



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, October 11, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Ray Harpham, Interim Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Hunter Rayfield, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: James Peltier, EMH&T; Pete Scott, Meyers + Associates Architecture; and John Woods, MKSK (Cases 1 & 2).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the September 20, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented. He made note of the following Minor Modifications:

1. Bridge Park, Fado – Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.
2. Bridge Park, Block H – Modifications to building material or color of equal or higher quality.
3. 250 W. Bridge – Modifications to the location and layout of parking lots.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F 18-060BPR**

**PID: 273-000867
Basic Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure with a residential liner, and an additional building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, southwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation for approval to City Council of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak presented the Bridge Street District (BSD) process and said the final approval will be made by City Council as there is an Economic Development Agreement in place. She said this application will be reviewed at their meeting on October 22, 2018, where City Council will make a determination on the Basic Plan Review and the future required reviewing body.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of Blocks F & G and the layout of the labeled blocks to illustrate context within the Bridge Park Development. She noted that Block G is directly across from Block H and Blocks A, B, C, D, and H have all been approved while Blocks D & H are still under construction.

Ms. Husak presented the general layout proposed for the three buildings in Block F. She said the applicant has proposed building F1 to contain a hotel and a restaurant, F2 as a parking garage, F3, which is a liner for the parking garage for hotel/commercial use, and F4 that is intended for office space in the future. She indicated details for the hotel such as the number of rooms, footprint, and architecture will come later as



this application gets developed. She noted the private access drive that will provide a drop-off area for guests and provide movement throughout the block. She said Dale Drive serves as the principal frontage street with this all being illustrated on the basic plan presented. She indicated that Staff has had some concerns about pedestrian circulation around the access drive as they envisioned it to be similar to A Block and asked the applicant to work with Staff to develop this area appropriately.

Ms. Husak said Staff had identified an Administrative Departure regarding front property line coverage, which is due to the shape for the block, especially for building F3. She said the Code requires 75% front property line coverage but the applicant is requesting 72% at Dale Drive.

Ms. Husak presented the intended massing and how the buildings relate to each other. She said the hotel (F1) would be the tallest building on this block and most likely the first building submitted for a final site plan review.

Ms. Husak presented the western elevations of F2 & F3 that showed the unlined portion of the parking garage along Dale Drive. She presented inspirational images for the proposed contemporary design characteristics for the block, which were very similar to the established character of the development.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed open space for Block F and said the applicant is meeting the open space requirements and should not have to request a Fee-in-Lieu.

Ms. Husak explained the six Waivers associated with Block F:

1. Building Types – Incompatible Building Types (F2).

Ms. Husak said this Waiver has to do with the unlined parking garage in Block F facing an unlined parking garage in Block B, which is appropriate given the location and design of each garage.

2. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (F1).

Ms. Husak said the proposed access point at Mooney Street to the north and mid-block pedestrianway to the south of Building F2 combine to reduce the ability for the front property line coverage requirement to be met on the Mooney Street frontage.

3. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (F3).

Ms. Husak said the required mid-block pedestrianway proposed to the south of F3 reduces the ability for the front property line coverage requirement to be met on the Dale Drive lot frontage.

4. Building Types – Maximum Ground Story Height (F1)

Ms. Husak said the increase in ground story height is due to the change in grade from east to west. The ground story height at the east end of the building is 14.25 feet and 20 feet at the west end of the building.

5. Building Types – Entry Location for Parking within Building (F2)

Ms. Husak said the Mooney Street elevation is the front façade of the Parking Structure (F2/F3) and is the only façade of F2 accessible from a public right-of-way that is not a principal frontage street.

6. Site Development Standards – Parking Structure Design: Entrance and Exit Lanes (F2)

Ms. Husak said the Parking Structure (F2) is fairly small and based on the surrounding mix of uses proposed to utilize these parking spaces, the need for additional exit lanes for a peak simultaneous vehicle exiting is unlikely. The entrance and exit lanes are aligned with an existing parking structure across Mooney Street and meet the maximum 30-foot opening requirement. Additional lanes in this location would be detrimental to both the character of Mooney Street and the Parking Structure.

