NORTH RIDGEVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF
REGULAR MEETING OCTOBER 8, 2013

To Order: Chairman Jim Rothgery called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. with the pledge to the flag.

Roll Call: Present were Planning Commission Members Tim Anderson, Jim Hurst, Larry Mollenkamp, Robert Olesen and Jim Rothgery.
Also present was Chief Building Official Guy Fursdon, City Engineer Scott Wangler, Mayor David Gillock arrived at 7:20 P.M., Safety-Service Director Jeff Armbruster and Secretary Donna Tjotjos.

Minutes:

Chairman Rothgery asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes dated September 10, 2013. He stated if there are no corrections to those minutes, then they are approved as presented and will be placed on file.

Old Business:

Chairman Rothgery stated that there is no old business.

NEW BUSINESS:

APPLICANT: Clayton M. (Mike) Pitchure, PE, Site Quest, Ltd, 3867 West Market Street; #309, Akron, OH 44333
OWNER: North Ridgeville Board of Education, 5490 Mills Creek Lane
REQUEST: Approval to construct a 300 foot Cellular Communications Tower, which will replace an existing tower within the local area.
LOCATION: 35895 Center Ridge Road in an R-1 District
Permanent Parcel No. 07-00-021-117-015

Application was read along with Administrative Officers comments received from Chief Building Official Fursdon, City Engineer Wangler, Fire Chief Reese, and Police Chief Freeman.

Chairman Rothgery asked for a representative to approach the podium and state their name and address.

Mr. Mike Pitchure, Site Quest, Ltd., Architects and Engineers for TowerCo for this application and located at 3867 West Market Street, Suite 309, Akron, OH explained that the application before the Commission tonight is a new tower, 300 feet in height, being located close to City Hall. He continued to state this is actually a replacement for an existing structure that will be taken down about a half a mile north east of here, down Bainbridge Road and just north of the Service Department. Presently that tower is not in the best of health and would require a lot of effort and dollars in order to be able to get it back into shape or add additional antennas or additional work on it. With that in mind, after many conversations with the City, we decided on this location since it would best benefit the City; best benefit all the other carriers on the existing tower, plus a new carrier, Verizon Wireless, that is looking at collocating also. Our application tonight is for a 300 foot tall structure located north of city hall and on the Board of Education property.

Chairman Rothgery asked if the representative looked at other areas other than the area right behind City Hall.

Mike Pitchure stated yes, they sure did. There were a number of things that they actually looked at; one being the existing tower. It was originally looked at to put Verizon on that tower itself. Unfortunately, after preliminary examination, our fears were that structurally, it would not end up working out. What they did in the long run is they came back to the City and asked for maybe some other measures that they might be able to look at. One thing that they did end up looking at was the existing water tower that is fairly close to here. The unfortunate thing about it is that one of the existing carriers that are on the tower right now is at a 300 foot level. The water tower is only about 120 to 125 feet in height and unfortunately it would never satisfy that top carrier. That top carrier unfortunately, is the U.S. Government. That tenant in particular has some driving rights in order to try and be at that same elevation. They looked for another structure that would be 300 feet in height. Unfortunately, there are no structures of that height in this area and therefore they have to build this new structure.

Chairman Rothgery turned the floor over to the Commission for questions and comments.

Member James Hurst pointed out the four foot buffer and stated that he noticed the drawings noted anticipated expansions and asked why the expansion couldn't just be built now to be ready for the future and that way; this variance wouldn't have to go in front of Board of Zoning and Building Appeals.

Mike Pitchure understood his concern and appreciates his concern. The reason they stopped the expansion of the site all the way to the north and to the lease limit was that they are aware of the School's functions out there as well as community functions and what they are trying to do in case no other carriers came on board to go on the tower, they were trying to reserve that 20 foot space for the school's purposes and uses. He believes that they have some kind of festival at some point in time and they would like to keep use of that space if they possibly could. In conjunction in working together with the Board of Education and the School, they decided to leave the top portion of the compound at least vacant at this point in time. Should those future carriers come along, they would have the ability to build that and put those carriers in that location.

Member Mollenkamp asked what the finished dimension was the whole fenced in area.

