

# MIAMISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – VIRTUAL MEETING

January 25, 2021

The virtual meeting was called to order by Mr. DeYoung at 6:00 PM on Monday, January 25, 2021.

Mr. DeYoung asked for the roll call.

The following commissioners were present: Mike McCabe, Steve Beachler, Mel Rutherford, Tim Finney, Vanessa Glotfelter, and Jim DeYoung.

Ryan Homs, City Planner, was present as the advisor.

Mr. DeYoung asked for a motion to appoint Mr. Homs as the acting secretary. Mr. Finney motioned. Mr. McCabe seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Beachler, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. DeYoung moved the election of officers to the end of the meeting.

Mr. DeYoung asked if there were any recommended changes to the meeting minutes of October 26, 2020. Being none, Mr. DeYoung asked for a motion for their approval. Ms. Glotfelter motioned. Mr. Rutherford seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Beachler, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. DeYoung asked if there were any recommended changes to the meeting minutes of November 30, 2020. Being none, Mr. DeYoung asked for a motion for their approval. Ms. Glotfelter motioned. Mr. Finney seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. DeYoung asked if any comments were received for the Citizen's Forum. Mr. Homs stated that there was one call prior to the meeting from a reporter at the Dayton Business Journal who requested information about the Post-Acute Medical (PAM) facility. The caller was sent an invite to the meeting.

Mr. DeYoung introduced the first item on the agenda, starting with Building 5 at Austin Business Park.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

SP-01-2021: Site plan review and approval of Austin Business Park Building V. This is a 60,000 sq. ft. flex office/light industrial building and a continuation of the development of Austin Business Park.

Mr. Homsy displayed an aerial image of Austin Business Park and described the development of the business park so far. Building 5 will be the first building on the north side of Byers Road in Austin Business Park and the first building that directly abuts residential uses.

Mr. Homsy displayed photographs of the existing conditions of the property and surrounding area.

Mr. Homsy displayed the site plan showing the proposed setbacks for the building and parking areas. The proposed site plan meets the applicable requirements of the Planning and Zoning Code regarding setbacks. Mr. Homsy stated that the proposed access point shown on the plan will change by shifting further to the west due to grading challenges with the site.

Mr. Homsy displayed photographs of the existing conditions of the northern bufferyard where the property abuts residential uses. Mr. Homsy displayed the preliminary grading plan, which shows that the parking lot of the subject site will sit lower than the adjoining residential uses.

Mr. Homsy displayed the proposed front elevation of the building. It will be like buildings 2 and 4 and meets the requirements of the Austin Overlay (AO-1) District. Mr. Homsy also displayed an example of the proposed wallpack light fixtures that will be used on the building, which will be fully cut-off fixtures like those used at the Buckeye EcoCare building in Byers Business Park since residential uses directly abut this use.

Mr. Homsy displayed and went over a table of the required bulk and general zoning standards for the property. The proposed site plan meets the applicable requirements.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Homsy stated that staff recommends that the Planning Commission approved SP-01-2021 with the following conditions:

1. The applicant agrees to coordinate with and adhere to any modification recommended by the City Engineer, Public Works Director, and/or Fire Marshal related to public utilities, grading, sight distance, storm water management, and emergency access to this site.
2. The applicant agrees to obtain approval of the City Engineer for the final placement of the access point(s) to the site.
3. The applicant agrees to submit a landscaping plan for review and approval by staff prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for the building.
4. The applicant agrees to submit a grading and buffering plan for the site for review and approval by staff prior to the issuance of any building permits for the site.

5. The applicant agrees to comply with zoning requirements associated with pertinent site elements, i.e. the placement and screening of trash receptacles, screening of mechanical systems, signage, etc. prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Homsy asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Jason Rudzinski of Mark Fornes Realty spoke. Mr. Rudzinski stated that he, on behalf of BW Partners, Mark Fornes Realty, and Construction Managers of Ohio, appreciates the partnership with the City and they look forward to one day building out the whole business park.

