

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

February 7, 2019

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Craig Krueger

Board members: Diana Atvars, Henry Liu, Stephanie Monk and Kevin Sutton

EXCUSED ABESENCES: Ralph Martin and Shaffer White

STAFF PRESENT: Lawrence Chung, Scott Reynolds and Amy Tarce, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting, and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Mr. Krueger at 7:00 p.m.

CONSULTATION

LAND-2018-01168, Macy's Building

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Exterior alteration to add windows with new materials to match existing colors

Location: 7400 - 166th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: John Marx *with* Jensen Fey Architecture

Staff Contact: Amy Tarce, 425-556-2938 or atarce@redmond.gov

Ms. Tarce explained that the Macy's Department Store building is an anchor tenant at Redmond Town Center and in the process of moving out. Town Center is looking at other uses for the building and two levels are planned; the ground floor will remain retail and the upper floor will be offered as office space. New windows are needed.

The Master Plan and Design Standards require windows on both floors, but the current design was a compromise due to the department store use. More windows are consistent with the intent of the Design Standards. Staff felt that after evaluating the proposal and the rationale for the architectural features that were recognized as strong elements of the design. The applicant is being asked to respect the existing proportions of the building and treatment of the building articulation.

At this meeting, the architect would present the proposal and also alternative designs based on staff recommendations.

Mr. Krueger stated that the presentation was termed a Consultation and not a Pre-Application, and asked if a Consultation was to address comments staff has only. Ms. Tarce replied that the project is in Administrative Modification. Any time a building or project changes which had been previously approved, the project comes back as an Administrative Modification if the scope of work is small enough to fit criteria of the project; otherwise, the project would come back as a Site Plan Entitlement. The word Consultation is used for projects not yet ready for approval but not a pre-application as a formal application is already submitted. The hope is for clear direction from the Board so that approval can be given at the next presentation.

Mr. Uk Kang *with* Jensen Fey Architecture continued by explaining that the building is tilt-up concrete which was built in the 1990s serving a single tenant. Existing materials are simple, brick on top of concrete. There is currently no second-floor expression. In incorporating office use on the second floor, the need for window expression is inevitable. The biggest window size possible was desired, originally asking for wider windows. The structural engineer did not believe this would be possible due to the tilt-up panel joints. The height, however was able to be increased, one foot higher than the initial proposal. Continuity with ground level windows would occur.

The second-floor window pattern will be simpler than the ground level pattern as ground level is related to retail use, a different function. Renderings were displayed. The current building is more horizontally designed and verticality would occur in the new design. The main entrance will remain unmodified. Retail facades are to the west and south. Deliveries come to the north façade. Different perspectives were shown.

There is a strong use of brick consistently throughout Redmond Town Center, and this concept will be kept but move higher, speaking to verticality and the relationship of the ground level to the second floor. New paints will match the existing color. Existing design will be respected. The goal was to not deviate from the design standard of Redmond Town Center and the proposal is consistent with this goal.

Mr. Kang asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Krueger asked if the alternatives mentioned at the beginning of the presentation would be displayed and Mr. Kang continued.

Most prominent in existing design is that there is a proportion of brick to the entire building height, consistent and strong. Two alternative designs were shown with different window and belly band placements.

Mr. Krueger asked if the second-floor windows in the alternative designs would be the same size and Mr. Kang replied yes.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the Architect had done a great job of incorporating the windows into the second floor and these were very natural looking.
- Ms. Monk stated that the north façade was a blank wall, and that while any view out windows would be of the parking lot, windows would help make the façade more consistent and that allowing more light inside is always positive.

Mr. Kang stated that there were elevator shaft stairs and air ducts resulting in a limited opportunity for windows on the north façade. Every possibility had been reviewed.

- Ms. Monk. asked if something could be done on the north façade exterior to break up the blank wall.
- Ms. Monk liked the simulated columns.
- Ms. Monk preferred the original design presented.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if there was a reason a corner shown in a rendering had remained the same.

Mr. Kang replied that a change to the corner had not been thought necessary and was kept as-is. The stairs were kept to break up the blank space.

