



**Land Use and Long
Range Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 19, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; and Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer.

Other Staff: Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jenny Rauch, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Tammy Noble-Flading, Senior Planner; Marie Downie, Planner I; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Michael Cox, DaNite Sign Co. (Case 1); Matt Stavroff and Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests; Adam Welker, Ford and Associates Architects; and Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC (Case 2); Vern Hoying (Case 3) and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 3, 4 & 5); and Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors (Cases 3 & 4); Melissa Spires, OHM Advisors (Case 4); and Miguel Gonzales and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan; and Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T (Case 3 & 5).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the March 12, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

**1. BSD Indian Run Neighborhood District – OCLC – Sign
15-021MPR**

**6565 Kilgour Place
Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for replacement of an existing corporate office sign facing I-270 with a new 184-square-foot sign. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said the applicant is requesting to replace the existing wall sign comprised of green channel letters with a new wall sign with white channel letters with black aluminum returns. She stated the lettering reads "OCLC" with a white logo. She presented both the existing sign and the proposed sign for comparison.

Ms. Ray stated the proposed sign is classified as a "Corporate Office Signs along Interstate District" and meets the applicable zoning regulations for sign size, number, location, height, and colors.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for this Minor Project with no conditions.

Steve Langworthy asked the applicant if there was anything he wished to add. The applicant had no further questions. Mr. Langworthy then asked the ART if there were any questions or comments. Dave Marshall said he discussed the Minor Project Review process with the applicant prior to this meeting. No other comments were made.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's approval of this Minor Project with no conditions.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

2. BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Goodwill Building Site and Architectural Modifications

6655-6665 Sawmill Road

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a pre-application review for site and architectural modifications for an existing site within the Bridge Street District prior to the submission of a Minor Project.

Ms. Rauch presented the existing Goodwill building site and noted the parking. She said the applicant is requesting feedback on the proposed modifications from the ART.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is proposing site plan and landscape modifications including additional parking spaces along the Village Parkway frontage; a patio along Village Parkway; and sign and architectural modifications, such as changing the roof material and changing portions of the façade to brick and incorporating more glass. She explained that additional signs are proposed for the east elevation that faces Sawmill Road.

Ms. Rauch said Staff reviewed the proposal and provided feedback to the applicant prior to this meeting. She reported one of the concerns Staff had is the request to remove street trees that are in good condition so the applicant can attain better visibility for their building and provide additional parking spaces along Village Parkway. She said Staff would support decreasing the height of the mound along Sawmill Road, but the existing street trees will have to remain and be protected. She noted that Planning recommends the inclusion of only the four of the eight parking spaces proposed along the southern edge of the parking area in front of the building along Village Parkway. She said this would require a Waiver as they do not meet Code for parking location but only one street tree would have to be removed.

Ms. Rauch indicated Staff would support the conversion of the southernmost landscape island in the parking area to add two parking spaces while leaving a 22-foot-wide drive aisle. She added the center concrete slab in the middle of the parking area could be used to replace the southern landscape island to maintain the requirements for internal parking lot landscaping

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, said the applicant submitted information about the proposal, and although Staff originally had 15 issues, they have since narrowed them down to three. He explained the applicant tried to meet everything in the Code that they could. He said he is requesting direction from the ART for the final three issues:

1. Landscaping – He said the applicant proposed a hedgerow and removal of four trees along Village Parkway. He explained the building cannot be seen from the roadway because of the trees, and the applicant would need to remove the trees to attract the right tenants. He asked if the request for tree removal can be achieved by requesting a Waiver. He said the applicant proposed to add landscaping around the patio; they are trying to enhance the site's landscaping, not just take it away.
2. Parking – He said since the applicant has to now adhere to the BSD Code, they are requesting a compromise by only requesting four parking spaces instead of the eight originally requested. He said the intent for the building is to attract smaller users/tenants. He noted the whole front façade was being designed to allow for that. He reported there are only 55 spaces in the front parking lot; most of the parking is in the back. He said if the applicant cannot get the parking they will not succeed in attracting the users/tenants desired and will not be able to lease to tenants because of the parking problem.

3. Signs – He said the Goodwill sign exceeds the BSD Code requirements for signs. He said the wall signs shown on the elevations are 40 square feet but per the Code, the applicant would only be allowed a 20-square-foot wall sign. He said a wall sign that small would not be visible from Sawmill Road. He asked if a compromise could be reached at a 30-square-foot wall sign for example. He emphasized the need for appropriate signs and inquired about ground signs.

