

June 3, 2019 @ 2:02pm

Design Review Board – Joe Dunstan (Chair), Peter Perry, Jane Rein, Jason Wilkensen, Carl Yurdin

City Council Liaison - Ron Peltier

Planning Commissioner - Jon Quitslund

City Staff – Heather Wright (Planning Director), David Greetham (Planning Manager), Kelly Tayara (Senior Planner), Ellen Fairleigh (Associate Planner), Carla Lundgren (Admin)

Coates Design (for the Applicant) - Bob Hutchinson & Matthew Coates

Kelly Tayara (Senior Planner): **(5:30)** We anticipate that this would be Site Plan and Design Review. Or perhaps, we are not sure yet because that is established in the preapplication phase. But it appears to be that the site plan and design review adjustment, maybe major adjustment, maybe new, perhaps an adjustment to the conditional use permit. It's an institution or government facility in the R8, which is a residential district. So it's an existing building and the conceptual is part of that process. You are required to do a conceptual review where we talk about design guidelines and the comprehensive plan and then to do a design guidance meeting. Now that conceptual can be waived by the planning director and so that's what happen for this one. So, this is the first time you are seeing this, and this is the design guidance meeting so prior to the preapplication meeting.

Joe Dunstan (DRB Chair): Ok. Go ahead. You're welcome to present the project. Like I said we have an hour and I'll hold you to it.

Bob Hutchinson (Design team for applicant): Okay. Sure, that's great. Now is my presentation, is it already loaded. Will it come up?

Ellen Fairleigh (Associate Planner): We should be able to bring it up.

Joe: We should be able to do it.

Kelly: The design review board receives this electronically, so we have the materials that you sent to us.

Bob: I have more. Large boards if that works better for people.

Peter Perry (DRB): That would help.

Bob: Okay.

Joe: That always helps.

Peter: Do you need a hand with it?

Bob: What's that? No no. I got them right here.

Carla Lundgren (Admin): I only have the checklists.

Jane Rein (DRB): There's a lot of graphics in the packet.

Jason Wilkensen (DRB): Yeah.

Jane: Right there. Starting there.

Kelly: Do you want an easel or anything?

Bob: You know...I don't think so. I can probably just

Kelly: You can put them up behind me and you.

Group: You can stand them up.

(7:47) <Multiple voices: undiscernible>

Bob: By way of introduction, it's the existing Harrison mob that I am sure that everybody knows where the building is and knows of it. Our charge when we got the project was, we programed the facility for courts and police and roughly the combined program for two, is around 24 thousand square feet. And this building is a little over 17 thousand square feet. So, the mission was to see how the program could be made more efficient to fit within the boundaries of this building with either no addition or very minimal addition to make it work. And we went through the planning process with both the police and courts to get a conceptual design worked out where the building was gutted with the exception of...Matthew come on up...Matthew is the principle in charge and lead designer on the project.

Matthew Coates: Good to see ya.

Joe: Good to see ya.

Bob: So, we dove into this project to see how we can make the fit work and minimize the amount of demolition that occurs inside relative to taking out shear walls. Everything else is movable. And, you know, there is going to be work that occurs inside where we are going to have to restructure part of the building else wise the plan just isn't efficient. **(9:33)** But it's minimal and we think it's a for 17 thousand square feet it's going to meet the intent of what the police and the courts need. And the next steps for us will be to hone down on the design and get beyond the concept and to refine it. But from an exterior stand point one thing that is going to occur is on this elevation, this portion of the building, it has police offices that occur here and there's a bullet resistivity requirement that comes into play for those offices and we got to re clad the building with the bullet resistant material and use bullet resistant glazing. So, this wood, this wood comes off, this wall gets restructured and then the whole thing becomes more opaque with smaller bullet resistant windows in some pattern, that hasn't been defined yet. It's gonna be a product of what the final plan looks like. So, from a character standpoint, this will be the element that changes the most on the building. Everything else where is wraps around there will be a small addition that's shown here, in the orange that's at two levels. That's was space that is really going to be necessary to complete the requirements for the police department. There is an existing stair, an exterior exit stair that comes out right now at that point, which is back here. And we are going to replace it with a two-story addition that is going to have police functions in it be some locker space primarily and an enclosed stair that gets people down to grade. The site itself there's actually less traffic generated with the police court project than there is with the mob. So, our parking count and contribution to the neighboring streets is anticipated to be less than what it is currently. **(11:49)** So that's a benefit. There would be no real changes to any of the hardscape for the parking other than this will become a secure parking area in the back for police use. And then everything else as it currently sits is for the public and a few staff positions. The landscaping, all that will remain the same. There will be

