

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018**

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING  
Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level  
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804**

October 24, 2018

6:30 P.M.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Meredith Benz  
Michael Hannah  
Macy Leung  
Karlyn Neel

Kimberly Butt  
Tom Leader  
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:11 P.M.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Michael Hannah, Tom Leader, Macy Leung, and Karlyn Neel

**Absent:** Boardmember Kimberly Butt

Newly appointed DRB member Macy Leung was welcomed to the DRB.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Staff Present:** Planners Jonelyn Whales, Roberta Feliciano, and Hector Lopez; and City Attorney Everett Jenkins

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Public Forum**

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that the Santa Fe Neighborhood Council had been displeased with the DRB's approval of the Self-Storage and Artist Studios Building (PLN 18-053) due to its size and given the number of other storage facilities in the area; the Fairmede-Hilltop Neighborhood Council had expressed concern with the approval of the Aspire Richmond Technology Academy given concerns with respect to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility and seismic issues; and the applicant for McDonald's Façade Renovation project had not communicated with the North and East Neighborhood Councils or the 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Merchants Association. He reiterated that as a courtesy all applicants were to communicate with each applicable Neighborhood Council.

**City Council Liaison Report** – Mayor Butt was not present.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** None

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, November 5, 2018 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

### PUBLIC HEARINGS:

#### 1. PLN18-177

Description

#### NEW LIGHT INDUSTRIAL FACILITY

(HELD OVER FROM OCTOBER 10, 2018) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT AN INDUSTRIAL BUILDING OF ± 1,600 SQUARE FEET ON A 10,000 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.

Location

SOUTH 33<sup>RD</sup> STREET

APN

549-212-004

Zoning

IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

Applicant

DILSA BALTAZAR (Owner)

Staff Contact

HECTOR LOPEZ

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated October 24, 2018, for the construction of a new light industrial facility with site improvements such as landscaping and concrete work. The proposed structure would consist of a 22-foot high corrugated metal roof and siding, to be placed in the rear of the site facing the street and to be used to store construction equipment. Staff recommended the applicant relocate the building to the front of the property to be consistent with other development along the street, which would allow parking in front, and that the fence be relocated to expose the landscaping to the street.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

DILSA BALTAZAR, a General Contractor, advised that he used the lot for his construction business and there would be no change in use. He proposed a structure for a shell to be used for storage instead of having an open lot with no cover. He had no sample of the siding to offer. He wanted to park in the front of the building which was why the building had been proposed for the rear to get more use and space in the front.

Boardmember Hannah requested details of the gutters and downspouts and how the stormwater management would be addressed and was advised by the applicant that stormwater would be taken to the street. He recommended a lighter color (not tan) for the standing seam roof to avoid excessive heat gain, and suggested that the colors identified be lighter in tone.

Boardmember Benz recommended that the proposed colors for the roof and the wall be flipped with a dark color for the garage.

Boardmember Leader verified the existing landscaping on the property which included a line of redwood trees and other plantings, with irrigation on site.

Chair Livingston asked about the proposed trellis over the door and suggested an awning instead to keep water away, and Mr. Baltazar commented that he wanted at least two feet of eave but agreed to comply with whatever was necessary.

### Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Leader) to approve PLN18-177, New Light Industrial Facility, subject to the 10 staff recommended conditions of approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 11) Make the roof color lighter to avoid excessive heat gain**

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018**

on the structure and for visibility reasons; 12) Provide painted GSM gutters and downspouts to handle the stormwater drainage; 13) The metal panels to be 24 gauge or thicker and factory applied kynar painted; 14) The gutters and downspouts also to be 24 gauge kynar painted and match the colors of the building; 15) Include a lean to roof over the door in lieu of the trellis (per Chair Livingston’s Exhibit A); and 16) Stay within the neutral range of the color palette, as shown; approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leader, Leung, Livingston and Neel; Noes: None; Absent: Butt).

<b>2. PLN18-223</b>	<b>RYSE YOUTH CENTER BUILDING</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±12,136 SQUARE FOOT YOUTH CENTER FACILITY.
Location	205 41 <sup>ST</sup> STREET
APN	517-320-017 TO 020, 029, AND 106
Zoning	CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, COMMERCIAL EMPHASIS, AND IS-1 FORM BASED CODE OVERLAY DISTRICT
Owner	RYSE, INC.
Applicant	ANNE PHILLIPS ARCHITECTURE
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO
	Recommendation: <b>RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION</b>

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated October 24, 2018, for the modification of an existing 6,650 square foot building with a new 11,457 square foot two-story building for the RYSE Youth Center. The new two-story building would be set along Bissell Avenue. The site is near the Macdonald 80 Shopping Center. The DRB would be making a recommendation to the Planning Commission given that the application also requires a Conditional Use Permit. She added that there would be seven on-street and two on-site parking spaces.