Matt Stavroff, Stavroff Interests, reiterated that they are trying to meet Code but are getting pressure from their intended tenants from Los Angeles. He reported the tenants are telling the applicant what they need in order to occupy this space. He asked the ART if they could compromise to obtain a better building with vibrant tenants. He said with the opportunity to attract just mid-range tenants, renovation would not be needed.

Mr. Stavroff asked if trimming the trees could be an option as opposed to tree removal. He explained the renovations relate to functionality and signs are an issue. He indicated they are not the only business in this area with an issue with signs and asked if the sign sizes shown on the proposed elevations were offensive to the ART.

Mr. Stavroff said parking is bad on properties along Sawmill Road. He reported that they own the Rite Rug building, which has low parking needs, and they may be able to share parking with that site.

Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC, said he understands the requirement to abide by the BSD Code but the center has been failing, and maybe the changes the applicant is requesting could reverse that trend.

As the pre-applications stands, Steve Langworthy said a Waiver would need to be requested for the proposed parking location, and a Master Sign Plan would be necessary to request a larger sign in which all the signs in the proposal could be addressed. He inquired about landscaping and the request to remove the islands; the sidewalk along the south side of the building that appeared to run into the patio area; and the width of the drive aisle between the building and the rear parking area.

Mr. McCauley confirmed the sidewalk would be continuous and next to the building.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the patio was intended to accommodate adult beverage consumption. Mr. McCauley replied that was not the intention at this time.

Gary Gunderman requested clarification on the various signs.

Mr. McCauley said they are considering monument signs, which they understand are permitted by the Code, and would like a multi-tenant sign out front and one on the corner as the Dublin Village Center sign sometime in the future. He said the monument signs can be three feet by eight feet and would need signs for individual tenants as well.

Mr. Stavroff said perhaps if the monument signs were bigger they might not need to request the larger size for the wall signs.

Mr. Langworthy suggested that the monument signs be requested as part of a Master Sign Plan.

Jeff Tyler confirmed that the BSD Code applies to this site. He stated the site, signs, landscaping, and other related site and building requirements must meet the requirements of this district. He said this allows for an opportunity for a Master Sign Plan to deal with the sign issues.

Mr. McCauley stated the applicant is willing to submit a Master Sign Plan but questioned the exercise if the ART would not support the request.

Mr. Langworthy said the sign size objective of the BSD Code is to result in pedestrian scaled signs, but since this center has been set back so far from the road, the requests for larger wall signs could be entertained.

Ms. Rauch recommended the applicant demonstrate that the larger signs would result in signs that are more architecturally integrated to help make their case.

Joanne Shelly asked if there would be six tenants occupying this building, which would affect the parking. Mr. McCauley answered the applicant has four tenants currently but they have the space for five. He said he thought six tenants would be too tight; even with the sixth tenant in the rear of the building.

Laura Ball said she will visit the site to inspect the trees and would confer with the City's Arborist. She said proper tree trimming can really enhance a site. She indicated the issue was that the façade was outdated; the trees were not the problem.

Mr. McCauley said the three trees they are proposing to remove are the fullest. Ms. Ball reiterated that trees add value to a property and a qualified arborist could trim the trees for the desired effect.

Mr. Stavroff said a compromise needed to be reached as his tenants want the trees removed. He indicated the trees on Village Parkway are short and stout and the tree issue could break this deal.

Ms. Shelly recommended the applicant show at street level how the trees block visibility. She said at the intersection, which would be the decision point for people deciding whether to go to the site, the DVC clock tower sign blocks the visibility to the center more than the trees. She explained the more times people drive by and see these businesses, the more they will be present in their minds to trigger a future visit anyway.

Mr. Stavroff agreed, however the perception as it stands is there is a forest on the site.

Mr. Langworthy said Planning was not in favor of the eight parking spaces on Village Parkway or removing trees. He said two Waivers would need to be requested for the interior landscape island and the parking in the front, as well as a Master Sign Plan. He explained one interior parking island conforms to Code and suggested replacing one with another; if both are removed, a Waiver would be needed.

Aaron Stanford inquired if there was a dumpster located at the back end of the building. Mr. McCauley said it was behind an enclosure.

Mr. Underhill clarified if the applicant would submit a Master Sign Plan and request two Waivers that the Planning and Zoning Commission would be the reviewing body, otherwise the application would stay at the ART level.

Mr. Stavroff asked if he heard the ART was against the parking plan proposed, removal of street trees, but sympathetic to the signs proposed even after the applicant's comments/arguments for these requests as a way to attract the most exciting users/tenants for this site.

