



## ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

### MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 29, 2015

**ART Members and Designees:** Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; and Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer.

**Other Staff:** Marie Downie, Planner I; Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Katie Dodaro, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** Laura Timberlake, Big Sandy Superstores; and Logan Dilts, DaNite Sign Company (Case 1); James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 2); Jack and Eula Price, Joe Nichols and Donna Shaw, Dublin Barbershop (Case 3); Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; and Joell Angel Chumbly, Kolar Design (Cases 4 & 5); Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 4, 5 & 6) and Michael Burmeister and Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors (Case 6).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 22, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

#### DETERMINATIONS

1. **BSD SCN – Big Sandy Superstore – Signs** **6825 Dublin Center Drive**  
**15-090MSP** **Master Sign Plan**

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for the installation of one primary and two secondary entrance signs to be coordinated with proposed façade and site renovations. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Shelly presented the site and briefly touched on the site improvements already approved. She reported that the applicant has met with a local artist to design and fabricate benches to flank the main entry and for bollards to define all three entries adding visual interest to the sidewalk.

Laura Timberlake, Big Sandy Superstore, said the applicant met with the artist today to add lighting to the bollards.

Ms. Shelly indicated the applicant has demonstrated a willingness to meet the requirements of the BSD Code even in areas where the Code is not applicable, specifically with regards to façade improvements and walkability (open space and public art). She said the artistic elements are a good addition to the future streetscape as envisioned by the City for this area of the BSD.

Ms. Shelly presented the proposed sign locations and the previous sign options, all of which are on the front facade. She explained that the original proposal was for a primary sign on a metal frame and the two secondary signs on metal frames with the letters on the curved arc. She described the signs with individual internally illuminated channel letters with white faces and red trim on a charcoal gray painted back plate. She said the second proposal included brushed aluminum boxes with routed letters that were back-lit with additional brushed aluminum cut-out sculptures to be hung 12 feet behind the glass window

in the atrium space. She also presented the corporate standard sign size for comparison to the current submittal of trademark, text, and fonts with metal-cut furniture pieces to be pinned to the wall behind the glass.

Ms. Shelly restated the proposal includes: one wall sign over the main entrance in the middle of the building and two secondary wall signs for the entries on either side of the main entry. She said Code permits one wall sign per street frontage or one sign facing an off-street parking area, therefore, a Master Sign Plan is required. She illustrated the detail:

Size Permitted

**50** square feet - maximum ( $\frac{1}{2}$ -square-foot per lineal foot of storefront width)

Size Proposed

- Primary sign  
**472** square feet on 160 linear feet
- Secondary sign (left)  
**148** square feet on 140 linear feet
- Secondary sign (right)  
**135** square feet on 124 linear feet

Ms. Shelly said this is a single tenant building in the BSD Sawmill Neighborhood Center and BSD Code for a Large Format Commercial Building type requires 1 entry per 75 lineal feet and 1 sign per entry.

Ms. Shelly demonstrated the scale for a 50-square-foot wall sign on a building of this size and compared it to the proposed primary entrance sign at 472 square feet. She also demonstrated the scale for a 50-square-foot wall sign for each of the secondary entrances as opposed to the proposed 148-square-foot sign (west) and 135-square-foot sign (east).

Ms. Shelly said Code permits signs at a maximum height of 15 feet. She said the two secondary entrance signs meet this requirement, but a height of 20 feet is requested for the primary entrance sign.

Ms. Shelly said Code permits three colors, which the applicant is proposing in white, red, and blue. She said the portions of the sign to receive the halo treatment will be placed on a gray back plate, which can be considered a neutral color because the Code does not regulate the back plate color.

Ms. Shelly said Code permits a maximum depth of 14 inches from the face of the structure to which it is attached. She explained the "Big Sandy" text of the primary entrance sign will be mounted to the atrium structure with 0" depth. She said the text "Superstore" will project a maximum of four feet, six inches to be curved around the front of the canopy. Similarly, she said the secondary entrance signs are attached to a canopy that will arc at a maximum of four feet, six inches. She indicated this achieves more of the three-dimensional aspect desired. She said channel letters will be used on all of the signs that will be internally illuminated (LED). She noted "Big Sandy" is red; "Superstore" will be open channel with a double blue LED rope; the moon shape is white to be lit with a back-lit halo; "Sleep Solutions" is white with white; the "ampersand" is white to be lit with a back-lit halo; and "HDTVs Appliances" is white. She concluded her description by presenting the installation detail for each of the signs. In summary, she compared the BSD Code requirements to the latest proposal, highlighting the items that deviate from the Code.

