

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level**  
**450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804**  
September 23, 2015  
6:00 p.m.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Eileen Whitty, Chair  
Brant Fetter  
Brenda Munoz

Ray Welter, Vice Chair  
Jonathan Livingston  
Mike Woldemar

Chair Whitty called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Eileen Whitty; Vice Chair Ray Welter; Boardmembers Brant Fetter and Mike Woldemar

**Absent:** Boardmembers Jonathan Livingston and Brenda Munoz

**Staff Present:** Lina Velasco, Jonelyn Whales and Assistant City Attorney James Atencio

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - None

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Whitty said the Board has suggested moving Item 3 ahead of other items.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Welter) to approve the agenda, as amended; unanimously approved by voice vote: 4-0-2 (Ayes: Fetter, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Livingston and Munoz.**

**Public Forum – Brown Act**

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, suggested modern coffee shops with a Caribbean design and style.

**City Council Liaison Report - None**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Chair Whitty stated Items 1 and 2 are Consent Calendar items. She asked if Boardmembers or the public wished to remove any items from the Consent Calendar. Ms. Velasco stated two speakers are signed up for Item 2, and Commissioner Woldemar requested removal of Item 1. Chair Whitty removed Items 1 and 2 from the Consent Calendar.

Chair Whitty announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, October 5, 2015 by 5:00 p.m.

**STUDY SESSION**

**3. PLN15-374 MARIN CLEAN ENERGY 10.5 MW PV ARRAY STUDY SESSION**

Description	STUDY SESSION TO DISCUSS DESIGN OF A 10.5 MW UTILITY SCALE SOLAR ARRAY PROPOSED ON APPROXIMATELY ±60-ACRES OF THE CHEVRON RICHMOND REFINERY. THE INSTALLATION INCLUDES APPROXIMATELY ±80,000 THIN-FILM, NON-REFLECTIVE SOLAR PANELS, WHICH IN COMBINATION WITH 11 UTILITY-SCALE INVERTERS, WOULD CONVERT SUNLIGHT INTO ELECTRICITY.	
Location	CASTRO STREET AND WEST HENSLEY STREET	
APN	561-100-037, 561-100-038, 561-100-034	
Zoning	M-3 (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL)	
Owner	CHEVRON USA INC	
Applicant	STION CORP	
Staff Contact	LINA VELASCO	Recommendation: <b>PROVIDE COMMENTS</b>

Ms. Velasco gave the staff report, stating the item is a study session wherein staff asks to receive feedback and comments on the proposed design for the 10.5 MW solar array. Currently, MCE is also going to be the owner of the facility under a lease agreement. Chevron Refinery is preparing a DEIR which is out for public review and comment, which closes on September 29, 2015. The City will be a responsible agency under CEQA. Once the document is certified, the City will rely on that analysis as part of the design review permit approval required for the solar array. She said tonight Jeff Long and Gregory Page are present from Stion Corporation and two representatives from MCE, Alex DiGiorgio and Alexander Krosky who are available to answer specific questions.

Boardmember Fetter stated this is a very large project and he asked how the project applies to the DRB, given typically solar is immune to review. Ms. Velasco said the major trigger is its size. The state has streamlined review and process for residential solar and even commercial project. Because this is at utility scale, it is larger and the Board might recall there was a mitigation measure in the Chevron Modernization project that included a 2 MW solar array and staff looked for a larger one. The use itself is consistent with what is allowed in the zoning district and staff is looking for feedback on the design only.

Boardmember Fetter noted the CEQA review includes visual impacts and reflection, but as far as the Board's responsibility to design, he asked for a better location map. He clarified that the DRB's responsibility is to provide guidance to make it suitable for the site in its design and style.

Jeff Long, Stion Corporation, applicant, thanked the Board for their review and gave a brief PowerPoint presentation regarding the project at Chevron Refinery. He described the type of system and said it will produce 20 MW hours in the initial year of operation. Initial phases are well underway and outreach is being conducted with Richmond Build on labor resources, the EIR is underway, the landfill site is under geotechnical and civil review as well as for the pond site. He provided a display of the layout of the systems where solar panels will track the sun all day and night and briefly discussed operation of it. There will be no penetration into the capped landfill ground whatsoever and he displayed pictures of the ballast fixed tilt system.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned what 20,000 MW provides as far as households. Mr. Long said this will be 20,000 hours of 1 MW and 1 MW powers approximately 1,000 to 1,200 homes.

Mr. Long stated the modules have an anti-reflective coating to eliminate any glare, which are used in airports around the country. He then discussed local community involvement, sustainable workforce policies, and the hiring of local employees, involvement with Richmond Build, tie-in with MCE and Chevron promoting solar education and training.

Boardmember Woldemar asked for a photo of the edge of the site along Castro Street, and Mr. DiGiorgio said he could display a photo from his laptop. Boardmember Woldemar said further south on Castro, Chevron has gone to a great deal of trouble to create a berm and an incredibly well landscaped screen which is about 10-15 of earth and growth above that. He said there is 6 foot high shrubs level with the street and it looks as though there is some grade where this could be a berm which could have the existing shrubs, the berm and plantings which could include trees with the idea to create a green wall as a screen to the utility. He confirmed the shrubs would remain and asked that a berm and trees be created behind that which is already started in the northern part of the site and continuing south.

Mr. DiGiorgio said this then creates a shadowing effect onto those modules into that section and they would be opposed to this because the shrubs would continue to grow and affect the solar array. He noted there is also a cul-de-sac that serves as a turn-about and while he understands the desire to add trees to block it, it is not an eyesore.

Boardmember Fetter said one problem is that there are many planned views and faint images and the Board lacks the information it needs to be able to approve such a project. Therefore, the Board is looking for better information of what it looks like from other viewpoints. Mr. Long said he can share the renderings. Ms. Velasco said tonight the Board is receiving comments and this could be done at a subsequent meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the slide "Site 1" and in the drawings it is "second phase." He referred to Sheet 12.1, it shows these things at various angles but he cannot see what the heights of the arrays are when they are in the up angles. Mr. Long said they are 6 feet and they come to an up angle of 8'2" and are 14' in phase 2. Boardmember Woldemar said therefore, he suggested trees be planted at 20 foot on center picking up on what Chevron has already done to the south.