Mike Pitchure stated the entire leased area is 100 feet by 100 feet in size and of course they are sneaking in four feet on each side. So they are 92 feet in width and 20 feet short on the location he pointed to on the drawing and almost to the lease line on the area he showed on the drawing. So, they are almost at 79 by 92.

Member Olesen stated that he had an informational question. He proceed to ask that on this tower, 300 feet; he is aware of the Police not being able to reach some parts of the city on this equipment, how much more area will they be able to encompass with this new tower and their location on the tower.

Mike Pitchure stated that he didn't know the exact answer to that. He stated that they do know part of that answer and that is that this tower will give you better coverage throughout the entire community of North Ridgeville. As far as the exact coverage, that depends on a few things. It depends on the antennae that they are going to use and how far it may broadcast and likewise the radio that they are going to use and the amount of gain they can get out of the antenna. The preliminary look at this is that there will be a substantial increase for them, but at this point in time, he has not had the opportunity to work with the City's consultant on any coverage maps or anything of that nature.

Member Hurst asked what utilities will be required along the easement.

Mike Pitchure stated that there are only two utilities that they will need; one of course being electricity that they will get from the illuminating company and that is fairly simple because there is a transformer that serves City Hall that sits on the north property line right now and what they would have the ability to do is make a tap off of that transformer to get to the site. The other utility that they will need of course is telephone and it really is more than just telephone. What they are looking for is a fiber optic connection in order to be able to get the capacity that they need for all the phone calls and data that would end up going through this site. The only other utility that might be needed at a later date is natural gas for a generator or something of that nature, but at least at this point in time there are no plans for that.

Member Hurst asked, as he noted the drawing, if the "F" means the fiber optics on the drawing?

Mike Pitchure stated that is correct.

Member Olesen stated that in our previous discussions we talked about the easement and kind of drifted over into discussions about this tower and one of the things that we learned is that this tower is being built with a new concept and that being that it will collapse within itself if a tornado or heavy windstorm were to occur.

Mike Pitchure stated that is one concern that they had. He explained that this tower is awfully close to City Hall and they are very close to some residential structures in the area and there is one thing that they can do from an engineering structural standpoint. He stated that he is a structure engineer by trade so; he has been involved in this and many other sites. What they basically try to do is design it in such a way that some of the components that are inside the structure, inside the middle third of the tower, they try to create a fundamental weak point such that it if it were to go over with the wind load capacity of the tower, that it would end up buckling in the middle third rather than at the bottom. He showed how it would collapse itself on the drawing and stated that was the theory by which they design that.

Member Mollenkamp stated that it could be at 150 feet.

Mike Pitchure asked if he meant as far as where it might collapse at and responded that was correct. He went on to explain that what they were doing is creating in this middle third so that it would collapse upon itself and maintain any other portion that would fall off the tower within the compound.

Member Mollenkamp stated that this thing is structurally set at 90 mile an hour winds.

Mike Pitchure stated that was correct; 90 mile an hour and three second gust, which is equivalent of 70 mile an hour 0steady state wind.

Chairman Rothgery asked if anyone else had questions from the Planning Commission.

Member Hurst asked if they could explain what they need to do for the ice protection that may fall off it.

Mike Pitchure stated that any structure like this does end up having ice that accumulates on it. From what he has ever experienced before as far as ice falling off of the tower, that it usually falls within the compound and that is why the structures themselves that are within the compound usually have a concrete roof in order to protect themselves from falling ice. Most of that falls within the compound area.

Chairman Rothgery asked if there were any other questions from the Planning Commission. Hearing none, he turned the floor over to the Administration for discussion.

Safety-Service Director Jeff Armbruster stated that this conversation started probably well over a year ago about what we are going to do with the existing tower at the Service Garage. That tower, for those of you who have lived in North Ridgeville knows, that it dates back to the early 70s or even prior to that with Continental Cable and there is another set of guide wires that actually go to it. One of the concerns that the City had was the need to have it structurally sound. When Verizon came in and asked if they could collocate there, they didn't say it wasn't sound, but due to the age of the tower itself we started having serious concerns as to if that tower goes down, number one, it is extremely expensive to replace and we looked at the alternative and Verizon came in and said that they would like to build 150 foot tower behind City Hall. That didn't work because we needed to have our utilities, Badger Meter had to be at 280 feet and the FBI had to be at 300 feet. The FBI has a long term lease with the City of North Ridgeville. This was a very good opportunity for a win-win for the schools, a win for the City, a win for Fire, Police, Utilities and FBI in order to get a tower that is brand new at no cost to the City other than us putting brand new cables and antennas and stuff, which TowerCo is actually giving us money to do that. We have to buy the equipment, but it is a win-win for the community and really will take us beyond. Our cellular service will be that much better in the community and we do look forward to having this structure built. The old structure will be taken down so it doesn't become a further liability to the City of North Ridgeville and residents. He added that the old tower is not in the exact position it was supposed to be in. He stated that they didn't find that out until they actually did some BIS coordinates. He stated that it is actually 740 feet away from where it should have been placed.