Ms. Shelly reported the Administrative Review Team reviews Master Sign Plan applications based on the intent and purpose outlined in the Code, as follows:

- a) Allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display.
- b) Ensure sign work is in a coordinated fashion to meet the general intent of signs in the District.
- c) Not intended to permit larger signs, more visible signs, or additional signs than permitted, without any consideration for unique sign design and display.

Ms. Shelly said the ART has allowed flexibility for the creativity of the signs that has been generated from Staff discussions, but Planning is concerned with the sizes proposed. As a result, she said a reduction has been requested for the corporate brand text proposal.

Ms. Timberlake indicated she understands the ART's request for reduction in size, but asked if the applicant could still propose the desired size to the PZC. Vince Papsidero said the applicant could present any iteration of the sign to the PZC, despite the ART's recommendations.

Ms. Shelly again presented comparisons illustrating a 50% size reduction and how a 50-square-foot sign appears on a building of this size to meet Code regulations.

Ms. Timberlake noted that the applicant has other stores that are smaller, but have bigger signs. She said as a result of meeting with Staff, she likes what has been derived, prompting the applicant to "think outside the box". She indicated the company intends to use this new design going forward with other stores.

Mr. Papsidero indicated some of these variations may be permitted over time in the BSD. He said his concern was how to get approval for this applicant.

Ms. Timberlake said she was curious as to how signs are judged "to be integrated architecturally" when signs sizes which are substantially outside of the guidelines allowances are disallowed. She said proportionality from the architectural perspective should be considered. She indicated the size limits did not make sense to her.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the size of the Lowe's sign in Dublin. Claudia Husak answered that sign is 78 square feet in size, which meets the requirement of 80 square feet. She said Giant Eagle is another that has a large sign in the low 100's, but it is a much larger building. She indicated the fear is that Lowe's and other businesses will come back requesting larger signs.

Mr. Tyler said the outcome of this case will set precedents.

Ms. Timberlake asked the ART how to best proceed.

Mr. Papsidero pointed out that the applicant has made a good faith effort to meet the intentions of the character desired in the BSD.

Ms. Husak encouraged the applicant to go to the PZC informally and ask for exactly what they want, with a 50% reduction and show how they are struggling. She added the applicant could then return to the PZC in December after obtaining the PZC's feedback at the November meeting. She said the ART would make a recommendation to the PZC in December.

Mr. Papsidero inquired about the square footage of the signs originally submitted and encouraged the applicant to again illustrate those examples. Ms. Shelly confirmed the primary sign was 80 square feet, the one secondary sign (left) was 46 square feet and the other secondary sign (right) was 51 square feet.

Mr. Tyler indicated that the height at which the primary sign will be installed will be an issue.

Ms. Timberlake said the applicant would like to meet with the PZC informally on November 5<sup>th</sup>, presenting the original submission, the revised, and the 50% reduction limit as the ART has suggested today and then show them what is standard for a typical Big Sandy store. She indicated they would then have a better idea as to how to move forward.

Logan Dilts, DaNite Sign Company, said a 50% reduction may be doable from a fabrication standpoint, but the letters on the secondary signs will only be nine inches tall and will be tough to see.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to consider proportions and scale while playing with the reduction. He noted the original graphic worked proportionally.

Ms. Husak asked the applicant to explain their comment about the visibility of the smaller sized signs. She asked at what distance the sign would become not visible.

Ms. Timberlake explained that part of their consideration for the scale of their building improvements and signs are due to the proposed extension of John Shields Parkway, which will still be a far distance from their building, across the oversized parking lot. She said there are no other locations where their signs would be visible so the applicant wants their sign scaled for when the Sawmill Neighborhood Center is built out. She added that ground signs are restrictive due to their shared control status and therefore not worth pursuing. She indicated there are existing signs in the center that are not meeting Code regulations. She emphasized that signs over the three entrances are their primary concern and incredibly important. She said the applicant is trying to "Dublinize" their design, but they do not want to lose their brand's identity. She said out of all the options, sticking with their brand is preferable.

Rachel Ray said from the Economic Development Department's standpoint, they understand and support the importance of keeping the sign consistent with the company's logo and branding.

Jennifer Rauch said there has to be some flexibility in meeting Dublin's regulations.

Ms. Shelly recommended that a determination be postponed and this meeting considered another Case Review, using the Planning Report as analysis. The applicant agreed and said that the next step should be to go before the PZC informally before returning to ART for a recommendation to the PZC.