Boardmember Fetter said the quality of the images make the project difficult to view, and Mr. Long apologized, but said full sized plans were submitted to staff. Boardmember Fetter said usually during study sessions, the Board likes to provide as many comments as possible so when the project returns the Board can be comfortable with what is proposed. He said while this is a simple application, the critical items needed for decision-making are not provided.

Chair Whitty asked if they could provide a higher view so the Board can see the Richmond Parkway coming down and what they will see on the site from Richmond Parkway, which Mr. Long agreed he could provide. She also said the plans do not show the footage from the array to the property line. They show 30 feet at the top of phase 1, but further down Castro Street, when the applicant returns, she asked to bring footages of how far the project is away from the trees. She also questioned where the entrance is located on the map, and Mr. Long pointed to the top right hand corner of Castro and the U-turn area. He said this is then closed off after construction is completed. The maintenance entrance comes in through another gate through the refinery, which he agreed to return and indicate on the map with a higher view.

Vice Chair Welter echoed comments of Boardmembers and asked to provide as many angles back as well as entrances, construction access, and a larger view of the vicinity map.

Chair Whitty said since this is a groundbreaking project for Northern California, she encouraged this be posted on the Richmond Parkway, which will benefit MCE, and Mr. Long confirmed this will be done.

Chair Whitty also noted that signage must be approved. Ms. Velasco stated that staff will have to look at what the ordinance allows because the parkway is a scenic corridor, but on Castro there are opportunities.

Vice Chair Welter said staff will need to ensure the applicants become aware of what will be required as far as drawings and submittal requirements, given the project is unusual and at the utility level. Ms. Velasco said she will review the list and check with the building inspectors and it sounds like a landscape plan, a more detailed site plan with setbacks, etc.

Boardmember Fetter suggested also including scenic requirements along the Parkway and to also check the effect of the area off-set from the street, given the need for landscaping and site sections and sketches showing the arrays, landscaping and street to understand what is there and what is planned. Ms. Velasco said staff will also ask the applicants to provide a summary of the environmental requirements, given there may be mitigations that are incorporated as part of the aesthetics section.

Boardmembers thanked the applicant team and encouraged them to double-check with staff all submittal requirements before returning to the Board to achieve the best review results.

**Items Removed on the Consent Calendar:**

**Public Hearing(s)**

- 1. **PLN14-227 SEAPORT STAINLESS INDUSTRIAL ADDITION**
    - Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±4,200. SF LIGHT INDUSTRIAL METAL ADDITION TO AN EXISTING WAREHOUSE.
    - Location 5021 SEAPORT AVE
    - APN 560-033-028
    - Zoning M-3 (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT)
    - Owner DOVING RAYMOND & LINDA TRE
    - Applicant PARADIGM GENERAL CONTRACTORS
    - Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES
- Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Ms. Whales stated that Kieron Slaughter was the original project planner on the project and she was unsure of the history. However, the applicant is only adding an addition to the existing building. That the time the packets were sent out, she did not have the color prints which she brought, as well as color schemes and materials for the building. They are also proposing to landscape the site.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 2, second paragraph, the Knox-Cutting Specific Plan; that the development is compatible with the existing buildings in the industrial area, promoting

the use of building materials and colors similar to hue and texture. The owners have complied with this goal by choosing to paint the addition in a complementary exterior as surrounding areas of the building. He pointed to the submittal and questioned its compatibility. Ms. Whales said the signage brings out the blue color and she believes it will coordinate well. However, she deferred to the applicant for further discussion.

Boardmember Woldemar said when pulling into the project parking lot heading north and parking on the angle, he asked for back out dimensions. When getting to the far north end of the parking lot and if he finds there are no spaces available, he asked how to exit the lot. Ms. Whales said there is a cyclone fence there and it is for employee parking and they back all the way out. Boardmember Woldemar said he believes there is a requirement of more than 3 or 4 cars of back out is onerous. He suggested either deleting the last two spaces and drive out onto the street.

Boardmember Woldemar asked why there is not a public sidewalk on the site. He said there is one on Seaport Avenue that runs to the corner of what used to be an old public street. Ms. Whales deferred to the applicant and she believes it has to do with the land being vacant.

Boardmember Woldemar said there was no topography map with the project. While he knows the site is relatively flat, except in the southern end of the landscaped area, there is as much as a 5 foot grade differential between the existing street and parking area. Therefore, this may in fact end up affecting what is planted there. Ms. Whales said she believes they are working with a landscape architect.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if staff knows whether the existing fence runs along 51<sup>st</sup> Street is going to be removed or not because he said it does not show on the drawings. Ms. Whales deferred to the applicant.

Boardmember Fetter asked how much time had elapsed from the time of the application to the time it was deemed complete. Ms. Whales said it has almost been a year because the applicants had to go through a lot line adjustment. She acquired it from a previous planner and they realized there were two properties. If they were going to make such an investment, they decided to merge the two lots.

Boardmember Fetter asked if there was discussion about landscaping next to the building between paving and the building. Ms. Whales said there is not much room in the strip for landscaping and also deferred to the applicant.

Vice Chair Welter referred to the zoning compliance information and questioned it. Chair Whitty stated 15 feet is required and they are proposing 5 feet from the front setback. Vice Chair Welter asked if Seaport was considered the front or not. Ms. Whales said she believes it is 51<sup>st</sup> Street and said she will correct information in the table.

Boardmember Woldemar said he realized for the first time that the new building is higher than the existing building but he could not tell why in the drawings. He suggested the applicant indicate that the fascia's align and start the new building at that level and let it slope down towards 51<sup>st</sup> Street. He felt it was currently visually awkward and difficult to flash it for water.

