

**METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY, INDIANA**

July 15, 2026

The regular meeting of the Metropolitan Development Commission (MDC) of Indianapolis-Marion County, IN, was held on Wednesday, July 15, 2026, at 1:00 P.M. in the Public Assembly Room of the City-County Building, Indianapolis, IN, for various purposes, including the holding of a Public Hearing on various Petitions listed on the Notice of Public Hearing, and for taking official action upon public business and public Notice thereof as required by IC 5-14-1.5.

ATTENDANCE

The following Commission members were present:

John J. Dillon III, President
Brandon Herget
Brent Lyle
Daniel Moriarty
Brian P. Murphy, Secretary
Bruce Schumacher, Acting Secretary
Gregg West

The following Commission members were absent:

Brigid Robinson

The following City of Indianapolis employees were present:

Megan Vukusich	Director – DMD
Jennifer Fults	Deputy Director, Strategy and Collaboration – DMD
Carmen Lethig	Deputy Director, Planning, Preservation and Design – DMD
Kathy Frazier Battle	Principal Program Manager, Economic Incentives – DMD
Tonya Ellison	Program Manager – Economic Incentives – DMD
Sheri Oor	Principal Program Manager, Incentives Compliance – DMD
Latisha Ramsey	Compliance Manager, Economic Incentives – DMD
Kathleen Blackham	Senior Planner – DMD
Josh Levesque	Senior Planner – DMD
Jeffrey York	Manager, Current Planning – DMD
Bryce Patz	Administrator, Current Planning – DMD
Nancy Whitaker	Board Specialist – DMD
Chris Steinmetz	Senior Counseling Attorney – ACC / OCC

BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER

President Dillon called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M. and led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

Commissioner Moriarty made a Motion to adopt the Minutes from the July 1, 2026 meeting; Commissioner Herget seconded the Motion; the Commission adopted the Minutes by a roll-call vote (7:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: None
Recusals: None

The Minutes from the July 1, 2026 meeting were adopted.

SPECIAL REQUESTS

Attorney Alexandra Curlin (Irvington Community Schools) appeared and requested a 45-day continuance of **Petition Nos. 2026-CVR-815 (Amended) and 2026-CPL-815** on behalf of Irvington Community Schools. Ms. Curlin stated that the elementary school, which adjoins the subject site, had not been contacted by the developer until June, after the Hearing Examiner's recommendation had already been made. She noted that the school board had only first reviewed the site plan on June 1, 2026, that a revised plan had been received only the prior week, that commitments remained in draft form, and that the school board had visited the site as recently as the prior Monday and had not yet had an opportunity to discuss its findings. She stated the school was not seeking delay but rather adequate time for due diligence.

City-County Councilor Andy Nielsen (Council District #14) appeared in support of the continuance request, citing significant changes to the site plan and noting that additional time for communication between the school district and the Petitioner would be in the interest of all parties.

Mindy Westrick Brown (300 North Meridian Street, Suite 2500, Indianapolis, IN), strongly opposed a continuance. Ms. Westrick Brown summarized the case history, noting the Petition had been pending since March 2026 and had already experienced multiple continuances, including a continuance due to the 10-case rule [for docketing petitions for Hearing Examiner meeting], an automatic continuance by Remonstrators, and a continuance for cause in late June. She contested the school's characterization of the outreach timeline, stating that the school had received five emails, two phone calls, an in-person visit, a postcard, and legal notice beginning in late March 2026, prior to the public notice. She noted that the Petitioner had hosted nine school board members and administrators on a visit to a DC BLOX facility in Atlanta, chosen at the school's convenience, that ten commitments had been developed as a result of ongoing discussions, and that the school was included in the enforcement list for those commitments. She characterized the continuance request as a delay tactic.

Vincent Ash (10 West Carmel Drive, Carmel, IN) appeared on behalf of the property owner and developer, Lauth Group, and opposed the continuance.

Jon Hooker (President, Central Indiana Building and Construction Trades Council) spoke in opposition to a continuance request on behalf of the Building Trades.

Anna Warnsing, who introduced herself as a charter school psychologist in the Indianapolis school system, spoke in opposition to the continuance request.

