



AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

FOR ORANGE **COUNTY**
3160 Airway Avenue Costa Mesa, CA 92626 (949) 252-5170 Fax (949) 252-6012

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

AUGUST 15, 2019

PLACE: John Wayne Airport Administration Building
Airport Commission Hearing Room
3160 Airway Avenue
Costa Mesa, California 92626

TIME: Regular Meeting called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Chairman
Bresnahan

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Gerald Bresnahan, Austin Lumbard, Stephen Beverburg,
Schelly Sustarsic, Alan Murphy, Mark Monin, Jeff Mathews
Alternate Commissioners Present: Vern King, Patti Campbell

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Lea U. Choum, Executive Officer
Jeff Stock, County Counsel
Martha McCool, Secretary

PLEDGE: Chairman Gerald Bresnahan led all present in the Pledge of
Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Beverburg and seconded by Commissioner Sustarsic. Commissioners voted unanimously for the approval of the minutes from July 18, 2019.

Introductions:

Austin Lumbard was introduced as the new Commissioner appointed in April of 2019 by the City Selection Committee. He is a councilman with the City of Tustin, with previous experience on the Planning Commission for the City of Tustin. He is a married father of four.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. City of Costa Mesa: Request for Consideration of 3175 Airway Avenue Permanent Bridge Shelter Project

Lea U. Choum, Executive Officer, spoke about the City of Costa Mesa's proposal for the Permanent Bridge Shelter Project which would be located at 3175 Airway Avenue. Ms. Choum provided background information on the proposed project. The proposed site contains an existing building of approximately 30,000 square feet. The proposed project would repurpose approximately half of the existing building for a permanent bridge shelter for individuals experiencing homelessness. The City is proposing to provide 50 beds, although the space has sufficient area to accommodate up to a maximum of 100 beds. The City plans to lease the other half of the building to tenants for industrial warehouse uses. The shelter would be run by City staff and Mercy House and would be open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The shelter would provide clients with case management, support group programs, job training, medical services, veterans services and County resource programs to shelter guests. Shelter guests would be shuttled to the facility on a reservation basis, and clients leaving the shelter without transportation would risk losing their ability to stay at the shelter.

The building was constructed in 1973 and consists of two separate office areas. The proposed project was submitted to the Commission due to its location in the Airport Planning Area and requires a Zoning Code Amendment. Emergency shelters are currently allowed in the City's Planned Development Industrial zone, and this code amendment will allow shelters to be located in the Industrial Park zone as well.

The shelter is being proposed due to a lawsuit against the City of Costa Mesa initiated by OC Catholic Workers and eight plaintiffs who had been encamped at the Santa Ana Riverbed. Orange County, City of Anaheim, City of Costa Mesa and the City of Orange were named in the lawsuit challenging enforcement of unlawful camping ordinances. To reach a settlement agreement, the City of Costa Mesa had to commit to providing a homeless shelter.

Ms. Choum further explained that this proposed project has been reviewed with respect to noise, building heights and safety zones, and the development of heliports. In regards to the noise impact, the proposed project is located within the 65 CNEL noise contour for John Wayne Airport, and the proposed bridge shelter is defined as an Institutional use by the Costa Mesa Municipal Code. Section 3.2.3 of the *JWA AELUP* states that noise-sensitive institutional uses such as schools, churches, hospitals, libraries and other noise-sensitive uses may be inconsistent in this zone. All noise-sensitive uses are inconsistent in this area unless it can be conclusively shown that the unit is sound attenuated as to not exceed an interior noise standard of 45 dB CNEL. Since the proposed project is a shelter that will

be open 24 hours a day and 365 days a year, it is considered a noise-sensitive use within the 65 CNEL noise contour. The City did report that based on EPA protective noise levels, the existing building envelope for the proposed project would meet these interior noise standards.

With respect to building height restrictions, the proposed project will be utilizing an existing building with no proposed modifications for height or exterior modifications; therefore, the City did not have to file form 7460-1 with the FAA.

The proposed project is located within the Part 77 Obstruction Imaginary Surfaces for JWA. It is located within the Transitional Surfaces, which limits building heights to 200 feet AMSL. The proposed project is 67 feet AMSL and would not penetrate the Transitional Surface.

