

**SUGARCREEK TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF ZONING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2018**

This regular meeting of the Sugarcreek Township Board of Zoning Commission was held on Tuesday, December 4, 2018 at the Bellbrook Middle School, 3600 Feedwire Road, Sugarcreek Township, Ohio at 7:00 p.m.

Mrs. Hellmann called the meeting to order, thanking those in attendance for coming. She noted that the Zoning Commission members serve at the pleasure of the Township Trustees. She explained that the members of the Zoning Commission are civic minded residents of Sugarcreek Township and each has the best interest of the community in mind.

Everyone present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. Hellmann asked Mrs. Tilford to take roll. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-present
Ms. Baldino- present
Ms. Moore-present
Mrs. Hellmann-present
Mr. Schleich-present

For the record, alternates Dr. Mathews and Mrs. Gallagher, were also in attendance.

Mrs. Hellmann stated that the first item on the agenda is the Election of Officers, noting that any change in leadership would be effective immediately and run through 2019.

Mr. Baldino made a motion to appoint Mr. Betz to the position of Chairperson, which was seconded by Ms. Moore. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-abstain
Ms. Moore-yes
Mr. Baldino-yes
Mrs. Hellmann-yes
Mr. Schleich-yes

Mr. Betz made a motion to appoint Mrs. Hellmann to the position of Vice-Chairperson, which was seconded by Mr. Baldino. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-yes
Ms. Moore-yes
Mr. Baldino-yes
Mrs. Hellmann-abstain
Mr. Schleich-yes

Mr. Betz reviewed for those in attendance the format of the meeting, noting that comments would be limited to three minutes per person so that everyone would have an opportunity to be heard and asked that comments not become repetitive. He explained that it is acceptable to note concurrence with previous speakers. He noted that clapping, talking prior to being recognized by the Chairperson and other disrespectful activity would not be tolerated.

Mr. Betz noted that the first case on the agenda is BZC06-2018. Oberer Land Developers, LTD is requesting a map amendment to the Sugarcreek Township Zoning Resolution to rezone 83.226 acres located at 2745 Wilmington Dayton Road (and two adjacent parcels with no addresses of record) from E (Rural Estate Residential) District to R-PUCD (Residential Planned Unit Conservation Development) District. The subject parcels contain a total of 107.383 acres (of which 83.226 acres are proposed to be rezoned), can be further identified by parcel numbers L32000100050014200, L32000100050002800 and L32000100050002700 and are owned by Peter Rammel. Oberer Land Developers, LTD is also requesting preliminary development plan approval under Article 6 of the Sugarcreek Township Zoning Resolution for approval of the preliminary plan for a proposed subdivision containing 98 lots.

Mr. Betz asked Mrs. Tilford to provide her report.

Mrs. Tilford reviewed the Staff Report noting that the Regional Planning and Coordinating Commission did recommend approval.

Mr. Greg Smith came forward representing the applicant, Oberer Land Developers, LTD. He noted that this parcel is an annexable parcel, noting that they are not proposing it just pointing it out because the Long Range Land Use Plan discusses it. He showed a plan that could have been developed, absent the conservation aspect. He reviewed the realignment of the roadway as proposed. He noted that they've clustered their density away from the realigned road. He noted that they see this project as an opportunity for the community to fix a longstanding problem with the two sharp curves on Wilmington Dayton Road making this a win-win for the community. He explained how they came up with their plan. They looked at the site, talked with the property owner and decided what needed to be preserved. There are steep ridge lines, a substantial creek and a smaller creek running through the front of the parcel; all will be retained. He explained that they will be building mounds along the right-of-way similar to Oak Brooke and Woodland Ridge as well as on the southern side of the parcel where vegetation is scarce. They are proposing a no cut zone so that the tress adjacent to properties on Gerhardt Circle will be maintained. He noted that they feel their request is appropriate given the Long Range Land Use Plan goals. They are proposing a conservation subdivision with 50% open space and the site does have access to public water and sewer. They agree that the township should have an opportunity to review the language of the conservation easement. It will be made available for review. He reviewed density proposed, 98 lots on 81 acres or 1.2 dwelling units per acre which is lower than other developments approved recently. He noted that they are happy to work with the township and county on traffic. They would prefer not to delay the ability to start prior to the road improvements being done and feel that would be a burden. He noted he has his traffic engineers here, Jason and Richard Oaks. Mr. Smith reviewed the elevations that will be constructed in the neighborhood noting it is a patio home development, all one story, one to two bedroom with a den home. Homes will be all brick and hardi-plank. Price range would start at \$300,000. He noted it is similar to their Somerset development. Third car garages will be an

option on every lot. There are internal sidewalks. They will plow all driveways and sidewalks and do all the mowing as part of the HOA.