- Ms. Atvars suggested adding something that would come part of the way up the windows, to make the corner being kept make sense.
- Ms. Atvars was confident that whatever is chosen would blend and look fine.

Mr. Krueger asked Ms. Tarce for clarification regarding the rationale for alternative designs. Ms. Tarce replied that the building was meant for an anchor tenant, never

meant to blend with the rest of Redmond Town Center, and always was expected to be more special than other buildings. Because of the level of care in design for this building compared to the background buildings, staff pushed the applicant to provide more than usual. One third-two thirds design is repeated in the lower level. Regarding the suggestion by Ms. Atvars to come up to half of the second-floor windows had also been conveyed to the applicant by staff.

Mr. Liu:

- Agreed with Ms. Atvars regarding a possible option D.
- Mr. Liu suggested that the existing original brick color may have faded thorough time and asked if, realistically, the colors could be matched seamlessly.
- Mr. Liu commented that on the north and east sides there are not many windows but brick still comes up to the crown molding, less convincing; that the existing brick façade height should possibly remain.

Mr. Kang stated and assured the DRB that they found color matching the existing brick. The manufacturer takes a sample from the site and attempts to match as closely as possible. Leaving the brick as-is had not been examined and would be researched.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated being skeptical that leaving the brick as-is would feel right.
- Mr. Sutton was okay with what has been presented.
- Mr. Sutton did not understand why the one corner was left off and that there should be consistent treatment throughout.
- Mr. Sutton stated that Option B was reasonable.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for Option B to be displayed again, and preferred Option B.
- Mr. Krueger suggested that leaving the brick height as-is should be considered.

Mr. Kang replied that architecturally there was a conflict with windows and that this is why higher or lower brick heights were looked at as options. How the band interacts with the window would be brought to the next presentation.

- Mr. Krueger asked if there was a change in window type between first and second floor windows.

Mr. Kang replied that the window mullion was simpler on the second floor because of the use. Retail would be more celebrated and the office space would still respect the proportions.

Ms. Tarce clarified that staff did not have any concerns regarding the second-floor windows not matching the first-floor windows.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2018-01083, Modera Overlake

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: New multi-family residential building with 246 units and associated leasing office, resident amenity areas, parking and exterior courtyard

Location: 15260 and 15248 Bel-Red Road

Applicant: Darrell Turner *with* GGLO

Prior Review Date: 03/15/18 and 11/01/18

Staff Contact: Scott Reynolds, 425-556-2409 or sreynolds@redmond.gov

Mr. Reynolds stated that the project involves two lots on the southwest corner of Northeast 21st Street and Bel-Red Road. Staff has eight comments in total as outlined in the staff report. Comments are broken into two categories; the pedestrian experience and the building itself.

Staff concerns regarding the pedestrian experience involve Northeast 21st Street, Bel-Red Road, within the proposed plaza and when entering the building. Staff feels that on Northeast 21st Street, the building does not engage the sidewalk and improvements could be made. On Bel-Red Road where the plaza is outlined and regarding the sidewalk itself, clarification around how code requirements will be met is needed as well as how the sidewalk engages within the residential and public realms.

Regarding the building itself; further clarification on the roof line, elevator shafts, stairwells and blank walls are needed. Staff had two comments regarding how the building engages Northeast 21st Street and Bel-Red Road.

Staff was excited to see that the same energy was being brought forth from the last submittal. There are areas for possible improvement at the base of the building and the opinion of the Board is requested. In the Overlake Standards, there are requirements within the code in regard to how material plays out for the pedestrian experience and staff believes improvements are needed in this area as well for the next iteration.

Ms. Tarce stated that the project would set a precedent for other projects in Overlake Village. The site has a lot of potential and the area will eventually become an Urban Center. The project will distinguish the area from other areas of Redmond. The

applicant is commended for providing designs to explore. Input as far as what the strong elements are was desired so that these can be retained moving forward.

Mr. Krueger asked for clarification in the staff report regarding a prohibited concrete panel and if this is unique to the Overlake area.