Chair Livingston asked and was advised by a representative of RYSE that the power poles leaning on the site were expected to be addressed by PG&E as part of the project.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

WINSTON WIN, Anne Phillips Architecture, introduced the applicant team and presented an overview of the project. The project is for the development of a campus that would allow RYSE to expand its programming and serve more Richmond youth into the future. The project entails the renovation of the existing building, the development of a new building, and providing a main courtyard that would be large enough for events, benefits, and community gatherings. He described the open space, the indoor/outdoor zone, the covered outdoor space and the trellis that would connect the two to provide rain protected passage between the two buildings, and on the far side a combination of art and recreational spaces. Above the art space would be a second floor deck with trellis that would overlook the open space from above. There would also be open space proposed as a contemplative garden and a kitchen garden where vegetables and fruit that youth coming to the center would be able to eat. Two parking spaces would be provided on site including an accessible parking space in addition to using the parallel spaces along Bissell Avenue. He described the design of the building and pointed out that the words on the outside were from RYSE’s mission statement. The existing murals that wrapped the lower band of the existing building and around the corner would be retained as a nod to RYSE’s history.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018**

The landscape design was primarily permeable paving, a large specimen tree would anchor the outdoor space, street trees would be added along Bissell Avenue, and planters would serve as stormwater treatment areas as well as define the edges of the outdoor spaces. The facility would be a secured site but could be opened for community events.

DAN REILLY, RYSE Director of Innovation, responded to questions as to the age range of RYSE members, reporting that ages 13 to 21 were currently being served, although with the expansion ages 11 to 24 would be served, with additional services to engage families, invested stakeholders, teachers, coaches, and the like.

Mr. Win identified the specific spaces in the new building which would serve as an entrance to the campus, and described the spaces available, the services and programs provided, and noted that as part of RYSE's mission, food was always available to the kids. He also described the pop-up spaces at the street that could be used flexibly. Given the desire to work with the existing murals and the existing architecture, a light gray, neutral palette across the campus had been proposed with color to be introduced at strategic locations and incorporate RYSE standard colors of purple, blue, teal, and yellow.

Boardmembers expressed support for the proposed color palette, although Board member Neel recommended toning down the white text in the mural.

Chair Livingston questioned whether the applicant would be interested in an alternative to the CMU block wall coming out of the meditation garden and the applicant expressed a willingness to consider a rammed earth alternative.

Boardmember Leader referred to the proposed crepe myrtle trees along the street and recommended a taller species, something with a six-foot clear trunk, narrower and taller, which would be better for pedestrian areas and provide more shade to the courtyard.

Chair Livingston noted that the sidewalk was somewhat limited with a pocket of trees which left little walking room and suggested that the containers be moved back from the sidewalk at least a few feet.

As to the trellis, Boardmember Leader suggested the members were a bit frail and details of that element were requested. Mr. Win clarified that the trellis design was currently being studied.

Boardmember Hannah urged care with corrosive metals and sought more detail on the type of metal to be used. He recommended zinc for the siding and the standing seam roof because of its durability. He referred to the punched metal, perforated material and noted that it had been called out as powder coated, which would have to be done after it was punched given that staining could occur almost immediately. He urged care using as few corrosive ends and flashings as possible.

Asked if the project had been reviewed with the Police Department with respect to visibility, the applicants indicated that had not yet been done but it was a good idea. Some elements of the design related to site visibility were noted as issues of concern for security that should be reviewed with the Police Department.

Boardmember Leung supported the project and asked if there were indoor public arts areas where art or sculpture could be showcased. She also asked if there could be an increase in the number of parking spaces and bicycle racks.

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

Members of the DRB acknowledged that there was a massive amount of parking available in the immediate area.

Mr. Reilly described the significant amount of studio space that had been proposed and explained that the entire space would be used as a campus for young folks to display art throughout the campus. There was also an indoor special art studio space in the plans.

Boardmember Benz supported the project, noting that it had a great color palette and a youthful design that appeared to address all needs.

Boardmember Neel agreed with the good design but suggested that the white typeface be changed to a fifteen percent gray to provide better harmony.

