

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
February 7, 2024
THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vern McKissick, Vice Chair
Shaun O'Toole
Jamesetta Reed
Anne Marek (arrived at 6:51 PM)
Joe Canamucio

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joe Alsberry, Chair
DeRon Jordan

STAFF PRESENT: Emily Farren, Deputy City Solicitor

CALL TO ORDER: 6:30 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Canamucio seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the January 3, 2024 meeting without corrections. The motion was adopted by a unanimous (4-0) vote.

OLD BUSINESS:
N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. Variance Application for 513 North 2nd Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Dave Stezin with the JEM Group, to establish a three-unit, "Multifamily Dwelling" use, which requires a Variance from the density requirements outlined in Section 7-307.3(a) of the Zoning Code.**

The case was represented by Dave Stezin with the JEM Group (the representative for the property owner), 214 Senate Avenue, Suite 302, Camp Hill, PA 17011 (aka "the Applicant").

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Planning Bureau recommends the project not incorporate a fitness area and communal workspace on the first floor; as they are seeking to meet a pressing need for more units downtown, such accommodations should be considered subordinate to the primary need of housing.
2. Any exterior alterations to the building will receive approval from the Historic Preservation Specialist or, if necessary, receive HARB approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application.

3. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure that the account billing reflects the establishment of the proposed uses on-site.

Commissioner McKissick asked the Applicant whether they read the case report prior to the meeting; he stated that they had not. Commissioner McKissick asked whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; he stated that he didn't foresee an issue with the proposed conditions but would have to confirm with the property owner. He noted that the owner had been developing housing units throughout the city and that he'd likely be amenable to the condition.

Commissioner McKissick asked the Applicant if he had any additional information to provide; he stated that he did not and that the property owner was thankful the Planning Commission was willing to hear the case.

Commissioner McKissick asked whether any of the Commissioners had comments or concerns about the project.

Commissioner Canamucio stated that he had no questions.

Commissioner Reed stated that she had no questions.

Commissioner O'Toole noted that they had reviewed a number of office-to-residential conversions in downtown, and that he supported such proposals.

Commissioner McKissick asked for clarification on the proposed configuration of the first-floor space; he asked whether the project proposed a live-work unit on the first floor. Mr. Knight stated that the area in front of the first floor appeared to be a communal workspace and gym, noting that there was no separation between the common area and the stairway. He noted that the Applicant had stated a pressing need for new housing units in the neighborhood and thus the Planning Bureau felt that the entire floor area should be dedicated to that. Mr. Knight noted that the proposed work space and fitness amenities were already available throughout the neighborhood, specifically at the nearby Little Amps and YMCA, respectively.

The Applicant stated that the proposed floor plan was intended to maintain access to the basement. Commissioner McKissick inquired as to what was located in the basement; the Applicant noted that it was primarily the utility connections and mechanical equipment.

Commissioner McKissick asked if there was anybody for or against the project. There were no comments or questions from the public.

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

- 2. Variance & Special Exception Applications for 320 Reily Street, zoned Institutional (INS), filed by Doug Neidich with GreenWorks Development, to establish a mixed-use project with 144 residential units, commercial space, and associated parking facilities; this requires zoning relief for the proposed 'Multifamily Dwelling' use and from**

various aspects of the Development Standards and the off-street parking regulations in the Zoning Code.