The proposed project is located in Safety Zone 6, traffic pattern zone for JWA. Uses that are limited within this zone include schools, daycares, hospitals and nursing homes. The proposed project is an institutional use that should be limited within Safety Zone 6. Uses that should be avoided are outdoor stadiums and similar uses with high intensity. There are no uses prohibited in this zone.

The proposed project is a Transient Lodging Land Use Development and Guidelines for Safety Zone 6 recommend that overflight and noise be considered when developing in this zone.

With respect to heliports, since this is an existing building with no change of height, existing helicopter flight paths will not be impacted, and the building height will not be an obstruction to helicopters flight paths.

In terms of environmental compliance, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and (ALUC) staff provided comments.

Ms. Choum summarized her report and recommended that the Commission find the proposed permanent bridge shelter project inconsistent with the *AELUP for JWA*, but consistent with *AELUP for Heliports*.

Ms. Choum informed the Commission that the City was present and would like to provide more information.

John Stephens, Mayor Pro Tem, spoke about the project and its importance to the City of Costa Mesa. The decision to purchase the property on Airway Avenue was a high cost to the city, it also had a 7-0 approval vote by the City Council. It has been supported by the community and the businesses in the area. Mr. Stephens strongly urged that the Commission approve the proposal and find that the project is consistent with the *AELUP for JWA*.

Barry Curtis, Director of Economic Development for the City of Costa Mesa, provided more information about the proposed project. He confirmed the City is proposing to amend the Land Use Matrix to allow emergency shelters in the Industrial Park zone. He explained that there are two industrial zones in the City and the proposed project would be allowed in one of the zones subject to a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

He stated that in March of this year, the City entered into a Settlement Agreement for the lawsuit to provide shelters. The City is required to provide a total of 62 shelter beds. Twelve beds are located at College Hospital and 50 beds are proposed at the permanent shelter. The City opened a temporary shelter at the Lighthouse Church which is managed by City staff and professional shelter provider Mercy House. The City was once again able to start enforcing its anti-camping ordinances and to pursue long-term solutions for a permanent shelter.

He stated that in 2007, the State of California adopted SB 2, which required every city to adopt a zone within their city in which shelters are permitted by right. Costa Mesa designated a second Industrial zone, Planned Industrial Development (PDI), and it is located in the airport industrial area similar to the site proposed, there are portions of the zone that are just as close to the airport as the proposed site. The PDI zone area is where shelters are currently allowed.

In October of last year, the city started looking for properties in search of a permanent shelter site within the PDI zone. City staff, along with the City Council, looked at over 50 sites and analyzed them in great detail. They were unable to find any sites available for the shelter in the PDI zone. In April 2019, the City found and purchased the site located at 3175 Airway Avenue for use as a potential permanent bridge shelter facility, which would be run the same as the temporary shelter, with a reservation and transportation system. The site is located on the southwest corner of McCormick and Airway, in the MP zone where shelters are not currently a permitted use. The City is required to do a Code Amendment to allow the shelter in this zone. The City does not want to allow shelters by right but want to be able to regulate potential uses in the zone. They are not proposing to change the SB 2 zone.

Justin Martin, Assistant City Manager, stated that the goal of the bridge shelter is to assist people experiencing homelessness by providing shelter and services to those in need while working on getting them housed. The shelter would save City resources, taxpayer dollars and allow the City to continue enforcing its anti-camping ordinances, which provides safety to the community. It deters dangerous and unsanitary encampments and increases the ability for law enforcement to do their job. The Costa Mesa bridge shelter would operate on what is known as a hybrid operating model that utilizes the housing first approach. This model consists of day-to-day operations of the shelter by the expert shelter operator Mercy House and the client case management is the responsibility of the on-site City case-workers. The City of Costa Mesa specifically adopted this model, so there can be an increased level of oversight.

