



MINUTES

MEETING OF VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT PLAN COMMISSION / ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

July 14, 2022–VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

432 W. NEBRASKA STREET

- Call to Order:** Chair Rigoni called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM
- Commissioners Present:** Chair Maura Rigoni, David Hogan, Jessica Jakubowski, Brian James
- Commissioners Absent:** Dan Knieriem, Will Markunas, Nichole Schaefer
- Staff Present:** Director of Community and Economic Development Mike Schwarz, Senior Planner Chris Gruba, Planner Drew Duffin
- Elected Officials Present:** None

A. Approval of the Minutes from June 23, 2022

Motion (#1): Approval of the minutes, as presented, from June 23, 2022

Motion by: James

Seconded by: Jakubowski

Approved: (3-0, Commissioner Hogan abstained)

Chair Rigoni swore in any members of the public who wished to speak at the meeting.

B. Public Hearing: 324 Center Road, Root Residence

Drew Duffin summarized the staff report.

Chair Rigoni asked the applicant to approach the podium. She asked if the applicant had anything else to add.

James Murray, speaking on behalf of the applicant, stated he was available to answer questions and address concerns the commission had. He continued by noting that the existing siding on the home was done in wood, and the applicant was looking to match that with LP smart siding. Colors would match as well.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any public comments.

There were none.

Motion (#2): Motion to close the public hearing.

Motion by: Hogan

Seconded by: Jakubowski

Approved: (4-0)

Chair Rigoni asked if the Commission had any other comments or questions.

There were none.

Motion (#3): Recommend that the Village Board approve the request for a variation from Article 6, Section B, Part 2(g)(2) of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance to permit the use of non-masonry siding on the first floor of an existing home in conjunction with proposed first floor addition and exterior remodeling in the R-2 Single-Family Residential District located at 324 Center Road, in accordance with the submitted plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact.

Motion by: Jakubowski

Seconded by: Hogan

Approved: (4-0)

Motion (#4): Recommend that the Village Board approve the request for a variation from Article 6, Section B, Part 2(l) of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance to reduce the requirement that a basement be equal to 80% of the ground floor area of the first story to 60.55% in the R-2 Single-Family Residential District located at 324 Center Road, in accordance with the submitted plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact.

Motion by: James

Seconded by: Hogan

Approved: (4-0)

Chair Rigoni asked the applicant to contact staff with questions about the next steps for the project.

C. Workshop: 21420 S. Harlem Avenue – Thrift Home and Restoration (The Bridge Teen Center)

Schwarz summarized the staff report.

Chair Rigoni asked the applicant to step forward, and asked if she had anything to add.

Priscilla Steinmetz, the applicant, and Patrick McCarty, the architect, approached the podium.

The architect thanked staff for their help compiling information on the subject property. He explained that he had an engineer out to assess the integrity of the building, who reported that the “shell” was intact. Work would need to be done on the roof, which need

replacing. Additionally, the applicant wants to remove the existing dormers on the building to achieve a more modern-looking building. The applicant also desires to change the windows to be more modern, in particular the windows toward the back of the building, which would have shelving and storage covering them on the interior. The proposal would update the shell of the building and then create interior office, storage, and retail space. The interior would have an open concept on the sales floor. The east side would have the point-of-sale machine, while the west side would be left for offices and storage space, with the sales floor in between. For the exterior layout, the south side of the building would be considered the front. This would leave the north side for drop-off donations, logistics, and employee parking. He stated that the applicant and he were looking to comply with all relevant zoning regulations and to avoid the need for any variations. The applicant wanted to join the center two of the four lots in question into one lot, which would address parking needs for the building. It would also leave the northernmost and southernmost lots for other uses and future development. Finally, the architect stated that he was waiting for information on the status of existing utilities, namely water and sewer, to be sure that they had no issues. He was happy to answer any questions in relation to engineering or architecture, and that the applicant could speak more to the operations and use of the property.

