

February 14, 2018

The Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Administrative and Plat Committee held a meeting on Wednesday February 14, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in the Hendricks County Government Center, Rooms 4 & 5, 355 South Washington Street, Danville, Indiana. Members present: Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Planning Director and Chairman; Mrs. Julie Haan, Environmental Health Director; Mr. John Ayers, County Engineer; Mrs. Sonnie Johnston, Plan Commission Member Representative; and Mr. Cory Gehring, Deputy Surveyor. Also present was: Mrs. Suzanne Baker, Senior Planner; Mr. Nick Hufford, Planner; and Mrs. Joanne Garcia, Recording Secretary. Mr. David Gaston, County Surveyor, was also present but not as a voting member at this meeting.

Mr. Dombrosky called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance. There was a quorum with five (5) members present.

Mr. Dombrosky then called for approval of the minutes for the December 13, 2017 and January 10, 2018 meetings.

Mrs. Haan made a motion to grant approval for the December 13, 2017 meeting minutes.

Mr. Gehring seconded the motion with three for and two abstaining.

FOR – 3 – AGAINST – 0 – ABSTAINED – 2 –

Mr. Dombrosky – yes
Mrs. Johnston – abstaining
Mr. Gehring – yes
Mr. Ayers – abstaining
Mrs. Haan – yes

Mr. Dombrosky then called for approval of the minutes for the January 10, 2018 meeting

Mrs. Johnston made a motion to grant approval for the January 10, 2018 meeting minutes.

Mr. Ayers seconded the motion with four in favor and one abstaining.

FOR – 4 – AGAINST – 0 – ABSTAINED – 1 –

Mr. Dombrosky – yes
Mrs. Johnston – yes
Mrs. Haan – yes
Mr. Ayers – yes
Mr. Gehring – abstaining

Mr. Dombrosky then called for the first item on the Public Hearing portion of the agenda as follows:

MIP 1088/18: CAROLYN ROSEMARY; a 2-lot minor subdivision, 9.78 acres, Guilford Township, S15-T14N-R1E, located on the east side of County Road 600 East, approximately one (1) mile south of the intersection with County Road 600 South. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Dale Kruse of Kruse Consulting and the applicant's son, Jeff Rosemary, appeared. Mr. Kruse reviewed their request for a two-lot minor subdivision and the location of said plat. Mr. Kruse also informed the members that Mr. Rosemary's neighbor to the north was also present, Russell Combs. He stated that the north property line needed to be investigated and Mr. Combs might want to address his concerns to the members. He explained that they had done some changes to the south lot line. He explained Mr. Rosemary's plan to construct a house on the lot to the south and that he

February 14, 2018

wanted to have a way to get around the ravine to his back property. He stated after changing the lot line a couple of times, he believed Mr. Rosemary was satisfied with the current plan.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that he did not understand why the back property could not widen out to 150 feet to meet the minimum requirement. He stated he understood trying to get around the ravine but did not know why it could not widen back out to the 150-foot minimum or why it could not be done with an easement.

Mr. Rosemary gave his opinion that he liked to keep things clean and simple with straight lines and no easements or encumbrances on the property. He stated that the plan allowed him just enough room to get a tractor around the ravine to the back lot and not have a landlocked property.

Mr. Kruse asked if Mr. Dombrosky meant after going around the ravine that the property widen back out to 150 feet.

Mr. Dombrosky stated yes.

Mr. Rosemary responded that he had walked the property and that it became worse before it got better.

Mr. Kruse asked Mr. Dombrosky is he was okay with the plan.

Mr. Dombrosky responded that he liked the original plan better where the property line came around the ravine and they had talked about widening out the back end even more. He stated he had told Kevin that he did not understand moving the house up front.

Mr. Ayers asked if, technically, were they meeting the ordinance.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they were not and that it was a 150-foot lot width minimum for usable area and half of the lot did not meet that. He stated even though it was only ten feet, there was a minimum requirement for a reason.

Mr. Kruse stated he understood. He discussed their options.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that he understood them not wanting an easement.

Mr. Kruse gave his recommendation for an easement and that it would meet all the requirements.