Chair Livingston suggested that the weakness in the presentation was the landscape architect's details such as the fence details, which were a major component of the design which had not been worked out. He asked for details on the eight-foot high art wall in the back, sought more details on the drawings for the garbage enclosure, and commented that the materials were superb. He recommended a small roof to protect from the west sun and noted that the other doors and windows had no protection from the heat. The western elevation needed something to mitigate the unbroken wall and suggested some of the roofing material needed to be brought down low, through the use of rain protection or running the trellis through. He found no vehicular gate elevations and requested details. The tables and chairs were not organic or sufficiently detailed.

Boardmember Hannah sought information on the gutter and downspout details, the required garbage elements, and the elimination of as much corrosiveness as possible. The landscape plan also needed to be better detailed and defined, and an indication of the intention for the construction details as well, such as how it would drain and being mindful of the penetrations coming up to the roof, to be pushed to the backside and out of view. He urged attention to those details along with the specifics of the type of wood and metal to be used.

Boardmember Leader verified that the applicants had been working with the C.3 requirements and he too suggested that furniture, fence level, and trellis details needed to be better explained. He otherwise supported the project.

### Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Leader) to continue PLN18-223, RYSE Youth Center Building, to the Design Review Board meeting on November 14, 2018; approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leader, Leung, Livingston and Neel; Noes: None; Absent: Butt).**

<b>3. PLN18-173</b>	<b>THE CASCADE ON CENTRAL AVENUE (FORMER DOLAN LUMBER SITE)</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT 46 RESIDENTIAL UNITS CONSISTING OF FOUR STACKED FLATS AND 42 TOWNHOMES ON A VACANT 2.58 ACRE SITE.
Location	5620 CENTRAL AVENUE
APN	510-053-032
Zoning	CR (REGIONAL COMMERCIAL) AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

(CITY OF EL CERRITO)  
Owner REA PARTNERS LP  
Applicant AMG & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Chair Livingston advised that he and Boardmember Hannah had worked extensively with staff and the applicant over the last six months, and had also met with the City of El Cerrito and its DRB, which had supported the project. There was also a creek restoration component involved.

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated October 24, 2018, and clarified that the item was not a public hearing, as shown, but a study session, and there would be no approval at this time. She explained that staff had analyzed the project based on the current zoning but noted that the applicant had originally applied for PA (Planned Area) District, and the staff report did not mention a PA and there was no map to show the PA at this time, which was why no action could be taken.

While the original application had been approved for a 155-unit high-density development on the site in 2014, the applicant had now submitted a different project for 46 residential units, consisting of 4 stacked flats, and 42 townhomes on the vacant 2.58 acre parcel, the former Dolan Lumber site. The creek abutting the Belmont Avenue border of the site was required to be daylighted by the City, and that had been done. In addition, given the location of the site along the same corner as the I-80/Central Avenue Phase II project, a portion of the site had been set aside for the widening associated with that project. The project was located in both El Cerrito and Richmond and given the majority of the land was in Richmond, the City of Richmond had taken the lead in the project, although the project would be a gateway into the City of El Cerrito. Both Richmond and El Cerrito had been working together on the project. The property was also located in a flood zone area. The proposal was intended to mitigate all the issues.

Anna Felver and Jordon Cowell, representatives from the Dahlin Group, the Architect, presented the proposal for 42 townhouses and 4 stacked flats along Central Avenue with unit sizes ranging from 1,249 and 1,533 square feet; two to three bedrooms for the predominant age group in Richmond between 25 and 35, perfect for first-time homebuyers. All units included two-car garages, with two ride share pick-up/drop-off locations, two additional parking spaces towards the southern end of the site for visitors, and had been designed to blend in with the surrounding neighborhood and offer a more pedestrian feel. There would be a central green in the middle of the site and pavers or other form of concrete would be used to create a pedestrian pathway in direct line to the park across the creek.

The representative from the Dahlin Group explained that the floodplain that sloped down Central Avenue and San Mateo Avenue pushed the proposal out 16 feet off the site given that the flood plain was at 15 feet. The entry would be up higher through a flight of stairs and the architecture was a result of that challenge. The progression of the architecture with the DRB Subcommittee since June 2018 was identified leading up to the current final submittal. Vertical stucco massing had been used to separate the large building and identify the different units. The living spaces had been recessed back using cementitious lap siding, the roof had been lowered on the recessed elements with an overhang, and the bottom pedestrian level was designed to provide texture and warmth, using brick at the porches and bringing the lap siding down to the bottom and providing pops of color. The elevations were presented to show the design, and the color board identified the proposed colors and materials.