Mr. Tyler said the ART has given their feedback and only if the applicant does not agree with the ART would they need to proceed further with the Waiver requests and Master Sign Plan, as this is otherwise an application for a Minor Project.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or comments with regard to this pre-application. [There were none.]

CASE REVIEWS

3. BSD Historic Transition Neighborhood District - Bridge Park West

94-100 North High Street Site Plan Review

15-014ARB-SP

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for 2½ story mixed-use commercial development and 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking and site improvements. She said the site is 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 this application for Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(F) and (J).

Ms. Rauch said she did not have a formal presentation for the ART but five pages of comments have been relayed to the applicant and discussion should be about the comments.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, said the applicant is trying to comply with as many issues as possible. He said he would not go through the entire list with the ART but he had a few issues he wished to discuss.

Balconies

Mr. Sebach asked for clarification. Ms. Rauch said the Code requirement is found under the General Building Type Requirements, 153.062(I), whereas the balcony needs to be a minimum of six feet long by five feet wide. She suggested that the applicant show a normal balcony to compare to the one they are proposing to verify the requirement is met.

Windows/Transparency

Mr. Sebach said they were not able to meet the transparency requirement for the Mixed-Use buildings due to the garages on the lower level on the backside where they cannot increase windows below that line. He said the other issue with windows is that the residents will not want people to be able to look into their units. He said the applicant would not meet the calculation because of this privacy issue.

Ms. Rauch said the transparency should be 15% and there is only 3%. Jeff Tyler said that would require a Waiver.

Rachel Ray inquired about blank wall requirements – if detailing was required at least.

Mr. Sebach said the blank wall on the left side of the elevation had an elevator on the interior side of the wall but the other end is fairly flat and considered changing the material on that end.

Primary/Secondary Materials

Mr. Sebach said the applicant has removed EIFS as a proposed primary material; fiber cement panels would be used instead. He noted a couple of areas where solid panels would be more appropriate, like the bridge. Ms. Rauch said the applicant could make a case for requesting a Waiver. Steve Langworthy agreed fiber would be a better choice.

Joanne Shelly added that the Code requires a lighter material above a heavier material so the fiber cement panels would be appropriate.

Ms. Rauch stated the applicant had reached 78% for the permitted primary material requirement of stone, brick, and glass. She indicated the ART could approve that amount as an Administrative Departure since it is within 2% of the requirement.

Street façade entrances on the Mixed-Use side

Mr. Sebach said a restaurant does not need a door every 40 feet and asked if he needed to incorporate a fake door. He noted where the other doors were located. Ms. Rauch said an additional operational door would be necessary to meet the requirement.

Mr. Sebach reported he was working on the enlarged elevations and calculations.

Parking Plan

Mr. Langworthy asked if some of the parking is designated public and how to factor in spaces provided over and above the maximum required parking.

Ms. Ray said the spaces needed to be designated for what is required and what is private, and how the spaces are delineated within the structure for individual uses such as valet services, compact vehicles, ADA, etc.

Mr. Sebach said he would identify the loading zones and valet parking in the Parking Plan.

Streetscape

Ms. Rauch pointed out where there was one street tree and where there needed to be two street trees and instructed the applicant to ensure that all the trees line up along the streetscape with the light fixtures. She said Staff did not support street trees in planters as shown; they would need to be consistent with the streetscape standards used for the rest of the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch asked if the bike rack could be relocated. In addition to street trees, Ms. Rauch said street lights, planters, walls, and steps should all be properly aligned.

Aaron Stanford said the ART will need to make a recommendation to City Council about the walkable space and how much walkable space is left will factor into that recommendation. Mr. Langworthy said at least five feet clearance is necessary.

Vern Hoying, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked if the landscaping needed to look like the rest of the streetscape. Ms. Shelly said the Streetscape Guide includes the BSD, greenways, and the Historic District. She indicated the applicant was very close to meeting this requirement; they just needed to have everything aligned.

Mr. Sebach said he was concerned about walkable clearance for the row with the planters, wall, and steps per the grade changes and asked for guidance.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the detail of the area. He recommended the applicant identify what the various areas would be used for and what type of activity would be present behind the steps. He said providing dimension for passage will be helpful. He asked how the accessible space will grade out. Ms. Rauch said detail is provided in the landscape plans for Mr. Stanford to review.

Mr. Sebach said the upper plaza strictly provides access to the building and is pedestrian oriented with a walkway around. Ms. Shelly inquired if the path between the building and the wall stairs could be reduced as the path seemed wider than the sidewalk below at street level.