some replacement here as this wall is refitted to make it...again for the bullet resistant requirements, landscaping will have to be reworked. Or I think, not reworked. That is the wrong word. It will have to be enhanced just because there will be some removal of it in the process. And then just briefly what the plan is reads like is first level...main level is public entry here which is currently is *<phone ringing>*. Excuse me. Public entry here for both courts and police. And then on this side, a new entry that's built for police entry only that's secure. So public comes in, is greeted here and there is secure check points before people are allowed back into the secure police portion of the building. And that's everything back here. Public can then go up to the second level and you get up to the courts. Courts is on this half of the building. So, this will be, this will be the courtroom itself, administrative spaces and then there's a check point for people to come into the courts here. Then this portion over here, the balance of that is for police. So, police really covers probably a floor and a half of the building and courts gets about the balance.

Jane: Is there an image of the addition in terms of exterior finishes? Materials?

Bob: There is not at this time. Again, I think this meeting we were hoping to get some input on what impressions would be for replacement of this wood material. And whether that becomes **(14:22)** a problem. Matt jump in on this. One thing that it would probably be matching material to the existing siding that's already in place and just carry it around, so you don't have yet another material that's interjected.

Matthew: This space that's added on, there's already an existing stair there and its galvanized metal. So, whatever the enclosure is we'd be keeping with the existing building. I mean that would be the intent, obviously. We will get that in front of you at such time we have the design.

Peter Perry (DRB): Is there any concern...Is there any communications structures that is going to go on the top of that thing? **(15:05)**

Matthew: No. No. No there is no microwave. There is no towers.

Carl Yurdin (DRB): Do you see a building that has sort of a public statement as a courthouse and as a police station? Kind of a...well it's hard to describe it but it looks like what it is not what it was.

Matthew: Good point. To the extent possible. As much was pointed out to you, the only real material that is being changed is wood. The rest of the building and the structure is what it is. And that's what it is.

Carl: Well you're a good guy. You can figure out some good stuff.

Matthew: I'll do what I can.

Bob: And the building, I mean, the front doors has a lot of transparency and it's very engaging.

Jane: Yeah.

Joe: So, um I don't know how the police...I don't know what the program looks like **(15:59)** I just assume that it would need spaces for police cars outside. So, and that's been taken care of?

Matthew: All the secure parking happens down here. This is down a level. This is up at the street level. This slopes down so this whole parking area will be fenced off with secure for court and police.

Joe: Oh okay.

Bob: And that's not really visible.

Matt: You won't see it.

Joe: You won't see it?

Matt: No. You will not see it. You don't see it now and you won't see it then.

Peter: Is there any communications so between this...and you know homeland security puts some effort into the fire station. **(16:36)** Is there any sort of connection between these two in terms of function?

Matt: They have an emergency operating center there. We don't have that kind of program...so, the federal government is not involved.

Jason: Are there performance criteria that are being applied to the project?