The case was represented by Scott LeBell with KCI Technologies, Inc. (the project engineer); 5001 Louise Drive, Suite 200, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055; and Dominic Wiker with Washington Place Equities (the developers), 701 Cathedral Street, Baltimore, MD 21201 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. If granted approval for the requested zoning relief, the Applicant will file a Lot Consolidation, Subdivision & Land Development Plan application for the proposed mixed-use development; this application will be accompanied by a Traffic Impact Study and Photometric Plan that analyzes the effect of the proposed development on the surrounding community.
2. The Applicant will vacate the portion of Logan Street between Reily Street and the Boyd Street urban meadow. They should also consider vacating the portion of Logan Street between the Boyd Street urban meadow and Harris Street, and potentially consolidating parking with the VOA apartments to the west, as that right-of-way cannot accommodate the traffic movements as proposed in the site plan.
3. The Applicant will ensure that any future business(es) proposed for the first-floor commercial space will either conform to the Zoning Code or, if not, the Applicant will ensure the necessary zoning relief applications are filed and approval received from the Zoning Hearing Board.
4. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to confirm the appropriate size and location of refuse collection on-site, to ensure that City vehicles can access the refuse storage location.
5. The Applicant will coordinate with the City Arborist on the selection and location of trees on the property site; although some trees will likely be lost along the Boyd Street urban meadow, they should be retained where feasible and replaced at least one-to-one elsewhere on the project site or in the surrounding rights-of-way.
6. The Applicant will coordinate with the Planning Bureau on the number and location of bike racks around the site; the Bureau would recommend that the Applicant consider both a secure, indoor bike storage area for residents and employees of any businesses on-site, as well as publicly-accessed bike racks around the perimeter of the site. Furthermore, the Applicant should consider incorporating a SusqueCycle bike share station.
7. The Planning Bureau recommends that the Applicant retain flexibility in respect to the use and development of 1530 North 4th Street and shall explore potential development opportunities beyond the proposed use of an accessory parking lot.

Commissioner McKissick asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they stated that they were.

Commissioner McKissick noted the Planning Commission had initially reviewed the project several years ago, and asked what the primary changes were in the revision. Mr. Knight stated

that the project was slightly less intensive regarding the number of residential units and the amount of commercial space, and was providing more parking across a larger project footprint.

Commissioner McKissick asked whether any of the Commissioners had comments or concerns about the project.

Commissioner Canamucio asked whether the Applicants had an idea of what types of businesses would be accommodated on-site; they stated it was probably too early to confirm exactly what types of businesses would be on-site, but noted that given the small size of the space, it would likely be a retail space or coffee shop. Commissioner Canamucio asked whether Mr. Knight's synopsis of the changes was correct, noting that he had not been a commissioner during the previous review of the project; the Applicants confirmed the Planning Bureau's summary and noted that a subsurface parking garage on the principal parcel had been replaced by the surface parking lots to the north and west. Commissioner Canamucio stated that he was a nearby resident and stated that he thought it was a great proposal.

Commissioner Reed stated that she had no questions.

Commissioner O'Toole inquired as to whether the project would feature market-rate or affordable units and asked what the proposed rent might be. The Applicants stated that they were not sure what the proposed rents would be, but confirmed that it would be a market rate project that would be similar to others in the neighborhood. They stated that interest rates and construction costs had gone up since the previous zoning relief application had been reviewed and approved.

Commissioner McKissick inquired as to the construction type of the proposed building; the Applicants noted that the current project had removed a floor from the design of the original proposal and relocated the parking from a subsurface garage to surface parking. They stated that the changes were intended to address the changing financial conditions to make the project feasible. Commissioner McKissick asked whether the building would feature a masonry podium; the Applicants confirmed that it would be a masonry podium base with wood-frame construction above.

Commissioner McKissick noted that he was one of the consultants on the original proposal to redevelop the Reily Street corridor as part of HACC's Midtown Campus, a project which had since been abandoned. He noted that a model developer by students had envisioned similarly-sized structures enclosing the Boyd Street urban meadow. He stated that he was glad to see development coming to the corridor.

Commissioner Reed asked the Applicants what the percentage of one- and two-bedroom units would be; they stated that approximately three-quarters of the units would be one-bedroom units and that the remainder would be two-bedroom units.

Commissioner McKissick asked if there was anybody for or against the project. There were no comments or questions from the public.

Commissioner McKissick noted that the Applicants had not provided documentation regarding community outreach and asked Planning Bureau staff which organization covered the project site. Mr. Knight stated that the project was located within the boundary of the Friends of Midtown neighborhood group. He stated that the Planning Commission could make a condition that the Applicants engage the neighborhood association before the Land Development Plan was submitted for review.