Mr. George Oberer Jr. came forward noting that they have had the advantage of working with the school district over the years and they are sensitive to their concerns about growth. He noted that this is an empty nester targeted neighborhood. He noted it is similarly sized to Somerset. Even though it is not age restricted it is age targeted and they only have two or three students in that neighborhood.

Mr. Betz opened the public hearing and asked for citizen comments. He noted that responses will be provided after all comments have been received.

Mr. Brian Stewart, 2790 Gerhardt Circle and 4416 Centerville Road, came forward. He noted that his family has lived at 4404 Centerville Road since the late 1950's. He noted that the neighbors affected by this plan strongly object to it. He noted that the residents will circulate a referendum petition if this is approved. We would need 450 signatures and we can get that easily. He enjoys the current quality of life in the township. He noted that this empty nester talk is nonsense. With the roads all you are doing is straightening it out a little. The road should go through that parcel. There are other farms in the area that will be coming up for development.

Mr. Jesse Burchett, 2830 Gerhardt Circle, came forward. He noted they have a quarter acre pond on their property and they will be adjacent to this development. His pond drains back there. There will be all these lots there now. He wants to know what will be done with that. He noted that the ground water level is about a foot down. He wants to know what Oberer will do about that. He asked about the platted road between his neighbor to the right and the next house. He also had concerns about traffic, taxes and water bills. He noted concern about his property value.

Ms. Liz White, 2150 Stewart Road, came forward noting her love for Sugarcreek Township. She noted that she wants to keep it livable for those residents already here. She noted that this development proposal does not meet the intent of the Comprehensive Development Plan. It will not retain the attractive character of the township and it will not minimize the cost of delivery of governmental services and investment in infrastructure. She noted concern about the impact on the schools with all the other developments that have been approved recently. She noted it is a lot of pressure on taxes, police, fire, road maintenance, etc.

Mr. Tim Walsh, 4225 Centerville Road, came forward. He noted opposition to the plan totally and completely. He stated that there is something to be said about quality of life. We love open space. There has been a creep slowly and this is a tsunami. He is concerned personally about impact to him with respect to any roadway changes.

Dr. Philip Gallagher, 2382 Ferry Road, came forward. He noted he moved to Sugarcreek Township for the open space. He lived in a neighborhood his whole career and now he lives here. He drives the area all the time. It is not bad. We don't have a problem or a wait. He is concerned about the construction traffic. This project will be life-changing for a lot of us.

Mr. Doug Robertson, 2402 Ferry Road, came forward with concern about impact at White's Corner (725 at Wilmington Dayton Road). He noted you are essentially trapped in that gas station in the morning. He asked about how long construction will take from beginning to end.

Mr. Brad Ligibel, 5015 Lausanne Drive, came forward. He noted his neighborhood has two entrances and it is very difficult to get in and out. He wants to know if there has been any talk of a light or anything to ease traffic coming in and out. He noted concern with Oberer's density presentation. He asked if the parkland is included. He noted that if it is he feels it skews the units per acre when comparing it to other development without all that open area.

Mr. Tom Roth noted a concern with taxes and asked what impact this development will have on taxes. He noted a concern with straightening out the road and that it would lead to more accidents. He noted that there are not many accidents now. He noted that is relatively difficult to get out of his house (just north of Bill Yeck Park) and losing the curve is going to make it worse.

Mrs. Kathy Pray, 2860 Wilmington Dayton Road, noted a concern with traffic. She stated traffic backs up from the Centerville Road stop sign on Wilmington Dayton Road all the way to Conference for about an hour, sometimes two, every night. Traffic goes north in the morning and south in the evening. Bus traffic complicates things and this road is a primary ambulance route as well coming from the south.