Ms. Husak stated Staff is comfortable with the seven conditions identified for the recommendation of approval of the Basic Plan Review as all of the conditions are site related and can be addressed at the final site plan review. The conditions are as follows:

- 1) That Building F3 be located within the required building zone and comply with the front property line coverage requirement to the maximum extent possible, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
- 2) That Building F2/F3 be relocated within the required building zone of 5 feet to 25 feet for Parking Structures, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the proposed patio space and seating areas located between the existing tree grates in the Bridge Park Avenue right-of-way and the façade of Building F1 be revised to provide the minimum 12 feet of clear sidewalk width;
- 4) That the applicant provide a Parking Plan with the Site Plan Review to the satisfaction of the Planning Division;
- 5) That the applicant continue working with Staff to ensure the private access drive located between Building's F1 & F2/F3 can accommodate appropriate pedestrian circulation to the satisfaction of the Engineering & Planning Divisions;
- 6) That the applicant provide all the final details regarding open space and site development standards with the Site Plan Review; and
- 7) That the applicant continue to refine architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review.

James Peltier, EMH&T, inquired about condition #3. He confirmed Bridge Park Avenue is the shopping corridor but asked how far the 12-foot clear sidewalk extended on Bridge Park Avenue. Logan Stang explained the 12-foot clearance is a neighborhood standard that extends the full length of Bridge Park Avenue as part of the Scioto Neighborhood District. Ms. Husak said Staff will hold the applicant to that standard due to feedback received over time from the Commission for ensuring enough room for pedestrians is made available.

Donna Goss asked if the private access drive was a one-way or a two-way street and Mr. Peltier answered two-way. She expressed her concern in the potential conflicts between two-way traffic, pedestrian crossing, and the hotel drop-off.

Aaron Stanford encouraged the applicant to think about hotel guests coming out of that entrance and the garage parking circulation. Vince Papsidero suggested the applicant consider different paving materials to help guide the pedestrians and keep them out of harm's way. He said a change in materials can be aesthetically pleasing, as well. Shawn Krawetzki inquired about the landscaping in that same area as it is now shown as ornamental.

Mr. Stanford asked if the applicant intends to use a street wall lining. Mr. Peltier answered he was not sure yet.

Ms. Goss asked if the access drive will also be used as a service entry for deliveries. Mr. Peltier said the service/delivery is on the south side of the hotel.

Mr. Stanford inquired about refuge pick-up. Mr. Peltier answered there will be a trash compactor in the parking garage (F2) in the northwest corner at Mooney Street and they plan to provide nice screening. He noted that corner is notched out of the building and the transformer will be located adjacent to the compactor.

Ray Harpham said the trash compactor will create more traffic across the street and in his experience, a grease trail will be left behind from the restaurant space to the compactor. Mr. Krawetzki said he became concerned about the exterior noise of the compactor as well as the smell it would generate on the street. He indicated he did not see this sort of setup anywhere else in the development. Mr. Papsidero said these details could be addressed later. He said the applicant has always placed the compactors in their garages but this one will be visible from up above unless the screening addresses this concern. John Woods, MKSK, said the applicant could put something over the trash compactor to alleviate visibility. Mr. Papsidero asked that the applicant select something decorative for that purpose.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion to approve the Administrative Departure Review as follows:

1. §153.062—Building Type Requirements (O)(5)(a)(1) Corridor Building Type. Building Siting. Front Property Line Coverage: Minimum 75% front property line coverage required; 71.9% requested for F3 at Dale Drive.

Ms. Goss motioned, Mr. Harpham seconded, to approve the Administrative Departure as written and it was passed, unanimously.

Mr. Papsidero called for a vote to recommend approval to City Council for the six requested Waivers:

1. Building Types – Incompatible Building Types (F2)
2. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (F1)
3. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (F3)
4. Building Types – Maximum Ground Story Height (F1)
5. Building Types – Entry Location for Parking within Building (F2)
6. Site Development Standards – Parking Structure Design: Entrance and Exit Lanes (F2)

The vote was taken and everyone was in favor of the six Waivers to be recommended for approval.

Mr. Papsidero called for a vote to recommend approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review with seven conditions:

- 1) That Building F3 be located within the required build zone and comply with the front property line coverage requirement to the maximum extent possible, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
- 2) That Building F2/F3 be relocated within the required build zone of 5 feet to 25 feet for Parking Structures, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the proposed patio space and seating areas located between the existing tree grates in the Bridge Park Avenue right-of-way and the façade of Building F1 be revised to provide the minimum 12 feet of clear sidewalk width;
- 4) That the applicant provide a Parking Plan with the Site Plan Review to the satisfaction of the Planning Division;
- 5) That the applicant continue working with Staff to ensure the private access drive located between Buildings F1 & F2/F3 can accommodate appropriate pedestrian circulation to the satisfaction of the Engineering & Planning Divisions;

- 6) That the applicant provide all final details regarding open space and site development standards with the Site Plan Review; and
- 7) That the applicant continue to refine architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review.