Mr. Stanford asked if the width could be decreased and given to the public walk to decrease the right-of-way encroachment. He said the trouble lies where a door swings into an active space. He asked if there were any other right-of-way encroachments.

Open Space/Transformer

Ms. Rauch inquired about the location of the transformer in the open space and asked if there was an alternative place for the transformer as it appeared to encroach into the right-of-way.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said the transformer had to sit on that side corner of that triangular space. He explained the rock wall caused the problem and asked if the transformer could be integrated into the building design to help detract from its visibility.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, agreed that would be the best solution.

Mr. Sebach said there needs to be an allowance for access for a heavy duty truck close to a road but suggested the transformer be under/close to the location of the proposed pedestrian bridge.

Ms. Rauch asked if a rendering could be provided to show the transformer in context to show that the proposed location is suitable. She suggested another alternative could be to incorporate it within an accessory structure.

Mr. Stanford asked if the transformer lies in the right-of-way, and if it was on the City's property it becomes a much bigger issue and might need to be incorporated in the lease agreement. He recommended finding a way to keep the transformer off City property.

Mr. Quackenbush confirmed the transformer was intended to be placed on the developer's property and not in the right-of-way.

Ms. Shelly asked what happens when the parcel gets dedicated back to the City as open space, because even if it is inside the developer's property now it will become City property. Mr. Stanford suggested that Legal be contacted for guidance. Mr. Tyler said this might become a development agreement issue. Ms. Shelly recommended the transformer should be within the property boundaries to start.

Ms. Rauch said the northern property line discussion needed clarity. She presented what is proposed to be adjusted. She said how this impacts Dublin Road and the culvert needs to be explained. Mr. Quackenbush said he will have that information to present.

Laura Ball said Fred Hahn wants to make sure the path down below is usable.

Mr. Stanford requested additional aesthetic information for the retaining wall along the eastern side of High Street.

Mr. Quackenbush said High Street and Riverview Street improvements are not part of this application but the applicant is expected to show where the line is drawn. He said a meeting is needed for both the public and private side so everyone can be on the same page. He said the applicant may reduce the retaining wall. Ms. Shelly asked that someone from Planning be invited to that meeting as well.

Mr. Quackenbush said if the west side is widened, the applicant would have more space. Mr. Stanford added that they influence each other. He said an interim condition needs to be coordinated with the proposed public improvements. Mr. Quackenbush said he wants to know where that road is.

Ms. Rauch reported that Mandy Bishop was questioning the flood plain paperwork.

Mr. Gunderman inquired about the internal public use areas and guest rooms. He suggested locating the public use space adjacent to Frantz Road; even if there was a secondary entrance out to Frantz Road, at least the entrance would be open the same hours as the primary entrance if it were relocated to the south side. He asked why this suggested plan would not work.

Mr. Sebach said it was possible to go through the outdoor living room area and there would not have to be the same restrictions.

Steve Langworthy said Option 1 looked over-landscaped. He suggested by meeting the minimum requirement of landscape, if perhaps six more parking spaces could be added.

If the landscaping was modified, Mr. Sebach thought 1 or 2 parking spaces could be added.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said more spaces were not going to be found in this layout. Mr. Langworthy said it was hard to visualize the restrictions in a sketch drawing.

Ms. Shelly asked if the proposed building could be moved closer towards Frantz Road. Ms. Rauch said it would depend on the outdoor space. Mr. Sebach said if the building was moved closer to Frantz Road, the patio would be in the right-of-way and the building would not be in the required build zone.

Mr. Hunter asked by adding parking, the pocket park between the buildings would be lost and asked if the parking issue was a hurdle to get over.

Ms. Rauch asked how truly inflexible the brand was for changing the internal spaces/floor plan. At this point, she said it is hard to say that the ART would support the Waivers needed to make this work.

Mr. Sebach explained how the internal areas function as a whole. He said the brand has a formula and all the pieces interrelate.

Ms. Shelly noted that the building forms a corner and the inside of that corner makes dead space. She said it appears to just be a sidewalk. Mr. Sebach clarified that was a service area for laundry and service to go in/out there. Mr. Hunter said the pool hides the service aspect and mechanicals out there.

Ms. Rauch asked if an entrance could be placed where there were currently four guest rooms on the north side of the building.

Mr. Langworthy emphasized the importance of Frantz Road from a development standpoint for the City. He noted how everything is set back on Frantz Road and the intent is for future development to be brought forward so Option 1 would help that alignment.