Ms. Husak encouraged the applicant to prepare for PZC by outlining the merits for each of the options being considered. She said discussion questions would be posed to the PZC to guide the informal discussion.

Mr. Tyler indicated the ART is struggling with this MSP because the proposals could be considered appropriate due to the massing of the building even though the requests go beyond the Code and the decisions the PZC has made in the past. However, this proposal goes well beyond the past sign approvals by the PCZ with respect to size and height, which brings into question whether approving the signs would set an inappropriate precedent.

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park East – A Block – Mass Excavation  
15-104MPR**

**6500 Riverside Drive  
Minor Project Review**

Marie Downie said this is a request for site modifications including grading and excavation to prepare for future development at the northeast corner of Riverside Drive and W. Dublin Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Downie reported that the proposal remains relatively the same as the updates have not been substantial.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the permit plans demonstrates compliance with the requirements of the Ohio EPA and Section 53.300 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances regarding erosion and sediment control;
- 2) That the applicant obtains all required permits prior to beginning work, including but not limited to a Mass Excavation permit, Demolition Permit, and any other approvals from the Ohio EPA required to perform this work;
- 3) That the applicant and applicable contractors attends a preconstruction meeting with City Staff prior to beginning any earth moving work; and
- 4) That the applicant works with Engineering to address the remaining issues as outlined in this report.

Aaron Stanford explained in more detail the expectations from Engineering.

Vince Papsidero asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He asked the applicant if he approved of the conditions listed.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, approved of the four conditions.

Mr. Papsidero confirmed the ART approved the Minor Project Review with four conditions.

## **INTRODUCTION**

**3. BSD HC – Dublin Barbershop - Windows  
15-105ARB-MPR**

**24 South High Street  
Minor Project Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for architectural modifications to the windows and shutters of an existing commercial building on the east side of S. High Street, between Bridge Street and Spring Hill. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.062(H) and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented the site, noting it is on the National Register. She explained the existing windows replaced the original windows. She said the proposal includes replacement of the two lower level windows and the upper level set on the front elevation, and the window on the lower level on the south elevation. She said the existing aluminum and vinyl windows are proposed to be replaced with vinyl windows and the window panes will be divided differently than the existing windows. She said the

*Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* recommend the use of wood windows for historic structures. She asked for feedback from ART regarding this recommendation.

Jeff Tyler indicated the past remodeling and change of window materials has compromised the historical integrity of the structure. He said if the windows were replaced with the same size, he would not be opposed to the use of vinyl windows.

Donna Goss confirmed the replacement windows will honor the size of the original window opening.

Joe Nichols confirmed the new windows will be the same size as the existing windows but will be designed with fewer panes, which is closer to what would be expected for this historical structure. He described the existing lower windows as an aluminum 60s style and the upper windows as a white vinyl window. He said the replacements will be a brown vinyl; the exterior is a dark bronze and the grills from the side profile will appear as a wood clad window. He said the existing shutters do not match the window openings and are not of high quality, which is why he is requesting to replace them.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the shutters would be vinyl. Mr. Nichols explained the shutters are a custom width scaled appropriately to the window opening in a high quality vinyl with faux hardware.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is considering changing the color scheme of the building in the future and want to ensure the new windows and shutters will coordinate with that color scheme in the long term.

Ms. Rauch suggested the applicant return November 12<sup>th</sup> for a recommendation from the ART to the ARB for the meeting on November 17, 2015.

## **CASE REVIEW**

### **4. BSD SRN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B&C 15-099MSP**

### **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Master Sign Plan**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new 8.2-acre mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the intersection with Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak presented parts of the Crawford Hoying MSP submittal. She asked the applicant to integrate the following changes in a revised submission:

- Clarify text and graphics.
- Create ways to insert and expand this document so all the information can be included in one document going forward.
- Expand the introduction for the MSP and note the intentions after.
- Continually note the process for permitting as signs come forward.
- Provide examples on the same page that sign types are described.
- Create generic drawings.
- Create an example for each building and show how it is measured - height from grade level is measured to the top of the sign.
- Include the information of the variances and deviations from the Code in the footnotes.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked if the look should be similar to the BSD Sign Guidelines. Ms. Husak answered affirmatively.

Vince Papsidero said the current MSP was a broad view from the ART's perspective and asked that the applicant make it as clear and tight as they can for easy evaluations for any reviewing body.

Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant to provide an explanation of the methodology of measuring three-dimensional signs like the 'copper pots' sign/sculpture example in the plan. He said measurements should be determined as it fits into a box or rectangle and to state the widest part of the sign/sculpture. He emphasized that how objects are measured needs to be clear.

Jeff Tyler suggested that the applicant provide a clear understanding of the MSP keeping the end-user in mind. He said this could include sign fabricators, reviewing bodies, or future applicants.

Joell Angel Chumbly, Kolar Design, said the applicant started with the BSD Code for meeting requirements but explained there are a lot of variables.

Ms. Husak referred to the chart in Crawford Hoying's MSP regarding streetscape elements and asked why it is part of the MSP. She said kiosks will be part of the city-wide approach to wayfinding signs. She encouraged the applicant to remove the table, chairs, and patio amenities. She explained patio umbrellas would only need to be included in a MSP if a tenant is requesting signs printed on the umbrellas.

Ms. Chumbly said the three pedestrian kiosks are installed for urban spaces in the BSD, which were included in this sign package but she said they can be removed. She said the applicant is also working with the City on other locations. She described the kiosks as modular systems in the same basic structure for all of the BSD under one mapping system. She explained there would be a temporary panel in place until a full system was in place. She said then the universal map would be owned by the City, used city-wide, and updated by the City.

Mr. Papsidero asked if a permit applies to the kiosks.

Ms. Chumbly said they would be placed on private property and not in the right-of-way.

Mr. Papsidero asked how the program would be regulated and if it would fall under the PZC's purview. Mr. Starr responded on-site approval, originally.

Mr. Papsidero said the kiosk cannot be commercial and used for tenant advertising.

Donna Goss said the kiosks serve more like a directory.

Mr. Tyler indicated the kiosks would be similar to the use in the Historic District of Dublin from a graphic standpoint.

Ms. Chumbly said the pedestrian kiosks will have a LED edge and that the applicant is working with EMH&T to get the right electric installed originally. She indicated this is part of the CIP package. Mr. Papsidero said he would clarify that.

Ms. Husak questioned allowances for the number of signs for tenant spaces that front along three streets.

Jennifer Rauch asked why window signs are not counted as one of the tenant signs. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said that is true for both sides of the river. Ms. Rauch asked the ART if they were okay with that.

Mr. Papsidero said window sign descriptions had to be better defined in the MSP if they were going to be more for decoration than advertising. He asked if it could be a graphic.

Ms. Chumbly said the window signs would be connected to the brand. She asked if examples needed to be added to the MSP.

Ms. Rauch said all pieces should be brought together.

Ms. Husak said the allowance is 40% so it is possible the applicant could have more.

Mr. Tyler asked if there was going to be a difference between the two environments.

Ms. Husak asked why residential buildings are not contemplated as having identifiers. Mr. Hunter replied the residential building will be identified by address.

Mr. Starr said the addresses will be placed on the canopies located at the lobby entrances.

Ms. Chumbly said this is to achieve more neighborhood integration at the pedestrian level.

Mr. Starr added this is how they will market each building.

Mr. Hunter explained they did not want to give names to the buildings. He said people want to live in Bridge Park, not at the "Carlisle at Bridge Park in the Bridge Street District". He said it will make sense down on the ground.

Ms. Chumbly said the purpose is to guide people to the garages and then once they are walking, they will discover different places from the pedestrian level.

Mr. Tyler emphasized the need for signs to be large enough for the Fire Department to find. Alan Perkins added the minimum height is four inches.

Ms. Chumbly said the heights are 18 inches.

Sign size for scale purposes was discussed.

Ms. Husak indicated allowances could be made for a major tenant or an anchor tenant. Mr. Hunter said those tenants would be easy to identify by quantifying the square footage.

Ms. Chumbly referred back to the pots/pans projection sign. She noted the distance from the building and said it could be considered a sculpture rather than a sign. She said these types of installations would be determined by what feels right for the building as a placemaking element.

Mr. Papsidero agreed that if it was not defined as a sign but as a public art installation of an object it would require a permit. He said 80 square feet limits creativity.

Mr. Starr referred to the "bikes on the wall" example in the BSD Sign Guidelines and said it was an example larger than 80 square feet.

Ms. Chumbly indicated she would like to conduct more research. She asked if maybe the applicant could be given a range to stay within and base the size on the appropriateness of the structure. She suggested

a range such as 100 - 120 square feet may be more appropriate so the applicant would not have to come back each time.

Mr. Hunter said 100 – 140 square feet would be a really good idea.

Signs for parking garages were discussed.