Matt: I mean, absolutely. There is certain criteria in order...it has to be rated as an essential facility. So, there has to be redundancy and resiliency in the systems. Which is part of the conversation we've been having here with the city and the community is why these buildings cost more than a normal building. It's not just an office building. You know, the structure as it is now is fine for a medical office building but for police structure is has to have resiliency and redundancy in structure. So the difference is...to put it lay terms is...you're an architect so you know this but for everyone else, the way the buildings...the way the code is now is designed to allow the inhabitants to escape in a severe earthquake. To keep the building stable enough that it won't fall on you. **(17:42)** But the requirement for police stations is that they have to actually remain functional. There's a huge difference. Huge difference. So, this building in the event of a substantial earthquake has to remain functional. And because of that we will be making those structural retrofits and enhancements to the structure so it can handle that. As you know, the same thing is true for mechanical systems. So, the ducts don't drift apart and the electrical systems don't get ripped apart they all have to have flexibility in them.

Jane: **(18:16)** I read in someone's analysis of this project and I don't know the author but it was something about the site actually being a liquification zone for faction.

Matt: I have no knowledge of that. I haven't of that information of any kind. I am not sure where you heard that.

Jane: It's in the appraisal.

Matt: Liquification? Well, I'll go back and look at...we did this original...I hope you know...I don't know if you all know we designed, I designed that building that is there now and that never came up. I'll see that as a que to revisit the Geotech report, but it would be news to me.

Jane: That would be good.

Jason: So, Matthew in terms of it being an essential facility are there any requirements for emergency backup power?

Matt: Yes.

Bob: There will be. There is an existing generator that's already in place that's back here and we will avoid that in construction. And it will be sized to meet their needs. So, the power is there currently.

Jason: So, it's an existing...

Bob: It is. And part of our challenge when Matthew talks about the essential facility considerations, it's easy to build a structure when you're doing it from the ground up and you can do all of that work from the exterior. **(19:34)** Our challenge is how to...nailing it on the roof diagram for instance from the inside. It's all workable and all doable. It's sort of an added twist.

Peter: Can I ask you a question? Ron, given that we've got this suburb police station now coming into here now and the fire station, has Bainbridge looked at those two as a concentration for if we ever do have that 9.0? Is there anymore that can happen here? Did anyone ever look at sort what is the highest use and best use beyond just the police station and the courthouse?

Ron Peltier (City Council): Not sure why you are asking me, Peter, to be honest. **(20:12)** I've read the reports but I'm not quite sure what you're asking.

Peter: Well just living on the island and for anyone who doesn't know I was a first responder for the UN for quite a while. And I know that we're due for a 9.0 sometime in the next who knows how long, well I don't know. But I just wondered if because you already have such great infrastructure going on down there, is there anything else that hasn't been thought of that while you're doing all this...has anyone ever gone out in a helicopter and looked down and said, "Hang on a minute. If we only did X, we could even beef this up better in any other way."

Ron: I'm not aware of that but...

Peter: Just wondered.

Matt: We certainly have conversations...we take this project back to 2 to 3 years ago when they were thinking about co-locating. Those conversations did occur at that time between the respective chiefs. And so, they certainly have given a lot of thought to how they have synergy and don't have synergy with each other. I certainly couldn't speak for them at this time. Other than to say that the general proximity was definitely seen as a good thing which makes this site pretty desirable.

Jason: Has there been any conversation about integrating water storage and sort of looking at systems beyond the structure in electrical back-up but also life support for turning into a community lifeboat essentially. **(21:43)**

Peter: That's sort of what my question is because things happen in their little silos and now you guys have an opportunity to change something. Has anyone looked at that life support boat that that whole block represents and said, "Is there anything intelligent that can happen now while we are changing things?"

Matt: We have not been charged with that.

Peter: Alright.

Jason: Is there any sustainability mandate for this project?

Matt: There has not been a sustainability goal to date.

Bob: Not as yet.

Matt: Right.

Jason: Cuz it seems like one of the top priorities for 2019 for the climate action plan, there's this great opportunity for the city to get great leadership here in terms of sustainability. Especially with a project that intended to protect and maintain safety and security for the whole island.

Matt: As a practice, we do everything we can within a normal budget to accomplish what we can but terms of a sustainability there has not been a goal set for that. **(22:47)**

Peter: No I understand.