The shelter operation model requires reservation-based transportation into and out of the shelter. The shuttle takes the client from the shelter to various sites located throughout the city so that they can go to various appointments including scheduled meetings related to their housing plans. The shuttle transportation is provided six times per day. This operational feature will minimize impact to the local area by essentially eliminating the ability to loiter in the area, which is further complemented by the shelter security plan. Daily operations at the bridge shelter begin in between 5 and 6 a.m. with wake up and will end between 10 and 11 p.m. with lights out. Throughout the day, three meals are served for those clients that may remain on-site. Some on-site services may be provided, which include support groups, visits by County offices and social types of activities to help reacclimatize clients back into society. Other tasks that are on-site are laundry facilities, using the shared facilities and using multipurpose areas for leisure. The current statistics from the temporary bridge shelter show that a large percentage of clients are off-site for a major period of time throughout the day. The longest period of time which they are on-site, is on days when they meet with case managers and during the evening and overnight hours when they are sleeping. The security plan for the bridge shelter includes a screened perimeter with fencing that blocks views of the property due to privacy concerns, and 24 hour a day on-site security. In addition, there is an on-site surveillance system that will also monitor activity. The City will also have a Code Enforcement Officer and space for a Policing Unit to regularly visit the site. A roaming patrol will also monitor the area within a half-mile radius of the bridge shelter.

The good neighbor policy also continues the continuous public outreach to residents and businesses so that they can remain informed of shelter activities. There is a Permanent Bridge Shelter Advisory Board that is comprised of residents and business owners that will meet at scheduled meetings to provide output for community input. The goal is to transition the operation from the current temporary shelter to the permanent bridge shelter. The goal is to help shelter clients in the most expeditious way possible and to help them acclimate back to the community so that their housing will be successful once they achieve it.

Mr. Curtis provided a couple more points regarding issues that the City looked into when researching sites. The concern was proximity to the airport and the City's desire to make sure it's a comfortable site for people to be housed. The site is located within 65 CNEL noise contour and the City has committed to ensuring a 45 dB CNEL interior noise level for this property. Earlier this week, the City received back a preliminary noise study where two locations in the building were monitored over a 24 hour period on a Monday in July. The site has readings of a little over 46 dB CNEL interior noise and the other side had a little over 45 dB CNEL. The building is very close to the 45 dB CNEL interior noise goal. The majority of time, clients will be at the shelter during the airport curfew times. The majority of our clients will have about the same day-to-day exposure to airport noise with the same level of sound attenuation as most of those indoor employees have. As for long-term exposure, the City will be getting people in and out of the shelter within about a month and some people will take closer to two to three months but that duration is a relatively short period of time compared to employees that are working this area for years or decades at a time. The shelter will function more like an extended-stay hotel than a typical

institutional use. There are about three hotels in the area of the proposed Permanent Bridge Shelter that are located in the 65 CNEL noise contour. The Planning Commission considered the project last Monday and only one member of the public showed up. After listening to the Planning Commission, he left with an understanding of the project and he hoped the City would live up to their commitments. We would appreciate the Commission looking at this project with a slightly different perspective than ALUC Staff. This shelter is more akin to a hotel than other types of institutional uses.

Chairman Bresnahan opened the floor to questions.

Commissioner Mathews thanked the City of Costa Mesa for the time they took to make the presentation. He made two comments. One, in the Staff Report for Agenda Item 1, refers to Section 3.2.3, and that noise-sensitive institutions include schools and churches. Commissioner Mathews noticed that in this area, there is Mariners Church and a Saint James Church both of which have a small school attached. Rock Harbor Church is also close by, and that it looks like there are between two and three hotels within the 65 dB noise contour level and others within the 60 dB noise contour. He mentioned this because he is curious if Staff has information on those projects, as those are clearly institutional uses and they are in the 65 CNEL noise contour. Did they receive an exception, an avigation easement or anything that would otherwise mitigate that issue?

Lea Choum, Executive Officer, stated that those projects did not come to the Commission since they do not trigger a review by the ALUC. A General Plan Amendment or Zone Change by the City or jurisdiction was not required for those projects, so they did not trigger an ALUC review.

Commissioner Beverberg did not see who the target clients are. There is no statement whether this is going to be just individuals or families. He asked what is the expected usage. Mr. Martin answered that the plan is to house adults 18 and up. They will not be housing families or children at the shelter. Commissioner Beverberg then stated that it is indicated that there will be an outside area, so he suggested that the City put signage up that indicates this location is in the vicinity of an airport and that there will be noise and overflight in the exterior areas. He also asked if they are going to have any exterior lighting covering some of the areas, and that he wants to be sure that lights are pointed in the right direction so that they do not get in the way of airport operations. Mr. Martin confirmed the design phase would have lighting and that it would be directed onto the property.