Mr. Robert Collins, 8289 Rhine Way, noted concern with safety and traffic. Wilmington Pike is four lanes past 725, and it is two lanes south of 725 and that is problematic. He also noted that there is no bike lane either.

Ms. Kim McCarthy, 2525 Stewart Road, asked what the solution to the traffic issue is. She asked that if this fits into the zoning scheme, what is the impact of public opinion?

Ms. Rita Tresser, 2870 Gerhardt Circle, came forward. She noted she also owns the Golden Spring Company on Ferry Road. She noted her taxes have increased \$400 a half and she has only lived in her house for eight or nine years. She is opposed to the development as it doesn't meet the township's mission statement.

Mr. Nick Ladue, 2594 Sugar Ridge Lane, stated he is just to the west of this. He asked about the stub street to the park as it looks like it is designed for the development to be expanded. He stated he has questions about what happens if the parks do not buy the land. He owns the property above the Enclaves and he has been treated horribly by Ryan Homes and he would like to see the folks on Gerhardt treated better. He stated it is not fair to say this is 1.2 dwelling units per acre given the large park area that will be retained by the owner if it is not purchased by the park.

Mr. Chris Valenti, 2944 Pine View Drive, spoke in opposition. He noted he understood township requirements to be 2.5 acre lots and that should be followed.

Mr. Rod Coster, 8237 Rhine Way, spoke in opposition. He noted he does not trust large developers. They promise and do not deliver. He had questions about the bonding of the

development and who releases the money when they are done. He finds it reprehensible that no one is considering Wilmington Dayton north of the S curve. He noted getting out of Walnut Hills is dangerous. He asked about how the retention ponds will work. He has concerns about water runoff and erosion. He feels more attention to environment impact is needed.

Mr. Marvin Moeller, 3614 Middle Run Road, came forward noting he is one of five farmers left in the township and is a lifelong resident. Mr. Moeller talked about problems with the annexation laws in the State of Ohio. This would not be an issue if we didn't have the threat of annexation upon us now. He encouraged residents to speak with Rick Perales to ask that the law be changed to place townships on equal footing with adjacent municipalities.

Mrs. Megan Simmons, 2770 Gerhardt Circle, came forward to speak in opposition. She noted that this property is protected from annexation until 2024. She noted that the park purchase needs to be done on the front end so that the property owner will not be the only one with access. If not, it gains citizens nothing. She is concerned about traffic and safety. She noted this density is three to four units per acre. One is appropriate where sewer is accessible. She noted that the school district is in demand and comparing demand in Washington Township Centerville Schools to demand here is not a fair comparison.

Mr. Gregg Sparks, came forward representing the Lion's Club. The Club wants to make sure development of the road and property occurs as concurrent as possible. Timing is their main concern with respect to the use of their property.

Ms. Mary Simmons, 5012 Lausanne Drive, came forward noting that pulling out of her neighborhood in the morning is so dangerous. She noted she doesn't use Wilmington Pike in the morning. It is terrible. She noted she cuts through Bellbrook to get her daughter to Carroll. She stated that without the park purchase this falls apart.

Ms. Adrienne Kreighbaum, 2876 Wilmington Dayton Road, came forward to speak in opposition. This is not protecting the rural, scenic nature of the township and lots are not situated in areas least likely to block scenic views from the roadway. The development does not promote a sense of community by the use of green spaces. She noted concern with the open space in the developed area. She doesn't understand placement of the entrances either.

Mr. Mark Stapleton, 2011 Pine View Drive, came forward to speak in opposition. His development is 2.5 acre lots and throwing patio homes across the street is not fair. His taxes are embarrassing. Traffic is a concern now. The Centerville Road Wilmington Dayton intersection is an issue. There are horrendous accidents that happen there. Adding traffic will create a nightmare.

Mr. Chuck Loper, 2910 Gerhardt Circle, came forward to speak in opposition. He wants to know if they have considered a development with 2.5 acre lots.