Matt: We certainly do what we can.

Joe: So along the same lines with infrastructure, we know the city's sewer is at compacity so the occupancy of the building as it was compared to the occupancy of the building as it will be, is that...

Bob: It's basically unchanged. **(23:10)**

Joe: So, you don't see any added to the sewer system or anything like that?

Matt: No. No.

Joe: Cuz I know that that line there is already compacity.

Bob: Yeah and actually when the building was...when Matthew did the original design, it's been designed for...already designed for an addition at that point. All systems are in place to handle the additional surface water load, so they have a reserve in capacity right now.

Jason: Is the project targeting the 2030 challenge?

Matt: That has not been stated at the moment.

Jason: Cuz that seems like that would be a good thing for the city to target. Oh Ron left...

<laughter & undiscernible words>

Jason: The 2030 challenge is about reducing our dependence on fossil fuels in terms of building energy consumption. *<undiscernible word>* are responsible for 27% of in-house gas emissions in Washington so you know we are as the architects and designers are in the driver's seat for a big portion of the carbon emissions. And the 2030 challenge speaks to address that by getting us to zero carbon emissions by 2030. **(24:39)**

Peter: Cuz the client is the city, right?

Jason: Right.

Peter: That's why we ask you right?

Ron: I think there was a comp plan policy regarding sustainability or solar. I'm not sure. I am going to look up tonight.

Jason: Cuz it seems like a real opportunity. I was mentioning the 2030 challenge is one target that the city should definitely look for this project which is basically it's ratcheting down our green house gas emissions for buildings to get to zero carbon emissions by 2030. So, each year it's a bit more rigorous.

Ron: I think there is something in the capital facilities.

Jason: Yeah.

Jane: I may have been paying attention here when we were talking about possible expansion area for the structure. I found...cause I haven't seen the space needs study for program that preceded this. I found your three-page report about the short comings of this site almost breath taking. **(25:42)** And it suggests in so many ways that you're going to need significantly more space if the use changes or I should say, intensifies or if these other things become much more important to the overall functioning of both the courts and the police department. So, is that expansion area is enough, you think?

Matt: Yeah actually the way the program works pretty well. We were challenged on the budget and therefore the program. So, we as the design team put our heads together to find ways to make super-efficient use of space. To get a lot more with a lot less. We're pretty comfortable...actually it worked out pretty well.

Bob: It did.

Matthew: Surprisingly well. But there is that future capacity to add another wing onto the building if it turns out that either the court or the police need that additional...

Jane: So, this is 17 thousand square feet and what was the program needs?

Matt: A little bit over 24 thousand.

Peter: Is there any incarceration in there too?

Matt/Bob: No. No holding.

Joe: Any other questions from the DRB? **(27:01)**

Collective: No.

Kelly: So, Joe do you have input on...um...consistency **(27:09)** with the applicable design guidelines? Does the board have any input or guidance for the applicants on that?

Joe: Um...Well this is the first time we have seen it. So, we would actually have to go through the guidelines, which we could do if people wanted to do that. It seems...uh...to me that...um...that the building is not going to change much. You don't have anything on the outside and you aren't changing too much. So, I don't think that there's any large issues like look like that are in the way. I don't see any...uh...anybody else?

Jane: I want to reach one and there's so many places but your given what your working with you can't really do much more. **(27:49)** So...

Joe: Can't really say anything.

Jason: Right.

Joe: Right.

Jane: I don't see any issues with compliance with the existing design guidelines.

Kelly: And it appeared that any guidance or comments from the DRB on consistency with the comp plan. **(28:01)** had to deal with the perhaps sustainability or...

Jason: Right, I think for me it's the priority use of the green building code and the climate action plan, I think those are two things that are a big concern because this project has the potential to be a leader in that regard. It doesn't sound like it's doing a whole lot beyond just the code mandated. Which as you know is the worst we can do and get away with. So, it would be great to see some real leadership in that.