Commissioner Beverberg also had a question regarding the air-conditioning system and if it will be changed. The City verified the current AC system is roof mounted and they will replace it with the same type and do not anticipate a change to the height.

Commissioner Beverberg asked about the wording of this change, is it possible that this change will lead to forcing the City to allow these kinds of facilities in every Industrial zone, and could this trigger a General Plan change?

Mr. Curtis explained that it is not the intent of the City. It is the intent to have the rest of the Industrial areas be subject to a Conditional Use Permit and there are other conditions in the Code related to shelters that are much more restrictive. The intent is that there would be no way for someone else to go into the area and build a shelter just because this shelter is there.

Commissioner Beverburg asked about the use of 50% of the building as a shelter and the rest possibly being leased out for warehousing. He asked if there is a possibility that the shelter will expand to use the whole building.

Mr. Curtis said the City's intent is to have 50 beds, although the analysis/space plan was up to 100 beds in the 15,000 square foot building. There will be a demising wall put in to separate the space. The City confirmed that they are working closely with the Fire and Safety Department.

Chairman Bresnahan wanted to confirm that the Conditional Use Permit is for the parcel and that the City would not need to come back to this Commission to expand to the full building. The City commented that they would have to redo CEQA documentation.

Commissioner Beverburg commented on service resistant homeless and wanted to confirm that this shelter will be for only clients who want to be there. The City confirmed that they will not force people to go to the shelter, but they will make an effort to encourage them to move to a shelter.

Commissioner Sustarsic asked about outdoor space and if there will be recreational or leisure space, as they may be exposed to noise. She also commented that the 2019 point in time count said that Costa Mesa had 193 homeless persons and 60% of that number would be 112. She wanted to know where the 62 came from.

Mr. Martin from the City of Costa Mesa confirmed that the number used in the Settlement Agreement was the 2017 point in time count and that was before the temporary shelter was open. Commissioner Sustarsic asked how the temporary shelter was working out, and Mr. Marin responded that the temporary shelter is working great and has cleaned up the west side of the City.

Commissioner Sustarsic asked ALUC Staff; if the PDI zone, where the City can build by right, is also located within the 65 CNEL zone? Staff confirmed the zone is in the 65 CNEL noise contour. The PDI zone is already approved for shelter use and would not need to be heard by the ALUC.

Commissioner Beverburg asked if major changes to the building would cause another review by the ALUC. Staff confirmed they are in a Transitional Zone, which limits heights to 200 feet. Unless the building is proposed to go above 200 feet, there would be no trigger for the project to be reheard by the ALUC. Currently the building is 27 feet high.

Commissioner Murphy wanted clarification as to what the City of Costa Mesa is asking from the Commission. Is it an amendment to the Zoning Code for the entire area, which would open up the potential for future projects? The City confirmed this is correct. But, they do not want to allow the shelters by right and open this to everyone. The City wants this regulated. Commissioner Murphy expressed his concerns about the way the ALUC will deal with this zone, as they will only get one chance to address it. One of the things that may be done is that when the City goes through the Conditional Use Permit process, to also go to the Commission for review and possibly refer to staff for an informal review to determine if the project needs to come back to the Commission. The Commission gave up the right to review these when the other zoning was changed. He is concerned that there are churches and schools in the area, but they do meet the City's requirements and that is consistent with the ALUC. He is also concerned about the 45 db CNEL noise limitations and is glad to hear the initiative to conduct the noise study. There will also need to be measurements done after the building is attenuated and completed. Another concern is overflight and the exposure to helicopter operations around the site. An aviation easement would be recommended for the noise around the airport. Commissioner Murphy asked if the City be able to do that.

Mr. Curtis replied that the City would have to check in with their City Council to verify if they could grant an aviation easement.

Commissioner Sustarsic asked if residents would be there on the weekends. The City responded that the shelter will be open on the weekends, but clients usually spend less time at a shelter on weekends. Pet care was also discussed and the City confirmed pets are allowed at the shelter with only 10% of participants permitted to have them. The client would be fully responsible for the care of the pet.