Ms. Trish Evans, 4051 Clarkston Drive, came forward. She noted she has a one acre lot in Bellbrook. She noted being respectful is difficult. She stated that this development is a non-issue noting that it can't be annexed. She stated that the Zoning Commission has disrespected the residents for this entire meeting. She noted that the developer is treating the public like

children having tantrums. She noted it is like a duck with water running off its back. She noted her disappointment. She wants to know why anyone is even here because this property can't be annexed.

Mrs. Hellmann made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Ms. Moore. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-yes
Ms. Moore-yes
Mr. Baldino-yes
Mrs. Hellmann-yes
Mr. Schleich-yes

Mr. Betz stated that they have received a lot of questions. There were some drainage issues and a lot of traffic issues. He noted he will ask Barry and Cara to respond to a number of questions. He stated it makes most sense to talk about traffic first. We've heard from many Walnut Hills residents, we have heard about potential impact at 725 and Wilmington Pike, there were a lot of comments about the intersection of Wilmington Dayton and Centerville Road. He noted he would like the developer to respond.

Mr. Jason Oaks, 1448 Jackson Road, the developer's traffic engineer came forward. He stated regarding traffic north of the site, the property we are looking at doesn't touch it. Situations up there cannot be specifically addressed. That is a county issue with respect to alignment. From a volume standpoint, he agrees most traffic will go north and come from the north into the site noting that is what the study says. However, when we look in round numbers volumes on Wilmington Dayton are 8000 vehicles in 24 hours. We are looking at 100 cars with the development, staggered over peak hours which were analyzed or 1-1.5% of current volume.

Mr. Betz asked Mr. Oaks to address the Centerville Road intersection.

Mr. Oaks indicated that we've already established that most of the traffic will go north and there is already a problem at Wilmington Dayton and Centerville Road. Some traffic will go south, however there is an existing problem there. The intersection will be failing, yes this development will increase its failure, but it is already failing.

Mr. Schleich asked if the development goes in before the road is improved what the impact will be, asking if it will be an F right away.

Mr. Oaks indicated Conference will continue to degrade and Centerville is on its way to an F now.

Mrs. Hellmann talked about the impact of pass through traffic. What we have is a problem that the county needs to address before development begins. She asked about discussion on the county's part at the Regional Planning meeting about their plans to address the overall problem.

Mr. Oaks noted that he does not represent the county.

Mrs. Hellmann concurred but asked about any discussion with respect to their plans for this area's roadway network.

Mr. Oaks indicated he knows the problem is on their radar.

Mr. Oberer noted that they have had extensive discussions over the last 12 months with the County, with Regional Planning and with the Township. He noted the county's primary concern at first was that appropriate right-of-way is provided to accomplish the road improvement project as included in the Thoroughfare Plan. He noted that the schedule was not important 12 months ago to the county, but that concern has been elevated by the Township through those discussions and it is a higher priority today. He noted a meeting is appropriate after this stage to meet with Regional Planning and the County Engineer. The bigger problem is not straightening out Wilmington Dayton, the bigger problem is the Wilmington Dayton Centerville Road intersection. He noted that they are willing to cooperate in addressing that problem, but not fix it, as it is a regional problem that exists today.

Mr. Baldino asked the traffic engineer to address the safety of ingress and egress at the proposed subdivision entrance absent the realignment.

Mr. Oaks stated a single access point will be provided it will include turn lanes a northbound left and a southbound right.

Mr. Baldino noted concern that this subdivision will have the same issues folks at Walnut Hills have now getting in and out of the development.

Mr. Richard Oaks, the developer's other traffic engineer, came forward noting that the problem is at the existing four way stop. The southbound traffic will continue to back up until that is addressed. Clearly anyone trying to come out of the new access point will have a problem. The congestion problem is an existing problem. He noted he has done modeling and a traffic signal with left turn lanes at all four legs solves that problem. The amount of traffic coming from this site is nominal. Until something is done at the four way stop there will be a problem.

Mr. Baldino asked how this four way stop will impact those leaving the development.

Mr. Oaks indicated that in the morning time the amount of gaps will allow exiting to the north.

Mr. Baldino stated when you are leaving in the morning going north, the experience Walnut Hills residents have explained would be expected to also happen here.

Mr. Oaks stated no, not if the problem is fixed at the four way stop. There will be enough gaps to allow exiting.