Mr. Dombrosky stated yes.

Mr. Rosemary stated that he was still opposed to an easement.

Mr. Dombrosky stated he understood.

Mr. Kruse explained the ordinance requirement to Mr. Rosemary.

Mr. Rosemary stated that due to the character of the property, he thought he should get a waiver of that requirement as they were still meeting the minimum lot size and were exceeding it at 1.57 acres.

Mr. Dombrosky stated it could be approved with a modification. He added that the portion over the ravine was irrelevant since it was not usable area anyway.

February 14, 2018

Mr. Rosemary stated his concern that it would create landlocked property and would not allow him to navigate it in a tractor.

Mr. Dombrosky asked for any other comments from the members.

Mr. Ayers explained the situation to Mr. Gaston. Mr. Gaston pointed out the drainage easement on the property.

Mr. Rosemary stated that was a natural easement. He stated he was trying to avoid having another easement.

Mr. Ayers asked if Mr. Rosemary was going to build on one piece and sell the other.

Mr. Rosemary stated he had no plans to sell any of the property.

Mr. Ayers stated he had not walked that area of the site but looking at the plan, ten feet made a difference by that ravine.

Mr. Rosemary stated that was correct.

Mr. Kruse stated that they had staked the line so that they could know exactly where Mr. Rosemary was comfortable with it.

Mr. Ayers stated he understood the situation and that either way, it was affecting the shape of this property whether it was with a physical lot line or with an easement and was affecting that usable area of lot. He stated he believed an easement would accomplish the same thing

Mr. Dombrosky added that what it was going to come down to be was a series of events that might lead to a situation where if they wanted to build in the back and they were too close to one of the sides for some reason, and they wanted a setback variance, we would not be able to give that to them.

Mr. Kruse asked if they could build in a 140-foot-wide area.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that was questionable and technically no they could not. He stated that there would be a pinch point at the tip of that ravine anyway. He stated as he had said at the beginning, it should bump back out to the minimum after it passed that pinch point.

Mr. Rosemary stated again that he liked straight simple lines and he felt that Mr. Kruse's plan accomplished that.

Mr. Dombrosky added that the lines would not be put on the ground anyway unless a fence was put up.

Mr. Rosemary stated that could possibly happen.

Mr. Dombrosky suggested that the property line follow that ten feet outside the top of bank back to the back point and then cut up back to the north.

Mr. Kruse responded basically back to where the notch would be.

Mr. Gehring stated yes and then it would meet all the requirements.

Mr. Rosemary stated then that way there would be no easement.

February 14, 2018

Mr. Dombrosky stated that was correct and he explained to Mr. Rosemary how that would work. Mr. Dombrosky stated if he was going to go by the letter or the rules as written in the ordinance, any portion of the lot that did not meet the 150-foot minimum did not count toward your minimum acreage. He explained if he were to be particular about it, he pointed out what area would not apply.

Mr. Rosemary explained how he understood what Mr. Dombrosky was telling him.

Mr. Dombrosky stated he understood that Mr. Rosemary wanted to keep as much of the land as possible, but that when someone purchased it to build on, they needed to have enough room.

Mr. Rosemary stated he thought an acre and one half was more than enough.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they were running into more and more problems with an acre and one half lots because of the soils or topography.

Mr. Ayers added that if the concern was encumbering the shape of the lot, he felt it was cleaner if the lot was made rectangular and done with an easement. He stated that would be the preference of the committee.

Mr. Rosemary asked what if that was created with an easement and a future property owner wanted to put up a fence on that line.

All agreed that could not be done. Mr. Dombrosky stated that it all depended on how the easement was written.

Mr. Gaston stated since Mr. Rosemary owned the property now, he could set up the easement any way he wanted it.

Mr. Dombrosky stated it could read that nothing could be placed there.

Mr. Rosemary again expressed his concerns about an easement.

Mr. Ayers stated it would still allow him to get around the ravine but would make the lot lines cleaner and make for less debate in the future and it would make it meet the ordinance now so that there would be no question that Mr. Rosemary was compliant.