Doving Raymond, owner/applicant, said he believes it was the contractor and building manufacturer's recommendation to do that in the interest of making it easier. Boardmember Woldemar asked what will be done on the west side of the addition. Mr. Raymond said there is an existing parapet wall on the roof and they will flash over that from the addition. The reason

they propose this solution is with the pitch of the roof, if they started at the existing roof height and pitched down from there, by the time they got 30 feet or so out, they start to lose clearance and usable space which becomes an issue for storage. This was one of the reasons for taking it up for the flashing issue and that they end up with the same height they currently have.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the drawings and said the upside is 17' and the downside is 15'9". If that were lowered a certain amount, he asked if this would restrict the applicant's use on the west side by a great deal. Mr. Raymond said he believes this affects the door height.

Boardmember Woldemar said before seeing the project, he had made comments about colors. The building is a soft green and he assumed that the eave lines were the same and he could take the existing eave as a color and take it all around the eave of the metal building and have continuity there. He said this is a classic kind of building where it needs a base, bottom and lid. He suggested painting a line that runs along the building that carries itself out to the existing building, so there is a color A, B, and an A or C up at the top as a color pattern. He also thinks important is that this is an entrance to the university's property and this project should set a precedent to what will come along the way.

He said because he had imagined it to be one long wall of something, he proposed some clerestory windows be added along the eastern side to provide interest. Lighting is east light which is great.

Boardmember Woldemar echoed the question regarding the parking lot and access to get out, and the applicant indicated they were fine with adjusting this.

Boardmember Woldemar said he also suggested that the shrubs proposed at 8 foot on center are very low scale. When there is that much slope on the edge, they will vanish from the street side. He suggested that the whole shrub band under the trees be taller or something closer to 4 feet. He also thinks they should make a statement at the entrance and suggested tightening up on the trees, suggesting a 25 foot on center instead of 30 feet which equals one more tree. He thinks all of his comments can be implemented subject to the applicant's agreement.

Mr. Raymond pointed out locations of the wall run vertically and images of the roof, stating they interlock. He said they are open to the color scheme. He said he and his son drove around Emeryville and Berkeley and looked at some of the new modern buildings which are a mix of steel and cement. They are contrasting colors, as well as Quizno's in Richmond. He said the red was more of a brick color and the blue was more of a grey color, so they are somewhat saturated in the photos.

Boardmember Woldemar said he thinks the cool leaf green is better for that area and metal should drive the building color in finding a composite program, and Mr. Raymond said they are amenable to whatever looks best and definitely do not like the colors of the existing building.

Boardmember Fetter suggested and confirmed that the applicant was amenable to having the fascia one color and three tones, the curb cut and fixing grading issues and higher shrub band under trees. He then referred to the sidewalk issue and Mr. Raymond said there is no sidewalk and 4 buildings. Ms. Whales stated the Public Works Department will comment on the plan once they look at the driveway cut.

Boardmember Woldemar said across the street are fairly significant office spaces and they park on the other side of the street heading south and no sidewalk on the passenger side. On the next block over, there are many sidewalks, bulb outs, curbs, etc.

Vice Chair Welter asked if the new building could be a foot or two higher given right now it looks like a mistake. In architecture, if you cannot make it sloped, it looks like a mistake. Mr. Raymond said he would rather go higher and Vice Chair Welter suggested adding a couple of feet onto it. Vice Chair Welter suggested looking at some base colors given Boardmember Woldemar's comments, as well, and height will help that detail and the Board requested a condition to state, "new building to match existing building height to the west." Mr. Raymond said it looks as though it is 2-3 feet higher and agreed.

Chair Whitty asked to install wall lighting for the new building door which is not listed on the plans. Mr. Raymond said the question came up from their contractor and they are using LED lights above each man door. Vice Chair Welter asked and confirmed the use would be for storage of finished products and no additional work space.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period and there were no speakers. The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Whitty) to approve PLN14-227 with the staff's recommended 4 findings, as well as the staff's recommended 4 conditions of approval with the following additional conditions: 1) that the body color of the existing and new building be of the cool leaf green color indicated on the metal building color selection sheet; 2) that the bottom 3 feet of both buildings be of a darker grey/green and that the top fascia and gutter trim be also of a darker green; 3) that at the north end of the parking lot, there be a 20 foot wide exit way onto South 51<sup>st</sup> Street; 4) that the street trees be increased to 25 foot on center; 5) that the shrub band indicated as Manzanita be revised to be 5 gallon size of some species that will grow in the range of 4 feet high; 6) that the new building be increased in height to match the existing height of the existing building to the west, approximately 36" more; and 7) that an 8020 fixed glass window be installed at the centerline of each 20 foot bay and the metal frames be in a dark green color; unanimously approved by voice vote: 4-0-2 (Ayes: Fetter, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Livingston and Munoz.**

**2. PLN14-115 NEVIN AVENUE RESIDENTIAL**

Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT CONSISTING OF 289-UNITS WITH COMMERCIAL SPACE OVER A PARKING GARAGE. THE PROJECT SITE CONSISTS OF TWO ADJACENT PARCELS SEPERATED BY 22 <sup>ND</sup> STREET ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF NEVIN AVENUE BETWEEN 21 <sup>ST</sup> AND 23 <sup>RD</sup> Streets.	
Location	NEVIN AVE	
APN	514-080-013 and 514-090-018	
Zoning	MFR-3 (Multifamily High Density Residential) and C-2 (General Commercial)	
Owner	ADAMS CARL TRE	
Applicant	Alexis M. Gevogian	
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Ms. Whales gave the staff report and a description of the project location. She said the project was before the DRB on July 8, 2015 for a study session to ask for comments. The architect is present and can explain how comments have been incorporated. She said she was given a 3-dimensional version which addresses the corner ends, and she distributed these to the Board.

Chair Whitty said referred to the staff report on page 2 and said Building A has 150 units and Building B has 131 units, which equals 281 units.

Douglas Gibson, Architect, applicant, said the intent was to meet the same unit count they had initially submitted and what had been approved through the Commission. Therefore the unit count has not changed.

Chair Whitty said Building A is made up of 56 studios, 44 one-bedroom, 25 two-bedroom, 23 three-bedroom, and 5 four-bedrooms. Building B is 54 studios, 49 one-bedroom, 14 two-bedroom, 10 three-bedroom, and 5 four-bedroom. Ms. Whales stated staff will ensure the count is correct based on the MND done for the project.