Ms. Husak concluded that the applicant should send a mark-up of the changes requested to her and Staff will return their feedback to review. To allow time for this exchange of changes, she said the applicant would not have to return to the ART next week. She recommended the applicant return to the ART for Case Reviews on November 12<sup>th</sup> and plan on the ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 19<sup>th</sup> for the PZC meeting on December 3, 2015.

**5. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West  
15-100ARB/MSP**

**94-100 North High Street  
Master Sign Plan**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new mixed-use development on the east side of North High Street, approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said she had the same comments that Ms. Husak had on the 15-099MSP Bridge Park East, Blocks B&C case.

Ms. Rauch noted the submitted MSP does not permit internally illuminated signs. She said Code permits internally illuminated and halo-lit signs and asked the applicant if they were limiting themselves. The applicants said they just wanted the "P" illuminated as a projecting sign for parking. Ms. Chumbly said halo illumination is desired.

Vince Papsidero said the applicant needs to produce examples that fit their desires with graphics to match.

Ms. Chumbly requested illumination be discussed further with the applicant.

Ms. Rauch asked the applicants to clarify when and where signs are permitted for tenants with corner frontage. She said she wants to the document to be clear as to what is defined as "corner frontage". She asked that the graphics demonstrate the allowances as well. Mr. Starr agreed to clarify.

Ms. Rauch noted there are graphics for projecting signs on the upper levels that are not listed in the table. She encouraged the applicant not to limit themselves and to be very clear about what is permitted in the MSP. She said the tenants they are lining up now for the various spaces might change later.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, suggested being as flexible as possible.

Ms. Rauch questioned why some numbers and sizes differ while others are similar - projecting signs appear to be in line with the Code but the window signs and wall signs are permitted to be larger than Code permits. Ms. Chumbly answered various factors were considered: Code, scale of façade, architectural scale, and the distance the building was set back from the frontage. She asked if this was the right direction to which Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively.

Ms. Rauch said the Master Sign Plan document could default to the Code if something is not covered in the MSP, but cautioned the applicant that if the Code changes, what is permitted now may become more restrictive.

Mr. Starr requested the timing of proceedings so the applicant could go before the ARB on December 16, 2015. Ms. Rauch suggested the applicant bring revisions to the ART on November 12<sup>th</sup> so the MSPs for both the east and west developments could be reviewed together for consistency.

**6. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West  
15-102ARB/MPR**

**94-100 North High Street  
Minor Project Review/ Waivers**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for modifications and Waivers to the approved Bridge Park West development on the east side of North High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said the major issues were briefly discussed last week including:

- Changes to the cornice or “eyebrow” detail on the Apartment Building
- Bio swale design change
- Balconies depth/width change
- Vertical material transitions on balconies at the inside corners
- Parapet height exceeding six feet
- Utility transformer enclosure required to be brick or stone but a creative alternative was proposed
- Percentage of primary materials on the side elevations of the Historic Mixed-Use Building

Ms. Rauch said the proposed eyebrow detail meets the Code but her concern was the change to the aesthetics of the building.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, said the request to change the “eyebrow” feature size to be decreased is a result of constructability. He said they have looked at many options and have not found a solution to build the cornice as large as it was shown originally. He said he is confident they can build and maintain a smaller cornice but it differs from what the ARB approved.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the visibility of the railing on the roof. Mr. Sebach explained the purpose of the railing was not to screen mechanicals but to provide a railing to the outdoor patio space attached to the upper penthouse level.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the railing has always been there; it was not as prominent when the cornice was larger.

Ms. Rauch noted changes have been made to the basin. She presented the new design.

Mr. Sebach explained the reason for the change was due to bedrock location and as a result they moved the stormwater treatment to the north end of the site. He said a significant amount of water seeps out of the rock wall on the south end and trails out into the dry bed.

Aaron Stanford said the stormwater will be re-routed through an outlet on the north side of the building to Indian Run. He said they will continue to work with the applicant on this change. He said the applicant will need to create a long-term plan because the location of the future pedestrian path along the Indian

Run is located in the area where the stormwater is being re-routed on the north side. He suggested the applicant have a conversation with Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation to discuss the path and locate the stormwater outlet appropriately. He said if Parks and Recreation is comfortable with the proposed plan, the applicant can work through the issues during permitting.

Mr. Sebach said the new design for the utility transformer enclosure is a playful design, which is preferable to the previous brick box.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He stated the ART's recommendation to the ARB is scheduled for November 12<sup>th</sup> for the ARB meeting on November 17, 2015.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.]

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 3:50 pm.