

MINUTES OF THE STARK COUNTY LAND REUTILIZATION CORPORATION
July 21, 2014

The Stark County Land Reutilization Corporation met in regular session Monday, July 21, 2014, 8:30 a.m. in the Stark County Regional Planning Commission Conference Room.

Board Members

Alex Zumbar

Lem Green

Janet Weir Creighton

Tom Bernabei

RPC Staff

Bob Nau

Sarah Peters

Dave Thorley

Jill Gerber

Beth Pearson

Emma Posillico

Others

Tom Burns, City of Canton

Amelia Kocher, City of Alliance

Joe Mazzola, City of Alliance

Dave Maley, City of Massillon

Loren Souers, Jr., Attorney

Joel Owens, Community Building Partnership

Maureen Austin, Community Building Partnership

Beverly Hupp

Shirley Hupp

Kevin Stewart

Martin Olson

- 1) **CALL TO ORDER BY SCLRC CHAIRMAN - Alex Zumbar**
- 2) **ROLL CALL**

Board Members Present:

Alex Zumbar, Stark County Treasurer/Chairman

Tom Bernabei, Stark County Commissioner

Janet Creighton, Stark County Commissioner

Lem Green, Municipal Representative

- 3) **MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2014 - REGULAR MEETING**

Green moved, Bernabei seconded, and the motion carried to approve the minutes of June 16, 2014.

- 4) **TREASURER REPORT**

A letter from Jaime Allbritain giving notice of her resignation as Secretary/Treasurer of the Stark County Land Reutilization Corporation (SCLRC) was presented. Creighton moved, Bernabei seconded, and the motion carried to approve the resignation of Jaime Allbritain.

Zumbar stated that Jim Wallace, CPA, works in the Treasurer's office part time and has assumed the duties that Allbritain was handling for SCLRC and has prepared the bank reconciliation. The SCLRC balance for June 2014 is \$217,883.89, however; there is \$1 million that has been moved into an

investment fund, which is with Star Plus Ohio making the total \$1,217,883.89. Creighton moved, Bernabei seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Treasurer's report.

Beth Pearson, fiscal administrator for RPC, gave a brief overview of the proposed Financial Management and Secretarial Duties for SCLRC should RPC undertake those duties. Some of the duties would include preparing an annual budget, contract work, handling finances, processing payments and receipting of funds. In regards to processing payment, RPC would be approving payments but not actually issuing checks as that would still be the responsibility of the SCLRC. With the exception of side lot applications fees, all the other funding would go directly to the Land Bank. RPC would propose the side lot application fee be submitted at the RPC office and receipted into their accounting system, but those checks would then be sent to the SCLRC for deposit into the bank. RPC would also prepare financial statements that would be balanced with the SCLRC books and provide secretarial duties as requested. Pearson reminded everyone that these are draft procedures and RPC would put together a more detailed procedure manual if this is the route the board wants to go. Green asked if she had any recommendations on the dollar amounts that should go in the blanks. Pearson stated what guidelines RPC uses when authorizing payment of invoices and signing contracts, but the numbers used by the SCLRC would be on a larger scale. One of the questions proposed was whether the Board would fall under the Super Circular 2 CRF Part 200, which details some of those numbers. Bob Nau pointed out the draft document was modeled after the administration of the CDBG program for the County Commissioners where RPC has budgeting and planning duties, but the actual check writing remains with the Treasurer. (check writing would be with Alex Zumber as SCLRC Chairman).

Bernabei asked if the cost for performing these services fit within the contract for administrative services. Nau stated the costs to perform the services have exceeded the contracted amount with RPC. The general administrative duties RPC performs is billed quarterly and June totaled at about \$12,000. RPC's initial contract amount was \$10,000 a month, which was executed before the change with the NIP and fiscal responsibilities not yet taken over. Green asked how much of that was due to the Side Lot Program. Nau stated almost 100% of Sarah Peter's time has been spent on the Side Lot Program. Green asked if the refunds from the MOF are included in the administrative fees. Zumber stated they receive a very small amount. Green asked about NIP reimbursements. Nau stated NIP reimbursements are on a project specific basis, which is \$25,000 per property after the demos are completed.