Chair Whitty clarified that the Planning Commission decided the number of required parking spaces and the density and the DRB is not going to address these. Ms. Whales stated the applicant was also going to add some bicycle storage attempting to accommodate 300 bicycles based on the request from the Planning Commission. Mr. Gevogian said they worked out the space and specifications for those areas and they should meet that requirement. He said for the record, he believed the project was a continuance and the DRB did not make a motion to reject or deny. Ms. Whales clarified that it was a study session with direction given at the July 8<sup>th</sup> hearing.

Vice Chair Welter said he is unclear on the setbacks, stating he is having trouble seeing where the property lines are located. There is 10 feet required in the front, 20 feet in the rear and 5 feet side yard setbacks. Proposed is 8, 5 and 3 and there is an asterisk next to "proposed" which he asked about. That said, he questioned if the south property line is a side or rear and he confirmed there is no setback there. Ms. Whales said the applicant is between two different zoning designations; the C-2 and also the MFR-2 which borders this. There is a capital improvement project under construction there now and the Planning Commission was lax in this requirement for a zero setback in that one area.

Mr. Gibson said one reason they do not have the actual property boundaries is they literally received the ALTA on September 18<sup>th</sup>. Therefore, the building permit set will include boundaries in all of their property designations. In response to that comment, one design change they did make was that they took everything on the podium and pushed it 10 feet off of the south property line.

Vice Chair Welter said he was confused as to how the applicant is representing the open space. The requirement is 200 square feet which he assumes is common and 60 square feet for private, but then there is the total square footage. Ms. Whales said she did not break this out because by them having the density bonus, staff was able to be lax on the actual open space because of the affordability of the project.

Vice Chair Welter asked if the density bonus is allowing the applicant less overall open space. Ms. Whales stated yes and they are proposing 30 square feet per unit on average which Chair Whitty said is in the report on page 3. Vice Chair Welter asked if the zoning ordinance requires private square footage as it relates to the unit. Ms. Whales said it is a flat number.

Mr. Gibson said some of the one-bedroom units have 9 feet by 6 feet and some of the larger corner units where one would expect to have more activity outside are larger.

Vice Chair Welter referred to parking and while the Board is not going to get into these, he questioned the math. They are proposing 192 spaces and there are 104 standard and 10 ADA.

He asked where the remaining spaces are located. Chair Whitty said it has been reduced from 400 to 192 but not further reduced and she suggested it also state 90 tandem spaces. She suggested clarifying the space numbers. Mr. Gibson noted that A11A and A11B actually have the parking trivial to each one of the buildings. He apologized it was not incorporated into the report.

Chair Whitty referred to building design style on page 2, and she noted there are still Spanish tiles and she asked and confirmed this is a typographical error which was removed and replaced with metal roof. There are also no arches but there are trellises on the top in the corner.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 5 of 12, at the bottom staff talks about Nevin Avenue improvements, bulb outs, etc., and he asked if there were copies of this material for the Board to review. Ms. Whales said she does not and said she is not the manager of this project which was a CIP project. Boardmember Woldemar questioned and confirmed that the final construction drawings are complete and she can bring that back to the Board at a later date. When the applicant had learned the City had a CIP project based on that and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and Nevin Avenue Streetscape, they have been working together with staff. Boardmember Woldemar thought that the adjacent off-site improvements should be something the Board should see, given this project is adjacent to. Ms. Whales stated it will look like the same as what is in front of the Civic Center because the developer has been communicating with the City's engineer and public works.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Condition No. 1 and asked to insert the word in the second sentence, "Any minor modifications shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator."

Boardmember Woldemar asked what Item 5 means. Ms. Whales stated this was part of the Planning Commissioner's condition which she agreed does not belong in the DRB approval and staff will strike it.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Item 8 which is a discussion about mitigation measures. It seems that because they are part of the design approval, because they need to be pasted on the front end of the documents, he asked that they be included in this report. Ms. Whales said they will be part of the project's final conditions of approval and part of the construction drawings.

Chair Whitty referred to Item 10 which states "50" and it should state "300 bicycle parking spaces." Ms. Whales said this will be revised as it was changed by the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Item 15 and the recycling plan and covering phases of construction. This is part of the permitting process and does not belong here as a condition but a building requirement. Ms. Whales said she will strike it.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Item 16 which is basically iterating what is in the zoning ordinance, but it states if they do not build it as is, it can be revoked; however, this does not belong in conditions of approval, and Ms. Whales stated she will strike this as well.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Item 17 and did not understand it. Ms. Whales said this relates to the applicant's funding which was added by the Planning Commission, and staff was trying to consolidate all conditions because the project went first to the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if staff requires them to paste conditions of approval on the front end of their documents. He said this topic is a design review topic and he did not think it necessarily belonged here. Ms. Whales said they will need to show this when they come and submit for their building permits. As a planner, she would want to see all conditions for the project and staff requires them to have them all. However, she said staff can separate those out.

Boardmember Woldemar stated Item 21 talks about encroachment periods as well as Item 24, and he suggested combining them. He said the same occurs with Item 23 and Item 28 regarding erosion control plan, which Ms. Whales said she will combine.

Mr. Gibson noted that do include them on construction documents as part of a standard process and most jurisdictions require this in case the general contractor neglects to do something.

Mr. Gibson referred to Item 8 and mitigation monitoring. He asked and confirmed that Ms. Whales will provide this document.

Chair Whitty pointed to discrepancies in the staff report, stating some places it states 193 parking spaces on page 5 and 192 spaces on page 2 which is what it should be. Ms. Whales said she will make this correction.