Chairman Rothgery turned the floor over to the audience and asked if anyone would like to approach the podium and ask any questions they might have. Hearing none, he brought the discussion back to the Planning Commission and entertained a motion.

Member Hurst stated that presumably there are fees for carriers who utilize the tower and asked if those fees remain with the City or will those fees now go to the schools.

Safety-Service Director Armbruster stated that the fees will go to the City Schools. A wise use of the tax payer's dollars.

Member Mollenkamp asked if the generator that will be located within the compound carry power from now on and through any kind of expansion or is this thing just set for what we actually need right now.

Mike Pitchure stated that each of the individual carriers will have their own emergency generation. Verizon will have their own generator that will end up being inside their shelter for their own use. He didn't know if any of the current carriers have generators at the existing tower.

Jason Woodward, TowerCo, 5000 Valleystone Drive, Carey, North Carolina, 27513 stated that the question was about generators. The FCC requires all mobile communications to have an eight hour battery backup or generator backup. Verizon uses an actual generator, T-Mobile uses a battery backup and Sprint also uses a battery backup and then the City actually has a generator out back that could be tied into the emergency equipment if needed. The actual generator and battery backups are carrier associated. They don't allow other companies to plug into them.

Member Mollenkamp stated that consequently the generator that is going to be here is going to have to be natural gas powered.

Jason Woodward stated that it is actually diesel powered.

Member Mollenkamp asked if a fuel tank will have to be located on that site.

Jason Woodward stated that was correct, but the generator is actually contained within the shelter. It is inside the building with a four hour fire wall protection all the way around it.

Member Mollenkamp stated plus a diesel tank.

Jason Woodward stated that the diesel tank sits underneath the actual generator within the Verizon shelter.

Member Hurst explained that generators generally have the storage tank built right under them as part of the structure to hold them up.

Member Mollenkamp stated he was wondering because if they have to run gas back there further down the line, why isn't it being done now instead of diesel.

Mike Pritchure stated that when it comes down to priorities for usage of generators the wireless industry put themselves back to diesel generation rather than natural gas or propane. Here becomes the issue. In certain areas and not necessarily north east Ohio, but if you do have an earthquake one of the first things that they end up shutting off is your natural gas distribution system so that they can make an evaluation of the leaks and everything else associated with it because of that fact, if we ever had an event like that here and they shut down the natural gas, obviously, they would lose their emergency generation. As some of the operations managers told him at one time, he can send a technician out there with a 5 gallon bucket of diesel fuel but I can't get propane and he wouldn't get natural gas to that generator using his personnel. That is why they basically wrapped themselves around diesel fuel as being their emergency generation fuel.

Member Mollenkamp stated that it is basically for seismic action.

Mike Pitchure stated correct, for the potential of.

Chairman Rothgery asked if we get three cell phone companies that want to put an antenna on this tower, will they be able to fit their equipment inside the 100 by 100 foot enclosure.

Mike Pitchure explained that inside the 100 by 100 foot compound, they have actually planned for the four existing carriers that are on the existing tower, plus Verizon as being the fifth, plus two future carriers is what they are looking at for this new structure. So, it would be a total of, potentially, seven carriers on this structure. So, not only did they design for the present need but they have designed for two additional carriers; not only for the structurally on the tower, but likewise the space inside the compound. Now the only other thing that they would need to do to accommodate any future carriers as we had mentioned, this 20 foot buffer area that they have in back that they aren't making use of inside that leased area, they have planned future structures he showed on the drawing which would necessitate them having to move that fence line out to that leased area. In conjunction, he continued, if they were ever to do that as he showed in plan, they would either move or replace that landscaping as such in order to maintain that buffer around the north side of the site.