Green asked if the SCLRC was going to go without a named treasurer. Zumber stated the functions would be picked up by RPC as the administrative arm. Nau stated RPC could be the named secretary, but the agency is not set up to write checks and make investments as the treasurer. Zumber stated the checks are signed by him and Green has been added as a co-signer. Bernabei asked how this interrelates with the subject they started to discuss last month with regards to appointing a fiscal agent. Zumber responded Beth Pearson is the fiscal agent for RPC in terms of handling these arrangements and RPC is very capable of handling them. The checks are being processed and the board is approving everything, but if a named treasurer is needed, that is up to the board, but he was fine with the arrangements that RPC has proposed and will support them. Green asked if the bylaws required a named treasurer. Creighton stated she was comfortable with RPC. Bernabei stated he also was comfortable with RPC, but asked that Attorney Dave Thorley review the bylaws during the course of the meeting concerning the appointment of a treasurer.

Green stated assuming there is no reason to defer, he proposed that the Board enter \$1,500 in the two blanks [*referencing page 1 of proposal*] concerning revisions. Zumber agreed, and this amount can be modified in the future if necessary. Green requested someone else be given signature authority instead of himself as he didn't want to sign checks that are related to his activities. Zumber suggested approving Jim Wallace as the second signature. Green moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to give signature authority to Jim Wallace. The Board proceeded to fill in the remaining blanks of the RPC financial proposal. On page 2, it was recommended putting \$50,000 for the first blank and \$25,000 for the second blank. On page 2 under finances, \$1,500 for the next two blanks.

After review of the bylaws, Thorley stated in accordance with the Code of Regulations, Article VI, Section 6.1, the Board does appoint officers, which consists of a president, secretary, and a treasurer and one or more vice-presidents. Under Section 6.3.2 it talks about duties specific to the treasurer, and that the treasurer shall be the fiscal officer of the corporation, subject to the direction of the president. The treasurer shall be responsible for all the fiscal affairs of the corporation. Green asked Thorley if he could propose specific amendments to the bylaws to resolve that matter. Thorley responded he could handle that. Nau explained the way SCLRC is set up is different than most of the other land banks. Most of them have hired staff with a president, secretary and treasurer, but SCLRC has a contractual relationship, but it is functionally the same thing. If the bylaws need to be revised to more accurately reflect what SCLRC is doing, then they can do that. Green asked if this matter of approving RPC's financial management proposal should be deferred until the revisions are made to the bylaws. Zubar stated he was comfortable passing what RPC proposed in terms of the budgeting and contracting functions. Nau stated that functionally, RPC is the director and can be the secretary and Jim Wallace could be the treasurer, if somebody must be named. Bernabei moved, Green seconded, and the motion carried to appoint Jim Wallace as SCLRC treasurer.

Green moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to adopt the SCRPC Financial Management and Secretarial Duties of the SCLRC as presented with the previously discussed revisions as follows: Page 1 referencing revisions - \$1,500 in both blanks; Page 2 under Contracting - first blank will be \$50,000, and second blank \$25,000; Page 2, under Finances - both blanks will be \$1,500.

5) **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

Neighborhood Initiative Program Update -Bob Nau

Nau stated that the City of Canton has signed the agreement with the Land Bank for the Neighborhood Initiative Program (NIP). They sent out the same agreement to the cities of Alliance and Massillon. Their situation is different than Canton's in respect to resources, funding and staffing issues. In Massillon some of the demolitions done under the MOF were well over \$25,000, and under the NIP, that is the maximum reimbursement that is provided. It was questioned who would handle the funding if some of the demolitions go over \$25,000.