Chair Whitty asked if the applicant could discuss page 3 of 12 which is a list of items which she assumes has all been done. Mr. Gibson provided the following information:

- He referred to A11A and A11B which are the ground floor of the podium. Trash rooms are proposed at the northwest corner of Site A and the southeast corner of Site B. Drawing Sheet 11A in looking over at the designation of 21<sup>st</sup> Street at the southwest corner of the property, they have two shoots indicated, 2 compactors, 4 covered containers. On drawing sheet 11B along the 22<sup>nd</sup> / 2<sup>nd</sup> Street frontage, similar conditions but because of the number of units in that structure they have 5 placed in the area.
- On the building Type A where they have the proposed small retail use the intent would be that those individuals would be using waste facilities or some process to use the refuse within the structure and not a separate refuse area.
- Ground floor community lobby is located at the northwest corners of both buildings. For A11A there is an entry lobby. It would be a secure area where residents would be able to get into the elevator. There is a similar situation in Building B northwest corner. There is a lobby, an elevator with similar conditions. The intent is to provide for secure access for residents. He confirmed that there is a secondary entrance on the northeast corner of Building B into the lobby. Mr. Gibson said in looking south of that location it would be a leasing office to provide quick in and out. The elevator door is facing south into the parking area and the elevators will be configured to allow for that access.
- He will confirm the parking numbers are consistent with the application.
- Both buildings above the ground floor have been pushed back 10 feet. He referred to Sheet A.2 where there is a 10'1" dimension. There will be some articulation and decks that come forward to that, but they are approximately 10 feet from the gridline on Building A. He said it is not an occupy-able deck and residents in those units would have half walls. This addressed the concern about not having the development right up against the property line. On Building B, Sheet A9.2, there is a similar situation. He pointed out that in the center of Building B on the podium area, they extended the landscaping into that component which is to act as a buffer to keep people from using that as an attractive nuisance.

Boardmember Woldemar noted the stairway goes out to the property line, and Mr. Gibson concurred and this allows residents egress out of the structure down to 22<sup>nd</sup> Street. Boardmember Woldemar noted the stairwell has windows in it at the property line and Mr. Gibson said these will be removed.

- The 4<sup>th</sup> item; color sequence simplified in the base material: the CMU has been changed to stucco. The structure will be a concrete podium deck and they will use a darker, richer stucco color that continues up to the second floor band in some areas. He confirmed it will not be colored concrete but stucco.
- The 5<sup>th</sup> item specific to queuing areas added to both vehicle entrances to prevent traffic congestion. He referred to A1A and A1B. They wanted to bring the traffic off of Nevin so both structures have ingress off of Nevin and egress as well, but they are primarily showing on Building A egress at 22<sup>nd</sup> Street and at Building B they are showing egress at 21<sup>st</sup> Street. These will be pressure mats and only activated from inside of the parking garage. They also did the physical sized dimensions so there will be space for 1 ½ or 2 cars to queue into each one of these protected areas which allows for residents to continue to walk by on the sidewalk and not have issues with cars sticking out on the street.
- A note on the site plan indicates that assign tandem spaces to specific units. They just opened up a 256 unit project in Southgate that had tandem units and the same developer wanted to use tandem. They continue to stress they do not agree with it, but they had no choice. It is assigned tandem. Where there are issues, the management company works them out and re-assigns certain vehicles to another space. Operationally, it is working and he can provide substantiation of this from the operator of that property.
- Storefront windows were increased in height and frequency at the ground floor to bring the scale to a more pedestrian level. This was also part in parcel their decision to go away from any CMU module type design and go with a concrete.
- Drawing sheet A5.1B for example, this is the east elevation of Building A which would face the commercial off to the east. They are proposing to take that storefront up 10'6" so anything above the storefront would be the depth of the podium. The intent would be to maximize as much as the storefront as possible. It will be at the commercial space on Building A on the left. On the right where there is a lobby, it would also expose areas where there is bike storage and people would be able to see into the parking structure and they would deal with the mechanics of that in such a way to appear consistent across the whole plane. This is a similar design to Drawing Sheet A.10.1B and 10.1A. This would be the elevation fronting Nevin Avenue and he said they continued the same rhythm from the upper structure down for the most part but worked in larger storefront and it will be as transparent as possible, especially meeting spaces.
- The base of the building be simplified through continuity of color and horizontal uniformity: Mr. Gibson referred to A.10.2A which is the color board for Building B as an example, elevation one. Previously they had a lot of articulation and there was too much going on. They brought it down and made sure the color is consistent with those vertical elements they are trying to call attention to. This is consistent for both building types.
- Stair towers change to face the public streets: He referred to A.10.2A and said they have smaller windows and referred to the color board Building B's south elevation on the right side. On the left is a similar situation and windows in the stair tower work well which are 2x2 to get natural lighting into the stairwell.
- He referred to 10.2B, Elevation one, east elevation, the right side of the Building B, the Nevin elevation where it steps down at the corner and right to the left is where they would have windows as a square, strip pattern.

- Windows were added at corner patio units to increase views for residents. On Building A, they stepped out one of the units that faces the commercial to the east. They added it in several of the units because they do not know what their seismic is going to be, they would do it during construction documents.
- Window trim, horizontal banding, railings and corner details have been provided. Drawing sheet A.16.1 shows typical detailing to represent how they would propose to detail out. The detail sheets for these are going to be 6-7 sheets, but this provides an idea of what is being proposed.
- Spanish tile roofing was removed.
- They removed most of the sloped type roof and went with a flat blade coming right out of the structure which is easier to detail.
- Storage was added to units that were missing a storage component. This would be specific to the studio units where they do not have a storage unit on a patio. For Type A studio units, they have an allocation programmatically for storage but was not sure he could not locate it for Building A. There is sufficient common area on each floor to provide for it, such as an extra laundry area which would be transformed into resident storage. He apologized it is not shown, but will include it programmatically on the final plans.
- Planters have been revised to be part of the water filtration system. The set he has does not include the latest landscape plans, and Tom Phelps, their landscape architect got the plans to them late on Friday and he was not sure it made it in the packet. Ms. Whales said it was not, and Mr. Gibson said he would want these included, given they have designed the water filtration system on Sheet A.3.2 which shows the planters but not the landscape plans.
- The design motif was changed to a more urban context. He referred to the supplementary print out which is an aerial and said what they did not want was to have a big building that looked like two smaller buildings. They changed up colors on one. The east structure would have a cornice with clean, commercial lines at the top whereas the westerly structure would have a roof element coming over the top of it to add variety. He discussed the color variations and the two colors used at the base would be complementary. They would use a consistent color for railing and the storefront to tie the two buildings together and be complementary such as a dark brown.
- Control joints are added to the stucco finish for articulation and are in the renderings.
- Building A and B have increased amounts of light which can be seen in any of the podium deck plans such as A.3.2. They moved some of the units around so there would not be a long walkway with structural columns supporting the cat walks, which was one of the Board's main concerns. They reprogrammed some of the internal spaces.
- In addition on the west building, they pulled back some of the units where before they were over a public area on the podium. They opened the structure up on the south and provided an opportunity for cross circulation for fresh air.
- Regarding site lighting comments, these are included in the packet and while hard to read, he suggested the Board make a condition that the site lighting is consistent with the requirement for that lumen temperature of 5,000 versus 3,000. It would also be relative to lighting at the ground plane and while they do not want to over light the sidewalk, it addresses security concerns and their electrical engineer will provide photo metrics at the time of plan check submittal.