Commissioner Canamucio moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

3. Variance Application for 1901 North 6th Street, zoned Commercial General (CG) & Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Bill McKelvie with Catherine Hershey Schools, to permit a 44-square-foot wall sign and a 32-square-foot free-standing sign where one is not permitted, per Section 7-325.6 of the Zoning Code.

The case was represented by Bill McKelvie with Catherine Hershey School for Early Learning (the property owner), P.O. Box 830, Hershey, PA 17033; and Scott Diettrick, Esq. with JSDC Law Offices (the legal counsel); 11 East Chocolate Avenue, Suite 300, Hershey, PA 17033 (aka "the Applicants").

He noted the Applicants had concurrently filed an appeal of the Planning Bureau's determination that the free-standing sign was subject to the regulations of Chapter 7-325, and was not classified as an "Exempt Sign" per Section 7-325.7 of the Zoning Code. He stated that after further consideration of the issue, the Planning Bureau concurred that the free-standing sign would be classified as "exempt," although he noted that the case report still contained a condition related to that aspect of the proposal.

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the condition was that:

1. While the Planning Bureau concurs with the Applicant's position that the proposed free-standing sign at the corner of Muench Street and North 6th Street is exempt from the regulations in Chapter 7-325 of the Zoning Code, the Bureau believes it should be resized to the 25 square feet permitted for wall signage in the CN district, to ensure that such "Noncommercial" signage generally conforms to standards for signs otherwise permitted in the CN district.

The Applicants distributed packets to the commissioners and City staff with documentation on the proposed signage.

Commissioner McKissick asked the Applicants if they had any comments or questions regarding the Planning Bureau's case report. They stated that they appreciated the Bureau's concurrence that the signs were exempt from the Zoning Code [note: the Bureau was only supportive of this argument for the free-standing sign/sculpture], but requested that they be allowed to exceed the size for allowable signage in the CN district. They stated that because the building was set back a significant distance from the street, and the property was a corner lot, the signs needed to be large enough to be sign from both North 6th Street and Muench Street. The Applicants noted that the proposed wall sign was 44 square feet and stated that if were held to the 25-square-foot

limitation of the Zoning Code, it would not be visible. They stated that the project was bringing value to the city and that they wanted people to know who they were. The Applicants stated that the free-standing sign/sculpture was 32 square feet in size, noted that they wanted to ensure the signage was the same across all their campuses, and stated that the requested relief was de minimis.

The Applicants requested that the proposed signage be approved as submitted. Mr. Knight reiterated that the condition in the Planning Bureau's case report was only intended to be applicable to the free-standing sign, and not the wall sign; he noted that the Planning Bureau was supportive of the zoning relief request for the proposed wall sign. Mr. Knight noted that the exempting the proposed free-standing sign could potentially constitute a loophole in which, for example, a 200-square-foot sign could be considered exempt from the regulations, and thus he felt it was appropriate to apply some standards on the installation of the proposed sign.

The Applicants stated that they felt the installation was a piece of art and not a sign, and claimed that it would be difficult to downsize the proposed signage by seven square feet.

Commissioner McKissick asked Planning Bureau staff how the Zoning Code addressed artwork; Mr. Knight noted that the regulations likely didn't address artwork, but stated that the primary question was whether an organization's logo constituted signage or art. He provided an example of McDonald's golden arches, noting that it was universally recognized as their logo and thus constituted signage. He stated that the City would not allow a McDonald's to install 200-square-foot golden arches and claim it was art and not a sign. Mr. Knight noted that the issue was somewhat unclear and that a precedent may be established by the Zoning Hearing Board in their final decision.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he appreciated the Planning Bureau's explanation of its position and noted that the commissioners often had to consider the context of precedent in their reviews of larger signs. He noted that the new development on-site was a much larger building than the structures that had previously occupied the blocks before they had been demolished and the site consolidated.

Commissioner McKissick asked whether any of the Commissioners had comments or concerns about the project.