Joe Mazzola, Planning Director, and Amelia Kocher, Community Development Planner from Alliance, spoke how expensive asbestos remediation is in Stark County as costs are coming in much higher than \$25,000 per property. If it's not within the \$25,000, they would have to rely upon the general fund, and they did not believe the city could bear those costs at this point in time. Green asked if that was money they would like them to commit or give a positive attitude towards reimbursing in the future, or another option would be that the project can't be done. Kocher stated that was their response to RPC; they would love to, but they can't. Green asked if the city is asking for some commitment from SCLRC that they will either pay or assist in paying the upfront costs they are unable to cover. Kocher stated they haven't asked for anything, but if that were to be possible, then that would be a way they could do the program. Nau pointed out that under MOF, it wasn't a requirement that the properties be acquired, but under the NIP, the Land Bank is required to take title. Everything is done up front at the city's expense, then reimbursement to the NIP must be submitted. The agreement with Canton states that SCLRC will hold title to the property for the project period, which is three years. At the end of the project period, the property gets titled to the City of Canton. Green stated the downside of this is SCLRC gets the property and then it is discovered it is a \$30,000 demolition project. Kocher stated in addition to that issue, a lot of the houses are structurally unsound, so if asbestos abatement must be done, and if the structure would experience fire damage or collapse, then that may sometimes triple or quadruple the costs. Mazzola stated the demolitions in Alliance are as important as anything else they are doing in terms of moving the community forward economically.

David Maley, representative from Massillon, stated that all the issues discussed with Alliance, they have too. They are probably in a more difficult financial situation than Alliance being in fiscal emergency.

Zumbar asked Nau if it was his recommendation that the Board consider extending an amount of money, not to exceed a specific number. Nau stated that he was not making a recommendation at this point, but an option would be for the Land Bank to leverage the \$25,000 per property and cover additional costs. There needs to be a discussion on what the Land Bank is willing to do, and if it is a good expenditure of resources to leverage \$25,000 in grant money per property, knowing that they may go over. Bernabei asked how many properties they anticipate would be purchased, acquired and demolished under this program. Zumbar responded that the majority of properties that were submitted in the initial grant are based in the City of Canton, so 95% of the 180 are in Canton and the rest are in Massillon and Alliance. There is a Round 2, which will extend this program. That is why Nau reached out to the cities to see if there is still interest in the program. It is clear there is interest in the program, but it's a cost matter now. He was willing to entertain the idea of putting up the funds, and they did that with the MOF program. He would like to go back and review some of those higher cost items to see if they could get a better figure. The Board understands that they will not get reimbursed for anything over that \$25,000 figure, but he would not want to extend it that far out. Bernabei stated he would be concerned about making a blank commitment because if each property went over \$10,000, that is more than \$1.8 million, which is beyond the Land Bank's capacity. Zumbar stated this is an issue that is going to have to be addressed in the very near future and it should be determined what the board is willing to consider in terms of the limits beyond the \$25,000 figure, knowing this is money that will not be reimbursed. But it is an investment in that particular community that is having difficulty meeting the cash flow.

Nau added that when Canton did the NIP application, they put a lot of work into including areas outside of the cities as eligible. There will probably be some properties in other townships that will be looking at doing demolition. That would probably be bid under their agreement with the Land Bank. It was decided that a work session was necessary. Nau stated that RPC would set that up.

Moving Ohio Forward Update - Sarah Peters

The deadline for MOF is September 30, 2014.

Non-Match Approved Property Update:

Subrecipients

- 1) City of Alliance – Twenty (20) demolitions (20 units of housing) have been complete, submitted, and reimbursed by the State AG's office, for a total demolition cost, including soft costs of \$241,468.95; 100% reimbursed to the City of Alliance. Alliance has added 5 additional properties to the MOF demolition listing (match to be made up with DTAC funding). Work is underway.
- 2) City of Canton - 5 approved demolitions (5 units of housing) completed, submitted, and reimbursed by the State AG's office, for a total demolition cost, including soft costs of \$40,034.22; 100% reimbursed to the City of Canton.
- 3) Perry Twp. – 3 approved demolitions (3 units of housing) completed, submitted to the State AG for reimbursement. Total demolition costs, including soft costs of \$19,452.03; 100% to be reimbursed to Perry Township.

