



City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street
2nd Floor of City Hall
Richmond, VA 23219
www.richmondgov.com

Meeting Minutes - Draft Urban Design Committee

Thursday, June 8, 2017

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Call to Order

Ms. Almond called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Roll Call

Present -- 10 - * Chair Andrea Almond, * Vice Chair Andrea Levine, * Chris Arias, * Bryan Green, * Andrew P. Gould, * Giles Harnsberger, * Committee Member Dawn Hicks, * Committee Member David Johannas, * Jill Nolt and * Robert Smith

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Vice Chair Levine, seconded by Committee Member Hicks, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

1. [UDC MIN 2017-05](#) Minutes of the May 4, 2017 meeting of the UDC to be approved

Attachments: [UDC MIN 2017-05](#)

A motion was made by Committee Member Levine, seconded by Committee Member Hicks, that these Minutes be approved. It carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Chair Andrea Almond, Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Andrew P. Gould, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks and Committee Member David Johannas

Abstain -- 4 - Chris Arias, Bryan Green, Jill Nolt and Robert Smith

Secretary's Report

Mr. Son stated that they approved banners for the Robinson Street Association, 10 blocks between W. Broad and W. Cary Streets.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Harnsberger, seconded by Arias, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Chair Andrea Almond, Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Chris Arias, Bryan Green, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks, Committee Member David Johannas, Jill Nolt and Robert Smith

Abstain -- 1 - Andrew P. Gould

2. [UDC 2017-15](#) Final Location, Character and Extent review of renovation and addition

to Richmond Fire Station #21, 2505 Jefferson Davis HWY

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Location & Plans](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Harnsberger, seconded by Mr. Arias, that the Consent Agenda items be recommended, as submitted, for approval to the Planning Commission. The motion carried by the following vote:

3. [UDC 2017-21](#) Final review of Intermediate Terminal – Parking Lot Improvements, 3115 Water St.

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Location & Plans](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Harnsberger, seconded by Mr. Arias, that the Consent Agenda items be recommended, as submitted, for approval to the Planning Commission. The motion carried by the following vote:

4. **UDC 2017-22** Review of encroachments throughout the Near West End, the Fan, and Monroe Ward for Verizon Wireless telecommunications equipment on Dominion Poles, 19 W Main St., 420 E Cary St., 4201 Park Ave., 1200 W Cary St., 8 S Harrison St., 1309 W Main St.

Attachments: Staff Report
Location & Plans

This Encroachment was recommended for approval to the Department of Public Works

REGULAR AGENDA

5. [UDC 2017-16](#) Zoning Ordinance Sec. 30-440.3(1)d final review of The Doorways' Garden, 612 E. Marshall St.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Location & Plans](#)

Mr. Johannas recused himself from the project.

Ms. Nolt inquired what the Committee was reviewing and Mr. Son stated that they are reviewing the garden and the wall.

Ms. Almond inquired that they are making their recommendation to the Planning Director and not the Planning Commission and Mr. Son stated yes.

Mr. Arias inquired if zoning is requiring a 10ft setback and Mr. Son stated that because they are opening this they are creating a front yard and stated that when you are creating a front yard in the zoning district it is required review by the UDC with a recommendation to the Planning Director.

Ms. Stacey Brinkley, President of Doorways, stated that they are excited to provide some outdoor space for the guests and gave a brief presentation about the project. Ms. Harnsberger inquired about the sample that's in the application packet. Ms. Brinkley stated that is the recommendation for the ornamental fence that matches back to the fencing that is down at the old hospital.

Mr. Green inquired what would be the finish material on the wall and Ms. Brinkley stated that it is a split face block.

Ms. Almond inquired if they had any samples and Ms. Brinkley stated that Johannes Design Group is helping them with their renovations and stated that they would send a sample to the Committee and stated that it would be a color too match the rest of the building.

Ms. Nolt inquired if the masonry was a natural stone cap or cast stone material. Mr. Ralph with Johannes Designs stated that it is a precast or limestone. Ms. Brinkley stated that it will be ornamental so that it will be attractive on the outside.