The applicant stated she was grateful for the guidance of staff and the Plan Commission while they strive to make a difference in the community. She explained that the Bridge Teen Center operates out of Orland Park and that the organization has helped over 11,000 Lincoln-Way students over the years. The current location operates a thrift store, and the applicant is now looking to open a second location. The teen center has a job readiness program and the second location would help expand that as well. The center has served many families in Frankfort, so moving to the Village seemed like a logical next step. The job readiness program has helped students from 7th to 12th grade develop job, leadership, and professional skills. Since starting the program, current membership tripled the initial size. Emphasis with the program was placed on helping students who did not feel they had a place they belonged, and giving them a space to be themselves, while growing and learning. The teen center also offers jobs to certain teens, currently 15 teens are employed. The applicant stated that the teen center also has ongoing community service work, which is especially helpful for local high school students who struggle to find places to earn service hours which also promoted individual growth opportunities. The teen center serves 128 communities across the Chicagoland area, and the National Honor Society often connects students with the center for volunteer opportunities. Families also volunteer, not just individual teens. Needless to say, The Bridge Teen Center is flourishing at its current location, and it even serves as a model for teen programming nationwide.

The applicant continued by explaining how they wanted the proposed thrift store to not just feel like a thrift store, but instead to be an aspirational place where students could learn in an environment which felt modern. She stated they were looking to emulate Chip and Joanna Gaines, and Crate and Barrel in the design of the thrift shop. The applicant expressed her intention to promote a clean space that did not feel like a thrift store inside or out. Cameras would be installed to monitor donations. The existing thrift store uses a trailer to store and organize incoming donations and workers regularly organize the donations received and keep the space looking clean. The new location would also serve as a place to run job readiness training events, since the current location was too small.

All profits from the thrift store would be to support The Bridge. The existing store provides the center with approximately 30% of its operating budget, and a second store would allow the non-profit to become more self-sufficient, especially given the state of the economy. The proposed thrift store would store and sell donated items such as furniture and other home goods, to supplement the sale of clothing and antiques at the first location. Plants would also be sold from the thrift store.

Chair Rigoni asked the Commissioners to focus on the big picture of the proposal since the current item was a workshop.

Commissioner Jakubowski asked how donation drop-off would work, and whether it would be open to the public.

The applicant responded that donations would be accepted during retail hours.

Commissioner Jakubowski asked what intake would look like from an operational point of view.

The architect responded that there was only one entrance to the site off of Harlem Avenue. The parking lot to the north of the building would be dedicated to employee parking and donation drop-off. Donations would enter the building from the area on the plans marked as a dock enclosure and from there enter straight into the building. All logistical work would be done on the north side of the building, and the public-facing operations, including parking and entrances, would be on the south side.

Commissioner Jakubowski asked if donations would be accepted during all open hours.

The applicant responded that they would, and that someone would be on duty to bring them inside, to prevent any donations from being damaged. Customers were not supposed to see the back-of-house work being done.

Commissioner Jakubowski asked if sales and donations would happen simultaneously.

The applicant said that they would, but that weather would be a factor in whether donations would be accepted or not. The current location accepts roughly 30 donations per day, but traffic varies depending on the time of day, different seasons, weather conditions. Some donations would be turned away, if they were deemed not sellable, such as unsold items from garage sales. Information on the items the thrift store would not accept is clearly posted and publicly available, and most people abide by those rules. This proposed new location would have twice the space for donations as the current one.

The architect added that the drop-off space could be closed and locked.

The applicant explained that donations would not be accepted in bad weather.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any comments regarding the retail component of the Special Use.

Commissioner James stated that given what was shown by the Future Land Use Map from the Frankfort Comprehensive Plan, as well as what development exists in the area currently, opening the property to a commercial use is reasonable. Ideally the building's

main entrance would face to the east towards Harlem Avenue, rather than south, but that was not feasible. He wondered if future buildings would be built to match the orientation of the existing building or to face towards Harlem Avenue.

The architect agreed that the orientation of the building was not ideal, and that if the building did not already exist they would build a structure which faced Harlem Avenue, but the applicant had no intention to demolish what was there and rebuild.

Commissioner James noted that the existing shell was originally intended for an office use, which would explain the orientation of the building. He expressed that an important consideration for the future should be whether later developments were built to look consistent with the existing building or in a way appropriate for their use, which would make the existing building stand out.

Chair Rigoni asked whether the site was developed as a Planned Unit Development.

Staff responded it was not.

The architect noted that there were originally plans for four buildings, all oriented the same way. The applicant intended to combine the middle two lots for their thrift store.