Mr. Gibson concluded and said this is the list of items they addressed and he was available for questions and comments.

Vice Chair Welter referred to Sheet A.2.2 and the areas over the podium, there are some on A.3.2 and some of the smaller units have very shallow Juliette balconies. He suggested

increasing the outdoor spaces for 3 the units. The other decks are pretty generous and the smaller ones really cannot be used. Mr. Gibson concurred with this revision.

Vice Chair Welter he visited a similar already-built senior project on Friday and asked how construction administration was being done on that project. Mr. Gibson said he is present on a monthly basis. Vice Chair Welter said he noticed that there are some things that are just awkward such as trim that does not continue around, several locations where the vertical location of the horizontal trim is odd and hits the outsides of the decks. He said they pulled out the entitled and permitted set of drawings, which explained some of it, but mostly noticeable are the deck railings which are nothing like what was entitled and permitted. He said these are shown in the present drawings which got permitted in the building department and the ones that went in are flimsy and vertical. It was not what was approved and he did not want the same thing to happen with this building. He said he wants to be sure the design is being protected and the railing issue does not seem like it went through any process.

Boardmember Fetter noted that the railings in the initial construction documents still show the ones approved whereas oddly, it did show on the construction documents. There are situations where the documents show the area but the railings are not matching up with what was approved and to be done. Mr. Gibson noted that he never received shop drawings for the record. He knows the general contractor has done a lot of value engineering and other things like full course brick. His job is to “beat them up” but at the end of the day, it is done this way.

Vice Chair Welter stated he wants to let Mr. Gibson know there is a problem. The Planning Department and Director are aware of it and therefore he is very concerned with this project because it is much bigger, more visible and he is assuming it is the same development team. Therefore, the Board is going to work with the Planning Department to ensure these types of things do not happen. He said many of the items like trim alignments are not necessarily money items, but a coordination item. He knows affordable housing construction costs are low, but for this project the Board would like to see site sections in the next round, given he cannot see what is next door.

Vice Chair Welter said he is not prepared to support the project tonight, given there is a lot missing. He said there are discrepancies with the parking, missing information, no landscape drawings, site sections of adjacent parcels and other items. Ms. Whales said the problem is that they will be out the door and the city is going to come and tear up the street, given the Nevin improvements. She asked if staff could bring this to the Board’s attention without holding this project up. Vice Chair Welter said those improvements will not hold up this project and there are too many items missing. The Board needs complete submittals and there are too many items missing. The parking issue is an example. They are approved for 192 spaces and Ms. Whales said they will provide this. Chair Whitty said there is no other place to put in more parking and it is not shown in the plans. Vice Chair Welter said he will not approve a project with 182 spaces when there is supposed to be 192 spaces, and he will not make this a condition.

Ms. Whales said she knows the Planning Commission stated that there will be 192 spaces, and Vice Chair Welter said he is using this as an example. If they will need to find homes for 10-15 spaces, it will change things design-wise, and Ms. Whales said the developer will have to pull units out, and there will be 192 parking spaces for this project because that is what the document was approved for. Vice Chair Welter said it will change the design. Mr. Gibson said he understands the point.

Boardmember Fetter said something that jumps out at him that is a technical issue the developer needs to deal with is the production of drawings, illustrations and renderings. This

might be partly because there is mis-alignment of trim which lives on through the process. He pointed out software is being allowed to dictate the design which requires drafters to go in and adjust it and fix it. There are many small things like this, such as alignment of the stucco control joints and sizes of joints, and how they are expressed on the face. There is not a consistent methodology of that on this because he sees it is applied in some areas, but not others. There are also foam banding elements where this happens as well.

Boardmember Fetter recognized some of the stairwell perforations have been changed to address large blank walls. There is one which still bothers him which is Building A on the west side or the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street side. There is one set of windows there and he has seen multiple ways to deal with this. Therefore, he asked for relief to the large solid walls as there are many ways, and given the building's dominance to the street.

Boardmember Woldemar gave the following comments which he said were more logistical. He received 8.5 x 11 sheets on Friday which were entirely unreadable and he finds that receiving the materials at the meeting is terribly disrespectful of the Board. Mr. Gibson apologized.

Boardmember Woldemar said he also will not vote for approval of the project in any form, but for a continuance or for a denial. He agreed there are too many missing items, as follows:

- Page 1.1, landscape documents to show the street design, pavement, landscaping and how all of the street infrastructure work relate to this project.
- At the entries, he asked if there are special pavement areas that extend out into the public sidewalk area to emphasize things.
- On all podium items, all of the hardscape details are missing.
- Bench locations, planter locations are missing
- There are hundreds of details that need to tell the Board more about what this building is about and what the Board is specifically approving, such as vertical pickets on railings or horizontal rails.
- Missing are a number of courtyard elevations. He would like to know what they look like from the inside and what people are looking at across the courtyards.
- There are more sections needed all around the building of the various exterior conditions so the Board can understand what the sections are.
- Because there is some commercial and retail space, the Board needs a sign program and where they will be located. This is in the ordinance for the design review process.
- More needs to be learned about C3 requirements. He questioned whether there are enough quantities of area of filtration that will match almost 100% hard surface.
- He shares Vice Chair Welter's concerns about site sections.
- He referred to Sheet L-2 and said in the early part of the project a series of questions related to the Richmond Transit Village plans. He would like to see the trees and plantings on the site plans.
- On Building A's second floor above, there is a symbol for palm trees, but one is 4 times the size of the other one. He asked if this meant the palms were larger or not.
- He would like to see details between what above are private balconies down at the podium level are usable private open space, but what makes it private. He asked how it is separated and what the details are there.
- What other activities will occur in the courtyards, such as seating areas, barbecue areas, music events, etc., to make that plaza area something more than just a low income apartment building.