Ms. Nolt stated that in looking at the plan it looks like the wall is just being sheared where the garden wall starts and stated that she assumes that will be detailed to turn that corner and Ms. Brinkley stated yes and that it will wrap.

Ms. Almond stated that the staff recommendation is implying that they carve out a planter bed at the foot of wall on the street side to put landscaping or vines. Mr. Son stated that there are some other things that they discussed that wouldn't necessarily necessitate a planter maybe ivy or something of that nature. Ms. Brinkley stated that they were really hesitant about bringing it in because it is not a large space anyway and stated that with the trees 5 to 6 feet above the brick wall that will provide greenery and stated that they will be happy to doing something on the wall from a landscape prospective.

Mr. Smith stated that on the other there are 2 trees and a tree well and inquired would it make sense to balance that out. Ms. Almond inquired if the sidewalk was wide enough for tree wells and Ms. Nolt stated that would be great. Ms. Brinkley stated that there are a lot of buildings but not a lot of foot traffic back there.

Ms. Nolt stated that she tends to agree with the applicant that the wall both as a visual and sound barrier is important to the design of the healing garden and stated that she does think that it is important to have a height of the wall above the typical eye levels so that people can't see into the garden as they are walking by. Ms. Nolt stated that 6ft on the high side if the grade drops towards the corner 6ft near the entrance is well above the eye level and stated that they could drop the wall by 8 inches or so and that will give a bit more exposure to the vegetation and the trees on the inside. Ms. Nolt stated that she was okay with the wall being continuous and at the edge and stated that it is the condition that is there now and thinks that it will be more attractive than the existing wall. Ms. Nolt stated that she okay with the project being as proposed with the detailing on the wall.

Ms. Almond stated that she agrees and would like to see the detailing of the material at some point and would to see if some street trees could go along there in some configuration.

Mr. Smith stated that he thinks it keeps it very simple and stated that there is enough ornamentation already and stated that seeing the material with the split face block will provide some texture.

A motion was made by Ms. Nolt to approve the application without staff recommendation with the condition that the applicant come back with material samples for final review and have the applicant to work with the City to investigate opportunities to add street trees along the street front of the project and coordinate with Planning Staff and to ensure that the height is above a typical eye level from the pedestrian standpoint and to keep in mind that they do want the trees to be as visible as possible. The motion was seconded by Ms. Levine and passed.

Ms. Nolt made a motion to recommend approval of this item without Staff recommendations and made further recommendations that the applicant work with staff to review final materials; that the applicant work with staff to seek opportunities for the planting of street trees along the street-front of the project; and that, to the discretion of the applicant, the height of the wall is above typical eye-level from a pedestrian standpoint but that the interior trees are as visible as possible.

Ms. Levine seconded, the motion carried unanimously.

Aye -- 9 - Chair Andrea Almond, Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Chris Arias, Bryan Green, Andrew P. Gould, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks, Jill Nolt and Robert Smith

Recused -- 1 - Committee Member David Johannas

Aye -- 8 - Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Chris Arias, Bryan Green, Andrew P. Gould, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks, Committee Member David Johannas and Robert Smith

Excused -- 1 - Jill Nolt

Recused -- 1 - Chair Andrea Almond

7. [UDC 2017-18](#) Final Location, Character and Extent review of Monroe Park Furnishings, 719 W. Franklin St.;

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Location & Plans](#)
[Public Comment - Opposition](#)

Ms. Harrigan gave a brief presentation regarding the movable table and chairs, the drinking fountains, metal benches, and the gaming tables.

Ms. Levine stated that, in growing up in New York City, when you had a checkers table, you had a checkers table, she further stated that they had an inset for checkers and inquired if anything like that would exist to really connect the Checkers Building to the checker game and inquired if they saw anything in their research that would be reminiscent to that. Ms. Harrigan stated that game table is near the games court and the movable tables and chairs are by the Checkers House. Ms. Massie stated that they have asked for a few larger tables and putting the squares on them.

Mr. Gould inquired how they would take care of the movable furniture and Ms. Massie stated that they can stack it and lock it and stated that they know they might lose some.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired if the games were going to be accessible from the Checkers House or from a vendor and inquired if they were going to be free and be able to be checked out. Ms. Massie stated that they can bring them or check them out and stated

that the idea is to make them available.