Mr. Betz asked if the fix is a traffic signal at the four-way stop.

Mr. Oaks stated that the modeling that he done shows that if a traffic signal with left turn lanes at all leg would be installed the problem goes away.

Mrs. Hellmann asked if he considered modeling a roundabout.

Mr. Oaks stated it does not solve the problem, as it is a misapplication at this location. It doesn't have the capacity to handle the amount of traffic. A traffic signal has adequate capacity.

Mr. Betz indicated the engineer indicated that this development will have an impact and we heard Mr. Oberer indicate a willingness to participate in a solution. He noted that he would like to move on. There is a cul-de-sac in the development that abuts the proposed park. People have noted concern with it. What if the deal with the park district doesn't go through would you ask for more development then. He noted he would also like staff to discuss drainage.

Mr. Oberer indicated there would a conservation easement put in place to not allow any future development. He noted two park districts have an interest in the property. They have discussed the possibility of forming a cooperative entity to take ownership. An attorney has opined that is possible. Either the Bellbrook Sugarcreek Park District or the Washington Township Park District will most likely end up purchasing it. He noted that the cul-de-sac actually went west and to the north in a previous plan. It was pulled back to where it is shown on the current preliminary plan. He noted they are not sure which park district will own it. If it Bellbrook Sugarcreek, they really don't have access to it. This provides that access. Centerville Washington Township does have access absent the cul-de-sac through Bill Yeck Park.

Mr. Tiffany noted that we did have quite a few concerns with respect to runoff. One of the neighbors noted a high water table in the area. There is a requirement that water cannot leave at a faster rate than it does predeveloped. The detention basins will capture the water and allow it to be released at the same rate it is today. The basins will also filter the water and allow the solids to filter out. Water should not be an issue. If we look to the south, they can't impact it that way either; they cannot dam it up.

Mr. Betz asked for comments on the final plan.

Mr. Tiffany noted that more detailed engineering will be required at the Final Development Plan stage. He noted he would like to address one other concern. Ms. Evans noted that this process was disrespectful. He noted that we as a statutory township are a creature of statute. Anyone at any time can come in and request that their property be rezoned and we have to follow the mandated process to hear that case which is inclusive of public hearings. This is a respectful process to make sure the public is involved. To Mr. Stewart's statement earlier, any rezoning approval is subject to referendum to protect citizen rights. He noted the County Engineer requires bonding for roadways, detention, sewer and water lines. The Township require bonding for landscaping improvements and Mr. Oberer will tell you that we do not go easy on releasing bonds. We make sure things are built correctly prior to releasing any bonds to protect the rights of our taxpayers.

Mr. Betz asked if this development will have an impact on public services and result in increased taxes.

Mr. Tiffany noted taxes are always a concern. He noted he wishes he could say no and he wished he could say yes. In a community like ours, for residential development there is typically

an expenditure of \$1.25 for each dollar that is paid in. It's all services, including schools, all county agencies, etc. For commercial uses, for every dollar taken in, \$0.60 is expended. For agricultural uses, it is \$0.30. I cannot say if it will or will not increase taxes. It is a collective thing. Levies and valuations will continue to increase. We have not gone back for extra money in the last few years, we have absorbed state cuts, and we try to do more with less.

Mr. Betz asked if this development doesn't happen will Wilmington Pike be realigned.

Mr. Tiffany noted we have had recent conversations with the County Engineer to discuss this. Wilmington Dayton at Centerville is a concern. The traffic study done in conjunction with this development brought that to light. The other is Feedwire and Cloy; it is very bad at certain times of the day. They are going to be revitalizing that bridge over 675 but we have to look at how we work through that construction project. Walnut Hills onto Wilmington Dayton is a concern too.

Mr. Betz asked if this development doesn't happen will the realignment occur.

Mr. Tiffany stated it will have to happen. It is a pinch point and that's why it was on the Thoroughfare Plan and it is included in the proposed update.

Mr. Oberer noted they have had extensive conversations with the Engineer's Office. There are only two ways to fix the alignment. One is through this property, the other is through Metro parks and they have indicated no desire to cooperate.