Commissioner Sustarsic asked about the court-mandated deadline for the shelter. The City's deadline was to open a shelter within 45 days of signing the Agreement, which they were able to do because of the temporary shelter. Another question to staff is about the runway accident zone, which is shown on the Caltrans exhibit in the Staff Report at 18 to 29%. Staff verified it is a low-risk zone.

The City Planning Commission heard the Code Amendment and unanimously recommended approval by the City Council. The Planning Commission also recommended that the City Council adopt the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration and that the City Council approves the Code Amendment that allows shelters in this zone subject to a CUP (Conditional Use Permit).

Chairman Bresnahan commented that he understands the need for the shelter and knows what the City is trying to accomplish, but he is concerned with the area that was chosen for the shelter site. In his view, this is Residential use and located in an active aviation area and is subject to overflight. It will be noisy, with loud airplanes and helicopters. He stated that he has been on the ALUC for over 25 years and is a second-generation member. The goal has been to keep residential areas out of the 65 CNEL area. He believes that the Commission is not looking at this as a parcel, but as the entire west side of the airport, and

that we risk exposing people to noise and overflight. He stated that he can not support this project and will go by the staff recommendation to find this project inconsistent with the *AELUP*.

Chairman Bresnahan opened the floor for more questions or a motion.

Commissioner Beverburg commented that the staff recommendation is to find the project inconsistent with the *AELUP of JWA* and consistent with the *AELUP for Heliports*. He does not recall this type of recommendation in a very long time and asked staff why it was done.

Ms. Choum commented that recent projects referred to the ALUC had been reviewed for both the local *AELUPs* and *AELUP for Heliports*. The *AELUP for Heliports* covers all of Orange County. Staff confirmed the location of a heliport on Helistream, it is not on airport property and that is why the review for the *AELUP for Heliports* was included for this proposed project.

Commissioner Beverburg moved the staff recommendation with Alan Murphy as a second. In discussion for the motion, Commissioner Lumbard commented that he has experience locating shelters sites with the City of Tustin and also did not find many appropriate locations. Commissioner Lumbard commented that he wants to clear up what a shelter is, although people are staying overnight, it is not a long term residential facility, and that the goal is to move people along. Tustin has a similar shelter near a shopping center. He is not sure if the shelter is a noise-sensitive use and thinks staff took a conservative view on their recommendation. If it is noise sensitive, the City will be able to mitigate the noise. He wants to verify with ALUC Staff that the Commission reviews projects for building height restrictions and safety zones and if the City of Costa Mesa can fulfill the obligation of noise attenuation to have the building be under 45 dB CNEL. Staff verified the *AELUP for JWA* indicates that uses may be found consistent if they meet that interior noise standard. However the question is, if the use is a compatible use, per the purview of the Commission. The interior noise standard can be met, but the Commission needs to decide if they should be locating these types of uses within the Airport Planning Area, within the 65 CNEL noise contour and within the safety zones. It is also important to consider the issue that Commissioner Murphy pointed out regarding the zoning, which impacts more than just the parcel in question, but the area that is located in the industrial zone surrounding the airport.

Commissioner Lumbard asked about Commissioner Murphy's suggestion regarding the aviation easement and for the Commission to be able to review additional shelter projects in the future. Would it be possible to put these conditions on the project?

Commissioner Mathews stated that he likes the recommendations and is in agreement with Commissioner Lumbard in adding the additional conditions but said that there are already churches and schools in this area as well as hotels. He doubts that multiple shelters will show up, although, in his opinion, there is a need for shelters.

Commissioner Mathews stated he would like to make a substitute motion. The original motion to approve staff recommendation failed with only two votes.

Commissioner Lumbard made a substitute motion with conditions that the Commission find the proposed permanent bridge shelter project, consistent with the *AELUP for JWA* and consistent with the *AELUP for Heliports*. Commissioner Murphy clarified the conditions as follows:

1. Based on the City agreeing to refer to the ALUC any CUP (Conditional Use Permit) requests for shelters in the MP zone.
2. Agreeing on an Avigation Easement covering noise impacts and allowing the over-flight of aircraft over this particular project.
3. Submit for review, the final noise report after sound attenuation.

Commissioners Murphy and Mathews agreed with the motion.