Ms. Curlin appeared in rebuttal, acknowledging that Ms. Westrick Brown's account of the outreach was not disputed, but noting that the communications had not reached the school board, which had not had an opportunity to review the project until recently. She reiterated that additional engagement had already produced improvements to the project and that further time would benefit all parties.

Kathleen Blackham (Staff) indicated that Staff was prepared to proceed with the hearing.

Commissioner Schumacher made a Motion to continue **Petition Nos. 2026-CVR-815 (Amended) and 2026-CPL-815** for 30 days, to the August 19, 2026 meeting; Commissioner Lyle seconded the Motion. The Motion was denied by a roll-call vote (3:4:0) as follows:

Ayes: Herget, Lyle, Schumacher (3)
Noes: Dillon, Moriarty, Murphy, West (4)
Recusals: None

The Motion for continuance of Petition Nos. 2026-CVR-815 (Amended) and 2026-CPL-815 was denied (3:4:0). The hearing proceeded.

The Petitioner's attorney, Joseph D. Calderon (11 South Meridian Street, Indianapolis, IN), requested a continuance for **Petition No. 2026-ZON-057** to the August 5, 2026 meeting. Mr. Calderon cited the dynamics of the day as making a continuance beneficial to all parties concerned.

Kathleen Blackham (Staff) indicated that Staff had no objection to the continuance of **Petition No. 2026-ZON-057** to the August 5, 2026 meeting, and that the continuance would be without additional Notice.

2026-ZON-057 | 3709 East Washington Street

Center Township, Council District #18

Englewood Community Development Corporation, by Joseph D. Calderon

Rezoning of 2.49 acres from the I-2 (TOD), C-4 (TOD) and D-10 (TOD) districts to the D-10 (TOD) district to provide for residential development.

Hearing no other comments, Commissioner Murphy made a Motion to continue **Petition No. 2026-ZON-057** to the August 5, 2026 meeting; Commissioner Lyle seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (7:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: None
Recusals: None

The Commission continued Petition No. 2026-ZON-057 to the August 5, 2026 meeting.

City-County Councilor Jesse Brown (CD #13) requested that the Commission institute a data center moratorium, effective immediately. Councilor Brown stated that as of May 2026, all 25 City-County Councilors had voted for a moratorium until SU-47 zoning was completed. President Dillon acknowledged the request and noted that the Commission was constrained by state law, specifically IC 36-7-4-1109 (vested rights), which limits the Commission's ability to impose moratoriums on applications already in the pipeline. President Dillon stated that the matter would go back to the City-County Council for it to pass an ordinance requesting a moratorium, which the Commission would then have to address.

Tonya Ellison (Program Manager, Economic Incentives, DMD) requested a continuance for **Resolution No. 2026-A-034** to the August 5, 2026 meeting, citing a scrivener's error that had identified an incorrect parcel in the public notice, necessitating time to correct the parcel information and re-notice.

2026-A-034 (For Public Hearing)

Final Economic Revitalization Area Resolution for Zima International, Inc., located at 6900 English Avenue, Council District #20, Warren Township. (Recommend approval of seven (7) years personal property tax abatement.)

Hearing no other comments, Commissioner Murphy made a Motion to continue **Resolution No. 2026-A-034** to the August 5, 2026 meeting; Commissioner Herget seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (6:1:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Herget, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: Lyle
Recusals: None

The Commission continued Resolution No. 2026-A-034 to the August 5, 2026 meeting.

POLICY RESOLUTIONS

Nancy Whitaker (Board Specialist, DMD) read the following Policy Resolutions into the record:

REAL ESTATE:

2026-R-021 Authorizes the Department of Metropolitan Development to use locally available funds in an amount not to exceed \$15,000 to demolish a structure located at 2638/2640 East 10th Street to facilitate investigation and removal of underground storage tanks.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / INCENTIVES:

2026-A-014 Preliminary Economic Revitalization Area Resolution for Metrobloks, LLC, located at 2505 North Sherman Drive, Council District #8, Center Township. (Recommend approval of ten (10) years real property tax abatement.)

2026-A-015 Preliminary Economic Revitalization Area Resolution for Metrobloks, LLC, located at 2505 North Sherman Drive, Council District #8, Center Township. (Recommend approval of fifteen (15) years enhanced personal property tax abatement.)

