

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 15, 2022**

THE MEETING OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:29PM.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: TIFFANY TOLBERT, PAULA ISOLAMPI, CHRIS KOISOVICH, TOM EHRHARDT

STAFF: ROSS PIETRZAK (ZONING)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL – PETE MORIKIS & RITA McBRIDE WERE ABSENT

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

MS. TOLBERT STATED THE OFFICERS FROM 2021: MS. TOLBERT AS CHAIR, MR. EHRHARDT AS VICE CHAIR, AND MS. McBRIDE AS SECRETARY. MR. EHRHARDT MOTIONED TO RENOMINATE THE SLATE OF OFFICERS (NO CHANGES). MS. ISOLAMPI SECONDED; MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF 2022 MEETING DATES

MS. TOLBERT STATED THE STANDING MEETING DATES ARE THE THIRD TUESDAY OF EACH MONTH AND THERE ARE NO CONFLICTS WITH THOSE DATES. AS THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION INDICATE THE SCHEDULE FOR MEETINGS, THERE WAS NO NEED TO VOTE ON THE MEETING DATES.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – DECEMBER 21, 2021

MR. KOISOVICH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 21, 2021. MS. ISOLAMPI SECONDED. MOTIONED CARRIED.

ACCEPTANCE, ADDITIONS, OR AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA

NO CHANGES TO THE AGENDA WERE PROPOSED.

NEW BUSINESS

**HHPC 21-01B PETITIONER: TOMASZ GIELAZYN
REQUEST: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
PURPOSE: FAÇADE RENOVATION
LOCATION: 345 MAIN STREET**

MR. TOMASZ GIELAZYN, PROPERTY OWNER, WAS IN ATTENDANCE TO PRESENT THE PROPOSED WORK.

MR. PIETRZAK INDICATED THERE WERE SOME CHANGES FROM THE INITIAL SUBMITTAL. THE COLOR REFERENCES TO "DARK MOCCO" ARE TO BE SHERWIN WILLIAMS "VAN DYKE BROWN". THE APPLICATION HAD A LIST OF WORK ITEMS AND A SUPPORTING VISUAL. WORK ITEM "3" IS REPRESENTED BY THE NUMBER "2" ON THE VISUAL AND WORK ITEM "2" IS REPRESENTED BY THE NUMBER "3" ON THE VISUAL.

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 15, 2022**

Ms. Tolbert stated that the work completed on the building did not match what was approved by the Commission. She identified that the door was not approved and the siding above the transom windows was not approved. Mr. Gielazyn stated there was a misunderstanding between he and the Commission and that the glass was only intended to be for 347 Main Street. Ms. Tolbert asked if Mr. Gielazyn has any intention of installing glass in the transom area of this building. Mr. Gielazyn stated he did not.

Ms. Tolbert reviewed the work that was completed and the proposal submitted in the application. Ms. Tolbert stated the ribbed siding that was installed and proposed has a residential character and is not appropriate in the district. Mr. Gielazyn stated he has seen other buildings with similar treatment. Ms. Tolbert stated the buildings had completed their work prior to the establishment of the historic district and design guidelines. If there was a request to install similar material today it would not be in compliance with the codes and guidelines and would not be approved by the Commission. Mr. Gielazyn asked if the Commission wanted smooth siding instead. Ms. Tolbert stated if Mr. Gielazyn was not going to install glass, the smooth siding would be a better option than the ribbed siding. Mr. Gielazyn stated he would place smooth siding over the ribbed siding but felt it would bubble up over time. Mr. Ehrhardt asked if adhesive could be applied to prevent bubbling. Mr. Gielazyn stated adhesive is not used on this material and the material is too flexible. Ms. Tolbert asked if the flexibility is due to the material being aluminum. Mr. Gielazyn confirmed it is aluminum siding. Ms. Tolbert stated that wood or masonry are appropriate materials in the district and that aluminum is not allowed. By using materials that would have been accurate to the district, greater compliance can be achieved. The Commission needs to make their decision based on the applicable guidelines, not their personal preference. Ms. Tolbert stated that moving to a smooth siding would be a starting point in trying to find a solution to the issues with the building. Mr. Gielazyn said he would be willing to move forward with smooth siding.