Chairman Rothgery addressed Chief Building Official Fursdon stating that his comment mentioned that Planning Commission was to provide a waiver regarding the color of this tower.

Chief Building Official Fursdon stated yes, that is what the ordinance says.

Chairman Rothgery stated that if there are no other questions, he would entertain a motion.

> It was moved by Hurst and seconded by Mollenkamp to approve the application.

Chairman Rothgery asked the Secretary to call the roll.

Yes, 5 No, 0
Motion was approved by a vote of five to zero.

APPLICANT:	Daniel L. Allen, DLA Construction Services, 1307 Columbia Street, Vancouver, WA 98660
OWNER:	Rini Realty Co., 924 Westpoint Parkway, Westlake, OH 44145
REQUEST:	Approval to construct a Taco Bell Restaurant facility in a B3 District
LOCATION:	32350 Lorain Road, east of Lear Nagel and adjacent to Sheetz Service Station Permanent Parcel No. 07-00-004-108-094

Application was read along with Administrative Officers comments received from Chief Building Official Fursdon, City Engineer Wangler, Fire Chief Reese, and Police Chief Freeman.

Chairman Rothgery asked for a representative.

Ms. Lena Hill, CT Consultants, 8150 Sterling Court, Mentor, OH 44060 explained that they are the Civil Engineers on this project. She explained that this plan was presented to Planning Commission in May of 2011 and was approved. She stated the approval has expired and the developers wish now to move forward with the project. There are no changes except the building got a little bit smaller and the construction type of the building is different. Those were the only changes to the project.

Chairman Rothgery stated that there is grass shown on the drawing going into the dry easement. He asked if there would be anything posted that will suggest that vehicles could go through the back and exit onto Lear Nagle. He stated that there is no left turn onto Lorain Road during specific hours.

Lena Hill asked if he was asking them to buy signage.

Chairman Rothgery stated yes.

Lena Hills stated they could do that if that is a request of the City.

Chairman Rothgery asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission.

Member Hurst stated it was quoted that there are pretty serious traffic concerns in that area and he asked the Administration if there was any way the City could get a No-Right Turn on Red sign from Lorain onto Lear Nagle in order to give people who are exiting onto Lear Nagle time to turn onto Lear Nagle going north and south. He stated he has experienced difficulty trying to exit on to Lear Nagle out of those drives. He stated Planning Commission cannot make that a condition of this application, but asked the Administration if it was possible the City could make that change.

Mayor Gillock stated it is possible, but would leave that up to the City Engineer and an Engineering Analysis. He didn't believe, personally, it would be a good idea to hold that traffic up that is turning right onto Lear Nagle as it would back the traffic up passed I 480. That is something that the Engineering Department could look at.

Engineer Wangler stated they have not looked at that. That would provide a gap for exiting out of that driveway. The question is, is would it solve one problem and create a worse problem.

Member Hurst stated he believes it would, but he believes that the benefits outweigh the detriments.

Mayor Gillock stated that intersection has been studied by ODOT in great detail and he believes starting in June of 2015, that entire intersection will be reconstructed as part of the Lear Nagle widening and that will all be torn out and there will be double turn lanes. That issue will be addressed at that time. There will also be a median or barriers in the median that will prevent left turn lanes out of those businesses that will have to go right.

Chairman Rothgery asked if anyone had any other comments.

Member Olesen stated that people have asked him what happened to Taco Bell over the two year period when they first announced that project.

Mr. Mike Gordon, DLA Construction Services, 871 Canterbury Road, Unit G, Westlake, OH explained two years ago they were here two years ago with this project and it is just negotiations that took two years to come to an agreement and that is why this project did not move forward at that time. There are also some soil issues there, which will cause some undercutting of those soils and the ownership of the funding of that caused issues in the negotiations.

Chairman Rothgery stated Mr. Hurst did bring up these traffic issues a few years ago and explained in the past two years, the City has approved Panera Bread, a college, and a Chipotle in that area and he didn't feel that those businesses have made that much of an impact. He feels that the City and ODOT have made improvements in that area by adding the light at I 480.