Mr. Gould inquired how much it will cost to rent the games and Ms. Massie nothing right now.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired if it will serve the population of people that don't have laptops or money to check out the games. Ms. Massie stated that it could be loaned and hopes that it comes back and stated that as the Conservancy they could try these things.

Ms. Harrigan gave a brief presentation on the deterioration of the Checkers House pertaining to the railings, foundation, windows and bricks and other things that they found that was a concern to them. Ms. Harrigan asked the Committee for their comments on how to revitalize the Checkers House.

Mr. Green stated that he agrees and disagrees with the assessment and stated that he agrees with what's going on with the slab and it doesn't have appropriate coverage and stated that they can put a decent wash on it to expel the water from on top it and a drip edge on the bottom. Mr. Green stated that at that point the rail design is almost impervious and stated that this isn't going to get you any better drainage. Mr. Green stated that if they are taking care of the topping and getting their drip edge correct this isn't going to change anything. Mr. Green stated that he think in order to be consistent they need to put the brick back up the way it was.

Mr. Arias inquired if was going to be difficult to match the existing brick and Mr. Green stated that they can feather in 20% percent brick repair it's not going to be very visible and stated that the brick that is there has been replaced anyway.

Ms. Harrigan stated that the brick that was there was the 3 hole brick. Mr. Green stated that if the purpose is to respect the period of significance then what he discussed is the reasonable thing to do to keep it the way it looked and put a backer rail on the inside to get them up to code.

Mr. Arias stated that aesthetically he thinks the railing would help the building and stated that thinning the railing would be a nice transparency and it would be more inviting.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired if they wanted new railings due to structural and safety issues and Ms. Harrigan stated that they are old.

Mr. Johannas inquired if the space underneath was heated at all and Ms. Massie stated that it has large hot water radiators. Mr. Johannas stated that there is no seal protecting the water as it goes across and stated that just having a cup joint is going to fail and stated that the top is going to need to be protected to protect the edge of the building.

Ms. Levine stated that she is personally divided here and stated that she respect what it was and feel that it is important to try to bring back the original and stated that in this instance if that is not truly possible then they need to look at alternatives but if it is possible she feels strongly that it should go back to what it was. Mr. Green stated that it can be fixed and be maintained to keep the water out.

Public Comment

Mr. Charles Poole, speaking as a member of public, stated that they removed the original fence and pickets around the fountain and stated that the solid iron pickets are in great shape.

Mr. Green made a motion to recommend approval of this item with Staff

recommendations and made a further recommendation that appropriate flashing and drainage be incorporated into the design as necessary, when reconstructing the brick rail. Mr. Green further recommended to inscribe some of the proposed gaming tables with a checkers or chess board.

The Staff recommendations were:

-That, after repairing the first floor lintels, the brick railing of the Checkers House be replaced with a similar brick design and brought up to code with the installation of necessary safety measures. The National Register Nomination form for Monroe Park mentions the Checkers House and describes it as Modern (Art Deco), constructed in 1939. The brick railings define the Art Deco character of the Checkers House.

Mr. Johannas seconded, the motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Chris Arias, Bryan Green, Andrew P. Gould, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks, Committee Member David Johannas and Robert Smith

Excused -- 1 - Jill Nolt

Recused -- 1 - Chair Andrea Almond

6. [UDC 2017-17](#) Final Location, Character and Extent review of the Laurel St. Event Venue, 719 W. Franklin St.

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Location & Plans](#)
[Public Comment - Opposition](#)
[Staff Comment - City Arborist](#)

Mr. Johannas stated that there were two issues to be reviewed: the programming of tenting and the final design work regarding the pavilion and the plaza. Mr. Johannas stated that the applicant has been putting a lot of energy into the redesign of the pavilion and the overall plaza site. Mr. Johannas further believes that the applicant has greatly responded to the UDC's former comments regarding the plaza.