Mr. DeYoung stated that these developers have done a wonderful job in the past and asked for a motion with the five conditions suggest by the City.

Mr. McCabe motioned to approve the plan with the following conditions:

1. The applicant agrees to coordinate with and adhere to any modification recommended by the City Engineer, Public Works Director, and/or Fire Marshal related to public utilities, grading, sight distance, storm water management, and emergency access to this site.
2. The applicant agrees to obtain approval of the City Engineer for the final placement of the access point(s) to the site.
3. The applicant agrees to submit a landscaping plan for review and approval by staff prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for the building.
4. The applicant agrees to submit a grading and buffering plan for the site for review and approval by staff prior to the issuance of any building permits for the site.
5. The applicant agrees to comply with zoning requirements associated with pertinent site elements, i.e. the placement and screening of trash receptacles, screening of mechanical systems, signage, etc. prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Rutherford seconded. Motion carried. All in favor.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Beachler, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. DeYoung introduced the next item. Ordinance 6881.

**Ordinance 6881**: AN ORDINANCE TO REZONE CITY LOT, PARCEL ID K46 00718 0073 OF THE CITY OF MIAMISBURG, FROM THE CURRENT ZONING DESIGNATIONS OF RO-1 (RESEARCH OFFICE) AND I-1 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) TO SDD-1 (SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT) AND TO APPROVE THE COMPANION PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE POST-ACUTE MEDICAL REHABILITATION DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. Homsi asked the Chairman to swear in anyone who plans on speaking on this item. Mr. DeYoung swore in the participants; including: Anthony Lampasona of Catalyst Healthcare Real Estate, Vic Mosby of ACI Boland, Phil Schuck of Catalyst Healthcare Real Estate, Kerry Hardin of Collins Engineers, Inc, Steve Divinick of 321 Alexandersville Road, Miamisburg, OH 45342, and Ryan Homsi with the City of Miamisburg.

Mr. Homsi displayed an aerial image of the subject property, which sits at the southeast corner of the intersection of Alexandersville Road and Crosspointe Drive. The property is zoned I-1 (Light Industrial) and RO-1 (Research Office), and the applicants are requesting that the property be rezoned to a Special Development District. Mr. Homsi stated that the way this SDD is written is basically the light industrial district with hospitals added as an allowable use.

Mr. Homsi displayed photographs of the subject property and the existing conditions, including the existing detention pond located at the southwest corner of the subject site which is a component of the regional storm water management system at Southpointe Business Park.

Mr. Homsi displayed the site plan showing the ~74,000 square foot building and the 153 parking spaces. The proposed setbacks are appropriate for this area and are in-line with the requirements of the I-1 District.

Mr. Homsi displayed the proposed building elevations and stated that the main comment from staff regarding the building elevations deals with reducing the amount of corrugated metal siding on the building.

Mr. Homsi displayed the proposed landscaping plan, which meets the expectations of staff.

Mr. Homsi displayed the proposed utility connections. The subject site is located within an existing business park, so the utility connections are readily available.

Mr. Homsi reviewed the Special Development District guidelines. This proposed meets guidelines (c) and (d) of Section 1275.04 of the Planning and Zoning Code.

Mr. Homsi went over the general requirements applicable to all planned developments in Section 1276.03. The proposed development meets all the applicable standards.

Mr. Homsi stated that the staff recommendation is that the Planning Commission Recommend that City Council **adopt** Ordinance #6881 to approve the rezoning and preliminary development plan for the post-acute medical (PAM) development contained herein with the following conditions which shall be met by the final development plan and report, to be submitted and reviewed for consistency with the preliminary development plan at a later date:

1. The applicant agrees to coordinate with and adhere to any modification recommended by the City Engineer, Public Works Director, and/or Fire

Marshal related to public utilities, roadway improvements, sight distance, storm water management, and emergency access to this site.