Mr. Sebach said he hears what the ART is saying but feels really stuck.

Mr. Hoying asked if the ART collectively desired Option 1.

Mr. Langworthy said it was a better option even without the open space. He explained that how a building relates to the street in this area is more important than open space.

Ms. Rauch said that even if the ART recommended disapproval of the Waivers for these plans that did not prevent the applicant from moving forward to the PZC for their review.

Mr. Hunter emphasized the need to make this work and not lose the hotel for this site. He indicated this site would be tough for restaurants given the access issues.

Mr. Sebach asked to discuss the architecture. He said the applicant added glass for more transparency, tweaked the design of the tower; and changed the base material internally. He explained the brown brick was too heavy and will be replaced with a lighter color brick or modern stone. He asked the ART for feedback on the proposed material change for the base. He said even if the applicant decides to flip this building it will contain the same architecture.

Mr. Langworthy asked what happens to the white fiber board over time and if it was truly as white as it appeared in the renderings. Mr. Sebach said it will be more of a cream colored panel as opposed to a stark white.

Melissa Spires, OHM Advisors, said the dimension of the panels are 18 inches by 6 feet and appear as a flat panel. She explained the lines were softer and she provided real world examples of the panels. Mr. Sebach noted the fiber board provided a fresh modern look.

Ms. Shelly said it appeared to have been applied over existing brick, which is not acceptable. She asked if the building layout and façade treatment were set as a brand standard because Staff had looked at the brand across the country and found a lot of different architectural concepts. She said the design in Philadelphia, PA was a completely vertical design. Mr. Sebach said that was a building with a lot more floors than what is being proposed for Dublin and emphasized the brand needs to be maintained.

Mr. Hoying said there is a brand standard so as travelers cross the country, they recognize the buildings as the brand.

Mr. Langworthy requested examples of materials truer to color. Ms. Spires said she would provide those examples.

Mr. Langworthy said he liked the evolution of the tower with more glass and asked the ART if they had any further comments or questions with regard to this application. [There were none.]

5. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 1 (C Block)

15-018 DP-BSD/SP-BSD

**Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings with 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray said she had no new materials to present. She said the applicant has received the most up-to-date comments from Staff. However, she did say that the applicant has retracted vinyl windows as a proposed material.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, asked if it is acceptable for the applicant to be at 29% transparency when 30% was required. Ms. Ray said that could be within the Administrative Departure range if the applicant had reached their limit after exhausting all architecturally appropriate options.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant if they had anything new to present or was it still a work in progress.

Miguel Gonzales, Moody Nolan, said the applicant met the maximum transparency at the retail level but were working through the levels above.

Ms. Umbarger reported that the right-of-way and door swing issues were all resolved except for the tower element for building C4 at the parking garage entrance.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, added to achieve a door swing in the tower, a ramp would need to be removed, and therefore, recessing the doorways was not an option.

Mr. Gonzales reported that Building C1 met the vertical increments at street and residential levels but was a problem at the roofline for aesthetic purposes. He asked if a Waiver could be requested. Ms. Ray asked if any portions of the façade could be pushed out or pulled in to create some dimension.

Ms. Umbarger explained that the elevator overrun would be exposed if there was no parapet. Joanne Shelly said a Waiver could be supported if the applicant demonstrates the need based on practical reasons.

Ms. Umbarger noted a secondary material issue. Mr. Hunter said the applicant prefers fiber cement siding if it does not compromise the design. Mr. Gonzales added the final installation of the product is a concern and will depend on the quality of the install.

Ms. Shelly asked which product wears out first, between EIFS and fiber cement. Mr. Hunter said if both are done right, EIFS is guaranteed upwards of 10 years and fiber cement/Hardi-Plank can yield a warranty upwards of 20 years.

Ms. Shelly pointed out that since the secondary material would be used on the higher elevations, and will need repair in 10 – 20 years, to consider that a large machine/lift will be required to achieve the replacement. Mr. Hunter said he preferred to go with cementitious siding. Ms. Shelly said quality also depends on the fasteners. Mr. Langworthy suggested that the way to help gain approval is for the developer to engage a third-party inspector that would report findings regarding installation directly to the City.

Deadlines for materials to be reviewed were discussed briefly.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, concluded that MKSK was close to having the materials completed showing the streetscapes, rights-of-way, and buildings on Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further comments or questions regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He said a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on this application would be scheduled for April 2, 2015.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 4:15 pm.