- He noted on the Building B plan, there are no palm trees used and questioned the inconsistency. Ms. Whales said his designer put the palm trees there to provide some look and feel for it.
- On the 6<sup>th</sup> floor of Building A on the right hand side, the stairwell does not match the floor plans later on in the project.
- He referred to Sheet A.1.1 and he asked where the adjacent buildings are shown, and he asked to show what the edge conditions are.
- He would like to see a Will Serve letter from the refuse company. Along the western side there is extra space where there is an opportunity to implement some additional recesses in the lower floor wall to help entrances.
- The handicapped parking spaces are strung along the north side and he thinks across the entry way are small squares which probably are disabled announcements. When people are getting to the elevator they must get out into the 25 feet which he did not think is legal relating to path of travel.
- He asked where moving vans and delivery trucks will park and he suggested these be indicated on the drawings.
- There are bicycle lanes in the street work and he asked that those be pointed out given the emphasis of this project on bicycles.
- There is one room in the northeast corner or A.1.1a in the upper right corner that has bikes in it. There is no door and he asked how to get to it from outside and inside.
- He knows the applicant wrote about the parking tandem spaces and how they were allocated for the 2 and 3 bedroom units. In doing the arithmetic, he does not believe it works. He thinks some of the compact spaces will need to be assigned to someone else.
- He asked also how cars get out of the parking.
- Where is specific parking for the retail component for employees and customers.
- Property dimensions are still missing.
- He asked to show curbside parking and said there are possibilities on the east side by compact parking spaces.
- He said along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, the sidewalk is right out onto the curb and he believes in the form based code it talks about the sidewalk being 10 feet wide and up against and part of the commercial street. He is not sure this is an accurate representation.
- In the very center of the parking area there are tick marks, and Mr. Gibson said this is hanging bike storage which was directed by the developer to locate them there. Boardmember Woldemar said there is a security problem there, but they can be locked up.
- He referred to Sheet A.1.1b and he asked how some of the tandem spaces are allocated, where are commercial parking dimensions.

Ms. Whales said this project is a similar project the City is going into litigation on because the Planning Commission placed more conditions on a project than was necessary. Chair Whitty said she does not count up 300 bike spaces, and Ms. Whales said this is a random number, given dead storage in the ceiling area. She said a lot of the items will not work in this project and they will be off-site.

- Boardmember Woldemar said at both entryways, there is a 25 foot dimension across there and a box. Mr. Gibson said this is where the resident pulls in or a touch pad. Boardmember Woldemar said there is no indication of how wide the door is. It looks like it is a 16 foot door and he asked if it is wide enough to accommodate an outbound and inbound car trying to maneuver in and out.

- He referred to commercial space along the north side and he suggested putting in multiple entries because it is likely to be rendered into two spaces instead of just one, and in turn, they might want to consider another bathroom.
- In moving to Sheet A.2.1, up above on Unit 2, there is a label for a one bedroom unit type B. On the left side there is a slice of space. He commented that this apartment project has long straight corridors running through it. All entry doors are flush with the corridor walls. The simple recess of those entry doors would make the corridor feel so much better. He said it is a low and very low income project, so the simple things to make it a bit better are important here. He is very much worried about the quality of the apartments.
- Lastly, he took exception with a 3' x 10' balcony on the bottom Type A studio units. It has nothing to do with the sense of the zoning ordinance that talks about private open space. When subtracting out the railings it is unusable and he thinks this contributes to his worry about this project.
- The same comment applies to Sheet A.2.2, there is a 3' dimension on one of the units and they show up in many places. Chair Whitty suggested these turn into bay windows and remove the patio. Ms. Whales said the open space will stay the same as it does not need to meet the base zoning. Boardmember Woldemar recognized this, but there is a concept about private open space.
- On page A.3.2 on the southern-most side of the building on the left, there are two 3 bedroom units side by side. Each of the units has a 3'x10' deck. He understands doing it on the ground or on top of the podium, but he asked about above. Mr. Gibson said they would propose moving those out.
- Boardmember Woldemar said he wrote a note about the podium space up against the southern property line and he disagrees with Mr. Gibson about allowing people to have access to it. He thinks it should be landscaped to begin with for the people who live there looking out to the adjacent properties. He said they may find they want to use this for part of the C3, but people should be able to use that space on the ground floor.
- He referred to A.3.5 and pointed out another computer error, but said there is an entire window type discussion. When looking on the elevations, they clearly show a big window and then an awning window but it is in bedrooms. Mr. Gibson said they would do egress windows as part of the fire code.
- He referred to A.5.2a and the colored items, he asked where window trim is in the project. He flagged a series of places that require more detail. The open rails looking to the south to adjacent properties and he is not sure they shouldn't be solid rails instead of open rails because of the quality of items to the south.
- There is a detail in the upper corner in the project where he sees little pieces of planting appearing above what is the top of a wall or railing and he was not sure it was raised planters or not. Mr. Gibson confirmed it is raised planters and Boardmember Woldemar asked him to identify these.
- He said it seems the colors in this particular elevation are indeed a "polar white". He thinks this is way too bright and he asked to tone it down. Mr. Gibson said they will tone it down as linen or something else.
- He referred to A.5.2b and said at the top of the concrete stucco area, there is a band and some of it is dark and some is light. He asked why they are changing the color of it and a continuous band to give the building a base.
- The wall on the west elevation in the stairway is very strong and other things could be done to break down its scale a bit.
- He referred to the east elevation, the Board can see where the commercial space is on the left hand side and then things that look like storefront windows, but in fact, open up into the garage. He asked and confirmed these are windows looking into the garage. He noted that there are some marvelous places where the developer could do similar

openings but he could not tell whether there were raised or low planters in front of them and said this is the reason he asked for building sections so the Board knows where they might be. He worries about bums hanging out in some of the recesses, and he thought this might be something to think about.