- 4) Plain Twp. - 5 approved demolitions (5 units of housing) completed, submitted to the State AG's office for reimbursement. Total demolition cost, including soft costs of \$25,357.12; 100% reimbursed to Plain Township.

Non-Subrecipients

- 1) 43 demolitions (45 units of housing) completed, submitted, and reimbursed by the State AGs office. Total demolition costs, including soft costs - \$619,466.57 (\$500.00 match credit provided by Pike Twp.) (3 - Beach City, 1 - Canal Fulton, 1 - East Canton, 20 - Massillon, 2 - Meyers Lake, 1 - Navarre, 3 - Waynesburg, 2 - Wilmot, 1 - Canton Twp., 1 - Bethlehem Twp., 1-Lake Twp, 3 - Lexington Twp., 1 - Nimshillen Twp, 1 - Pike Twp., & 2 - Tuscarawas Twp.).
- 2) 1 property under contract for demolition, for a total of \$5,400.00 + soft costs/administration costs. (1 - Nimishillen Twp.)
- 3) 2 properties out for asbestos evaluation. Once received, they will be bid for demolition. (1 - East Canton & 1- Waynesburg)

Match Property - Subrecipient Update:

- 1) City of Alliance - 7 demolitions (20 units of housing) completed, submitted, and reimbursed by the State AG's office. Total demolition cost, including soft cost - \$177,457.36. A total of \$102,457.36 reimbursed to date. (As expected, the overall demolition costs exceeded the "matched" funding, \$75,000.00, provided by Alliance. This unmatched funding, \$27,457.36, was made-up with "MOF non-match funding".) No additional demolitions will be undertaken by Alliance utilizing match funding.
- 2) City of Canton - 289 demolitions (326 units of housing) completed, submitted, and reimbursed by the State AG's office. Total demolition cost, including soft cost - \$1,950,136.89. A total of \$975,068.36 reimbursed to date. Additional demolitions are underway, but not yet submitted for reimbursement to RPC/State AG.
- 3) Perry Twp. - No additional properties outside of the 3 non-match addresses will be completed.
- 4) Plain Twp. - Eleven (11) additional demolitions (11 units of housing) have been complete, and submitted for reimbursement to the State AG's office. Total demolition cost, including soft costs - \$74,389.33. A total of \$37,194.65 reimbursed to date. It is not expected that Plain Twp. will undertake additional demolitions utilizing match funding.

➤ **Total Available MOF Grant: \$2,343,607.00**

➤ **Total Reimbursement submissions to date: \$1,901,916.72**
(Balance available to submit: \$441,690.28)
(Administration credited to date: \$91,769.599)

- **Total Non-Match funding available - \$510,703.08** (\$500,000 non-match funding + \$10,703.08 match credit)

Invoiced to date: \$510,703.08

Remaining balance to be submitted for reimbursement: \$ -0-

- **Total Match funding available - \$1,832,903.92**

Invoiced to date: \$1,391,213.64

Remaining to be submitted for reimbursement: \$441,690.28

6) **DEMOLITION PROGRAM AND SIDE LOT PROGRAM REPORT** - Sarah Peters

Side Lot Program Update:

Canton City Applications

- 1) Total: 484

All other Community Applications

- 1) Cities:
Alliance - 37, Massillon - 38
- 2) Other communities where side lots have been submitted:
Bethlehem Twp -2, Brewster - 1, Canton Twp - 5, East Canton - 4, East Sparta - 4, Hartville - 3, Lake Twp - 1, Lexington Twp - 4, Minerva - 1, Nimishillen - 1, Osnaburg Twp - 4, Paris Twp - 1, Perry Twp - 1, Plain Twp - 7, Sugarcreek Twp - 1, and Washington Twp - 1, Waynesburg - 1.