Mr. Reynolds replied yes, but that there were exceptions. Board input regarding how this could be integrated in would be beneficial for staff.

Mr. Steve Yoon, applicant, stated that there is quite a bit of topography and irregular frontage. The applicant hoped that feedback from the last presentation had been interpreted correctly. The courtyard has been shifted from the east side to the main Bel-Red Road side for architectural benefit and to adjust the flow of pedestrians. There is now more of an open frontage around Bel-Red Road where the previous package was set back. Flexibility is being asked for regarding what can be done in the dedicated City-owned right-of-way at the corner.

Ms. Tiina Ritval *with* GGLO stated that primary guiding principles of design both for Bel-Red Road and Northeast 21st Street facades remain true to the aesthetics outlined in the first presentation. While massing has been altered, the design passion and precedent is intact.

Renderings of inside and around the project including drone photography were displayed. Maximum building height in the Overlake Village 2 zone is 85' and five to eight stories. Construction type will be five stories of type 5A over two stories and three basement levels of 1A. The most important vantage point of the project is Northeast 21st Street.

The building massing prioritizes the most prominent views of the building from the corner of Northeast 21st Street and Bel-Red Road, and the corner of 152nd Avenue Northeast and Bel-Red Road. The site slopes 12 feet from the northeast corner to the southwest. The Bel-Red Road building mass has been elongated along the south access. Since the iteration, the wedge mass has shifted to the south to come closer to the build-to line. The form has been broken at the residential entry, as suggested by the Board, to bring the building into compliance with the zoning code. The plaza further breaks the Bel-Red Road façade and creates a separate expressive element at the most prominent corner. The north portion of the building slopes up with the site providing a dynamic and pedestrian friendly environment. The notion of speed is articulated in the façade with the expression of metal cladding and horizontal patterning.

The courtyard now opens to the east allowing a stair connection to further activate the south facing plaza. Native plants will create a lush space at the interior of the project.

The Northeast 21st Street frontage has a distinct building wing addressing the frontage directly and in a more traditional way. Massing has been broken down to comply with City modulation requirements. A shared roof opens to Northeast 21st Street and caps the mass as a single volume. The base is gained with an inset to break the mass into three distinct pieces. The commercial use wraps the corner for activation at the eastern edge of Northeast 21st Street.

Commercial space fronts Northeast 21st Street, Bel-Red Road and the new south facing plaza, and amenities and the lobby will occupy the remainder of the Bel-Red Road frontage. Towards the west, the grade drops and spaces grow in height. On the Northeast 21st Street frontage there is a secondary residential entry, lifted residential units, building services and a parking entrance. More renderings were displayed.

Speed, drama and simplicity are the three guiding design principles for Bel-Red Road. As the project is developed further, metal siding will be detailed to appear monolithic and streamlined with horizontal texture fitting with the aesthetic. The metal will be differentiated from the lighter colored siding on Northeast 21st Street for a clarity in design language.

Massing at the southwest corner produces a reveal at the entry and heightens prominence of the entry location. The public entry will be further enhanced to ensure visible weather protection and pedestrian facility such as benches, special paving and bicycle walks.

On Northeast 21st Street, the guiding design principles are warmth and texture. The oversized canopy is the garage entrance, the depth providing protection from weather; another level or layer of canopies for pedestrian protection did not make sense here. The applicant believes that weather protection is designed in correct areas and weather protection in the set back area for residential use was not indicated; addressing the blank walls along Northeast 21st Street with masonry, trellises with planting, vertical articulation, artwork and light fixtures will be more successful.

The most prominent corner, Bel-Red Road and Northeast 21st Street, still occupies the highest realm of design hierarchy of the project with a dramatic pointed roof providing a beacon-like element. Proportion will be refined in the coming weeks. The base will be infused with a similar design energy. The commercial space accesses both covered and uncovered plaza areas with optimal visibility. The height of the space affords drama potential and ways to capitalize on this will be explored as the design continues to develop.

A correction to the Board packet was that white at the corner should be identified as metal and not panel. Renderings may appear confusing regarding this and will be fixed for the next presentation.