2. The final lighting details for the site be submitted for review and approval as a part of the Final Development Plan (FDP) submittal.
  3. The applicant agrees to submit details relating to the design of the proposed retaining walls, including any building-code-required railings and barriers.
  4. The applicant agrees to submit updated building elevation drawings for review and approval by the Planning Commission as a part of the Final Development Plan that eliminate or significantly reduce the use of corrugated metal siding on the building.
  5. As a part of the final plan, the applicant agrees to submit an official Final Development Plan and Report for the site; organizing and listing plans for all applicable uses, landscaping, setbacks, access, lighting, grading, storm water management, architectural elements, etc...of the site, to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and City Council, to ensure that the Final Development Plan conforms to the Preliminary Development Plan and any adopted conditions.
2. Further, the Planning Commission recommends that Ordinance #6881 be approved with the modifications recommended by the Planning Commission. These recommended modifications, which are reflected on the attached ordinance, include:
1. Modification of Exhibit B to the most recent preliminary site plan for the property.
  2. The addition of the preliminary development plan report and associated exhibits into Ordinance #6881 as *Section 4*. The exhibits of the Preliminary Development Plan Report include the following exhibits:
    - i. Exhibit 1 – Preliminary Site Plan
    - ii. Exhibit 2 – Preliminary Building Elevations
    - iii. Exhibit 3 – Preliminary Landscaping and Buffering Plan

Mr. Homsy displayed the three exhibits and asked the Planning Commission if there were any questions.

Mr. DeYoung opened the public hearing.

Mr. Anthony Lampasona spoke first. Mr. Lampasona, 1060 North Humboldt Road, Milwaukee, WI 53202 stated that Catalyst is the developer of the building on behalf of Post-Acute Medical (PAM) out of Enola, Pennsylvania. Catalyst is serving as the full-service developer and will serve as the long-term owner. Mr. Lampasona stated that everything Mr. Homsy stated is correct. Construction, if approvals are granted, will start in April of 2021 and will be complete by April of 2022. He thanked the Planning Commission and Mr. Homsy.

Mr. DeYoung asked if there were any other speakers.

Mr. Steven Divinick of 321 Alexandersville Road, Miamisburg, OH 45342 spoke next. Mr. Divinick lives across the street from the proposed development. Mr. Divinick asked about the drainage of the property and where the drainage will run from the site. Mr. Homsi stated that there is a culvert that runs underneath Alexandersville Road that carries a stream that runs along the southern portion of Mr. Divinick's property. Mr. Divinick asked if that stream could overflow based on the available data. Mr. Homsi stated that he would defer to the City Engineer to answer more detailed questions about storm water, but that the storm water system in this business park should not be designed in a way that overflows based upon the general storm water management standards that the City follows.

Mr. Divinick stated that he did not believe it would be a problem since the drainage area is far below the elevation of his house.

Ms. Kerry Hardin of Collins Engineers added clarity to this item. Ms. Hardin, 2033 West Howard Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53221, stated that the storm water pond was designed with a certain amount of impervious surface assumed for the subject site, so the 100-year storm elevation of the pond will be maintained. If the elevation of water in the pond were to exceed the 100-year elevation, it would still be contained within the existing pond before flowing downstream to through the discharge point is located.

Mr. Homsi told Mr. Divinick that he would follow-up with the City Engineer tomorrow to get more detail to better answer his questions. Mr. Divinick stated that he is confident that the pond has been engineered correctly.

Mr. DeYoung asked if there were any other people in attendance who would like to speak. Being none, Mr. DeYoung closed the public hearing and opened the discussion back up amongst the Commission.

Mr. Finney asked Mr. Homsi what the specific concern is with the metal siding. Mr. Homsi stated that, historically, corrugated siding hasn't been accepted to a great degree; with the restrictions in Mound Business Park and Austin Center being examples of where the City has prohibited or restricted such siding. Mr. Homsi stated that he is open to adjusting that condition if the Planning Commission is open to doing so.