- **Total Applications Submitted: 601**

- **Total Number pending approval: 281**
- **Total Number of Applications Denied: 110**
- **Total Number of Approved Applications: 210**

- **Total Number Pending Deposit Receipt / Request to Treasurer for Foreclosure / Completed Foreclosure Proceeding: 169**
- **Total Number Ready/Scheduled for Transfer: 12**
- **Total Number Pending Easement Restrictions from City of Canton: 7**
- **Total Number Transferred to Date: 22**

Neighborhood Initiative Program Update - Dave Thorley

Thorley thought it was important the Board knows where the Land Bank stands concerning the NIP. The Land Bank was awarded \$4.3 million through the efforts of the City of Canton. They are actually targeting 169 properties as of now. Before the end of March of 2015, 85 of those properties must be titled in the name of the Land Bank with the balance of those properties being titled by September of 2015. As of last week, 22 properties had been submitted through the Treasurer's office to the Prosecutor's office to begin the actual foreclosure process. These would be tax delinquent properties and they will go through the Board of Revision process.

The original statewide NIP program had \$60,000 million of which \$48,000 million was committed to the various Land Banks during phase 1 funding. Of that amount, SCLRC received \$4.3 million. Cuyahoga County along with many others throughout the State also received funding. There were a couple of Land Banks that weren't in existence during phase 1 that have now applied for Round 2 funding. There is \$12 million left for Round 2. Based on SCLRC's performance under phase 1, the Land Bank is eligible to receive up to another \$500,000 for Round 2 funding. The City of Canton has indicated that they would like to go forward with this. They are putting together the application, but one of the things that must happen is that 10% of those properties, which are basically 17 properties, must be titled in the Land Bank's name prior to the submission on July 31. Canton has engaged an agent to work on behalf of the city who has targeted properties that will be transferred to the Land Bank, hopefully this week. If the paper work is in order, they will get 20 properties transferred either by a direct sale process or a deed in lieu of foreclosure. It looks like 16 of them will be deed in lieu of foreclosure; with the remaining four being direct sale process. Through the NIP program, \$5,000 is allotted toward the actual acquisition of properties but in no way can any of those properties be tax delinquent, and it is not permitted to use this money to pay tax delinquencies.

The original pipeline that was submitted with the grant was upwards of 400 properties. In that pipeline there were approximately 50 properties that were submitted on behalf of Massillon and 10 or more on behalf of Alliance in their target areas. Requests have been received from Massillon to do 14 properties that they would be ready to go forward with depending on whether they have the staff and also upon execution of a contract with them, but right now the entire program is being driven by the City of Canton. Green asked what needs to be done on those Massillon properties. Thorley responded they are ready to go, but the problem is the funding issue that was spoken of earlier, which can be done after the work session. The deadline is September 2015 to acquire 169 properties.

Thorley stated the Wednesday conference calls have been very beneficial in keeping the program going in the right direction. Nau stated the critical path item now is that Round 2 funding is due July 31. The Land Bank must have title of 10% of those properties to be eligible to apply for Round 2 funding. There was discussion on the difficulty in meeting the goals when the rules and regulations are always changing. Nau stated Canton was working under the premise that back taxes were eligible costs out of that first \$5,000, then the Treasury Department changed the rules a month ago to say it is not eligible. Green asked if they are ultimately eligible as part of the \$25,000. Bernabei asked if they could pay off back taxes and get reimbursed. Nau stated taxes are not eligible to be reimbursed. Thorley stated the City of Canton had targeted upward of 60 properties that they were going to do a direct transfer through a sale process of around \$3,200 per property. Acquisition costs are allotted up to \$5,000, but the moment the rules changed, they lost a great bulk of these properties because they were delinquent with taxes and assessments. Green stated ultimately that can still be done. If the Land Bank would file a tax foreclosure and Zumar does it at the Land Bank's request, then the Board of Revision would order the taxes abated. Thorley stated that is correct, which is why there are 22 properties now pending. They had to back up, take the properties that were going to be a direct transfer, which would have occurred prior to the end of July, and put them through the Board of Revision process, which can take anywhere from 4 to 8 months. This is a much longer process but would be well within the March 31, 2015 deadline on the 85 properties. Green stated if the Land Bank takes a deed in lieu and there's no other and gets clear title, then the

Auditor can still abate the taxes. Thorley agreed, and that is where the 16 properties are coming in today. He had a conversation with Robert Murphy last week, and he was going to transfer over to him a packet of information for his review prior to his meeting this afternoon. The language of the statute requires that the Stark County Auditor as an agent of the State of Ohio sign off on these. Now that doesn't mean that taxes are immediately wiped off, but there is a process once they are in the Land Bank's name that the Land Bank can then have those taxes abated.