Mr. Kosovich asked what the procedure is for approving the petition if an alternative material is being used without being presented to the Commission. Ms. Tolbert stated that the material would need to be specified and, given the previous miscommunication, would like to have more specific details on the record prior to granting approval. Mr. Gielazyn proposed to use the same smooth aluminum siding he used on other portions of the building and would install the siding using rivets every couple of centimeters to try and avoid bulging and achieve a flat surface. Ms. Tolbert stated her concerns about the potential result of the proposed work. The siding should be set with an adhesive and the work requires a lot of precision to achieve a desirable result. Mr. Kosovich asked if a plan should be submitted prior to approving the request. Mr. Pietrzak stated the Commission could continue (table) the request and request the petitioner submit drawings that show dimensions, materials and installation methods. It would be a very detailed plan.

Ms. Tolbert asked if there was framing behind the siding that has been installed. Mr. Gielazyn confirmed there was framing. Ms. Tolbert asked if the proposed smooth siding would be attached to the framing. Mr. Gielazyn stated he would not use the framing for the installation of the smooth siding. He would place it over the ribbed siding that has already been installed. Mr. Kosovich stated that even if a plan was submitted showing the proposed work, the issue remains that aluminum siding is being proposed and is not appropriate. Mr. Pietrzak stated that

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 15, 2022**

ALUMINUM IS LISTED AS A "NON-COMPATIBLE MATERIAL" IN THE DISTRICT'S DESIGN GUIDELINES. MR. KOSOVICH STATED THAT GIVEN THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE DESIGN GUIDELINES, THE COMMISSION WOULD STILL RECOMMEND AGAINST APPROVAL. MS. TOLBERT REITERATED THE APPROPRIATE MATERIALS WOULD BE GLASS, WOOD OR MASONRY. MR. GIELAZYN STATED HE COULD INSTALL A BRICK VENEER WHICH COULD MEET THE MASONRY REQUIREMENT. THE VENEER COULD BE APPLIED WITH AN ADHESIVE. MR. GIELAZYN STATED HE COULD NOT EXACTLY MATCH THE BRICK ON THE BUILDING BECAUSE IT IS OVER A CENTURY OLD. MS. TOLBERT STATED THE VENEER SHOULD MATCH THE LAYOUT OR PATTERN OF THE EXISTING BRICK AND BE AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO THE COLOR OF THE EXISTING BRICK. MR. GIELAZYN AGREED WITH THE STIPULATIONS. MS. TOLBERT ASKED TO SEE A SAMPLE OF THE PROPOSED VENEER PRIOR TO APPROVAL. MR. GIELAZYN STATED HE WOULD BRING IN A SAMPLE FOR THE COMMISSION TO REVIEW. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE VENEER WOULD BE PLACED OVER THE WINDOWS AND THE DOOR. MR. GIELAZYN CONFIRMED. MR. PIETRZAK ASKED IF THE VENEER WOULD REPLACE ALL OF THE RIBBED SIDING CURRENTLY ON THE BUILDING. MR. GIELAZYN CONFIRMED HE WOULD IF THAT IS WHAT THE COMMISSION IS REQUESTING. MR. PIETRZAK STATED IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO TABLE THE PETITION WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT A VENEER SAMPLE WOULD BE PROVIDED TO THE COMMISSION FOR REVIEW AT THE NEXT MEETING. MR. PIETRZAK STATED THE VENEER WOULD ADDRESS THE FIRST WORK ITEM IDENTIFIED BUT THAT ADDITIONAL ITEMS STILL NEED TO BE DISCUSSED.