Mr. Johannas asked Mr. Son to review the decision by the Planning Commission and how that impacts what the Committee is voting on. Mr. Son stated that the Urban Design Committee highlighted several concerns regarding the impact of the proposed conceptual design on the character of the park. The Committee sought answers regarding the extent of the proposed tent design in terms of the frequency of events on the proposed tent site to understand how that may impact the maintenance of the lawn and the surrounding flora. In this regard, the Committee questioned the removal of the trees and further implied that tented events should accommodate the existing trees. As the discussion moved to the pavilion, the Committee questioned the pavilion's strong orientation to the Altria Theater. The Committee discussed the possibility of reorienting the pavilion to better address its placement in the park and its impact on the park's overall circulation pattern. The discussion then moved to focus on the character of the park and whether or not the Victorian influence of the improvements should be maintained or if the park should reflect more contemporary elements, resulting in the consideration that the Committee and the applicant review and discuss the Monroe Park Master Plan to better understand the character intent of the plan and subsequent improvements. The Urban Design Committee recommended that the Planning

Commission defer the conceptual design for resubmission to the Urban Design Committee with the following considerations:

- That the applicant examine alternatives to the removal and/or movement of the magnolia and maple if they are part of the historic species list as mentioned in the Monroe Park Master Plan of 2008
 - That the applicant remove the proposed decorative paver crosswalk. It is not supported by the city traffic engineering department as it is problematic from a pedestrian safety and parking perspective
 - That the applicant and the UDC review the Monroe Park Master Plan for discussion on character-intent
 - That the applicant provide more detailed design sketches of the pavilion to include materials and patterns
 - That the applicant reconcile the geometry of the pavilion and the pervious brick paver plaza with the site
 - That the applicant provide an option of how tents may be laid out with the trees in place
- Furthermore, upon conceptual approval by the Planning Commission, the Urban Design Committee recommended the following considerations for final review:
- That the final plans include detailed architectural plans and renderings for each structure, indicating dimensions, building materials and finishes
 - That the final plans include a landscaping plan and schedule showing plant species, quantity, location and size at the time of installation
 - That the landscaping plan seeks to utilize native, non-invasive species where possible
 - That the final plans include a lighting plan, showing make, model and finish for any light pole and fixture, as well as fixture light source and color temperature

Mr. Son stated that at the regular meeting of the Planning Commission on April 17, 2017, a motion was made that this item be referred back to the UDC and continued to the next UDC meeting. The motion failed by 3-5. Thereafter, a motion was made that this item be approved with the considerations of the Urban Design Committee for final review. The motion passed 5-3.

Mr. Johannas stated that the Planning Commission approved the design as presented and that the request to redesign relative to the comments of UDC was denied to defer it. Mr. Johannas stated that with the preliminary approval the Planning Commission in his perception was the approval for the Pavilion which has been changed and the location of the tents and inquired if that was correct. Mr. Johannas inquired if the UDC is in a position to do anything about the tent location because it's already been approved as a conceptual design and stated that they have been given a revision by the design team for the new gazebo shaped Pavilion as opposed to the elongated shape which was just a design revision by their choice in response to UDC comment.

Mr. Olinger stated that he would agree probably on the location, character and extent of the tents and stated that he would suggest that on the venue on the gazebo and the event plaza that if they want to come back and show the Committee another option that is more in line with the intent they had at the last meeting and stated that he wouldn't say no to it.

Mr. Gould inquired if there was a way to confirm what the Planning Commission did act on in respect to the tents and Mr. Olinger stated that they gave conceptual approval to the location, character and extent of the tents. Mr. Son stated that it was approved with considerations of the UDC for final review.

Ms. Nolt inquired who was going to be operating, scheduling, and maintaining the venue space and Mr. Son stated that the Conservancy is working in conjunction with SMG.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired about the bullet points in the report as their scope of review and inquired if they want to refine the bullet points that passed at the previous UDC meeting. Mr. Johannas stated that all of the final design things are up for review but

states that in terms of intent and character and scope it has been approved. Mr. Johannas stated that if they want to start rearranging all of the tents they don't have the power to do that.