Bernabei asked Tom Burns, City of Canton, if there was any hope of getting the 17 properties done by July 31. Burns stated since he was out of the office last week, he was not current on what has happened, but he knew that Mike Boylan was supposed to submit two properties. Thorley stated Boylan submitted them to him last Thursday. He looked them over and then Boylan immediately took them to Zumbar for his signature. This entire program is driven through the mortgage foreclosure crisis from before, so all these properties, once they are titled in the Land Bank's name, must have an obligation associated with them. There will be an obligation from the Land Bank for \$100 that deals with The Stock Pile going out and evaluating them for deconstruction purposes. Nau stated The Stock Pile (SCRPC, Inc.) is a non-profit and at their last board meeting, he got approval to put a note on these properties and basically for \$100 the Stock Pile manager will evaluate the properties for deconstruction. This is a requirement from the Treasury Department. Zumbar explained this is not the mortgage note that ultimately gets put on the property for three years. This is the initial step that must be taken in getting title to the property. Thorley added, concerning the three-year requirement that the property must be titled in the Land Bank's name, there are certain circumstances where the Land Bank has the ability to transfer the property within that three-year period, and one of the eligible transfers would be to a Side Lot program. If these do qualify for side lots, and he believed a lot of them will, then the Land Bank won't be holding them that three year period. The Ohio Housing Finance Agency will sign off to release that mortgage, so the Land Bank will not own that property three years and will not have the maintenance worries as it relates to that.

7) **PUBLIC SPEAKS**

Subject of Discussion: Side Lot Program - parcel 236022

Loren Souers Jr., Attorney representing Kevin Stewart, stated this parcel of land has already been foreclosed upon in the 900 block of McKinley Avenue. Mr. Stewart owns two parcels which are adjacent to this parcel, and he also owns another parcel on the other side of this property that is just across a small very narrow street. His purpose should the lot go to him is to provide parking for those three properties. He has also been mowing this lot for 10 years and has maintained the property. They are asking that this parcel be awarded to Mr. Stewart. Green asked Souers if he had spoken to RPC about working something out with the other applicant. Sourers said they had not, but following the guidelines that have been adopted, they are willing to talk.

Thorley stated the other applicants are the Hupps and they are present. In March of 2013, Beverly and Glenn Hupp made application for the exact same lot of which Sourers just referred. Kevin Stewart applied for this lot May of 2013. Those dates are irrelevant in terms of awarding the property in the Side Lot Program. Both have gone through the process, and that process goes through a number of steps within the City of Canton for review and eventually is signed off on by the ward councilman, Thomas West. The first applicant to go through was the Hupps, and they were approved. The second applicant to go through was Mr. Stewart and he was approved also, but a comment was made per the councilman, that approval was pending the Hupps and Mr. Stewart agreeing to split the parcel. When looking at the transfer procedure, when both applicants qualify, the next step in the process would be to look at a potential split of the property. So right now the property is titled in the Land Bank's name subject to the decision the Board makes today. Thorley suggested that it be split at the cost of the applicants and that the property be titled in their respective names. He and Nau went out and visited the property which is on the corner of Herbert and McKinley. These are substandard lots. The Hupps in their

application had indicated they wish to use it for a side yard, but their daughter actually lives in the home with her children. They noticed there was a trampoline on the property, but it appears this property is a perfect property to be split. He believed it would serve both their needs while giving a side lot for use for the Hupps and additional parking for Mr. Stewart. Green asked if he was suggesting the Board act on this matter. His attitude was that they should sit down and work it out. Thorley stated he had a phone conversation with Attorney Lora Goutras, who indicated that she was representing the Hupps in furtherance of their application. She is not present today, but the Hupps are here. It is possible the parties could sit down and work it out at some point, but he felt it would be improper to begin that discussion without Hupp's attorney being present.