MS. TOLBERT STATED THAT THE DOOR THAT HAS BEEN INSTALLED IS RESIDENTIAL IN CHARACTER. THE ISSUE WITH THE DOOR ARE THE LITES INSTALLED ON THE DOOR'S WINDOW PANE DIVIDING THE GLASS WHEREAS THE REST OF THE WINDOWS ARE OPEN AND UNDIVIDED. MR. GIELAZYN PROPOSED TO REMOVE THE LITES FROM THE WINDOW SO THAT IT BECAME ONE LARGE PANE. THE COMMISSION EXPRESSED AGREEMENT WITH THIS SOLUTION.

MR. PIETRZAK STATED THE NEXT ISSUE TO DISCUSS WAS THE SMOOTH ALUMINUM SIDING INSTALLED AROUND THE WINDOW TRIM AND STOREFRONT DOOR. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE ISSUE WAS THE COLOR. MR. PIETRZAK STATED THAT THE PRIOR COA APPROVAL WAS FOR ONE-INCH SILVER TRIM. MS. TOLBERT FELT THE ALUMINUM WRAPPING AROUND THE WINDOWS IS APPROPRIATE AS THE COMMISSION HAS APPROVED SIMILAR TREATMENTS IN THE PAST.

MS. TOLBERT SUMMARIZED THE DISCUSSION TO THIS POINT. THE SUMMARY INCLUDED: REPLACING THE RIBBED ALUMINUM SHEATHING (SIDING) IN THE TRANSOM AREA AND ABOVE THE STOREFRONT DOOR WITH A BRICK VENEER TO MATCH THE COLOR AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE WITH THE EXISTING BRICK AS WELL AS MATCHING THE DESIGN OR LAYOUT OF THE EXISTING BRICK, REMOVING THE DIVIDED LITES FROM THE STOREFRONT DOOR GLASS. MR. PIETRZAK ASKED IF THE DOOR COULD BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE ALUMINUM SIDING. MS. TOLBERT STATED THE DOOR COULD BE PAINTED. MR. GIELAZYN CLARIFIED THAT THE DOOR IS METAL. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE PROPOSED PAINT WOULD WORK ON THE DOOR. MR. GIELAZYN STATED IT IS A SPECIAL PAINT THAT WOULD WORK ON METAL.

MR. PIETRZAK STATED IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO TABLE THE PETITION NOW THAT ALL ISSUES HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED. MS. TOLBERT REQUESTED THAT MR. GIELAZYN PROVIDE A SAMPLE OF THE BRICK VENEER FOR THE COMMISSION TO REVIEW. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THIS COULD BE DONE BY NEXT MONTH'S MEETING. MR. GIELAZYN CONFIRMED HE COULD HAVE A SAMPLE AT THE NEXT MEETING.

MR. EHRHARDT MADE A MOTION TO TABLE HHPC 21-01B WITH REFERENCE TO THE SUMMARY PROVIDED BY MS. TOLBERT. MS. ISOLAMPI SECONDED; MOTION CARRIED. DURING THE TRANSITION TO PETITION HHPC 21-

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 15, 2022**

02B, MR. PIETRZAK NOTED THAT MR. GIELAZYN ALSO PROPOSED TO REMOVE THE ALUMINUM SIDING AND PAINT THE EXPOSED CONCRETE CEILING ABOVE THE RECESSED ENTRY TO MATCH THE ALUMINUM SIDING. MS. TOLBERT STATED THAT WAS ACCEPTABLE.

**HHPC 21-02B PETITIONER: TOMASZ GIELAZYN
REQUEST: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
PURPOSE: FAÇADE RENOVATION
LOCATION: 347 MAIN STREET**

MR. GIELAZYN, PROPERTY OWNER, WAS IN ATTENDANCE TO PRESENT THE PROPOSED WORK.