Mr. Gehring stated it seemed like a good compromise to him.

Mr. Rosemary talked about it devaluing his property.

Mr. Ayers stated it would not devalue it any more than the idea of creating a notch.

Mr. Rosemary stated again that he did not like easements.

Mr. Ayers then stated that this compromise was what they were telling him he needed to do with the property.

All the members agreed.

Mr. Dombrosky then stated that there was an associated waiver with this item and that this was a public hearing.

February 14, 2018

Mr. Russell Combs of 6981 South County Road 600 East appeared. He talked about a survey of the south property line and that it appeared to be in a substantially different place than it had been when he moved in to the property in 1974. He stated that it had been surveyed a couple of times since then. He stated that the southeast corner of his lot appeared to be about eight feet north of where it was originally and that the southwest corner appeared to be about four-feet north of where it had been. He stated after talking with Mr. Kruse, some survey work was going to be done to see if the survey pins could be found. He explained where he thought they might be.

Mr. Gaston explained what he observed about that matter and discussed it with Mr. Kruse. Mr. Gaston observed that it may make a difference with the north line of the property.

Mr. Dombrosky asked how that could be resolved.

Mr. Kruse stated he would just do some research work to make a determination to support the location of the pins.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if that would affect today's decision on approving the plat.

Mr. Kruse stated he did not think it would affect today's decision because if they did have to come back and shift the property line south, then they would just re-monument.

Mr. Gaston agreed and explained his thoughts about the affect it might have.

Mr. Ayers asked if we approved the plat today and there had to be changes made even though it was not recorded yet, would there have to be a certificate of correction before it was recorded.

Mr. Kruse stated he felt it would have to be after it was recorded.

Mr. Ayers stated then that what they might be approving was not the exact legal description presented.

There was further discussion among the members on the matter.

Mr. Gaston stated he was okay with an approval today and that they were not concerned with a property line dispute which would be through a court of law.

Mr. Dombrosky stated he was okay with an easement or the notch and widening back out.

Mr. Rosemary stated then that he could write the easement anyway he wanted to, and the members agreed with that statement.

There was a discussion with Mr. Rosemary on his options with the easement and Mr. Rosemary then agreed to do an easement and that it would be placed on the plat.

There was a discussion on the sidewalk waiver and a note about sidewalks on the plat.

Mr. Ayers and Mr. Dombrosky discussed the driveway plan with Mr. Kruse and Mr. Rosemary.

Mr. Kruse then asked about the comment in the staff's letter regarding a vicinity map on the plat and he stated he did not like putting them on plats. He stated they belonged on development plans but not on plats.

February 14, 2018

Mrs. Baker stated she thought the ordinance required them to be on the plat and she checked the ordinance again. She and Mr. Dombrosky determined it was in their discretion and they agreed it should be on the development plan and not the plat.

Mrs. Johnston then asked about the final decision for the lot line.

Mr. Dombrosky stated it had been agreed to square it off and provide an easement.

Mr. Ayers then made a motion to grant approval for **MIP 1088/18: Carolyn Rosemary** subject to the following:

1. Conditions & recommendations in staff's letter dated February 14, 2018;
2. A vicinity map is not required on the plat; and
3. Lot 2 to meet the 150-foot width requirement with access easement shown on plat.

Mr. Gehring seconded the motion.

FOR – 5 – AGAINST – 0 – ABSTAINED – 0 –

Mr. Ayers then made a motion to grant approval for **WA 290/18: MIP 1088 Carolyn Rosemary**.

Mrs. Johnston asked if subject to being installed if there are adjacent sidewalks in the future.

Mr. Ayers stated he thought that language was already in the conditions for approval.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that was correct and the language was on the plat. Mr. Dombrosky stated he wanted to add a comment that if there was an existing lot developed to the south of the property or if a subdivision came in even two lots to the south, the house in between might not be required to install sidewalks and the line may end there. He asked if the note could be modified to say that if sidewalks were installed on that property, that sidewalks would be required on this lot too.

Mr. Rosemary stated he was unclear with that.