2026-A-019 (For Public Hearing) Resolution authorizes an amendment to the 2023 Real Property Tax Abatement approved by Resolution 2023-A-026 at Alfa Laval U.S. Group Services Real Estate LLC, 5820 Meritage Parkway, Council District #25, Franklin Township.

2026-A-033 (For Public Hearing) Final Economic Revitalization Area Resolution for CCBCC Operations, LLC, located at 5000 West 25th Street, Council District #11, Wayne Township. (Recommend approval of four (4) years personal property tax abatement.)

President Dillon noted that **Resolution Nos. 2026-R-021, 2026-A-014, and 2026-A-015** did not stand for public hearing, clarifying for the record that approval of these resolutions would place them on the August 5, 2026 public hearing calendar and that no substantive decision on any of them was being made at this meeting. Hearing no comments or questions, Commissioner Murphy made a Motion to approve **Resolution Nos. 2026-R-021 (7:0:0), 2026-A-014 (6:1:0), and 2026-A-015 (6:1:0)**; Commissioner Moriarty seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West (with Schumacher voting no on 2026-A-014 and 2026-A-015)

Noes: Schumacher (on 2026-A-014 and 2026-A-015)

Recusals: None

The Commission approved Resolution Nos. 2026-R-021 (7:0:0), 2026-A-014 (6:1:0), and 2026-A-015 (6:1:0).

President Dillon announced **Resolution No. 2026-A-019**, which stood for public hearing.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / INCENTIVES:

2026-A-019 (For Public Hearing) Resolution authorizes an amendment to the 2023 Real Property Tax Abatement approved by Resolution 2023-A-026 at Alfa Laval U.S. Group Services Real Estate LLC, 5820 Meritage Parkway, Council District #25, Franklin Township.

Letitia Ramsey (Compliance Manager, Economic Incentives, DMD) presented the resolution. Ms. Ramsey explained that the amendment would transfer the MOA to the new owner, Alfa Laval U.S. Group Services Real Estate, LLC, and extend the job creation commitment deadline to December 31, 2026. Staff recommended approval of the amendment.

Hearing no comments or questions from the Commission or from the public, Commissioner Herget made a Motion to approve **Resolution No. 2026-A-019**; Commissioner Lyle seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (7:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West

Noes: None

Recusals: None

The Commission approved Resolution No. 2026-A-019.

President Dillon announced **Resolution No. 2026-A-033**, which stood for public hearing.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / INCENTIVES:

2026-A-033 (For Public Hearing) Final Economic Revitalization Area Resolution for CCBCC Operations, LLC, located at 5000 West 25th Street, Council District #11, Wayne Township. (Recommend approval of four (4) years personal property tax abatement.)

Kathy Frazier Battle (Principal Program Manager, Economic Incentives, DMD) presented the resolution on behalf of CCBCC Operations, LLC, better known as Coca-Cola Consolidated. Ms. Frazier Battle explained that the company was installing a new glass bottling manufacturing line at its 5000 West 25th Street location in Speedway (only the third such manufacturing glass bottling line in the United States). The resolution requested a four-year personal property tax abatement at a 50% straight-line deduction on a \$31.5 million investment. The project would retain 179 full-time jobs, 77% of which are held by Marion County residents, and create 16 new positions all paying above \$24 per hour. The company committed to a 10% inclusivity obligation (double the standard 5%) totaling \$91,000 to go toward infrastructure improvements along Georgetown Road. Staff recommended approval.

Hearing no comments or questions from the Commission or from the public, Commissioner Schumacher made a Motion to approve **Resolution No. 2026-A-033**; Commissioner Lyle seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (7:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: None
Recusals: None

The Commission approved Resolution No. 2026-A-033.

PETITIONS OF NO APPEAL

Nancy Whitaker (Board Specialist, DMD) read the following Petitions into the record.

Petitions Recommended for Approval by the MDC Hearing Examiner:

2026-APP-011 | 5001 East Raymond Street

Center Township, Council District #19

SU-9 (FW) (FF)

City of Indianapolis, by Kevin Montgomery

Special Use District Nine Approval to provide for a six-foot-tall fence within the front yard of Emerson Avenue, per plans filed.

2026-ZON-016 | 3030 Southeastern Avenue

Center Township, Council District #18

JO & CE Real Estate LLC, by Dylan Seesman

Rezoning of 0.34-acre from D-5 (FF) to MU-2 (FF), for an existing building to be renovated for commercial retail uses and up to six dwelling units on the second floor.