Mr. Don Summers, Chief Capital Project Manager for the City of Richmond, stated that the current lease agreement with the Conservancy and City is that the Conservancy will manage the program up to 30 days and anything over 30 days will be brought back to the City for approval. Ms. Nolt inquired about the maintenance of the park. Ms. Alice McGuire Massey, Monroe Park Conservancy President, stated that part of their lease agreement is to be worked in conjunction with Parks and Rec. Ms. Massey stated that in regards to maintenance VCU has contributed \$250,000 for maintenance for the park and stated that Richmond City has put in \$10,000. Ms. Nolt inquired if VCU has seen this and Ms. Massie states yes. Ms. Nolt inquired if they were affirming the materials choices for maintenance and Ms. Massey stated yes. Ms. Nolt stated that at the end of the events who is responsible for the cleanup and Ms. Massie stated that it is a part of the rental agreement. Mr. Summers stated that the City will continue be landlord and the Conservancy is the tenant.

Mr. Arias inquired if there are other groups that rent out the space. Ms. Massey stated yes and stated that a lot of other groups have interest in the Pavilion.

Mr. Johannas inquired if the 30 days was a single event and Ms. Massey stated that in their lease if someone wanted to rent a space and if they are there for 30 days or more they have to go to the City for approval. Mr. Johannas stated that one of the concerns was having a tent structure up for a certain amount of time and stated that someone could have a tent up for 30 days. Ms. Massey state that she don't see that happening.

Ms. Nolt stated that the tent rental is a concern for someone to be able to have a tent up for 29 days and then reapply for another permit for 29 days and so on. Ms. Massie stated that she don't want the park to look like a shopping mall so that will not happen. Ms. Nolt inquired if the Conservancy has jurisdiction to deny someone a tent application that complies with 30 days and Ms. Massie stated yes. Ms. Nolt inquired how they will use their discretion to approve or disapprove the application. Ms. Massie stated that in her vision that will not happen and stated that this is an outdoor living room and not a shopping mall. Ms. Nolt stated that they should have some language in their agreement for that. Ms. Massie stated that they are working on that right and that they are working on a draft now.

Ms. Katie Harrigan, with 3North, gave a brief presentation of the period of significance about the park regarding the Masterplan and showed the Committee material samples.

Mr. Johannas inquired if they had a mortar color in mind for the brick and Ms. Harrigan stated yes and stated that it is a darker blackish grey.

Mr. Arias inquired why they went with the other material verses a sand cast stone structures that are in the park. Ms. Harrigan stated that they wanted to differentiate the fact that it was new and stated that one of the recommendations that the National Park Services of Secretary Standards is that when you put something new that it should not imitate history. Ms. Harrigan stated that it should be compatible but also differentiated and stated that this has already been approved for the Checker House. Ms. Harrigan gave a brief presentation on the tents, the vehicle access points, plaza planting and the tree removal and replacements.

Ms. Nolt inquired what the width on the stone cap on the seat walls and Ms. Harrigan stated that it is a 2ft wall that insets 2 inches and is flushed with the wall so it is exactly 2ft. Ms. Nolt stated that their detail doesn't have a dimension on it and stated that it looks like the cap may not completely cover the width of the brick and stated that the

sketch shows an overhang and inquired if their intention is to have the granite cap to align flush with the face of the brick and Ms. Harrigan stated correct. Ms. Nolt inquired if there was a height limitation for the Pavilion by zoning and Ms. Harrigan stated no. Ms. Nolt stated that it looks a little short to her given the diameter of the pavilion and stated that it could be a little taller. Ms. Harrigan stated that they were cautious about making it too tall and be overwhelming and stated that they wanted to make it wider. Ms. Nolt stated that the width is appropriate but stated that it could stand another foot. Ms. Harrigan stated that they wrestled with idea of how tall the Pavilion should be and if it's tall enough stated that she think they are willing to play with the idea of it being a little taller. Ms. Harrigan stated that she don't want it to become too tall and overpower the space and stated that the space is a park and this should appear as a garden structure.

Mr. Gould inquired which parts of the park are stone dust versus hardscape and Ms. Harrigan stated that all the paths are stone dust except for the entry points and around the fountain. Mr. Gould inquired if the stone dust was ADA accessible and Ms. Harrigan stated yes.