The vote was taken and everyone was in favor of the Basic Plan Review to be recommended for approval to City Council with seven conditions, as stated.

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block G
18-061BPR**

**PID: 273-012471
Basic Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a residential building, a parking structure with a liner, and an additional corridor building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, northwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation to City Council for approval of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak noted that City Council reviewed Block G when Block H was reviewed but the proposal for Block G has since been changed, which requires another Basic Plan Review.

Ms. Husak presented the basic plan for Block G. She said the proposal is for three new buildings with 170,000 square feet of office, 16,000 square feet of commercial, 110,000 square feet of residential, 0.43 acres of open space, and associated site improvements on the ±2.28-acre site. She said there is potential for residential liners on the garage similar to other blocks.

Ms. Husak presented a basic drawing to depict massing as viewed from the southwest corner. She said Staff had identified five Waivers, including one requested for the office building (G1) to be seven stories where six stories is the maximum permitted in the Code and Staff is recommending approval. She presented similar drawings for east, west, north, and south elevations and noted this will not be the tallest building in the development. She said the variety of heights on this block was supported by the Commission.

Ms. Husak presented the inspirational images for the proposed character for Block G. She said these designs seem appropriate to what has been approved. She reported the Commission conveyed they welcomed the images with the intent for something different.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed open space for Block G and pointed out the area in G4 of a private amenity space the size of ±7,667 square feet. She said 0.43 acres of on-site open space is proposed for Block G. She reported the Commission discussed open space, specifically how much should be turf versus hardscape with planters, especially given the amount of pets in the area. Vince Papsidero encouraged the applicant to look for inspiration at the small pet park in Cincinnati, which is just one of the amenities offered as part of Washington Park.

Ms. Husak stated the applicant is requesting one Administrative Departure:

1. Building Types – Parking Structure, Required Building Zone (G2)

Ms. Husak explained the applicant is requesting for building G2 to be 4.66 feet from Dale Drive right-of-way, encroaching beyond the required building zone. She said Staff is not recommending approval as the building

can be shifted to the south to meet the required building zone placement to provide the minimum five feet of separation of parking structures from the right-of-way.

Ms. Husak said a few Waivers had been identified for the project such as allowance of the seven-story building (G1), front property line coverage, and occupation of corner (G4). She explained the requests for the four Waivers are as follows:

1. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (G2)

Ms. Husak said the applicant is requesting G2 to be 58.8% at Dale Drive in combination with G4 on the same lot, whereas 90% front property line coverage is required. She said the block configuration reduces the ability for the front property line coverage requirement to be met on the Dale Drive lot frontage.

2. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (G4)

Ms. Husak said the applicant is requesting G4 to be 58.8% at Dale Drive in combination with G2 on the same lot, whereas 75% front property line coverage required. She explained similarly, the block configuration reduces the ability for the front property line coverage requirement to be met on the Dale Drive lot frontage.

3. Building Types – Ground Story Use (G2)

Ms. Husak said the applicant is requesting G2 unlined with commercial uses at the ground story along Dale Drive, a principal frontage street, whereas, commercial uses are required. She explained the surrounding existing and proposed land uses along Dale Drive are generally a variety of residential uses. She said this specific area of Dale Drive has a significant existing landscape buffer on the opposite side of the street from the parking structure, creating a single-loaded street. She said commercial uses at the ground story of the parking structure in this location would be an isolated node of commercial use.

4. Building Types – Maximum Permitted Building Height (G1)

Ms. Husak said the applicant is requesting G1 to be seven stories in height whereas there is a maximum six story height regulation. She explained the proposed location of G1 is in a low point of the topography on Block G and the topography north to south at the proposed building location, along with the slope increase to the east, may serve to visually minimize the increased building height proposed. She stated Staff has expressed concerns about the garage and entrances being accurately shown given the change in grade through the block.

Aaron Stanford noted the problem with doors swinging into the right-of-way on the east side of G2. He said based on the current plan there are a number of doors that would encroach into the right-of-way. Ms. Husak suggested adding a condition of approval, which can be addressed at the Site Plan Review.