Commissioner Hogan asked if the applicant planned to purchase all four lots.

The architect stated that all four lots were being sold together. The applicant wanted to hold on to the other lots for later use or to sell to others in the future.

Staff noted that much of the northernmost lot was a mapped floodplain, which could not be built on.

The architect asked if an unfinished drive aisle at the Walgreens to the north of the property was intended to connect to the proposed thrift store.

Staff responded it was not.

Commissioner Hogan stated that the use was appropriate for the space. It did not seem like there was going to be much development nearby anytime soon, and he was glad that someone was taking an interest in the site. He noted that there were some complexities from a use perspective, but he had no real issue with the proposed use.

Chair Rigoni wondered whether other commercial developments would go that far south along Harlem Avenue. Perhaps the office use should remain across all lots, or blend the retail use with the existing zoning around it. She noted that vehicle access was challenging for the location, and that retail may not be as successful as a result. Therefore, a blend of retail with office uses may be an ideal mix. She noted it was important that there was a clear understanding of the whole development. The proposed thrift store was not like traditional commercial uses, but she wanted to keep the integrity of the office use for the other lots. She stated that she struggled with the proposal since there were still many unanswered questions in regard to the site plan. She wanted to meet the needs of the applicant while also blending with the potential future fabric of the surrounding spaces.

Commissioner Jakubowski noted that the area around the development was largely residential. Turning on or off this road anywhere but an intersection was often a challenge for drivers due to the amount of traffic at peak hours.

The applicant agreed that traffic there was rough.

Chair Rigoni stated that there was not much concern with what was there at the moment, and that she understood the applicant would improve the existing property. She wanted to know how allowing retail in that location would impact the local fabric of the community. She did not know what the intention was behind the initial B-4 Office zoning was, but was happy to see interest in the property regardless.

The architect asked if there was any support for allowing the special use on only the middle lots.

Chair Rigoni asked in response if the applicant wanted the Special Use permit for all four properties.

Staff clarified that per the application, all four parcels were under consideration for the Special Use Permit. However, that could be changed and the lot or lots granted the permit could be made clearer after a resubdivision.

Chair Rigoni stated that her understanding was that the Special Use Permit was for the lot with the existing building, not all four lots. She did not want a Special Use Permit granted for undeveloped land without knowing what would go there in the future. She then asked about how much activity was anticipated at the loading dock marked on the plans.

The architect clarified that it was a three-sided enclosure, not a loading dock, which would provide protection from the elements for items entering and leaving the store.

Commissioner Hogan asked if the proposed dock was similar to one at another location in Orland Park.

The applicant responded she was unsure. There would not be any large trucks entering the site; the space was intended for cars to pull up and load or unload items.

Commissioner James asked what kind of truck would deliver larger items such as furniture.

The architect said a box truck would deliver those items, no large vehicles.

Chair Rigoni asked if the drop-off space was intended for any sort of outdoor storage.

The architect responded it was not.

Chair Rigoni explained she did not want anything to be left outside after being dropped off.

Commissioner Hogan asked if there had been any traffic studies conducted for the site.

Chair Rigoni noted that Cook County has jurisdiction over Harlem Avenue.

The architect responded that no traffic study had been done.

Commissioner Hogan encouraged the applicant to have a traffic study done to get a sense of what kind of infrastructure would be needed and what was there already. He reiterated that granting a Special Use Permit to fewer lots was more agreeable than for all four lots. It is possible that another party may come along and look to also have a non-traditional retail space, but the main concern is with how operations would work, how traffic would flow, whether the use and design match the character of the neighborhood, and whether the space would benefit the operation of a thrift store. He also stated she would like to see landscaping in the area where the screening fence was proposed.

Chair Rigoni added that the Plan Commission typically looks for landscaping in areas like the one under consideration, and that fences were usually reserved for areas with more intense uses.

The architect responded that he had not put much work into the landscaping just yet. The limiting factor for landscape screening was the utility easement located near the rear property line.

Chair Rigoni stated that there was space for landscaping.

The architect agreed that there was space for landscaping and clarified he was just trying to manage expectations.

Commissioner Jakubowski suggested a wrought iron-style aluminum fencing in lieu of the proposed white, opaque PVC fencing.