Mr. Dombrosky explained that if the field ever developed, that Mr. Rosemary would be required to put in a sidewalk even if the lot in between didn't.

Mr. Rosemary asked if this would be required on Lot 1 and 2.

Mr. Dombrosky stated yes.

Mr. Rosemary asked if on the lot immediately to the north, sidewalks would not be required.

Mr. Dombrosky stated it would depend on whether there was a restriction on those lots.

Mr. Ayers stated those lots were old and it would probably be up to the county to decide.

Mr. Ayers then modified his motion to grant approval for **WA 290/18: MIP 1088 Carolyn Rosemary** subject to the following:

1. Recommendations in staff's letter dated February 14, 2018; and
2. Sidewalks for this plat must be installed when sidewalks become adjacent or are available on the undeveloped property two (2) lots to the south.

Mr. Gehring seconded the motion.

Mr. Rosemary stated he was still unclear about the sidewalk statement. He asked if they were saying he would be required to install sidewalks across the two lots even though on both the north and south sides, there would not be any sidewalks.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that was correct.

Mr. Ayers added that they wrestled with this on every plat and that the idea was that sidewalks would be installed if they became adjacent, but that the issue with this plat was that the lots adjacent were probably old enough that they were not subject to that requirement. He stated, however, if sidewalks came up even one lot to the south, then the more continuity there was, the better, and there would then be just one to be installed for a continuous line.

Mr. Rosemary stated he saw a gap on both sides.

Mr. Dombrosky stated yes and that in all honesty it would be a long time, if ever, that this might be annexed by Plainfield and there might be more incentive for them to put sidewalks in as a municipality on those two adjacent lots if Mr. Rosemary's and whatever developed had sidewalks.

Mr. Rosemary stated he understood but did not think it was realistic.

Mr. Ayers reminded Mr. Rosemary that if they did not approve the waiver, he would be required to install sidewalks now. He stated it was standard policy in certain townships.

Mr. Dombrosky then called for a vote.

The vote was approved with Ms. Haan voting against.

FOR – 4 – AGAINST – 1 – ABSTAINED – 0 –

The staff recommendations were as follows:

DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:

1. Subject to Drainage Board approval and the conditions of the County Surveyor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Provide an 11 X 17 copy of the plat
2. Provide a vicinity map on plat
3. Lot 2 does not meet 150' width and does not meet the 3 X 1 ratio, needs modification approved.
4. The Health Department is not in favor of any sidewalk waivers due to high rates of obesity, in children and adults, as well as the chronic diseases that result from limited exercise opportunities. Studies show that people with access to sidewalks get more exercise. Reduction of short car trips when engines emit the most pollution because they are not yet warmed up will also improve air quality.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. A properly executed County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided prior to approval with all appropriate fees paid prior to the start of any construction.

2. This project is subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit covering storm water quality. Procedures there under are governed locally by the Hendricks County Stormwater Management Ordinance and Technical Standards Manual. An application, fees, construction plans, specifications and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan must be presented for approval to the Hendricks County Drainage Board separately from the application to the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission. Secondary Stormwater Approval for a plat or development plan must be obtained from the Drainage Board prior to Approval by the Plan Commission. In addition, an Erosion Control Permit issued by the Hendricks County Surveyor is required for individual building lots prior to obtaining a Building Permit.
3. A septic system must be designed for these lots prior to building permit application to reflect the actual house location and size. The initial review of the submitted soil analysis indicates that the soils are rated severe and that septic systems are feasible on these lots. Additional soil borings for each lot may be required at the time of septic permit application. Proposed subsurface drain outlet elevations are required on each lot prior final design of the septic systems.
4. The absorption field areas must be fenced in such a way that accidental crossing of the site with equipment is prohibited. This may be done by farm fence, snow fence, or other similar materials. Preservation of the absorption field areas is the responsibility of the developer and if these areas are not preserved it could make the lots unbuildable.
5. Secondary septic field easements (SSFE) must be shown on the plat, or separate easement document to be recorded with the plat must be provided.
6. Prior to recording a statement must be added to the plat that states: Those designated as secondary septic field easements (SSFE) are secondary septic field easements that are hereby expressly reserved for the purpose of the placement of a sewage disposal field. Uses shall be limited to those consistent with the proper operation of a septic system and that will not result in soil compaction. The easement shall terminate only with the written approval of the Hendricks County Health Officer.
7. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.