There were no other comments. Mr. DeYoung made a motion to find that the project meets the Special Development District requirements of Chapter 1275 and the general planned development requirements of Chapter 1276, and that the project be sent onto City Council with a recommendation to adopt Ordinance 6881 with the following conditions:

- a. The applicant agrees to coordinate with and adhere to any modification recommended by the City Engineer, Public Works Director, and/or Fire Marshal related to public utilities, roadway improvements, sight distance, storm water management, and emergency access to this site.
- b. The final lighting details for the site be submitted for review and approval as a part of the Final Development Plan (FDP) submittal.

- c. The applicant agrees to submit details relating to the design of the proposed retaining walls, including any building-code-required railings and barriers.
  - d. The applicant agrees to submit updated building elevation drawings for review and approval by the Planning Commission as a part of the Final Development Plan that eliminate or significantly reduce the use of corrugated metal siding on the building.
  - e. As a part of the final plan, the applicant agrees to submit an official Final Development Plan and Report for the site; organizing and listing plans for all applicable uses, landscaping, setbacks, access, lighting, grading, storm water management, architectural elements, etc...of the site, to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and City Council, to ensure that the Final Development Plan conforms to the Preliminary Development Plan and any adopted conditions.
1. Further, that Ordinance #6881 be approved with the following modifications:
    - a. Modification of Exhibit B to the most recent preliminary site plan for the property.
    - b. The addition of the preliminary development plan report and associated exhibits into Ordinance #6881 as *Section 4*. The exhibits of the Preliminary Development Plan Report include the following exhibits:
      - i. Exhibit 1 – Preliminary Site Plan
      - ii. Exhibit 2 – Preliminary Building Elevations
      - iii. Exhibit 3 – Preliminary Landscaping and Buffering Plan

Mr. Finney seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Beachler, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. DeYoung introduced the next item, a study session item.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### Pending residential development

Mr. Homsy stated that this study session is covering the Chamberlin Property. Mr. Homsy introduced the study session and stated that the study session is more for the design of the site itself. The applicant has submitted a traffic impact study which is under review by Miamisburg's City Engineer and Public Works Director.

Mr. Homsy went over the proposed unit count and displayed a site plan of the project. Mr. Homsy stated that the connection to Middleport Drive has been eliminated due to the presence of a stream in this area.

Mr. Homsy then displayed an updated site plan for the MI Homes portion of the development and went over the proposed updates to the site plan. Mr. Homsy stated that

a comment provided by staff is that the applicant makes efforts to protect the mature trees in the southeast corner of the property.

Mr. Homsy displayed a site plan of the MI Homes portion of the development with some of the remaining staff-related comments; including the requirement that corner lots provide higher-quality finishes on the exteriors, the addition of more screening on the south and east sides of the development, and the expectation that the trees in the “tail” of the subject property be retained as best as possible.

Mr. Homsy displayed the Redwood portion of the development and went over the proposed plan. Mr. Homsy then displayed the same plan with the main staff comments, which include connecting the two dead-end streets in the development, providing more “interest” to the building elevations on the southern-most street, and providing better buffering on the north, east, and portions of the west side of the site.

Mr. Homsy stated that another comment from staff is that the developers of the Redwood portion of the development reduce the size of the “low/no” mow areas of the site.

Mr. Homsy scrolled through the staff report that was sent out to the Planning Commission, which includes the site plans, landscaping plans, building elevations, etc... for the proposed development.

Mr. Homsy asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commission.

Mr. DeYoung asked what the spacing between the houses in the MI Homes portion of the development will be. Mr. Homsy stated that 15 feet is the minimum separation, but that the lots are proposed to be 60’ wide while the proposed housing products start at 40’ in width plus buyers have an option to add a 4’ bump-out on the garages for extra storage. If everyone puts the 4’ bump-out on every garage in the development, you will have about 16’ between each house.

Mr. Rutherford asked if the development is the same as the one the Planning Commission visited off Yankee Road. Mr. Homsy stated that the Redwood portion of the development is the same developer.

Mr. Rutherford asked if this development would put a lot of additional children in the school system. Mr. Homsy stated that staff can estimate the number of students would be added to the overall district and that this will be a part of the full-fledged review of the plan. Mr. Homsy stated that his understanding is that there are no schools that are bursting at the seams like they were in 2008 and 2009.