Ms. Moore noted in response to the public's ability to have a say that before she was on the Zoning Commission a development was proposed adjacent to her neighborhood. She stated that her neighborhood became involved, raised their concerns, the case was tabled, the neighborhood met with the developer and changes were made to address their concerns.

Mr. Betz asked about the construction period.

Mr. Oberer stated typically 20-25 lots a year, so realistically 4-6 years.

Mr. Betz asked about the stub from Gerhardt. It appeared someone envisioned a road into this adjacent property. There is a way for that right-of-way to be vacated. The last item he has on his list is noting that the Long Range Land Use Plan was updated in 2013. It was a lot of work. At that time there was a lot of discussion about annexation. There was a lot of discussion about the City of Centerville approaching our businesses. As we sat down and looked at the plan, we took a fresh look at where are our highest risk areas for annexation. We identified vacant parcels that would be subject to annexation. This was one of those parcels. At that time the non-annexation agreement that Mr. Rammel signed did not exist. He noted he feels a little different about this parcel because of that versus the other parcels we have dealt with. It is a terrible position to be in. In the Long Range Land Use Plan we had to devise ways to fight annexation because state law is not helpful. We did not change the status of 90% of the land in the township.

Mrs. Tilford noted someone asked about comparable densities and if this one was skewed because of the large park. She explained open space in all the neighborhoods is calculated into

density. She also noted that if the park doesn't purchase the land, it will be held in conservation easement in perpetuity.

Mrs. Hellmann asked if the trees could be removed.

Mrs. Tilford stated that would depend on what the language of the conservation easement says. She noted also that there was no 2.5 lot plan brought forth by the developer.

Ms. Moore indicated that she likes the patio home concept and believes they are needed in the township. She asked about a reduction in density and if that was possible.

Mr. Oberer stated we originally laid out lots on the entire tract. He noted confidence with the patio home product. In general there is a shortage of that product. He noted that this property is uniquely suited for development with public sewer and water and accessibility to shopping. He noted that it will produce very few school age children, a handful, but it will pay into the system. He noted they have looked all around for properties and this is the best one they could find.

Mr. Betz noted that it was time for deliberation. He noted he sees this as 49 acre development not an 83 acre development. He feels it is in the wrong location. The density in this neighborhood is just not appropriate. He noted that he cannot support it.

Mr. Schleich noted that he doesn't see the open space within the development area and that is problematic looking at the R-PUCD standards. He noted he is also concerned about traffic. He feels the improvements are necessary before the development would be built. The R-PUCD should prevent congestion based on poor site planning and it is doing the opposite.

Ms. Moore again encouraged revision to include more open space into the development area so it looks more rural than it does.

Mr. Oberer indicated his belief that it meets the requirements of the Zoning Resolution.

Mrs. Hellmann noted she agrees patio homes are needed and based on how many school children are in Sugar Ridge, a patio home development adjacent to her, she likes that concept. She noted her concern is with traffic. She agrees the county needs to do a better job of addressing it but the traffic is a concern here and she has no confidence it is being addressed with this.

Mrs. Hellmann made a motion to deny the applicant's request, which was seconded by Mr. Schleich. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-yes

Ms. Moore-yes

Mr. Baldino-yes

Mrs. Hellmann-yes

Mr. Schleich-yes

Mr. Betz moved to the approval of June 5, 2018 Minutes. Mrs. Hellmann made a motion to approve the June 5, 2018 Minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Scheich. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-yes
Ms. Moore-yes
Mr. Baldino-yes
Mrs. Hellmann-yes
Mr. Schleich-yes

Mrs. Hellmann made a motion to withdraw her motion, which was seconded by Mr. Schleich.

Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-yes
Ms. Moore-yes
Mr. Baldino-yes
Mrs. Hellmann-yes
Mr. Schleich-yes

Mrs. Hellmann made a motion to approve the October 2, 2018 Minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Baldino. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-yes
Ms. Moore-yes
Mr. Baldino-yes
Mrs. Hellmann-yes
Mr. Schleich-yes

Mrs. Hellmann moved to adjourn, which as seconded by Mr. Baldino. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betz-yes
Mr. Baldino-yes
Mr. Schleich-yes
Mrs. Hellmann-yes
Ms. Moore-yes