Commissioner Hogan asked if the applicant had spoken with the neighbors about the proposal.

The architect responded that the sale of the property was not finalized yet.

The applicant added that The Bridge was trying to be fiscally smart, and would not buy the property if they would not be granted the Special Use Permit they applied for.

Chair Rigoni asked about the intention behind installing the fence along the rear property line.

The architect responded that the main intention for the fence was for screening to give the neighbors more privacy.

Chair Rigoni expressed that she would like to see more passive screening, such as landscaping, rather than just a fence.

The applicant asked whether the Plan Commission was seeking old trees and mature landscaping to screen the property.

Chair Rigoni responded that the Village had experience using landscaping to screen properties effectively, and that landscaping was preferable to a fence.

The applicant asked whether other properties incorporated both fencing and landscaping.

Chair Rigoni responded that other properties had installed both landscaping and fencing, and stated that the fencing was commonly faux wrought iron.

Commissioner Jakubowski stated that the Homeowner's Association of the nearby neighborhood may have some concerns.

Chair Rigoni asked whether the width of drive aisle on the west side of the building was currently 15 feet or would be reduced to 15 feet.

The architect stated that the drive aisle was currently 15 feet, but it would not be used to allow traffic to flow from the south to the north side of the building, or vice versa.

Chair Rigoni asked about the width of the drive aisles on the south side of the building.

The architect responded that the drive aisles were 20 feet.

Chair Rigoni remarked that typically 24 feet were required for the Fire Department.

Staff clarified that 24 feet is required for drive-aisles with parking on both sides, but 20 feet is sufficient for access and movement.

Chair Rigoni asked whether the pavement for the parking lot would just stop without a curb at its end.

The architect said that it would and that the decision to design it that way was largely a cost consideration. He noted there was enough space for vehicles to turn around via a three-point-turn, but no drive aisles would be designated for continuous flow.

Chair Rigoni stated that the applicant would need to consider how the proposed trash enclosure would impact vehicle flow on the north side of the property.

Staff mentioned that there was not a lot of buildable area available on the north side of the property.

Chair Rigoni agreed, and noted that the Plan Commission would need clarity on vehicle flow through the site to help them understand how the paved area would be laid out and allow for access to the building and space to maneuver. She then moved the discussion to the proposed architectural changes, and asked the applicant if they were going to keep the existing color of the brick.

The architect said they were not looking to keep that color, and instead change the existing red brick façade's color to an off-white.

Commissioner Jakubowski asked if there would be any technical issues with changing the color of the façade.

The architect responded there would not be, and that the applicant was intending to update the building for a more modern look.

Chair Rigoni asked what changes would be made to the roof material.

The architect said they would use darker shingles to contrast with the lighter-colored walls. In addition, the windows would be single-pane with no muntins.

Chair Rigoni stated that the proposed design did not match with the architecture of the nearby houses, which was a concern.

Commissioner Jakubowski noted that nearby commercial developments were designed to look more traditional and less modern, which was also true for the abutting residential neighborhood. The current structure matches better with the local fabric than the proposed design, which made deviation a concern. Another concern was with the covered windows on the west side of the proposed design. The renderings looked like the windows were just boarded up. She requested more detail on the design of the window covers.

Commissioner James noted that there were examples of buildings with similar designs appearing in the downtown area. He was unsure whether future nearby B-4 developments would want to match the proposed style.

The applicant noted that the proposed designs drew inspiration from Downtown Frankfort.

Chair Rigoni said that while she understood wanting to draw inspiration from local buildings, the look and feel of Downtown Frankfort was unique. Additionally, the proposed building was not in or near downtown, so nearby architecture was more important to consider and draw inspiration from. By changing the building from office use to retail use, the Plan Commission and the applicant would be changing the dynamic of the area around the property. She wondered if such a change would set a pattern for future development, and was not sure. She noted that while the proposed thrift shop was a form of retail, it was different from more traditional retail uses.

Commissioner Hogan stated that, on the other hand, denying a Special Use Permit may result in leaving the property vacant for the foreseeable future, similar to the past 30 years.

Chair Rigoni agreed, and stated she was unsure about what to do.