MIP 1089/18: DUANE LANE; a 1-lot minor subdivision, 7.58 acres, Marion Township, S05-T15N-R2W, located on the north side of U.S. Highway 36, approximately 0.4 mile west of State Road 75, more commonly known as 7410 West U.S. Highway 36. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Dale Kruse of Kruse Consulting, Inc. appeared along with the applicant, Duane Lane.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that the primary development plan for Hawkeye Storage associated with this plat was continued at the Plan Commission meeting.

Mr. Kruse stated then that they were just going to discuss the plat.

Mr. Gaston stated that the Drainage Board had approved the preliminary development plan and would hear the final at next month's meeting.

Mr. Kruse stated that the property in question had been the former Trailer's Galore business and that Mr. Lane had bought the property in October of 2016. He stated that a metes and bounds description had then been created for a portion of the property and that the owners had not sold the entire property to Mr. Lane. He stated that the purpose of this plat was to talk about making the property a buildable parcel so that Mr. Lane could develop the 7.58 acre parcel which contained the

existing buildings with no new access requested on U.S. Highway 36. He stated that there was an existing septic system onsite and since they were not going to use it, a note was added to the plat stating that it would be abandoned.

Mrs. Haan asked if written documentation of this would be provided to the Health Department.

Mr. Kruse stated he would do that.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that the note in the staff letter about a vicinity map could be included on the development plan and not the plat. He also asked if a note was needed on the plat about the septic or just documentation to the Health Department.

Mrs. Haan stated that she just needed written documentation prior to recording of the plat and a note did not need to be added to the plat.

Mr. Kruse stated that a sidewalk note was added on the plat.

Mr. Dombrosky then stated in regard to the development plan, the landscaping in the front needed to be discussed. He stated that since it was not dedicated right-of-way, no easement would be needed in order to allow the landscaping in that right-of-way.

Mr. Kruse stated that they were placing landscaping on the frontage on the south side of the line and the question was whether or not they needed to provide any additional easement or notation. He stated he did not believe they did as Mr. Lane owned down to the right-of-way.

Mr. Gaston stated that the not dedicated right-of-way was based on the Hendricks County Thoroughfare Plan and was not on any state plans. He stated if the state came in to take it, they would need to compensate Mr. Lane for it.

Mr. Dombrosky stated for the land but probably not for any landscaping or improvements.

After some discussion, it was agreed to place a notation on the development plan and not on the plat.

Mr. Gaston again discussed that the Drainage Board had given primary approval to the development plan and the plat and that he was okay with approving the final for the plat today. He stated that there were no drainage related easements on the plat and no offsite easements. He also stated that they were making sure there were no offsite issues.

Mr. Dombrosky then opened the public hearing. There being no one signed up to be heard, Mr. Dombrosky closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kruse then discussed some details having to do with the development plan for this project. He stated that some changes had been made to the building in the front so it would be the same. He stated they had talked about the ends being masonry product and not different colored metal.

Mr. Lane stated that they would be using a stone type instead of an actual masonry foundation type of product.

Mr. Kruse stated they had not shown that product on the west end of the buildings because they could not be seen from the roadway. He stated those plans were turned in with the secondary application. He then stated that they had talked about the drainage on the north side and maintaining a swale on the property and he also discussed how the drainage went into the detention pond. Mr. Kruse also displayed the landscaping plan for the property.

February 14, 2018

Mr. Dombrosky stated that there had also been discussion regarding the fence on the east side being on the east side of that detention.

Mr. Lane stated he was okay with that.

Mr. Dombrosky stated with that being a dry bottom, it was not as concerning.

Mr. Kruse stated then that the trees and bushes should be installed outside of the fence.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that was correct. Mr. Dombrosky then asked about slats on the fence on the front.

Mr. Lane asked if he meant the front only.