Joe: Are we actually looking for feedback on the building exterior material? I think you're pretty straight forward on that.

Bob: Any suggestions will be welcome.

Joe: Any suggestions? Right.

Matt: So, I can tell you generally before you...so you can base your comments on this...we are gonna be probably recommending something that is metal or some sort of more durable finish than wood. And it will actually by necessity need to have smaller openings. **(29:04)** But other than that...

<Multiple people talking at same time – undiscernible>

Jason: Could you consider sky lights if you are reducing the amount of glazing on the wall to bring in daylight on that upper level? Is that's something that's been discussed?

<Multiple people talking at same time – undiscernible>

Bob: But that's only because the mandate was to keep as much of the envelope intact and ever efforts been made to leave the roof untouched. **(29:36)** But sky lights would be a great idea.

Matt: There's still a lot of windows. If you've been in the building, there's still a lot of windows.

Jason: Well like if you are thinking about an expansion to the south then all of these windows go away.

<Multiple people talking at same time – undiscernible>

Peter: Is the budget already set?

Bob: It is.

Peter: That's tough.

Bob: It is. It's been...we have worked hard with the city to **(30:04)** keep it where it's at.

Jason: Yeah.

Kelly: So, then the only question I had was whether the applicant was seeking any or to make the design review board of any departures from the city's design and construction standards or the design guidelines? It doesn't appear that you're seeking any.

Matt: No, we will follow the rules.

Joe: Oh okay. No go ahead.

Kelly: One more thing, the only thing I am not clear on and I wasn't the project planner for the Harrison building so there's a lot of history with the design review board saw it first but there is a requirement for outdoor public space and the application or the prior report does talk about where there is some landscaping that's kind of public but is there any like courtyardish or seating areas or anything?

Matt: Right here. This is the landscape plan but there is a bench and a little water feature...

Kelly: Okay great. Thank you.

Matt: This is well planted if you visit the site.

Carl: Do you plan on doing any changing on the glass portion of hall?

Matt: Not if we can help it. **(31:17)** The front part will largely be as it is.

Bob: Pretty much. This is really becomes the focus for security. This part of the elevation right here...

Matt: Because if you look at the floor plan this is going to be the secure bullet proof area here so that all this elevation...so this can stay glass. It will save a lot of cost to leave it that way. That's the main reason.

Peter: But I think to your point, that changes the light flow in there a little more even so doesn't it? Cuz if you look into that building you can sort see right in...

Jason: I was sort of thinking some of these deeper spaces like the briefing room that looks like a exercise room and then the courts.

Matthew: It's both.

Jason: Yeah. So those two spaces look like they could benefit from some...uh...

Matt: Um...yeah we will look at that.

Jason: Strategic sky lights...yeah but I think overall it would be great to see the city to sort of push this as a model. **(32:22)**

Joe: Okay so I'm going to the checklist here. Number eight...encourage the <?> and outdoor spaces. You would have the space on the inside and are you planning on putting any new benches in the front of the entry or anything like that? Just basically drive up, get out of the car and go into the building...is that right? Pretty much?

Jason: Pretty much.

Matt: There are benches. The front door is right here and...

Joe: Right.

Matt: ...there are some benches right about out here.

Joe: And that's...um yeah...I don't think this particular checklist number is probably relevant to that. **(33:02)**

Matt: You can see in the picture...

Joe: The focal bench is there.

Matt: There's benches right here.

Joe: Mmm hmmm...

Matt: Now I don't know if you've seen all this, but this is all outgrown. This was taken right after it was built so the landscaping was pretty tiny.

Jane: Is that snow on the ground?

Matt: Yeah it was, we had snow on the ground. It was weird.

Joe: The only concern that I would have visually is, myself, and this is my personal opinion so don't take offense to this...I like half the building, but I don't like the other half. I really like the glass half. I've always liked that.

Bob: We are halfway there.

<laughter>

Joe: The other side, I am getting a little concerned if you're going to do core ten and you're going to get a façade. How are you going to articulate that?