Staff noted that the existing structure was built in the Federalist style. Staff also noted that with the floodplain on the northern end of the property, there might only be one or two additional buildings on the property, so the number of future buildings that would have to either match or deviate from the current proposal was small.

Discussion continued about how the floodplain would impact the future development of the site.

Chair Rigoni said she wanted to make sure the design of the proposed building matched the fabric of the nearby neighborhood. It was also important to know what buildable area would be left over after the lots were resubdivided. Lastly, to make sure that the Special Use Permit, if granted, would only apply to the existing building, and not to the undeveloped lots as well.

Staff explained that the next steps for the project would include a resubdivision, which would allow for the Special Use Permit to be more specifically applied to the building and not include the adjacent undeveloped lots.

Commissioner Hogan also noted that additional detail from the applicant regarding the building renderings and proposed landscaping would also be beneficial to the Plan Commission. He suggested the applicant consider different designs for the covered windows.

Staff suggested using tinted panes to allow future uses to modify the windows in case they wished to use them as windows.

Chair Rigoni said she appreciated the design considerations which were present in the submitted materials. The Plan Commission was looking for clarity now to avoid confusion on design elements later.

Staff asked if the members of the Plan Commission were alright with the proposed modifications to the roof.

The architect explained that dormers and other decorative elements of the roof were being taken out because they had deteriorated since construction.

Staff asked the applicant if they felt that they had enough clarity on the Plan Commission's concerns with visuals and aesthetics.

The architect stated that they wanted to change the roof to look cleaner. What existed currently was a combination of non-essential utility and decorative elements which were never completed.

Chair Rigoni asked where the mechanical units would be located if the rooftop utility elements were removed.

The architect responded that those parts were not designed yet, but were planned to be located on the ground in the rear of the building.

Chair Rigoni noted that may be a future concern for the Plan Commission as well, depending on what the next round of drawings showed. The Plan Commission wanted to avoid an industrial look.

Commissioner Jakubowski asked that the applicant have more detailed renderings for the next time, since what was submitted currently had a big box store look. She said she would like some design changes so the building better matched the architecture of the nearby homes.

The applicant asked for the Plan Commission to clarify whether they wanted the brick to remain or if they were okay with the brick being painted over.

Chair Rigoni stated she was looking for a balance between nearby architecture and what the applicant was looking to do.

Staff added that the Federalist style of architecture was characterized by red brick, dark shingles, and roof dormers. Staff then asked the Plan Commission if they were alright with moving away from that design somewhat.

Chair Rigoni responded that she was, depending on what the next set of submitted designs showed.

Commissioner Hogan said the ground-level elevations showed a long, empty roofline, and that he would like to see changes to it to make it less boring.

D. Workshop: 10235 W. Lincoln Highway – Opa! Addition

Gruba summarized the case.

Chair Rigoni asked the applicant to approach the podium.

Steve Francis, the architect for the project, approached the podium. He stated that they were looking to enclose the patio so they could provide additional seating during the winter or other periods of inclement weather. The addition would match with the existing materials. The existing wall sign would move forward and remain in relatively the same location: on the gable facing Lincoln Highway. There would also be some minor changes to the exterior brickwork to accommodate the larger changes.

Chair Rigoni asked the members of the Plan Commission if they had any questions or comments about the act of enclosing the patio space.

Commissioner Hogan agreed that the restaurant needed more seating and asked if more seats would be added within the existing outdoor patio footprint.

The architect responded that the reason for the addition was to keep existing space available despite weather conditions, and that the overall amount of seating within the patio footprint would not increase beyond what it is today.

Commissioner James agreed that the addition made sense. He saw no problem with the use.

Commissioner Hogan asked if there would be any changes to square footage or if the existing exterior wall would be removed.

The architect responded there would be no change to square footage and the current exterior wall would remain.

Commissioner Jakubowski asked whether there would be four additional tables on the proposed outdoor deck area.

The architect said there would be four new tables.

Chair Rigoni asked if the proposed enclosure met the setback requirements from Route 30.

Staff responded they were unsure, but believed they did.

The architect said he would verify that the enclosure did.

Staff noted that the setback from Route 30 could be granted an exception as part of the Major PUD Change.