Mr. Rutherford asked if the Redwood streets are private. Mr. Homsy stated that yes, the roads are private and will be maintained privately.

Mr. DeYoung asked if the streets need to meet the City requirements for a public street. Mr. Homsy stated that the proposed roadways in the Redwood portion of the development



are 22' wide and there is no parking on both sides of the road. There is also a 4' sidewalk on one side of the road, so they do not meet the minimum specifications for public streets.

Mr. DeYoung stated *Sycamore Walk* is still a concern in that the City may have to one day step in to take over the streets in the development fails. Mr. Homsy stated that he does not have an answer since this is an unknown. Mr. Homsy stated that the roadway is essentially a drive aisle in a parking lot, except instead of parking spaces on either side they have a two-car garage and driveway for the residents. Mr. Homsy stated that he cannot guarantee that this will not become an issue in the future. Mr. Homsy then stated that he would follow-up with some people on this concern.

Mr. Beachler stated that he agreed with the City's assessment that the low/no mow areas are excessive on the Redwood portion of the site. Mr. Homsy asked for clarification if he is okay with some of it. Mr. Beachler stated that yes, he is okay with some of it. Mr. McCabe stated that that kind of vegetation, even on a golf course, must be mowed a few times per year and maintained. Mr. McCabe stated that his concern is on ensuring that it is maintained.

Mr. DeYoung asked if there were any other questions or comments. Being none, Mr. DeYoung asked what Mr. Homsy would like from the Planning Commission at this time.

Mr. Homsy asked if there were any other comments from the Planning Commission about what was discussed and sent out before the meeting. Mr. Homsy also stated that there are a few people attending the meeting who can answer questions or comments from the Commission.

Mr. McCabe asked if we are okay with the proposed density. Mr. McCabe added that the traffic and access issue is still out there as a challenge.

Mr. Homsy stated that the density piece with MI Homes is not much of a concern since they lost 8 units by eliminating the connection to Middleport. So long as we can work with them on preserving the wooded areas of the site as best as possible, that the MI Homes piece is comparable to what was approved with Aberdeen.

Mr. Homsy stated regarding the density of the Redwood piece, the proposed density is more dense than the adjoining uses; however, as long as the developer is willing to provide substantial buffering, meet the City's expectations on building materials, and traffic/access works for the site, he would rather have the site designed in a way that we're happy with rather than tell the developer to get rid of a certain arbitrary number of units.

Mr. DeYoung asked Mr. Homsy what he thought the comments from the Miami Township neighbors will be. Mr. Homsy stated that the biggest item we usually get comments on is traffic, cut-through traffic, concerns about Redwood being a rental product rather than owner-occupied. Storm water is also a concern that is frequently brought up by concerned

neighbors. Density will also probably be brought up due to the density changes in the proposed development when compared to the adjacent developments.

Mr. DeYoung asked Mr. Homsi to see if anyone in attendance wanted to speak.

Mr. Brad Austing of MI Homes spoke first. Mr. Austing stated they were excited to move the project forward and they had submitted the application last year. They are fine with Mr. Homsi's comments. Mr. Austing stated they would like to get on the next City Council meeting. Mr. Austing stated that spoke on the land use plan for this area of town, the impact on the schools from the number of new school-age kids, and on the traffic impact study. Mr. Homsi asked what the estimated prices of the houses would be. Mr. Austing stated that the prices would likely average about \$350,000 across the single-family portion of the development with the starting price of ~\$300,000.

Mr. Todd Foley of POD Development, on behalf of Redwood, spoke next. Mr. Foley stated that all the roadways within the Redwood portion of the development are 26 feet wide, including a 22-foot-wide drive aisle and 4-foot-wide sidewalk on one side of the road. Mr. Foley stated that rentals being offered will not be "entry-level" but will cost \$1,400 - \$1,800 per month. Mr. Foley agreed with Mr. Homsi's earlier comments on the density regarding buffering.

Mr. McCabe commented that he glad to hear of the proposed quality of the developments.