Bob: This one's yours.

Matt: Nobody said anything about core ten. **(33:57)**

Joe: Oh, I thought that's what we were talking about. You were joking. I was gonna say...okay we're good. Yeah...I'm just...is there a way...what are you gonna do...that part of it?

Matt: We'll have to kick that can down the road until we come in front of you next time. **(34:13)** I'll have some proposal for ya.

Jane: Oh good.

Kelly: They don't come before you until after they've applied.

Unknown voice: The preapp is scheduled?

<Multiple people talking at same time – undiscernible>

Kelly: The don't come to the design review board before the pre-app. Just to let you know what happens...you are welcome to come to that meeting.

Jane: I can't hear this conversation. Kelly what did you say?

Kelly: Sorry. So, the design review board **(34:41)**, as a board, does not see this again until after they submit application for their Site Plan and Design Review. So, the final recommendation, in other words. There is a pre-application that will take place unless the design review board wants to do a public meeting...it is a public meeting, but you can send two or three members, I think. Two? Three?

Carla: Less than four.

Kelly: Less than four. So, you can send a some members to that meeting if you would like and according to the land use review process, you will receive the summary of what happens at that conference. But the design review board is not scheduled to see this again.

Peter: So, as you beef up that wall, is the landscaping that is in front of it now, has it grown significantly?

Matt: Yes.

<Matt/Peter talking at same time – undiscernible>

Matt: **(35:40)** So I want to make sure we are talking about the same thing. So, these are vines that have grown up this wall.

Peter: Yes.

Matt: But these are just bushes. So, they are all pretty low.

Peter: Right.

Matt: And they want that. They want visual connection. But probably I would say the first ten feet in front of that building is gonna get removed and destroyed because they are gonna have scaffolding and everything in there and it's gonna get replanted after the fact.

Peter: And does that then require good visibility out or they can function?

Matt: Yes.

Jason: Matthew I am sure you guys are thinking about this but when you do replace the siding if you could think about how to improve the performance of the envelope. It's just something that if you have to put bullet proof metal siding, on it could it also be an insulated metal panel for instance? You know and then...

Matt: Yes, it's very likely we could do that.

Jason: And then increases the R value of the wall. Or something along those lines.

Bob: Actually, the materials there is customary almost like a Kevlar sandwich that gets applied over the sheathing and then your finish material gets applied over that.

Jason: Oh okay.

Matt: It also...what's cool about it Jason is that it also **(36:51)** creates a thermal break.

Jason: Uh huh.

Matt: I mean other than a couple screws....I mean the panel itself feels like really hard fiberglass.

Bob: It's nonconductive.

Matthew: Yeah, it's nonconductive.

Jason: Right. I see.

Matt: Which will help also.

Joe: So early someone had their hand up in the audience. Would anyone like to make a comment?

Jane: Oh do Pam first.

Pam (Citizen): Um hi...I was looking at the landscape plan and I noticed that some of it was packed gravel, recommended by the landscaper. I guess my question and a comment. Packed gravel is very difficult for somebody in a manual wheelchair or a walker or a cane it's not as smooth as asphalt, so I am wondering where packed gravel is being planned. Is that intended to be a walkable area for people?

Matt: Right now, there's sidewalks, concrete sidewalks that are maintained everywhere that you would need to go. So, I'm not, actually not sure where you're even referring to that because we have no intention to make gravel a walking surface or the wheelchair surface.

Pam (Citizen): Okay but is there going to be packed gravel in some area of this design? I thought that there was.

Matt: I don't think so to be honest. But I hear what your...what I hear from what your saying is please be cognizant of folks with mobility issues and be able to make sure that there is good solid surface for them to move on. I hear that.

Kelly: Maybe it's this right here?

Matt: Oh! Oh, you're referring to...okay okay...that's totally separate. There is a weird...there's a very odd...I just want to confirm that you are talking about this trail. There's a trail behind the building.