Much of the Northeast 21st Street language is warm and refined, what the applicant identifies as a residential texture at the upper levels. The inset or knuckles of the building are treated as a dark transition material to create additional relief and to produce a clarity to the hierarchy of the volumes.

On the Bel-Red Road or south façade, there is a predominantly refined or cool texture, metal profile that wraps from the northeast corner to the courtyard, moving from high to low with the sloping grade to invoke movement. The same sloping gesture is expressed in the south, with the bottom edge of siding moving from high to low and meeting at the residential entry.

The west elevation received criticism at the last presentation and this elevation has been brought more in line with the Northeast 21st Street elevations, treating the mass as a single expression with insets and modulation that compliment Northeast 21st Street. Ways to improve ground level energy will be examined at this corner. The relationship between the build-to and building face is variable and is being considered to meet code.

Parking and services fill the first two levels below grade. Level one emerges from the ground with the northeast corner still below grade. The residential amenity and lobby are on the south and garage entries on the north. Commercial is protected by a large overhang at the northeast and now opens to both street frontages ensuring visibility and daylight access. The lobby to the west is a two-story volume. Units begin to populate the west and north facades. The commercial space is two-stories. A roof deck at southwest will give solar exposure and views. Building mass at the north upper levels of Northeast 21st Street produces decks. The roof echoes the design concept and language of the hierarchy of the massing.

Mr. P.J. Benenati *with* GGLO stated that the site plan had evolved since the last presentation, responding to the goals of a stronger street edge for the building. A centralized plaza space south facing would meet grade to the street to the east, remaining flat and slightly proud of Bel-Red Road as elevation drops. At the same elevation, a wrapping terrace reinforces architectural drama at the corner, under cover with the colonnade on the outside. Lighting, sculpture and furnishings are being considered. There is a connection from the level two plaza to the level three courtyard with access control at the mid-landing so that the lower half of the stair run can be accessible to the public. An upper level overview will be looked at in more detail and the residential courtyard will be densely planted with understory planting.

As the character of open spaces evolves, more detail such as the stair element, bike rentals, terrace planters, lighting and how the commercial space interacts with the plaza and stair and differentiating private residential from public plaza will be looked. Opportunities for seating elements, viewing and a balance of materials that are durable but add warmth and vibrancy will be examined as well.

The upper level residential courtyard will be quiet in nature with all residential units surrounding. Private patios will be densely planted and buffered, some with direct access to the main circulation path. Lighting, planting design, site materials and paving transitions will pull out more detail. The upper level roof deck will have a connection to the indoor amenity space with elements such as outdoor fire pits and outdoor dining. There will be a balance of both hardscape and green roof. The plant list is a mix of native and adaptive, low maintenance and low water, to provide color, texture and seasonal interest.

Red Oaks along Bel-Red Road are proposed to be replaced due to road widening. Sun loving plants transitioning to shade tolerant plants will move up the stairs to the courtyard.

Ms. Ritval continued that there are three deviations identified at this point; parking, trash location and pedestrian facilities.

Mr. Krueger asked if there were questions or comments from the audience and there were none.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Believed the metal piece should be floating and asked for clarification regarding the corner.

Ms. Ritval replied this was to add texture and draw an eye in, but if more of an urban expression the metal could be carried down. This was meant to be a grounding element.

- Mr. Sutton stated that two columns at the southwest were not marking.

Ms. Ritval replied that this could be transitioned to metal if desirable.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the interior columns are metal panel.

Ms. Ritval replied yes, metal and matching storefront.

- Mr. Sutton commented that at other entry locations this works, but at the particular corner in question this does not.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the roof line was cantilever.

Ms. Ritval replied that this was 30'; a complicated geometry, and ways to make this less jarring were being examined.

- Mr. Sutton stated that the roof line felt like too much; other roof lines appear more subdued and if the one roof line will be big, the other roof lines should be played up more.

Ms. Ritval replied that a hierarchy was intentional at the prominent corner and high-side of the site. More drama can be designed for the other roof lines.