Green suggested their attorney be contacted to set up a time, and he would be happy to attend also. When this process was initiated, it was his business. When Hupps sent in their application, he could see from the Auditor's records that the tax mailing address for the owner was that very address. So he came to the incorrect conclusion that they were residents, because the tax bill is never sent to a tenant. The Hupps would clearly had a priority under the side lot guidelines had they been a resident owner, but it turns out they are not residents, but their daughter lives there. So he processed the application through to the end and then it turned out this was not resolvable on this issue. He apologized for that happening, but he would prefer to defer the matter until Hupps can join with their council and meet together. Green asked Beverly Hupp, who was present, if Lora Goutras still represented her. Hupp stated that she did. He asked that she call her during the course of the meeting and set up a time convenient for both parties to meet to resolve this matter.

8) **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Appointment of Municipal Representative Lem Green to 2 year term

Zumbar stated the City of Canton has provided a resolution appointing Lem Green to another two year term. Bernabei moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to reappoint Lem Green for another term.

- b. Appointment of Township Representative

Zumbar stated he had not received any letters of recommendation, but he did know the Township Association has been made aware of the vacancy. But at this point of time, he didn't want to release any speculative information on who might be interested.

- c. RPC April invoice - \$5,961.83

Creighton moved, Bernabei seconded, and the motion carried to approve the RPC April invoice.

- d. RPC May invoice - \$6,973.23

Creighton moved, Bernabei seconded, and the motion carried to approve the RPC May invoice.

- e. Phil Schandel PJR invoices - \$4,400.00

Creighton moved, Bernabei seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Phil Schandel PJR invoices.

- f. FER Title Agency invoices - \$3,200.00

Bernabei moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to approve the FER Title Agency invoice.

- g. Clerk of Court BOR hearing invoices - \$5,503.62

Bernabei moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Clerk of Court BOR hearing invoices.

- h. Sheriff Office deed fees - \$600.00

Bernabei moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Sheriff Office deed fees.

- i. Press News invoices - \$2,944.50

Bernabei moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Press News invoices.

- j. Refund of \$100.00 fee for parcel 1306796

Bernabei moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to approve the \$100 refund for parcel 1306796.

- k. SCLRC and City of Canton OHFA-NIP Contract.

Zumbar stated this contract was a draft submitted to the Board at last month's meeting and was ultimately submitted to the City of Canton for their approval.

- l. OHFA-NIP Round II Funding

Zumbar stated the Round 2 application is due on July 31 and is expected to be filed next week. We are on track and will know by 1:00 p.m. if we have 20 properties. We could anticipate receiving \$500,000 if approved.

He provided a copy of a letter of support regarding the Bank of America pending settlement that he requested the mayors and Bob Nau submit on behalf of the Land Bank. This letter was sent to Jeff Graber, Council for the Assistance Attorney General, Civil Division, Department of Justice. This is the mortgage foreclosure settlement. This will hopefully urge them to come to an agreement and see if these funds will be available for further demolition or rehabilitation.

The cities of Canton, Alliance and RPC did submit letters on behalf of the Board. He had emailed a letter to the Mayor in Massillon but had not received anything from them.

9) **OLD BUSINESS**

Nau passed out a survey to the Board members and asked them to think about where they want the Land Bank to be in the medium and long term. With the various grant programs that they have been administering, it has been basically a demolition program, but that is only one piece of the pie. A work session will need to be scheduled to talk about the NIP. It would be good to have our new member on board at that time.

10) **NEXT MEETING - August 18, 2014 at 8:30 a.m.**

The next meeting will be held on August 18th at 8:30 a.m. at the RPC office. Zumbar stated the Board does not have to meet at 8:30 a.m., but the third Monday of the month was selected unless there is a holiday in which case it would be a Tuesday. He left it to Nau to find a convenient time everyone can get together for a work session, and hopefully there will be a township representative by that time.

Creighton suggested that any change in the meeting time should wait until a township representative is present.

11) **ADJOURNMENT**

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Gerber
RPC Office Manager