Pam (Citizen): Right. Right. **(38:49)**

Matthew: So that trail...that is...don't quote me on this but it goes way back in time there was something that went with the title of this land that said that there had to be a connection to Sakai of a walking trail. And so it has no programmatic relevance to the project what's so ever. And is only there to meet a title requirement. And so that trail shouldn't even...you're not even gonna know it's there.

Jason: Is it existing or is it proposed?

Matt: It is existing. I think it is existing.

Jason: Okay.

Matt: And the title requires that it somehow be left in place. **(39:30)** And so the minimum that anyone would do would be to put gravel or wood chips or something on it. It's not intended to be a nature walk or anything like that. It's literally not a part of this project but it's a requirement of the title. Anything related to the function of the building will have paving and be fully ADA compliant.

Pam (Citizen): I guess I must have misread something.

Matt: Can I borrow this again?

Pam (Citizen): I thought something said **(40:00)** "packed gravel was recommended by the landscaper."

Matt: It's right here. Here's the building and the front of the building, there's this weird trail that comes way behind...this is where the police cars park so there is no one would ever be back there.

Pam (Citizen): So that's gonna be packed gravel?

Matt: I'm not sure. It says right now it's existing.

Bob: "packed gravel trail..."

Matt: It's a requirement of this neighborhood. That's my understanding. I wouldn't want to be quoted on that but the Sakai neighbor is over here...they somehow got this in their title that they would have a connection to their trail. So, it's completely separate from the property. But I assure you that all the sidewalks and entry ways will be...

Pam (Citizen): That's the only point that I wanted to make is that if there was something on this project was going to be packed gravel. My only point is that it doesn't work. But if it's not part of this project then...

Matt: I appreciate you bringing it up and I am glad we could clarify that for you. Thank you.

Joe: Do you have a comment? Question?

Citizen 2: I have a question that has been on my mind. **(41:16)** About immediate access to the highway? May I ask if they will just be using the back driveway or will they have access to the highway?

Bob: So, you're talking to a direct link to 305?

Citizen 2: Yeah.

Bob: Yeah...That was discussed early on in the project and there were a lot of comment to it because the connection would be too close to the signal which would be problematic and also just the effort to get through DOT to make that kind of connection was...was almost overwhelming. So, the police have accepted using the existing access to the site and if need be, they claim they can use the property at the church if they really have to get out of there for whatever reason. But that was considered.

Joe: Yeah. Charles.

Charles Schmidt (Citizen): When this building was originally designed there were certain environmental standards to be met. I was wondering if measurements have been shown and predictions...

Matt: Measurements of what Charles?

Charles: **(42:42)** Of electricity use...of water use...was there certain LEAD standards?

Matt: No, the original building was not built to a LEAD standard. Um...no it wasn't. I haven't had access to...I mean the city might be able to get the information, but we haven't had access to the information since it's been privately owned. But there wasn't a performance standard in place at the time.

Joe: Any other questions? Okay. Just for us to summarize real quickly. Um...The design concept meeting we waived, you guys didn't do that? That's fine this is the design guidance. The next we will see you is will be the site plan review meeting.

Matt: Okay.

Joe: Unless you wanted to come back sooner.

Matt: I mean I always enjoy your company but... <laughter>

Joe: I'm just...I wanna make sure that meeting goes smoothly and there aren't any hiccups. I think if you're coming back with something similar to what's happening here, and not a lot of contradictions, you can just come back to the next meeting.

Matt: And I wouldn't, frankly, mind getting folks' opinions on the cladding, I wanna be on the same page.

Jason: That would be great.

Joe: So, you are welcome to come back but it's not something that...

Matt: Okay...But certainly, if there is time in the schedule and um it seems like there would be a question, I think we should try to make that happen.

Jason: Sure. Absolutely.

Joe: That would be great.

Matt: I would like to leave that as an option.

Joe: Yeah, it's an option for you guys.

Joe: Okay...any other comments...thank you very much.

Matt: Thank you. **(44:17)**