The two added conditions were as follows:

- 6) That the setback along the shopping corridor along Bridge Park Avenue be revised to meet Code requirements; and,
- 7) That the applicant revise the plans to eliminate door swings into the right-of-way.

Ms. Husak added the Sycamore Ridge Apartments are to the east and have been there \pm 20 years. She said per the new BSD Code, the property would be considered incompatible. She said there is a similar situation

north of Tuller Ridge where Block H was deemed incompatible with the surrounding development. She indicated Staff is questioning whether or not the BSD Code actually speaks to existing development and if incompatibility applies. She indicated they determined the BSD Code does not apply to existing developments but if Sycamore Ridge were to be redeveloped, they would have to follow the BSD Code to become compliant.

Mr. Papsidero commented the height variation in these two blocks will be good for Bridge Park. Mr. Krawetzki said he was concerned with the potential impact on the neighborhood given the height change.

Ms. Husak referred to condition #4, which will likely be a Waiver for the final site plan.

Ms. Husak said disapproval is recommended for the following Administrative Departure:

1. Building Types – Required Building Zone (G2)

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion to approve the Administrative Departure Review as stated. He stated that motions are taken in the affirmative so if the ART is voting to disapprove then they need to vote against the request. Ms. Goss motioned, Mr. Krawetzki seconded, and the vote was unanimous to disapprove the Administrative Departure.

Mr. Papsidero called for a vote to recommend approval to City Council for the four requested Waivers:

1. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (G2)
2. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (G4)
3. Building Types – Ground Story Use (G2)
4. Building Types – Maximum Permitted Building Height (G1)

The results were unanimous for a recommendation of approval to City Council.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended to City Council for a Basic Plan Review with seven conditions noted:

- 1) That the applicant request approval of a curb cut along a principal frontage street (building G2 along Dale Drive) by the City Engineer at the Final Site Plan Review;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to ensure that the internal circulation of the parking structure meets building applicable Code requirements at the Final Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the proposed design of the plaza and streetscape extension adjacent to building G1 be revised to meet Code to provide adequate pedestrian space;
- 4) That the applicant provide additional information to evaluate the actual relationship between the existing and proposed building G1 to the building in Block H, prior to submitting for a Final Site Plan Review;
- 5) That the applicant will have to address inconsistencies between the plans prior to applying for a Final Site Plan Review;
- 6) That the setback along the shopping corridor along Bridge Park Avenue be revised to meet Code requirements; and
- 7) That the applicant revise the plans to eliminate door swings into the right-of-way.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for a vote for the Basic Plan Review and the results were unanimous for a recommendation of approval to City Council with seven conditions.

**3. BSD HC – Dublin Toy Emporium, Sign
18-067ARB/MPR**

**28 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for an approximately 4.5-square-foot blade sign for an existing tenant space within Historic Dublin on a 0.15-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core, east of North High Street, ±200 feet north of the intersection with West Bridge Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 & 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented the process for a Minor Project Review. She noted the ART is making a recommendation today to the Architectural Review Board that will hear this application on October 24, 2018.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site for context. She explained that in general, the Code allows two signs of different types and one additional sign for buildings with access to a public parking lot located to the side or rear of the structure. She added the Code allows for a projecting sign within the Historic District to be a maximum of eight square feet in size on the first story of the structure with a minimum of eight feet of clear distance between grade and the bottom of the sign.

Ms. Martin presented a photograph of the building on North High Street, which has a small concrete entrance between the front door and the City's brick sidewalk in the front at the corner of Wing Hill. She presented the proposed sign that consists of three colors, approximately nine feet in height, and 4.48 square feet in size. She described the proposed sign as a panel that is a double-faced, 0.5-inch MDO (Medium Density Overlay) plywood. She said the graphic is printed on 3M ControlTac with a UV laminate coating and is subsequently affixed to the MDO, which is not a permitted material in the Code. She said the sign will need to be revised to incorporate an approved material of High Density Urethane (HDU), cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent materials, as required by Code.

Ms. Martin said the sign is affixed to an existing wrought iron bracket, which the applicant has indicated is mounted to allow for 8 feet of clear distance below the sign. She stated the applicant will need to submit verification to the Building Standards Division confirming the clear distance below the sign prior to the issuance of a sign permit. She said additionally, all mounting hardware should be painted to match the mounting bracket. She reported this sign is already installed.