- Mr. Sutton understood the hierarchy but believed this was too dramatic.

Ms. Ritval replied that more drama elsewhere in the project may feel applied.

- Mr. Sutton stated that views experienced would be lower and not the birds eye views of the presentation and if not exaggerated, smaller views will be lost.
- Mr. Sutton believed the design was coming along nicely.
- Mr. Sutton asked if translucent panels on the west side were necessary for light.

Mr. Ritval replied that this was to create a more welcoming feel at the formerly blank wall. The panels also provide light into the parking garage and populate the façade with visual interest. The elevation will be densely planted.

- Mr. Sutton stated believing the translucent panels were unnecessary and landscaping would resolve the wall. Attention is drawn to the wall more with the panels than without.
- Mr. Sutton asked for clarification regarding staff concern around street fronts.

Mr. Ritval replied that on the northeast side, commercial space is in front. Moving west, a fitness area and building amenities populate the façade. The garage has been pulled out for flexibility in providing as much store front as possible along the entire frontage.

- Mr. Sutton liked the stairs and visibility into the plaza area, a nice amenity for the public.

Mr. Liu:

- Believed the project had progressed since the last presentation and was excited.
- Mr. Liu did not believe the rendering shown of the right-of-way corner showed promise and that the corner should be made important and usable, in example, for street performances, and hardscape rather than grass could be used.

- Mr. Liu commented that a natural separation of residential access and commercial activities should be an option.
- Mr. Liu commented that variation of height in metal siding, not lining up with commercial areas, and pulling the canopy a few feet down, would bring more human scale to the particular street. Turning the corner to the rest of the façade would be fine.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated being on board with all changes made since the last presentation.
- Ms. Atvars liked that the wedge had been broken up, and this feels more organic now.
- Ms. Atvars commented that the courtyard was spot-on with details.
- Ms. Atvars asked if the cement board that staff had expressed concern about only occurred in one area.

Ms. Ritval replied all storefront on one side.

- Ms. Atvars was not bothered by the cement board but asked if stone elements could be varied.
- Ms. Atvars commented that the mass could be more connected all the way through and leaning out, and that the form of a bird could be imagined.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that there were very good changes.
- Ms. Monk asked to see the city property where activation was desired was.

Mr. Yoon replied page 9. The plan view was displayed. Flexibility for design here to create was being asked for.

- Ms. Monk commented that something could be created at the corner to distract from passing traffic such as a fountain or lights reflecting the cantilevered shape of the roof.
- Ms. Monk stated liking the cantilevered roof and that this was unique.
- Ms. Monk commented that at the west elevation, the vertical bands of black material were good but asked why the design decision was made to not line these up horizontally or to move from roof to street level.

Ms. Ritval replied that the entire volume was capped as one. The reveal underneath the material was hard to pull out, but the overhang of the middle band on Northeast 21st Street is at the transfer slab. The rest drops down to express the building inside and some units have been dropped down.

- Ms. Monk agreed with the other comments regarding the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification regarding the corner dedication.

Mr. Reynolds replied that the project has been through one technical review and a second is coming involving Transportation and Public Works, where the regulations for the corner will come into play. Board comments would be integrated into internal conversations for opportunities for improvement.

- Mr. Krueger stated that site distance may be the problem, but creative ideas can be considered.
- Mr. Krueger commented that the entrance to the courtyard should be exciting.
- Mr. Krueger liked the description of elevations and opportunities in steps.
- Mr. Krueger stated that regarding the pedestrian experience, there appears to be a 6' sidewalk and a 5' planter next to Bel-Red Road; enhancements were hoped for. The previous double sidewalk had been good.
- Mr. Krueger asked if materials such as wood and masonry were still being decided on.

Ms. Ritval replied that for the next presentation, material would be decided on.

- Mr. Krueger stated that wood was not desired from a maintenance standpoint but that the wood material at the Kenmore City Hall was sharp.
- Mr. Krueger asked what the blank grey rectangle was at the west elevation.

Ms. Ritval replied that this would be addressed as the zoning code requires using either enhanced materiality, trellises or artwork.