Boardmembers requested true samples of the proposed materials.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018**

Chair Livingston opened Public Comments.

FERNANDO MARISCAL, the owner of property at 3242 Belmont Street in El Cerrito, stated he had not received notice of the project, and reported that he had submitted documentation to the Planning Commission to identify the flooding issues in the area.

Mr. Mariscal referenced the condition requiring the daylighting of the creek and the planting that would replace the cement lining of the creek. He suggested the removal of the lining of the creek would create erosion issues severely impacting the adjacent neighborhoods. He also suggested that raising the subject building would force the flow of water into the neighboring homes.

When asked, Ms. Whales verified that residents within a 500-foot radius of the site had been notified of the hearing, including those who lived in El Cerrito, and initially there had been a 1,000 foot radius notification.

MARY SELVA, President, Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council, Richmond, stated she had also not been notified of the project. While she liked the project, her concerns were with the removal of the cement lining of the creek and who would be responsible for the damage as a result of flooding because of that removal. She spoke to the required setbacks associated with the original proposal both from the creek and from the adjacent streets, and emphasized that the I-80/Central Avenue Phase II project would increase traffic, which would also have to be addressed.

Chair Livingston referred to the City of Richmond Creek Protection Overlay District, and explained the application was consistent with that District and its requirement to re-establish riparian corridors where channels had been. There were also creek setback requirements where 20 feet was required from top of bank or a minimum 30 feet from the centerline of the creek.

Boardmember Hannah clarified that the applicant would remain pretty true to the slope of the site. He also clarified for the speakers that given the designation of a floodplain, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) would no longer allow new building or habitable space to exist in the floodplain, which was why the proposal had to be 16 feet off the ground.

GARLAND ELLIS verified the size of proposed roadways and the circulation for the site, verified that the exits would be two way, and recommended that the street be widened to include three lanes given the continuous traffic in the area. He also recommended the designation of an area to allow moving vans or U-Hauls to park for move-ins and move-outs. With respect to the historical flooding, he explained that the water disbursed through a channel under I-80, which was oftentimes clogged, and that no agency wanted to take responsibility for the channel when it was blocked, an issue the City of Richmond needed to address given the kinds of damage that could be associated with flooding on the garage level. He questioned the kind of disclosures that would be required due to the creek issues.

Chair Livingston asked staff about next steps, and Ms. Whales explained that the map would have to return for the PA with a public hearing, and the DRB's decision on the PA would be forwarded to the Planning Commission. Public comments could be provided during the next DRB hearing and when the item was submitted to the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Hannah noted the current challenges of the area related to traffic, the lack of infrastructure, the situation with a blocked channel, the creek issue and the desire to know more about daylighting issues and what had been planned. He too had a concern with the removal of

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018**

the concrete channel and why the current project and potential projects could not share in the cost of addressing that situation. Given the floodplain and the potential for flooding of the first floor garage level, he stated that something should be done particularly since the flooding issue would affect more than just the subject project. He suggested the creek should be treated as a resource for residents after the issues had been addressed.

Boardmember Leader commented with respect to daylighting that it was normal to conduct a hydraulic analysis to make sure the situation was not being made worse, suggested the situation might be improved by creating additional storage, and while there could be more debris in the channel there could be a lot more capacity. He added that a naturalized creek channel could provide as much or more flood protection but there could still be flooding from King Tides.

Boardmember Benz referred to the building colors, questioned why some of the buildings were so gray, and offered suggestions for a color palette with a color board that she had prepared. She referred to the color on Central Avenue with no significant color anywhere else and agreed with Boardmember Hannah that the color should be spread evenly throughout the building.

Boardmember Leader clarified that the curbs reflected the planned widening, a new turn lane would be installed, and the sidewalk would line up off-site. He suggested that all the sidewalks on that part of Central Avenue were very narrow with a very busy street which created an unfriendly pedestrian condition. He also suggested that the buildings facing that street were too close to the street. Referring to the sycamore trees across the street at the park, he recommended a row of sycamore trees on the project side with a sidewalk behind those trees to give the buildings a sense of separation from the traffic and help offer the sense of a gateway. He suggested the gardens in front of the units could be reduced to create more public walking space that felt safer and generous and with trees help create a pedestrian environment that could continue on. He urged the dedication of more space to the pedestrian environment, cutting back on the gardens, and pushing the buildings back if too tight.

