusionary amounts for this program, the Committee continue the item to the call of the chair. Next week's hearing was too full to continue it one week.

I would note that our current inclusionary amounts do consider properties that have had their density decontrolled, and that anything above our current rates will like make project infeasible.

Full Board

- 210116 Planning Code, Zoning Map - Central Neighborhoods Large Residence Special Use District. Sponsor: Mandelman. Staff: Merlone. Passed First Read
- 210898 Planning Code - Landmark Designation - One Montgomery Street (aka 1-25 Montgomery Street) (Crocker National Bank Building). Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: LaValley. Passed First Read
- 211236 Planning Code - Massage Establishment Zoning Controls. Sponsors: Mandelman; Ronen and Preston. Staff: V. Flores. Passed First Read
- 220037 Planning Code - Landmark Designation - "Allegory of California," The City Club of San Francisco (formerly Pacific Stock Exchange Luncheon Club), 155 Sansome Street Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: LaValley. Passed First Read
- 220031 Hearing - Appeal of Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review - Proposed 2000 Oakdale Avenue Project.

This week the Board also took up the CatEx Appeal for 2000 Oakdale Avenue. The appeal was filed by Michael Lozeau on behalf of Libkra Investments Corp. The project consists of interior tenant improvement work to establish a cannabis retail business with no on-site smoking. The project would not include any structural work to the existing building.

Concerns raised by appellant included that the project does not comply with the planning code regarding the type and amount of retail proposed on site; the potential for cannabis-related odor impacts; and that the CEQA review did not include mitigation measures to prevent any environmental impacts.

Members of the public in support of the appeal expressed concerns regarding potential odor impacts and concerns that the CEQA review was not thorough enough. Members of the public that spoke in opposition to the appeal and in support of the project expressed that the planning department adequately reviewed the project under CEQA, and that the city should encourage and support minority-owned businesses.

Notably there were no comments or questions from the Supervisors during the hearing, and once public comment was over, they quickly voted to uphold the CEQA determination and deny the appeal.

- 211207 Housing Development Incentive Program for Homeowners Sponsors: Mar; Melgar. Staff: Small. Adopted

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

There is a report from the Board of Appeals. They met last evening and heard an appeal of the cannabis retail establishment at 2000 Oakdale Avenue and some tenant improvements to an existing light industrial building in a PDR 1-B Zoning District. You heard this matter as a DR on December 9, 2021, and the DR requester basically cited concerns about odor impacts. After hearing, the Commission voted unanimously to not take discretionary review and approve the project. A CEQA appeal was then heard by the Board of Supervisors on March 1st. The appellant cited the same concerns related to odor impacts and the lack of adequate environmental review. After hearing public testimony, the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously 10-0 to deny the appeal and uphold the Department CEQA exemption. Last night at the Board of Appeals, the appellant reiterated his concerns about odor impacts. And again, after hearing public testimony, the Board of Appeals voted 4-0 to deny the appeal and uphold the permit on the basis that the Department properly reviewed and approved the permit.

D. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – 3/2/22 Email to Commissioners
Sue Hestor – Pre-App meetings

E. REGULAR CALENDAR

The Commission Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; when applicable, followed by a presentation of the project sponsor team; followed by public comment. Please be advised that the project sponsor team includes: the sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

8. [2014-001272DVA-03](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)
PIER 70 DEVELOPMENT – Request for an **Amendment to the Design for Development (D4D)** of the Pier 70 Special Use District, which outlines the controls, standards, and guidelines specific to the Pier 70 Mixed-Use Project. The proposed D4D amendment would amend the definitions of “Retail Use” and “Office Use”; the amendment would not alter overall building height maximums, parcel designations, or the overall development capacity of the Project. The project site is located within the P70-MU (Pier 70 Mixed-Use) Zoning District, Pier 70 SUD (Special Use District), and 65-X and 90-X Height and Bulk Districts.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: = Michael Christensen – Staff report
+ JR Eppler – Support
+ Kelly Pretzer – Project sponsor response to comments and questions
ACTION: Approved
AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner
MOTION: [21086](#)

F. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

The Commission Discretionary Review Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; followed by the DR requestor team; followed by public comment opposed to the project; followed by the project sponsor team; followed by public comment in support of the project. Please be advised that the DR requestor and project sponsor teams include: the DR requestor and sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

9. [2021-001932DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
[649 28TH STREET](#) – south side between Diamond and Douglass Streets; Lot 025 in Assessor's Block 7520 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2021.0201.3766 to construct a rear horizontal and vertical addition to a two-story, one-family residential building within a RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).
Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve
 (Continued from Canceled hearing on February 17, 2022)

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff Report
 - Chris McMahon – DR Presentation
 + Jonathan Pearlman – Project Sponsor Presentation
 - Georgia Schuttish – Demo calcs on DR's house
 + George Carolinas – Support
 + Jana – Support

ACTION: No DR

AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

DRA: [775](#)

10. [2021-003638DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
[450 MYRA WAY](#) – southeast side between Molimo and Hillcrest Streets; Lot 010 in Assessor's Block 3007 (District 7) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2021.0324.7216 to construct a rear horizontal addition to a two-story over basement, one-family residential building within a RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).
Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff Report
 - Mary Fitzpatrick – DR Presentation
 + Sunny Gao – Project Sponsor Presentation
 - Deborah Adkins – Request alternative design
 + Brian Caruso – Support

ACTION: No DR

AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

DRA: [776](#)

ADJOURNMENT 2:35 PM - ADJOURNED IN OPPOSITION TO THE UNNECESSARY AND TRAGIC LOSS OF LIFE, AND IN SUPPORT FOR PEACE BETWEEN TWO SIBLING NATIONS.

ADOPTED MARCH 24, 2022