Commissioner Canamucio asked Planning Bureau staff to confirm that the condition referenced in the case report only applied to the free-standing sign; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case. Commissioner Canamucio asked whether the Planning Bureau was supporting the proposed wall sign as submitted; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case. The Applicants noted that they could not confirm the exact size and dimensions of the sculpture due to its shape, but stated that it was not overly large.

Commissioner Reed stated that she had no questions.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that he had long felt the Zoning Code's signage regulations were too restrictive and that he did not have a problem with the size of the proposed free-standing

sign/sculpture. He stated that he felt the commissioners should treat it as a sign and recommend approval of the Variance, as opposed to exempting it from the regulations, due to the concerns raised by the Planning Bureau. Mr. Knight confirmed that that was the Bureau's original approach to the proposal and acknowledged the Applicant's differing perspective, but that after consideration of the specifics of the project, how the Bureau had approached other similar projects in the past, and how they might address such projects in the future, he had changed the Bureau's position on the proposed free-standing signage. Commissioner O'Toole agreed and noted that claiming iconography was exempt from the Zoning Code would establish a significant loophole in the regulations.

Commissioner Reed stated that she concurred with Commissioner O'Toole's perspective but also stated that she agreed with removing the condition limiting the free-standing sign to 25 square feet.

Commissioner McKissick asked if there was anybody for or against the project. There were no comments or questions from the public.

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Canamucio seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Additional Conditions; the additional condition was that Condition #1 from the case report be rescinded. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

4. Street Vacation Application for 1610 North 4th Street, in the block bounded by Clinton Street, North 4th Street, Harris Street, and Logan Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Chris Bryce with Midtown Redevelopment, LLC, on behalf of Harrisburg Redevelopment Authority (owner), to vacate various rights-of-way (grocer's alleys) in order to effectuate the consolidation and development on the block.

The case was represented by Matt Long with Midtown Redevelopment, LLC (the project developer); 2901 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110; and Dan Wise with RJ Fisher Engineering (the project engineers), 1546 Bridge Street, New Cumberland, PA 17070 (aka "the Applicants").

Mr. Knight noted that the final two cases were related, and recommended that the commissioners review both applications concurrently; Commissioner McKissick concurred. Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. If required by utility providers, the Applicant will execute easement agreements with those providers to allow access to and maintenance of existing infrastructure running through or along the rights-of-way or will have such infrastructure formally abandoned.
2. The Applicant will hold at least two community outreach sessions for the proposed street vacations, as outlined in Chapter 9-117.4(f) of the Harrisburg City Code, and will provide documentation regarding notification and attendance of the meetings.

Commissioner McKissick stated that they would address the cases in order, and would start with a review of the street vacation; he asked the Applicants if they had any comments or questions regarding the Planning Bureau's case report regarding the Street Vacation review. They stated that they had not questions or comments and agreed with the conditions.

Commissioner McKissick asked the Applicants if they had any comments or questions regarding the Planning Bureau's case report regarding the Lot Consolidation & Land Development Plan review. They noted that they had discussed the proposed façade treatments on the building with the Planning Bureau, and had revised the proposed façade treatments; they provided the commissioners and City staff with updated renderings of the building.

Commissioner McKissick inquired as to the changes in the updated renderings. Mr. Knight noted that in the previous iteration, there were "boxes" enclosing the windows on the North 4th Street and Clinton Street sides of the building, and the updates reflected a consistent treatment across the entire façade.

Commissioner Canamucio stated that he had no questions.

Commissioner Reed stated that she had no questions.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that he had no questions.

Commissioner Marek asked whether they were just addressing the Street Vacation aspect of the project; Commissioner McKissick confirmed they were discussing both aspects of the proposal and the Applicants stated that they had discussed the façade treatment to address the condition in the Planning Bureau's case report.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he thought it was a good project, and echoed the Planning Bureau's concerns regarding the appearance of the façade, particularly its integration into the streetscape and urban design of the surrounding community. He stated that he appreciated the renderings provided by the Applicants because it helped the commissioners to better understand the impact of the project at street level.