- He suggested adding details with all of the various parapet conditions so the Board can understand where they can go.
- He referred to Sheet A.71 and does not clearly see where elevator overruns are and how those are expressed on the roof.
- He said it shows up in the 3-D view, but he voiced concern about screening of mechanical equipment. The Board does not know there is a taller building nearby, and Ms. Whales said there is and it is the housing building off of 27<sup>th</sup> Street. Boardmember Woldemar asked for screening on the mechanical equipment so it is properly screened.
- He referred to Sheet A.8.1 and said he flagged a discussion about the window types out of bedrooms which is the same comment he had earlier.
- He referred to Sheet 10.2.A and said there was a symbol listed for metal roofing, but he could not find any. Mr. Gibson said they had it shown at an angle and at the last minute they pulled it out because it was up too high. It would be an edge condition and at this point they are not proposing any metal roof.
- The windows on the south elevation stairwell are nicely done with sun shades, except it is right on the property line.
- He thinks a sign program is needed for all commercial spaces as well as the exterior building. Ms. Whales noted that this building is probably going to be phased and therefore, they can bring back a sign program and it does not need to be part of this submittal. It is what staff requests at the time, but she acknowledged it is in the zoning ordinance.
- He wanted to confirm the railings along the property line podium.
- He referred to 10.2.b and he said the white color is too bright. On the upper right corner, there is the upper balcony and he could not tell whether it was raised planters or not. The same comment applies for the massiveness of the wall.
- He referred to the detail sheet and said the applicant includes on all details a Type 1 that has a foam band around windows, but then there is also a Type 2 that does not have a foam band. He cannot distinguish in the elevations where one or the other occurs. If there is foam bands around the openings, if there is paint to accentuate the trim, it should go to the inside corner and not just on the surface.
- He referred to the guardrail detail in the upper left corner and said it seems to be illustrating vertical pickets, but the elevation shows horizontal pickets.
- He has a site electrical plan that had landscaping drawn on it. He asked what is on it, given landscaping does not belong on an electrical plan. Mr. Gibson said this just shows the lights on the boundary and the exterior of the buildings.
- He thinks the 23<sup>rd</sup> Street detailing on the plan is incorrect.
- As evidenced by what the Board has seen on the other project that the owner has completed, he is very much of the mind that this project needs to be completely detailed. It needs an absolutely complete application before he is willing to consider an approval. He noted it is not an approval and not a recommendation. If the owner wants the Board to make a decision, he would be glad to make a denial decision and he can take it up on appeal to the City Council.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

CHUNG YEUNG YIN, Richmond, said he lives less than 300 feet or right next to this project at 430 21<sup>st</sup> Street in an apartment. He thanked the Board for their work to ensure the developer does the right job. There will be children and families living at the project and said he typed up notes that he shared with the Board. The problem with this project is the crime because before the project there were very tall trees around his apartment building and next to the EDD building. What happened were drug dealers and prostitutes were using the vegetation and at night, it turns into a very dangerous area. At the same time, residents worry about the fact that the design cannot help improve the community. For kids to be successful, they need good schools and a stable environment. He said the rent is set at \$1100 for a studio which is a lot higher than what is affordable.

Chair Whitty commented that the Route 74 bus goes up 23<sup>rd</sup> and down 24<sup>th</sup> and she did not check and see if there was a bus stop. Ms. Whales said it will be on the Nevin side because of the capital improvement project. Chair Whitty said this is another great opportunity to make the entrance to the BART station usable. Ms. Whales said the area is still dangerous, and this is the reason the City wants to have more multi-family units in that area so it would provide more eyes on the street.

Chair Whitty asked who is dealing with the ability to walk from 21<sup>st</sup> Street to BART exit. Ms. Whales said the City has engineering plans with wider sidewalks, bulb-outs and she will ask engineering to provide a presentation on the plans.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, said he agrees with Mr. Yin's comments and said he visits 23<sup>rd</sup> Street on a regular basis. In the daytime it is fine, but it is not as safe in the night. He likes the idea of a family friendly project, but there is a lot of prostitution, homicides, and he supported Boardmember comments on requiring missing information return.

Assistant City Attorney Atencio said it sounds as if the Board would like to continue it. He recommended that if there are enough significant changes the Board expects back, the public hearing can be continued or closed. Chair Whitty said the Board has always left the public hearing open for projects they continue and she did not know they could.

Boardmember Woldemar said it has to do with whether the Board has to act in one hearing or one meeting, and documents from the Attorney's office indicated that it could be a hearing and this is why the Board continues the hearing as opposed to the one meeting. Mr. Atencio said that analysis is not applicable, as this is an instance where the Planning Commission is involved and the DRB makes a recommendation.

Chair Whitty said she thought 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> Streets will be two-way streets. Ms. Whales said this has not been adopted and this was suggested. Chair Whitty said this will cut down on racing of cars and drug and crime problems.

Boardmember Woldemar said because he missed the last meeting, he spent time reading through the minutes to use as background. There are a series of comments that Boardmember Livingston made but there were no responses.

Chair Whitty asked and confirmed that Boardmember Woldemar did not know exactly what comments were not responded to. Ms. Whales said she can email those minutes from July 8<sup>th</sup> to Boardmembers, and she noted they were approved by the DRB. Chair Whitty supported this suggestion and Boardmember Woldemar suggested the applicant read those minutes as well and determine whether or not they can meet the suggestions. Ms. Whales said if the applicant cannot meet those suggestions, she asked the applicant to specify why they cannot.

Chair Whitty commented that the blank wall on the project is a great opportunity for art.

Boardmember Woldemar asked that when the applicant returns to be complete.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Welter) to keep the public hearing open and continue PLN14-115 to a date to be determined in order for the applicant to address comments of the DRB; unanimously approved by voice vote: 4-0-2 (Ayes: Fetter, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Livingston and Munoz.**

#### **Board Business**

**A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None**

**B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements - None**

The Board adjourned at 9:35 p.m. to the next meeting on October 14, 2015.