Mr. Austing added that a \$1,400 monthly rent payment is equal to the mortgage payment on a \$300,000 house with today's rates, and that they view the Redwood component as a housing option for people who have sold their house and are spending part of the year elsewhere, so they are comfortable with the product and believe they would be a good neighbor.

Mr. Austing asked if his application could get on the agenda for the next City Council meeting for a first reading to get the zoning process started. Mr. Homsi stated that the challenge with the project is getting the access portion finalized due to some of the standards required with Planned Developments, but Mr. Homsi stated that he would follow-up after he gets an update on the review process of the TIS. The review schedule was discussed.

Mr. DeYoung asked if there was anyone else on the call who would like to speak. Being none, Mr. DeYoung moved onto the last study session item, which is a study session about Hutchings Station.

### Hutchings Station

Mr. Homsi discussed the updates to the redevelopment of the Hutchings Station property. Much of the property has sold to Frontier, which is a company that has purchased several other decommissioned power plants for redevelopment. Mr. Homsi stated that the

business development director of Frontier, Pat Ford, is interested in formulating a working group to talk about the future use of the property.

Mr. Homsy asked if there were any questions. Mr. McCabe commented on the two recent articles in the Dayton Daily News about the Hutchings Station property.

Mr. Homsy stated that the new owners have confirmed that they plan on removing the dam. They may demolish the building or just demolish parts of it. The purpose of the study session tonight is to give a quick update on the property while also inquiring on if the Planning Commission would be interested in being a part of a “working group” that would work on the redevelopment of the property. All Planning Commission members were interested in participating in this group.

Mr. DeYoung moved onto the next item on the agenda, a public hearing.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Homsy reviewed the proposed ordinance, which is the second “housekeeping ordinance” for the zoning code.

Mr. Homsy stated that multiple study sessions have been held on the item. Mr. Homsy stated that the ordinance covers several sections of the planning and zoning code; including:

1. Beefing up the home occupation standards while also moving home occupations to the generally-permitted category from the special use category.
2. Updating the residential conversion standards for the CSD-1 District.
3. Fixes numbering and wording issues in the Mound Business (MB-1) District.
4. Updates various definitions.

Mr. Homsy reviewed the proposed changes to the ordinance, including:

1. Removed definition changes for brewpubs and open spaces.
2. Removed the proposed updates to the lighting standards of Chapter 1292.
3. Retained the existing setbacks in Mound Business Park.

Mr. Homsy then scrolled through the proposed ordinance and went over the following staff recommendation: *Recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance 6869 with the changes recommended by the Planning Commission.*

Mr. Homsy asked if there were any questions. There were none. There were no attendees wishing to speak on the item. Mr. DeYoung closed the public hearing.

Mr. DeYoung motioned to send the following recommendation onto City Council: *That City Council adopt Ordinance 6869 with the changes recommended by the Planning Commission.*

Mr. Beachler seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Beachler, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. Homsi asked if a motion was made to excuse Mr. Mahan. Mr. McCabe motioned to excuse Mr. Mahan. Mr. Finney seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Beachler, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. DeYoung moved onto the election of officers.

Mr. McCabe motioned to nominate Mr. DeYoung to serve as Chairman. Mr. Rutherford seconded. There were no other nominations. All in favor. Motion carried.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Beachler, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. DeYoung asked for a motion for vice chair. Mr. Beachler motioned to nominate Vanesa Glotfelter as vice chair. Mr. Finney seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

VOTE: Mr. McCabe, yea; Mr. Beachler, yea; Mr. Finney, yea;  
Mr. Rutherford, yea; Ms. Glotfelter, yea; Mr. DeYoung, yea;

Mr. Homsi stated that there was no one present to be nominated as secretary.

Mr. DeYoung thanked the Board for their vote of confidence.

Mr. DeYoung asked for a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Glotfelter motioned to adjourn; Mr. Rutherford seconded. Mr. DeYoung declared the meeting adjourned.

---

James DeYoung, Chairman

---

Ryan Homsi, Acting Secretary