MR. PIETRZAK EXPLAINED THAT THERE IS BLUE-COLORED FLASHING AND WOOD ABOVE THE STOREFRONT THAT MR. GIELAZYN WAS GOING TO REMOVE. MR. GIELAZYN CLARIFIED THAT THE BLUE FLASHING COULD NOT BE REMOVED AND THAT IT WOULD BE PAINTED. MR. PIETRZAK ASKED IF THE WOOD BENEATH THE FLASHING WOULD BE REMOVED. MR. GIELAZYN CONFIRMED THE REQUEST IS TO REMOVE THE WOOD. MR. PIETRZAK CONTINUED TO DESCRIBE THE REQUEST, WHICH INCLUDED APPROVAL OF PREVIOUSLY INSTALLED ALUMINUM SIDING AROUND THE WINDOW FRAMES AND TRANSOM AREA ABOVE THE STOREFRONT DOOR, PAINTING THE NEW BRICK INSTALLED AT THE CORNER OF THE BUILDING TO MATCH EXISTING BRICK, PAINT THE METAL DOOR TO MATCH THE ALUMINUM SIDING AND PAINT THE EXPOSED CONCRETE CEILING ABOVE THE RECESSED ENTRANCE TO MATCH THE ALUMINUM SIDING. THE PAINT FOR THE DOOR AND CEILING WILL BE SHERWIN WILLIAMS "VAN DYKE BROWN".

MS. TOLBERT ASKED WHAT MATERIAL WAS BEHIND THE WOOD THAT IS BEING REMOVED AND WHAT WOULD REPLACE THE WOOD. MR. GIELAZYN STATED THE CONCRETE CEILING WOULD BE EXPOSED AND THAT HE PROPOSED TO PLACE ALUMINUM SIDING WHICH WOULD MATCH THE EXISTING ALUMINUM SIDING. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THIS AREA WOULD BE THE BASE FOR FUTURE SIGNAGE. MR. GIELAZYN CONFIRMED THAT SIGNAGE COULD BE PLACED OVER THE AREA WHERE THE WOOD IS CURRENTLY LOCATED. MR. GIELAZYN STATED THE ALUMINUM SIDING WOULD STILL BE VISIBLE BUT THAT IT WOULD SERVE AS FLASHING TO PROTECT THE BUILDING. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE SAME PAINT WOULD BE USED FOR THE METAL AND THE CEILING. MR. GIELAZYN CLARIFIED THAT THEY WOULD BE DIFFERENT PAINTS BUT THE SAME COLOR. ONE IS A SPECIALIZED PAINT FOR METAL, THE OTHER IS A SPECIALIZED PAINT FOR CONCRETE. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE PIECE OF ALUMINUM REPLACING THE WOOD WOULD BE FLUSH WITH THE FAÇADE. MR. GIELAZYN CONFIRMED IT WOULD BE FLUSH.

MR. PIETRZAK STATED HE SPOKE WITH A BUILDING INSPECTOR REGARDING THE CORNER COLUMN. THERE IS A BRICK WHICH HAS ITS BASE EXPOSED AT THE TOP OF THE COLUMN. AFTER DISCUSSING VARIOUS OPTIONS, IT WAS ADVISED TO FLASH THAT BRICK BASE SO THAT THE MORTAR HOLES ARE PROTECTED FROM WATER INFILTRATION. THE FLASHING SHOULD MATCH THE PROPOSED SIDING. MS. TOLBERT ASKED MR. GIELAZYN IF HE WAS IN AGREEMENT WITH THAT REQUEST. MR. GIELAZYN CONFIRMED HE WOULD FLASH THE BRICK ACCORDINGLY.

MS. TOLBERT FELT IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO TAKE ACTION ON THIS PETITION WITH THE INFORMATION PROVIDED. MS. TOLBERT SUMMARIZED THE DISCUSSION TO THIS POINT. THE SUMMARY INCLUDED: REMOVING THE WOOD AT THE BOTTOM OF THE TOP OF THE STOREFRONT, REPLACING IT WITH METAL FLASHING TO BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE ALUMINUM SIDING ("VAN DYKE BROWN"), PAINTING THE DOOR "VAN DYKE BROWN", STAINING THE CEILING "VAN DYKE BROWN", WRAPPING THE TOP OF THE COLUMN WITH ALUMINUM FLASHING.