Mr. Dombrosky stated he was not sure and would have to take a look at that again.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they could now go forward with approval for the plat. He asked Mr. Ayers if he had any further questions or concerns.

Mr. Ayers stated that there did not need to be any notation on the plat regarding the landscaping.

Mr. Ayers then made a motion to grant approval for **MIP 1089/18: Duane Lane** subject to the conditions and recommendations in staff's letter dated February 14, 2018.

Mr. Gehring seconded the motion which was unanimous.

FOR – 5 – AGAINST – 0 – ABSTAINED – 0 –

The staff conditions and recommendations were as follows:

DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:

Subject to Drainage Board approval and the conditions of the County Surveyor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Provide vicinity map on plat.
2. Add note that the septic system is abandoned
3. Add the sidewalk note on the plat (sidewalks are not currently required for this lot).
4. Prior to recording, the existing septic tank must be abandoned, and written documentation provided to the Health Department according to 410 IAC 6-8.3-90.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. A properly executed County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided prior to approval with all appropriate fees paid prior to the start of any construction.
2. This project is subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit covering storm water quality. Procedures there under are governed locally by the Hendricks County Stormwater Management Ordinance and Technical Standards Manual. An application, fees, construction plans, specifications and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan must be presented for approval to the Hendricks County Drainage Board separately from the application to the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission. Secondary Stormwater Approval for a plat or development plan must be obtained from the Drainage Board prior to Approval by the Plan Commission. In addition, an Erosion Control Permit issued by the

Hendricks County Surveyor is required for individual building lots prior to obtaining a Building Permit.

3. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.

MRP 087/18: STEVEN & BLAIR HICKAM; a 1-lot minor residential plat, 3.75 acres, Liberty Township, S25-T15N-R1E, located on the west side of South County Road 300 East, approximately 0.15 mile north of the intersection with East County Road 350 South. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Dale Kruse of Kruse Consulting, Inc. appeared on behalf of the applicant and reviewed the location of the proposed minor residential plat. He stated that Mrs. Hickam was the granddaughter of the landowner and the almost four-acre parcel was to be created so that she could build a house on it.

Mr. Gaston stated that the project had received approval at the Drainage Board meeting.

Mr. Dombrosky asked about the driveway drainage.

Mr. Ayers stated that it looked like the drainage might get trapped on the south side and needed to have a way to get to the west with a cross pipe there or get it across the driveway. He stated that might still be an issue though as there was not a pronounced grade. He stated the drainage needed to get under the driveway or it would be trapped.

Mr. Kruse pointed out where a culvert had been installed. He stated he had been out at the site after a snowmelt and he did not believe there would be an issue there. He pointed out where a culvert on a driveway had been completely smashed and there still was not a problem with drainage. He stated he felt the reason why was because there was a slope there.

Mr. Ayers stated that it would need to be graded correctly so that it flowed west away from the roadway.

Mr. Kruse suggested placing a note on the development plan about the grading.

Mr. Dombrosky stated then that a note was needed to ensure that the drainage flowed west away from the road.

Mrs. Haan asked Mr. Kruse about a note being added when the tile was installed.

Mr. Kruse stated that the note had been added but did not know if it indicated that it was free flowing.

Mr. Dombrosky asked about noting a building setback line on the plat.

Mr. Kruse stated that had been done.

Mr. Dombrosky asked about the lot not meeting the 3:1 ratio. He stated, however, that the property went to a natural break in the grade and the ordinance allowed for an exception due to topography. He stated that would be a modification request.

Mr. Dombrosky then asked for further questions or comments. There being none, he called for a motion with the modification for the 3:1 ratio.

February 14, 2018

Mr. Gehring then made a motion to grant approval for **MRP 087/18: Steven & Blair Hickam** subject to the following:

1. Conditions & recommendations in staff's letter dated February 14, 2018; and
2. Modification approved for the lot not meeting the 3:1 ratio due to topography.

Mrs. Haan seconded the motion which was unanimous for approval.

FOR – 5 – AGAINST – 0 – ABSTAINED – 0 –

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m.

Timothy Dombrosky, Chairman