Member Hurst stated he agreed, but most of those businesses have the opportunity of exiting onto Cook Road to that light and assumes that most of them do, but he has a very strong feeling about those exiting onto Lear Nagle as it is pretty difficult getting out of there.

Chairman Rothgery stated that was why he made a comment about the signage that directs traffic behind the driveway that leads out to Lear Nagle.

Member Hurst stated that is exactly why he is trying to get that traffic stopped so that the traffic exiting out onto Lear Nagle doesn't get backed up as a result of not being able to exit onto Lear Nagle due to traffic coming from Lorain Road.

Member Mollenkamp stated sometimes the traffic backup southbound onto Lorain Road negates being able to make any kind of turn one way or another coming out of Sheetz if you were going to Lorain Road or going south on Lear Nagle. He realizes what Member Hurst is saying and does agree with that, but he believes that if the City puts a no right turn there at the light, the traffic will back up past the bridge during heavy traffic times. He stated it might behoove Planning to wait and see what ODOT is going to do with that intersection. The City Engineer and Administration will look at it during the future studies. He believes a no turn on red would suffice to making any kind of difference at that intersection.

Member Hurst stated he used to be part of that traffic that sat on Lorain Road waiting to turn right, but has also been on the other end trying to come out of McDonalds and Sheetz and you take your life in your hands getting out of there.

Chairman Rothgery asked if there were any other questions from the Planning Commission. Hearing none, he opened the floor to the Administration. Hearing no comments, he opened the floor to the audience for questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked Planning Commission for a motion.

It was moved by Anderson and seconded by Hurst to approve the application. Chairman Rothgery asked the Secretary to call the roll.

Yes, 5 No, 0

Motion was approved by a vote of five to zero.

APPLICANT:	Village at Ashton Place, LLC, 36097 Westminister Road
OWNER:	The New Market Corp., 10 East, Three Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15222
REQUEST:	Approval for lot splits creating landlocked parcels to include two lots without frontage on right of way.
LOCATION:	Village of Ashton Place, Ashton Place Condominiums in Waterbury PCD.

Permanent Parcel No. 07-00-038-700-004

Application was read along with Administrative Officers comments received from Chief Building Official Fursdon, City Engineer Wangler, Fire Chief Reese, Police Chief Freeman and Assistant Law Director Toni Morgan.

Chairman Rothgery asked for a representative.

Attorney Bryan Dardis representing Village of Ashton Place, LLC and located at 28601 Chagrin Blvd., Suite 500, Woodmere, OH 44122 explained this is not a normal Planning Commission request as what they are trying to do is fix a title issue. This is where it led us. He explained the client is under contract to purchase the remaining 37 undeveloped units in Ashton Condominiums, which is a subdivision of Waterbury PCD. They have been under contract since probably about a year and a half ago to do this and in doing their due diligence in working with the title company, they discovered that when the condominium was formed back in 2005, it was actually improperly formed as a condominium property. He continued to make a long story short, the condominium declarations and the plat were filed as if everything was completed; all 49 units were completed, when in fact none had been completed. The condominium statute within the Ohio Revised Code, Chapter 5311 requires that certain units are to be completed and those are the units that are to be filed with the original declarations and it is to include what is called expandable property, which are were the additional units are to go and then amendments are to be filed thereafter as additional units are developed. So, the title company did not feel that it was a valid title to take. This is a problem that they have to fix and New Market Corporation, which is a subsidiary of Dollar Bank; who currently owns title to the property right now engaged the law firm of Kaman and Cusimano, who are experts in condominium law and they followed their path. They created the amended and restated the declarations, the plats, and legal descriptions that were presented to this Commission. They need to record these with Lorain County Recorder in order for the Recorder to accept these declarations and legal descriptions an approval must be given by the City and Planning Commission. That is what brings this here today.

Chairman Rothgery asked if someone would be caring for all the property.

Attorney Dardis stated that was correct and that is the whole idea behind this process.

Chairman Rothgery opened the floor to the Planning Commission.

Member Hurst stated for clarification, he asked the representative to show on the drawings which properties were being discussed. He stated he is under the assumption that because these are private streets, that is why this problem has come up.