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 15, 2022**

MR. GIELAZYN CLARIFIED THAT HE WOULD NOT BE ADDING FLASHING TO THE AREA WHERE THE WOOD IS REMOVED, BUT WOULD INSTEAD BE PAINTING A PORTION OF THE CEILING THAT WOULD BE EXPOSED AS A RESULT OF THE WOOD BEING REMOVED. NO NEW MATERIAL WOULD BE ADDED TO THE AREA WHERE THE WOOD WAS BEING REMOVED. MR. PIETRZAK ALSO NOTED THAT THIS APPROVAL WOULD ADDRESS A CHANGE FROM THE PREVIOUS COA APPROVAL. THE PRIOR APPROVAL INCLUDED TRANSOM WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED ABOVE THE EXISTING STOREFRONT WINDOWS. THE NEW REQUEST IS FOR AN EXTENSION OF THE STOREFRONT WINDOWS TO THE CEILING WITH NO TRANSOM WINDOWS OR HORIZONTAL DIVISIONS.

MS. TOLBERT RE-SUMMARIZED THE PROPOSAL WHICH INCLUDED: REMOVING THE WOOD AT THE BASE OF THE UPPER STOREFRONT AND PAINTING THE EXPOSED EDGE OF THE CEILING "VAN DYKE BROWN", PAINTING THE CEILING "VAN DYKE BROWN", PAINTING THE DOOR AND DOORFRAME "VAN DYKE BROWN", RETROACTIVE APPROVAL OF FULL STOREFRONT WINDOWS, FLASHING THE EXPOSED BRICK AT THE EDGE OF THE CORNER COLUMN TO MATCH "VAN DYKE BROWN" AND REAFFIRMING THE PAINTING OF THE REPLACED SECTIONS OF BRICK TO MATCH THE EXISTING BRICK.

MR. KOVOVICH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE HHPC 21-02B WITH REFERENCE TO MS. TOLBERT'S REVISED SUMMARY. MS. ISOLAMPI SECONDED, MOTION CARRIED.

MR. PIETRZAK REQUESTED CLARIFICATION IF THE PAINTING OF THE REPLACEMENT BRICK SECTIONS WAS NOW A PART OF THIS COA. MS. TOLBERT STATED THAT THE PAINTING OF THE REPLACEMENT BRICK WAS NOT A PART OF THIS COA AS IT WAS APPROVED AS PART OF A PREVIOUS COA. THIS COA APPROVAL IS ONLY FOR CHANGES FROM THE PREVIOUS APPROVAL AND ALL PREVIOUSLY APPROVED WORK WAS STILL IN EFFECT.

**HHPC 22-01 PETITIONER: HEIDI MORGAN
REQUEST: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
PURPOSE: NEW SIGNAGE
LOCATION: 618 E. 3RD STREET**

THE PETITIONER WAS NOT PRESENT. MR. PIETRZAK STATED THAT HE FELT COMFORTABLE PRESENTING AND DISCUSSING THE PETITION AT THIS TIME. MS. TOLBERT AGREED BUT NOTED IT WAS PREFERRED THAT PETITIONERS BE PRESENT TO DISCUSS THEIR PETITIONS.