- Mr. Krueger liked the changes and thanked the applicant for bringing a design that does not have flat roofs and has modulation that code requires. The project will be dramatic and design will continue to improve over time.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00096, Gill Investment Company

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Multi-family exterior alteration including: replace all windows and patio doors, replace stair handrails and guards, replace balcony privacy partitions and guards, replace entry doors and install accessible door hardware, re-side entire building, install patio amenity area with stairs and create accessible parking space.

Location: 9110 Redmond-Woodinville Road Northeast

Applicant: Jaspaul Gill

Staff Contact: Lawrence Chung, 425-556-2404 or lmchung@redmond.gov

Mr. Chung stated that the building had been built in 1978. The proposed material is grey hardy cement lap siding, dark 3" wide hardy trim and burgundy entry doors.

Mr. Craig Pontius *with* Citizen Design continued that the project was straightforward with a crisp color palette. Guardrails are proposed to be black powder coated metal.

Mr. Krueger stated that the Design Review Board was limited to making comments and suggestions regarding the design and materials. Mr. Chung replied that because of the scope of the project, the City decided that this should be reviewed by the Design Review Board.

Mr. Chung stated that stucco would be changed to hardy siding.

_____ asked Mr. Chung if the project had been brought to the Design Review Board for approval or comments. Mr. Chung replied that the project had been submitted as a building permit. If the Board finds further conditions or restrictions, this would be considered in the Building Permit.

Mr. Chung clarified that staff is recommending approval tonight of the building permit, if the Board determines that the proposed materials are acceptable.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Atvars:

- stated that the building appeared to be not very visible.

Mr. Pontius replied yes, that the building sits 15 to 20 feet above sidewalk grade.

- Ms. Atvars believed the changes were an improvement and approved of the color scheme.
- Ms. Atvars commented that the striping at the west elevation near the street currently breaks up the blank wall and asked why there was less detail in the proposal.

Mr. Pontius replied that the striping did not do much to affect the overall building.

- Ms. Atvars stated that, however, the proposal has nothing now at this wall and suggested the striping be brought back in an accent color.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if there was a reason for the change in texture and color.

Mr. Pontius replied that the lap siding is typically a more residential detail where panelized siding often occurs in larger commercial or institutional buildings. Cement fiberboard is chosen for maintenance, long lasting and durable, as opposed to wooden lap. Colors were chosen to be more modern. The existing building is a design product of the seventies.

- Mr. Liu agreed that changing stucco to hardy panel is a performance enhancement.
- Mr. Liu commented that band or trim to create an interesting façade element or variation should be considered.
- Mr. Liu asked for clarification that windows and doors were not changing locations.

Mr. Pontius replied that at the south side, triangular windows would change but the size of the building would not change.

- Mr. Liu commented that brighter colors and textures should be considered.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked what extends beyond the deck.

Mr. Pontius replied that the lower decks extend the full width of the façade. The overall structure at the deck would remain.

- Mr. Sutton had no issues with materials or colors but commented that the design was blank and monolithic, and the building actually was prominent while at the stop light facing east.
- Mr. Sutton commented that the building should be broken up horizontally. One suggestion would be to take the lower level and run a darker accent trim band across to anchor the base.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton that the building is actually prominent.
- Ms. Monk believed the bands on the side help and an accent color would be the suggestion.
- Ms. Monk liked hardy siding instead of stucco.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if there was any siding on the building at this time.

Mr. Pontius replied that there is no siding currently.

- Mr. Krueger agreed that the building is actually prominent and asked what kinds of interior rooms are at the west elevation.

Mr. Pontius believed this was a kitchen.

- Mr. Krueger stated believing the applicant should come back with revisions as a design element needs to occur at the west elevation per Board comments.
- Mr. Krueger stated believed that without adding a lot of cost, some variation should occur in the siding material to break up the building. This could include variation in width or thickness.
- Mr. Krueger stated color differential should be included.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the west elevation would be visible for a long time.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTIONED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:00 P.M.
SECONDED BY MS. ATVARIS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**March 21, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**