Commissioner McKissick asked if there was anybody for or against the project. There were no comments or questions from the public.

Commissioner McKissick asked if there were any final questions or comments from the commissioners regarding the project; there were none.

Commissioner Reed moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

5. Preliminary/Final Lot Consolidation & Land Development Plan Application for 1610 North 4th Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Chris Bryce with Midtown Redevelopment, LLC, on behalf of Harrisburg Redevelopment Authority (owner), to consolidate the existing lots on site to establish a four-story, 36-unit senior apartment building with related site improvements.

The case was represented by Matt Long with Midtown Redevelopment, LLC (the project developer); 2901 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110; and Dan Wise with RJ Fisher

Engineering (the project engineers), 1546 Bridge Street, New Cumberland, PA 17070 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Applicant will provide a formal photometric plan to confirm consistency with the Environmental Performance Standards in Chapter 7-331 of the Zoning Code.
2. The Applicant will install a varied façade treatment similar to that submitted with the current application documentation.
3. The parking lot curb cuts will be revised to feature driveway access points, as opposed to the current street access designs.
4. The Applicants will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to confirm the appropriate size and location of refuse collection on-site, and update the billing accounts to reflect the new use.
5. The Applicant will coordinate with the City Arborist on the species of trees and the installation of appropriately-sized and -located tree pits.
6. The Planning Bureau recommends that the Applicant consider incorporating community benefits on the properties through which an access walkway will run (332 & 334 Harris Street), such as green stormwater infrastructure catchments or native pollinator plants.

Commissioner McKissick stated that they would address the cases in order, and would start with a review of the street vacation; he asked the Applicants if they had any comments or questions regarding the Planning Bureau’s case report regarding the Street Vacation review. They stated that they had not questions or comments and agreed with the conditions.

Commissioner McKissick asked the Applicants if they had any comments or questions regarding the Planning Bureau’s case report regarding the Lot Consolidation & Land Development Plan review. They noted that they had discussed the proposed façade treatments on the building with the Planning Bureau, and had revised the proposed façade treatments; they provided the commissioners and City staff with updated renderings of the building.

Commissioner McKissick inquired as to the changes in the updated renderings. Mr. Knight noted that in the previous iteration, there were “boxes” enclosing the windows on the North 4th Street and Clinton Street sides of the building, and the updates reflected a consistent treatment across the entire façade.

Commissioner Canamucio stated that he had no questions.

Commissioner Reed stated that she had no questions.

Commissioner O’Toole stated that he had no questions.

Commissioner Marek asked whether they were just addressing the Street Vacation aspect of the project; Commissioner McKissick confirmed they were discussing both aspects of the proposal and the Applicants stated that they had discussed the façade treatment to address the condition in the Planning Bureau’s case report.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he thought it was a good project, and echoed the Planning Bureau's concerns regarding the appearance of the façade, particularly its integration into the streetscape and urban design of the surrounding community. He stated that he appreciated the renderings provided by the Applicants because it helped the commissioners to better understand the impact of the project at street level.

Commissioner McKissick asked if there was anybody for or against the project. There were no comments or questions from the public.

Commissioner McKissick asked if there were any final questions or comments from the commissioners regarding the project; there were none.

Commissioner Canamucio moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff & Additional Conditions; the additional condition was that the Applicant would receive City Council approval of the associated Street Vacation application. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

Commissioner McKissick asked whether there was anything else to discuss.

Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau's case reports had incorporated a section with references to the Comprehensive Plan; he stated it would likely only be incorporated into reviews of Land Development Plans and more intensive zoning relief requests, such as for the project at 320 Reily Street, to demonstrate that the Plan was being incorporated into the Bureau's reviews and documentation on a daily basis.