MS. TOLBERT STATED THE REQUEST IS FOR NEW SIGNAGE AT 618 E. 3RD STREET. THE AWNING AND FRAME HAVE BEEN REMOVED PREVIOUSLY. THE REQUEST IS ONLY FOR NEW SIGNAGE. THE SIGN READS "BELLE AME BOUTIQUE". IT IS A FLAT ALUMINUM SIGN THAT WILL BE MOUNTED FLUSH TO THE FAÇADE. MR. PIETRZAK CLARIFIED THAT THE WORDS "BELLE AME" ARE THREE-DIMENSIONAL FOAM THAT WILL BE MOUNTED ONTO THE SIGN AND PROJECT ROUGHLY ONE INCH OUT FROM THE SIGN. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THERE WAS A REQUEST FOR LIGHTING. MR. PIETRZAK STATED LIGHTING WAS NOT A PART OF THIS REQUEST. MR. EHRHARDT ASKED IF THE BACKGROUND OF THE SIGN WAS BLACK. MR. PIETRZAK CONFIRMED THE BACKGROUND WOULD BE BLACK, THE WORDS "BELLE AME" AND A GRAPHIC FEATHER WOULD BE WHITE, AND THE WORD "BOUTIQUE" A BORDER TRIM AND ANOTHER GRAPHIC FEATHER WOULD BE BLUE.

MS. TOLBERT STATED FINAL ACTION CAN BE TAKEN OR THE COMMISSION CAN TABLE THE PETITION UNTIL THE PETITIONER CAN BE PRESENT TO DISCUSS THE PETITION. MR. KOVOVICH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE HHPC 22-01 AS PRESENTED. MR. EHRHARDT SECONDED; MOTION CARRIED.

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 15, 2022**

STAFF COMMENT

MR. PIETRZAK PROVIDED A SUMMARY OF RESEARCH INTO 131 CENTER STREET, MR. PIETRZAK STATED CODE ENFORCEMENT WAS DOING AN INTERIOR INSPECTION AND WILL FOLLOW UP WITH A REPORT.

MS. TOLBERT HAS INQUIRED WITH THE CITY ABOUT THE STATUS OF THE SYKES FARMHOUSE AT 6197 S COLORADO STREET. THERE IS A ZONE CHANGE PETITION AT THIS SITE. THE CITY HAS REACHED OUT TO THE DEVELOPER AT HER REQUEST AND THERE IS AN EFFORT TO CONNECT THE DEVELOPER AND INDIANA LANDMARKS TO SEE IF THERE ARE OPTIONS AVAILABLE FOR THE BUILDING. THE MOST LIKELY OUTCOME THAT WOULD SAVE THE BUILDING WOULD BE RELOCATING THE BUILDING.

MR. KOVOVICH IDENTIFIED AN UPCOMING HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM ON FEBRUARY 22ND BY INDIANA LANDMARKS WABASH VALLEY TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION ENTITLED "REHABILITATION INCENTIVES FOR HISTORIC PROPERTIES". HE ASKED IF ATTENDANCE AT THE PROGRAM WOULD COUNT TOWARDS CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT STATUS. HE STATED THIS PROGRAM IS AN ONLINE PROGRAM. MR. PIETRZAK STATED HE HAS RECEIVED QUESTIONS FROM VARIOUS COMMISSION MEMBERS ABOUT QUALIFYING ACTIVITIES AND COULD NOT ADVISE THEM. MS. TOLBERT STATED THE FEBRUARY 22ND PROGRAM WOULD QUALIFY AND THAT THERE IS NOT A DEFINITIVE LIST OF QUALIFYING PROGRAMS. THE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE ALIGNED WITH HISTORIC PRESERVATION PRIORITIES OR EFFORTS.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MAGGIE REISTER OF 1ST UNITARIAN CHURCH APPEARED BEFORE THE COMMISSION TO HIGHLIGHT THE CHURCH'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY, WHICH WILL BE IN 2024. MS. REISTER REQUESTED ASSISTANCE IN FINDING RESOURCES TO HELP IMPROVE THE PROPERTY AND PARTNERING OR FINDING PARTNERSHIPS TO SUPPORT THE CHURCH. THERE WAS EXTENSIVE CONVERSATION ON POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES, PROGRAMS AND POTENTIAL PROJECTS.

MR. EHRHARDT MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. *MEETING ADJOURNED*

NEXT MEETING: MARCH 15, 2022

MINUTES APPROVED ON 1/19/2022

CHAIRMAN *Jeff Zolney*

ATTEST *Rita Mc Bride*