Attorney Dardis state the problem came up because the developer formed a condominium under the old statute which was no longer in effect when they formed this condominium property and so, the statute changed the way these condominiums were to be formed and developed. Reality is that when most condominiums were formed it became a non issue as units were sold, the problem took care of itself because they all became under private ownership and there was no longer an issue. In this instance, the developer went bankrupt and so the title transferred to the bank and the problem still exists. He has spoke to the individuals who are trying to solve this problem and asked how often they had seen this. He stated that they have seen it, but have never had to deal with it because the problem normally resolved itself. To answer the question, there are twelve existing units that will be taken out of the condominium and then rededicated to the initial condominium property and then everything else will be expandable property and as his client once he takes title and develops it, they will make amendments and declarations to the plats to form the condominium units.

Member Olesen asked if what they are proposing to do will inconvenience any current residents in this development.

Attorney Dardis stated no, in fact the residents all had to sign off on the restated declaration. The whole idea is for the applicant to come in and build, which will decrease their cost by prorating the expenses.

Member Hurst addressed the Assistant Law Director and asked since he owns condo in Wildflower, will this new statute affect him in anyway.

Assistant Law Director Morgan asked what will affect him.

Member Hurst stated that issue with Public Street versus Private Street.

Assistant Law Director Morgan stated not at this point she didn't know how it would. She explained this just allows frontage. Planning Commission can allow frontage on a public street now or they can waive that requirement and allow it on a different street. The ordinances that went to Council just make it clear because now we require private streets and public streets to be built to the same standards. She stated that the ordinances are being amended so that it is a non issue. She didn't think it would affect anything existing.

Chairman Rothgery asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, he opened the floor to the Administration for discussion.

Safety-Service Director Armbruster stated that from the Administration side, they certainly appreciate having this built out. He believes that it really is going to enhance, not only those that live there, but really will complete what was originally started. He stated that they certainly appreciate these gentlemen and Bud Hagy who came in and bought the property and try to develop it. He believes it is outstanding, that they have done that.

Chief Building Official Fursdon asked what necessitates subdividing this property and not just recording the plat with the six existing buildings and then moving forward as each building is constructed and recording the new plat.

Attorney Dardis stated that they are removing the twelve existing units from what was improperly formed and then essentially rededicating it to properly form it as condominium under Revised Code 5311.

Chief Building Official Fursdon stated then by law to do that, they have to create these property splits to make that all work.

Attorney Dardis stated they had to create a meets and bounds legal description of the expandable property where they will add the units to.

Chairman Rothgery opened the floor to the audience for questions or comments.

Ms. Laverne Marchak 8764 Wakefield Run, Village of Ashton Place agreed that she is happy to have the new developers come in finish this project. She stated in discussions with the proposed new owners, she didn't recall this discussion at all and she is just curious as to what sites are being discussed that have to be split.

Attorney Dardis explained again the existing units that are built are being taken out and rededicating them as a condominium to reset and fix the problem and make it a proper condominium. That is one split. They are adding all of this additional vacant land that he showed on the drawing as expandable property that can be developed. As Green Quest builds, they will amend the declarations to add the units that are being built.

Ms. Laverne Marchak stated that there were more properties that were being affected according to what she read on the card sent to her.

Attorney Dardis stated that the developed condos will be one parcel with one legal description to start with and then because of the layout of the land, they created three separate legal descriptions that as they are developed and units added, they will be dedicated properly.

Ms. Laverne Marchak asked if any other changes will be made.

Attorney Dardis stated no.

Chairman Rothgery asked if there was any one else that would like to make a comment.

Mr. Westley Stump of 8691 Ashton Place Drive asked when the condos are built out, the areas between the single family homes and the condos, will there be a continuation of landscaping there.

Attorney Dardis stated they will do everything within the existing declarations and by-laws. They actually had ample discussions with some of the existing Board Members and they agreed to do what has been done and they are covering part of the cost.

Chairman Rothgery asked if there was anyone else in the audience who would like to make a comment. Hearing none, he moved discussion backed to Planning Commission and asked for a motion.

It was moved by Anderson and seconded by Mollenkamp to approve the application.

Chairman Rothgery asked the Secretary to call the roll.

Yes, 5 No, 0

Motion was approved by a vote of five to zero.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Rothgery stated since there is no other business, this meeting is adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 8:26P.M.

Chairman **Secretary**

November 12, 2013

Date Approved