Chair Rigoni explained that Lincoln Highway had unique setbacks, and that the setback should be met. She also expressed concern over the issue of parking. She noted that the owner of the former Simply Smokin' restaurant space met with the Plan Commission recently to reopen the space as a restaurant with modifications and the Plan Commission insisted that there should be no increase in seating compared to what existed currently. The proposed enclosure and new patio area for Opa would make the parking problem at that location worse. Other uses have been turned down because of this issue in the past. Even though the proposed increase was small, it would be hard to approve the seating. Her only issue with the enclosure was with parking, since it would become a year-round challenge rather than a seasonal one.

Commissioner James asked if it was possible to consider the building enclosure and new outdoor patio separately.

Commissioner Hogan asked staff how many additional spaces would be required for the new seating.

Staff responded that three additional spaces would be required, per the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Rigoni stated that the main problem was the changing availability of parking spaces throughout the year.

The applicant stated that the restaurant was busiest when most of the other uses in the PUD were closed.

Chair Rigoni responded that the restaurant opened at 11:00 A.M., while the offices were also open.

The applicant agreed, but said that the majority of his business came when the restaurant was the only one using the lot.

Chair Rigoni agreed, but noted that it was always possible for the restaurant to be busy while the offices were open and sharing the existing parking, and so wanted to anticipate that situation. She asked the Commission for comments regarding the architecture.

Commissioner Hogan noted that he had no issue with the proposed architecture, but that the main issue at this site was parking. The Plan Commission had heated discussions about parking concerns in this development in the past, most recently regarding the vacant building to the east.

The applicant asked if this discussion was taking place as a result of the additional tables.

Commissioner Hogan responded that the discussion was taking place because the development which included the restaurant currently did not meet the code requirements.

Chair Rigoni added that in the past, the Plan Commission had not considered parking when discussing outdoor seating spaces, but that the enclosure of the outdoor seating meant that parking became a consideration.

Commissioner Jakubowski noted that there were options to make outdoor seating viable during the winter months that did not involve enclosing spaces, and that they would also result in parking challenges.

Staff noted that regarding the front yard setback of the building, the proposed building addition would require an exception from the regulation as part of the request for a Major Change to the Planned Unit Development. The existing 150-foot front yard setback regulation was adopted in 2002, which was after the building was built, and therefore made the existing structure legally nonconforming.

Chair Rigoni recalled that the setback regulation in question was put in place to allow for Lincoln Highway to be expanded in the future. She asked if the other members of the Plan Commission were willing to move forward.

Commissioner Hogan said that he was, but that parking needed to be addressed.

Chair Rigoni asked the applicant if there was an architectural reason for the change in materials under the front gable, particularly for the proposed cement paneling within the pediment.

The architect responded there was, but that changing the proposed design to match the existing brick facade was not a problem.

Chair Rigoni stated her preference for brick, since the proposed materials do not age well, as seen on other properties in the Village.

E. Public Comments

There were none.

F. Village Board & Committee Updates

Schwarz noted that the following matters that previously came before the PC/ZBA were approved by the Village Board at its meeting on July 5:

- Chase Bank Service/Utility Areas Variance at 20810 S. La Grange Road – the ordinance was approved.

In addition, at the July 13 meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole, staff was authorized to research and draft regulations for electric vehicle charging stations. Schwarz noted that some charging stations already existed in the Village, but there were no regulations for them. Certain designs for charging stations included advertisement components which do not comply with the Village's Sign Ordinance. Some preliminary research had been done, but the Plan Commission should expect draft regulations to be forthcoming.

Commissioner Hogan noted that electric vehicle charging was cheap, so it was important to be ahead of the curve.

Chair Rigoni noted that there should be considerations for how parking lots are set up with different kinds of spaces as electric vehicles become a larger and larger share of automobiles on the road. Especially with smaller parking lots.

G. Other Business

There was no other business.

H. Attendance Confirmation (July 28th, 2022)

Chair Rigoni asked the Commissioners to notify staff if they will not be in attendance on July 28th, and to respond to staff should they reach out.

Motion (#5): Adjournment 8:44 P.M.

Motion by: James Seconded by: Jakubowski

Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Approved ^{August 11th, 2022} ~~July 28th, 2022~~

As Presented As Amended _____

Maura A. Rigoni /s/ Maura Rigoni, Chair

Dan Duff /s/ Secretary