Ms. Levine inquired how they were going to control the vine plantings and Ms. Massie stated that there is a group of volunteers to do the gardening and Ms. Massie stated that is a part of their role as the Conservancy to maintain it.

Mr. Smith inquired about the color temperature for seat all lighting and Ms. Harrigan stated 3000.

Ms. Hicks inquired how tall would it be around the perimeter and Ms. Harrigan stated 4 to 6 feet.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired if there was going to be up lighting in the stone structure and Ms. Harrigan stated yes.

Mr. Green inquired that the inside of the structure is a plaster and Ms. Harrigan stated yes and stated that they would like to build it out of metal. Ms. Massie stated that she would like the Committee to consider different possibilities of the tents so they can be programmed and the rest of the park can be used by the public.

Ms. Levine inquired how the grass is going to grow and Ms. Massie stated that is a part of programming the tent so that you don't put up a tent for 2 weeks so that the grass can breathe.

Ms. Nolt stated that they need to get those things in their bylaws and operations.

Public Comment

Mr. Charles Poole, speaking as a member of the public, came to speak against the project and showed a brief presentation. Mr. Poole stated that they should have some alternatives for cutting the trees down.

Mr. Todd Woodson, Representing the Fans of Monroe Park, came up to speak against the project and stated that the Pavilion does not fit in with the historic nature of the park. Mr. Woodson stated that the tents are way too big for the park.

Ms. Kelly Cox, speaking on behalf of Jennifer Hancock President of the Oregon Hill neighborhood Association, stated that they are opposed to the project. Ms. Cox stated that the tents are too large and the Pavilion conflicts with the Victorian Park.

Mr. Craig Bieber, liaison for Councilwoman Kim Gray, stated that she represents the second district which includes the park. Ms. Gray stated that she greatly appreciates what the Conservancy has done as far as publicizing the plans and holding

neighborhood and community meetings with various associations. Ms. Gray stated that she has been informed every step of the way by the conservancy about their plans and appreciate the fact that they addressed the concerns that were raised by this Committee. Ms. Gray stated that this has been a long process and stated that she supports the applicant and would encourage the Committee to do the same and in the interest of time she would like to let the Committee know that also supports the other 2 projects that are coming next regarding the furnishings and Portland Loo restroom facility.

Mr. Green stated that they brought this up some years ago with Kanawha Plaza and stated that there is lack of coordination between the parks and what the parks do and stated that it is a larger issue for the Planning Department and inquired if there was a larger plan in the masterplan for city parks. Mr. Green stated that they have a variety of parks with a lot of different physical conditions and locations but states that they are not seeing a master planning process that is focusing on appropriate uses for those parks. Mr. Green stated that he would like to see this taken up on larger issues like how do they coordinate these things and use the parks for what they were programmed for.

Mr. Johannas made a motion to approve the new design and design elements as presented with staff recommendations as the applicants has addressed, and passed Green and Arias opposed. Mr. Johannas made a recommendation that an operations management be programmed be reviewed by the Planning Commission regarding excessive use of tenting. Ms. Harnsberger inquired if there was something within the Planning Commission scope where they can always make recommendations that the Planning Commission can look more closely at use and operations. Mr. Olinger stated that in this regard where it affects the physical layout, design and use and maintenance of the park he thinks that flagging that is an issue to look at is not beyond their purview. The motion was seconded by Ms. Harnsberger and passed. Arias not in motion.

Mr. Johannas made a motion to recommend approval of this item with staff recommendations and made a further comment that an operation management program be reviewed by the Planning Commission regarding excessive use of tenting.

The Staff recommendations were:

-That the proposed plan accommodate tree species found on the 1904 tree inventory in a way that can preserve or replace the species per the City's adopted Municipal Tree Policy.

Ms. Harnsberger seconded, the motion carried unanimously.

Aye -- 9 - Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Chris Arias, Bryan Green, Andrew P. Gould, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks, Committee Member David Johannas, Jill Nolt and Robert Smith

Recused -- 1 - Chair Andrea Almond

OTHER BUSINESS

Adjournment