Mr. Knight also noted that the Planning Bureau was working to finalize Comprehensive Plan story maps to post to the Bureau's webpage. He noted that the Bureau had been making good progress until Mack Breech's departure, which would impact the project completion date, but noted that with a new GIS Administrator, they would hopefully be able to have a beta version available for Planning Commission review sometime in Spring 2024.

Commissioner McKissick asked when the Comprehensive Plan was finally adopted; Mr. Knight stated that City Council had granted final approval of the document in November 2021. Commissioner McKissick noted that the process had begun in 2014; Mr. Knight confirmed that the Steering Committee had been assembled at that time and a Request for Expressions of Interest circulated.

Mr. Knight noted that the current document was easier to review, update, and modify in its current format than the former document from 1974; he noted that the current Comprehensive Plan could be reviewed on a regular basis, with some goals, objectives, and action items being added, modified, or removed as conditions in the city warranted. He noted that the Planning Bureau had developed documentation to help track progress towards the goals and objectives of the Plan, which would be circulated internally within the City to solicit input from different departments on the progress they had made towards the recommendations of the plan. Mr.

Knight stated that he hoped this effort would better identify areas where progress had been made and potential areas for improvement.

Commissioner McKissick noted that in his professional capacity, he was engaged with several different planning commissions and planning bureaus, some of which would present annual progress reports to their board. Mr. Knight confirmed that the current effort would result in an annual report to be presented to the commissioners at the end of the year; he noted that there were over 500 goals, objectives, and action items throughout the plan, and that the current effort would allow the Bureau to provide a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the progress. Commissioner McKissick agreed and noted that the Plan was intended to be a living document.

Commissioner Canamucio asked whether, given the capacity constraints in the Bureau, there was anything the commissioners could do to help out Planning Bureau staff. Mr. Knight noted that it would be helpful if the Planning Commission was able to go to digital packet delivery, as it would save time in the compilation and delivery of hard copy packets. Commissioner McKissick concurred, but asked whether the City and Planning Commission had the ability to fully utilize the potential and capabilities of digital documentation. Mr. Knight noted that the City Council Chambers were upgraded with new equipment in 2023, including large screen TVs on which documentation could be projected. He also noted that it would provide environmental benefits.

Commissioner McKissick asked how the commissioners could utilize that technology as well. Mr. Knight stated that he had not determined how to utilize the new AV technology on his end and that he intended to work with the IT and Communications Departments to figure out how to run presentations on the video screens. Commissioner Marek asked whether the commissioners would be able to control the presentations themselves; Mr. Knight stated that he wasn't sure.

Commissioner Marek also asked how the commissioners would be able to access the digital files themselves during the meeting. Mr. Knight stated that he envisioned starting with simple Powerpoint presentations focused mainly on project visuals as opposed to being text heavy. He stated that he could create slideshows based on the images provided in the digital packets online so that the public had the same information as the commissioners, applicants, and City staff. He stated that he was not sure whether the commissioners would also be able to

Commissioner Marek asked whether that would increase the Planning Bureau's administrative burden; she stated that she didn't want to propose changes that would increase the Planning Bureau's workload. Mr. Knight stated that it would not require a significant of additional work and that if that became an issue, he could just ensure that a rendering of the project, floor plans, or existing conditions could be shown on the screens.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he didn't want to end up printing our large-scale plans at home; Commissioner Marek agreed and noted that she didn't have that capability. Mr. Knight stated that he could distribute packets digitally before the meeting, and then bring hard copy packets to the meeting for commissioners, which is the process he used for the HARB meetings.

Commissioner McKissick noted that in his professional capacity, he worked with a lot of school boards, and many used Board Docs, a system that allowed them to control the graphics on

screens from an iPad or Chromebook. He suggested that the City could provide iPads or tablets to the members of the various boards for use during meetings. Commissioner Marek stated that they could be shared amongst the members of all the boards.

Commissioner Canamucio noted that the hyperlinked agendas were posted to the Planning Bureau's webpage ahead of meetings and packets could be accessed in that manner. He noted that he used his own laptop at the previous meeting and felt comfortable viewing documents digitally.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:29 PM

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).