Ms. Martin said this sign was reviewed against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines, Minor Project Review Criteria, Architectural Review Board Standards, and Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site. She stated three conditions of approval were identified for the requested recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board:

- 1) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material);
- 2) That the applicant demonstrate eight feet of clear area is provided beneath the sign to be verified by the Building Standards Division at sign permitting; and
- 3) That the sign mounting hardware is painted to match the color of the hanging bracket.

Shawn Krawetzki inquired about the detailed sign dimension. Ms. Martin assured him the sign meets all applicable Code provisions.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for a vote for the Minor Project Review and all were in favor of a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board with the stated three conditions.

INTRODUCTION

4. BSD C – McDonald's Exterior Modifications & Signs 337 W. Bridge Street 18-036MPR/WR Minor Project Review/Waiver Review

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications and new sign installations for an existing drive-thru restaurant on a site zoned Bridge Street District – Commercial. The restaurant is south of W. Bridge Street, approximately 250 feet east of the intersection with Frantz Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the process for a Minor Project Review. She explained there is an additional review process for the requested Waiver and Master Sign Plan, which the ART will need to make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission as the Minor Project Review is not meeting Code. She said the intent of today's discussion was to gather the ART's feedback to relay to the applicant.

Ms. Martin presented the aerial view of the site for context and zoomed in closer to show the surrounding development. She explained there is a shared parking agreement for this standalone restaurant with the larger plaza. She said the circulation for this structure contains one drive-thru lane that works counter-clockwise.

Ms. Martin said the proposal consists of site improvements, architectural modifications to the building, and a comprehensive sign package. She presented a photograph of the existing conditions. She said the applicant is proposing to add a patio with outdoor seating and other site improvements will include the removal and replacement of paving materials for 11 parking spaces including two ADA marked spaces. She said they will also remove and replace the sidewalk and patio with like-for-like materials as these have deteriorated over time.

Ms. Martin presented a landscape plan and reported Michael Hiatt has been out to the site and found the proposed landscape plan to be appropriate.

Ms. Martin presented renderings of each of the four elevations and explained the building structure itself would not change and the architectural modifications will just affect the facade. She said the applicant has proposed a variety of materials: brick will be on the main building to match the existing brick, and E-wood to create two feature walls (black tile arcade) with the iconic golden "M", aluminum trellis awnings and portions of the upper façade will contain fiber cement siding. She said this "look" is becoming a common part of McDonald's concept.

Vince Papsidero inquired about the drive-thru accent material as shown and Ms. Martin answered she thought it was intended to be a darker brick than the rest of the building.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the transparency requirement. Ms. Martin noted the BSD Code does not address transparency with existing structures and the applicant will now be required to comply with the new standards as defined in the Code.

Ms. Martin asked the ART if a building type should be designated to this existing structure. She indicated she wanted to keep the application simple as the footprint for the building is remaining the same.

Mr. Papsidero indicated the proposed Code amendments will negate all this and will need to be reinterpreted.

Shawn Krawetzki commented the proposal would clean up the architecture but he did not like the appearance on the southern elevation that faces Heartland Bank. Ray Harpham said the only place that would be visible would be from the neighboring property.

Mr. Papsidero said he would support the use of tile as a secondary material.

Ms. Martin said the applicant has requested a variety of new signs; two, golden arch "M" as wall signs and one as a monument sign, the text "McDonald's" for a wall sign, a digital menu board, and a digital pre-browse board, both for the drive-thru. She presented the site plan with the sign locations marked as well as details and illustrations of each sign.

Ms. Martin noted in a Master Sign Plan, an applicant can request a variety of signs but Staff tries to guide the applicant in a direction that upholds the intent of the sign guidelines and Code provisions. She restated per the Code, the applicant is not permitted this many different sign types. Mr. Papsidero suggested the applicant at least reduce the number of signs.

Mr. Stanford said the ground signs are typically near the access and since this would not be anywhere near it then maybe a wall sign would be more appropriate.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. Claudia Husak said the scheduled ART meeting for next week, October 18th, is being cancelled.

Ms. Husak referred to all the Kaizen work posted on the walls of this room and explained Staff has been developing process improvements in terms of the content, design, and delivery of meeting materials. She said a more streamlined agenda and chair agenda are being implemented and materials are being pushed to just the website instead of storing materials in several places. However, she said, Staff will continue to use OneDrive for a while but will eventually phase it out and materials will only be found on the website.

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 3:09 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on November 1, 2018.