In response to Boardmember Leader as to the plan's C.3 calculations, Mr. Win noted that the civil engineering was still working on the C.3 calculations. He also recommended some accommodation for seating and a tot lot. As to the paving plan and the crossways, he suggested some paved connection to the park across the street.

It was noted that the park across the street was a shared park between El Cerrito and Richmond and there was a tot lot in the rear of the park.

Chair Livingston asked about bike parking and the applicant stated that bike racks could be incorporated throughout the site, as could handicap spaces, although the applicant advised that given the carriage units, there were no handicap units.

The DRB urged the applicant to determine whether there would be a requirement for handicap accessible units, which it was noted was a goal of the City's General Plan.

Boardmember Leung asked about electric vehicle charging stations, reported by the applicant to be provided in the garages. She also asked if there had been any consideration of the Governor's net zero recommendations for 2020, and the applicant advised that they would check into that.

Chair Livingston referred to a list of recommendations that he and Boardmember Hannah had provided the applicant from the DRB Subcommittee discussions, and highlighted the list the applicant was asked to address, which included:

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

- The soffit material: The applicant stated the soffit material would be the body color, wrap underneath at the deck, and the fascia would always ramp under, with a little soffit at the garage level.
- The guardrail design did not match elevations: The applicant had responded that the guardrail would look like the elevations provided and the Board requested the detail of that element.
- Hot dip galvanized steel before powder coating to protect against rust: No response from the applicant.
- Steel awning pictured showed an open wire: The applicant had provided another picture and would show a consistent detail in the final elevations, and Boardmember Hannah recommended a proper solid awning.
- Dark windows in the drawings versus the white Milgard sample: The applicant explained that the white sample would be removed and the windows would be darker.
- Recessed windows in the elevations: The Board discussed that issue given that the architect preferred not to recess the windows. Boardmember Hannah suggested that buildings always looked more substantial with the setback and given the nature of the architecture would strengthen the architecture and look more appealing. All members of the Board agreed.

The DRB requested the following:

- Deck drainage details to show compliance with the intent of design drawings.
- Flat roof fascia details and other details to show the drainage, the fascia, the venting, and other architectural details that would affect the look of the gateway design given that the decks were the primary architectural component.
- Recessed lights and soffits for required front door lights, if possible, in lieu of sconces.
- Identification of stair and riser material, and the applicant explained that plydeck, a slip resistant material, would likely be used in a gray color.

At this point on the discussion of the stair and riser material, Boardmember Neel commented that the brick material looked like brick veneer and cheapened the appearance. After discussion, a four-inch board form concrete, or stacked slate, was recommended as more consistent with the exterior. Boardmember Hannah recommended that board form concrete would be better than the brick, offer a cast impression of a stone wall for an informal feel, play well with the terraces going in and out, and save money, with stairs, risers, and terraces all in one structure.

The DRB also requested the following:

- Ensure that the trees along the creek would be appropriate for such a location.
- Landscape architect to change the landscape palette to be consistent with the creek environment.
- Given that the park is a detention basin, advised that the location and depth be determined, with every available open planting area be used for bio-filtration detention (C.3 requirements) to preserve the central turf area as a park.
- Specifications of the selected garage doors to be provided in the plans.
- Provide flush trim at the boards around doors and window openings, although if the windows were specified with a flange it would be appropriate not to have a framed trim. Recommended a corner trim to match the dark metal of the windows.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018**

Chair Livingston clarified that it was not within the purview of the DRB to talk about traffic, which would be a Planning Commission issue although he recognized that there had always been a traffic problem in the area. He highlighted the DRB's other major comments as:

- Recommended the use of the color board that had been submitted to the applicant by Boardmember Benz.
- Given the narrow sidewalks, the buildings being too close to the street, there was a need for a more pedestrian-friendly environment in the front, with sycamore trees between the sidewalk and the street to mimic the sycamore trees across the street in the park.
- Address additional comments on C.3 requirements, the lack of bike racks, handicap accessibility issues, and accessible units and consider an elevator to make some units accessible, return with sustainability features, recess the windows, solve the deck drainage issue, and consider board form concrete based stair issues.

The item would return to the DRB again prior to submittal to the Planning Commission, which would review the Planned Area application.

### **Board Business**

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

**B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:**

Chair Livingston requested that the selection of a Vice Chair be placed on the next meeting agenda.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, November 14, 2018.