Chairman Bresnahan commented that if the City does not accept the conditions of this finding, then this reverts to an inconsistent finding. Kimberly Barlow, the City of Costa Mesa Attorney commented that if the City Council does not agree to the conditions, they will have to accept the inconsistent determination. She said that she cannot speak for the City Council but does feel that they will agree to these conditions. It was clarified that this condition does not apply to projects in the PDI zone.

Commissioner Sustarsic mentioned Municipal Code Section 13-200.79; if the City owns the shelters then the rules apply, but if it is a private shelter, they will go back to Municipal Code. There are more restrictive conditions for private shelters.

John Stephens, Mayor ProTem, thinks the conditions are reasonable and will recommend the conditions to his colleagues.

Chairman Bresnahan reminded the Commission that the mandate for the ALUC by the State of California is to protect the people from the airport and the airport from the people, and that this decision does not seem to accomplish that. The need and motivation for the shelter is understood, but it could open a door that the Commission does not intend to open and the next proposed project could be a shelter or another marginal use that would push the envelope a little further and put a few more people closer to the airport. The whole reason there is an industrial park there, as well as around a lot of airports in the country, is because that is where you locate industrial uses around the airport as a buffer. He indicated that by finding the project Consistent, the Commission is not protecting the people from the airport and the airport from the people

The substitute motion was approved by a 5-2 vote, with Chairman Bresnahan and Commissioner Beverberg as No's.

2. Administrative Status Report

Lea Choum, Executive Officer spoke on the various pieces of correspondence provided to the Commission. She referred to the letters sent to the City of La Mirada and the LA ALUC regarding the update to the *AE LUP for Fullerton Municipal Airport*.

3. **Proceedings with Consistent Agencies:**

Nothing new to report.

4. **Proceedings with Inconsistent Agencies:**

Nothing new to report.

5. **Items of Interest to the Commissioners:**

Chairman Bresnaham referred to the parcel for Agenda Item 1 (located at 3175 Airway Avenue, Costa Mesa), and stated that the City of Costa Mesa could potentially put an inconsistent use in an area that has a consistent plan. The City was found consistent in 2008 and they must have had a General Plan Amendment since 2008. His direction to staff would be to take a look to see if the Commission needs to look at this particular topic in this particular area and around the different airports within the County of Orange and see if the Commission needs to update the way they look at projects and perhaps the *AE LUPS*. He asked staff to agendize this item so it can be discussed further.

Commissioner Murphy also expressed concern about the City bringing in a Zoning Code change for review by the ALUC, but when changes are made in the future they might not come back to the ALUC. There are more churches and schools in this area which are not supposed to be there. He agrees with the Chairman that this area is supposed to be a buffer zone and it is being intruded upon. Those projects do not come to the Commission because of the existing zoning. He suggested having Counsel review to see if there is an opportunity for those projects to come to the Commission during their Use Permit process so the Commission could review those sensitive uses.

Alternate Campbell stated that she worked with Mercy House on their first project in Santa Ana and the shelter worked fine and it will be done well.

There was a discussion about the Commission's authority with development projects permitted by right. Counsel mentioned opportunities to weigh in, and its when the City proposes some kind of change to their Planning documents (General Plan, Zoning Code, etc.). Counsel will research the possibility of reviewing individual projects.

Commissioner Beverberg asked a question about the State law requiring that notices be provided to tenants in the vicinity of an airport and what ALUC's power was or was not. Counsel Jeff Stock said the State recognized that the notices that go to property owners about noise and vibrations is insufficient. There is an Assembly Bill 2776 that amended the Civil Code 1102.6 that specifically addresses these issues and there are a number of overlaying property type laws that deal with anything that you do when you are selling

property. There is also Business and Professions Code 11010 when Tract Maps and Parcel Maps are updated and those need to have notices about airports that are in the vicinity, (Civil Code 1102-1103). They are also contained within the Caltrans Handbook that gives some sample notices. Some other things that are at the Commission's disposal for use are Deed Restrictions and Avigation Easements. Basic powers of the Commission are whether or not a project that is coming in, is in conformity with the *AELUP*. You can find it consistent, consistent with conditions, or inconsistent. It was discussed that if project proponents do not follow the conditions, there is an enforcement mechanism against them with the County, but someone has to go to the County and inform them.

6. **Items of Interest to the Public:**

Nothing new to report.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Lea U. Choum
Executive Officer