2026-ZON-027 | 1611 East 18th Street

Center Township, Council District #8

Diamonds Xellent Investments LLC (Diego Gomez), by Jorge Oscar Gonzales Vasquez
Rezoning of 0.12-acre from the C-3 district to the D-8 district to provide for residential development.

2026-ZON-029 | 1003 West 30th Street

Center Township, Council District #12

Skyline General Contracting Corp, by Jorge Gonzales

Rezoning of 0.09-acre from the C-3 district to the D-5 district to provide for residential development.

2026-ZON-030 (Amended) | 3505 South Harding Street

Perry Township, Council District #22

Jose de Jesus Padilla Zavala, by Jorge Oscar Gonzales

Rezoning of 0.24-acre from the D-4 (FF) district to the C-1 (FF) district to provide for a multi-tenant building.

2026-ZON-038 | 1830 Shelby Street

Center Township, Council District #18

Abiodun Babalola (Trueworth Realty LLC), by Leyla Paz

Rezoning of 0.15 acres from the MU-1 (TOD) district to the D-5 district to provide for the construction of a duplex.

2026-ZON-046 | 3216 East 25th Street

Center Township, Council District #8

Felipe M. Mata, by RG Development, LLC (Josh Smith)

Rezoning of 0.379-acre from the C-3 to the D-5 district to allow for residential uses.

2026-CZN-813 (Amended) | 1127 South East Street

Center Township, Council District #18

Josh Smith

Rezoning of 0.12-acre from the C-5 district to the D-8 district to provide for a multi-unit dwelling, consisting of two units.

2026-CAP-824 | 4107 East Washington Street

Center Township, Council District #13

SU-7 (TOD)

Shepherd Community, Inc., by Mindy Westrick Brown

Modification of Commitments related to 2005-ZON-123, to provide for modifying Commitment 4 of Attachment 'C', to permit construction of a community center expansion, with the site plan filed with this petition, and to provide for terminating Commitment 10 of Attachment 'C' requiring existing freestanding sign and sign pole removal within 60 days of the issuance of an Improvement Location Permit.

Hearing no other questions or comments, Commissioner Murphy made a Motion to approve the above-listed **Petitions of No Appeal [Petition Nos. 2026-APP-011 (7:0:0), 2026-ZON-016 (7:0:0), 2026-ZON-027 (7:0:0), 2026-ZON-029 (7:0:0), 2026-ZON-030 (Amended) (7:0:0), 2026-ZON-038 (7:0:0), 2026-ZON-046 (7:0:0), 2026-CZN-813 (Amended) (7:0:0), and 2026-CAP-824 (7:0:0)]** that the Hearing Examiner recommended for approval; Commissioner Schumacher seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (7:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: None
Recusals: None

The Commission approved Petition Nos. 2026-APP-011, 2026-ZON-016, 2026-ZON-027, 2026-ZON-029, 2026-ZON-030 (Amended), 2026-ZON-038, 2026-ZON-046, 2026-CZN-813 (Amended), and 2026-CAP-824.

PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

COMPANION PETITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL BY HEARING EXAMINER, APPEAL FILED BY REMONSTRATOR:

2026-CVR-815 (Amended) / 2026-CPL-815 | 305 Fintail Drive

Warren Township, Council District #20

I-3

DCB Indianapolis, LLC, by Mindy Westrick Brown

Variance of Use and Development Standards of the Consolidated Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance to provide for construction of a data center (not permitted), consisting of up to two buildings, up to a total of 330,000 square feet, with no less than 100 parking spaces (minimum 330 parking spaces required).

Approval of a Subdivision Plat to be known as Replat of Block A of Thunderbird Commerce Center, subdividing 32.406 acres into two lots.

President Dillon explained the Rules of Procedure governing the hearing, providing 15 minutes each to the Petitioner and to Remonstrators, followed by City-County Council testimony, Staff presentation, five-minute rebuttals for each side, and then Commission questions and a vote. President Dillon noted there would be two ballots (one for the plat, 2026-CPL-815, and one for the variance, 2026-CVR-815 (Amended)).

Petitioner Presentation:

While referring to an electronic and paper presentation booklet as well as two exhibit binders, the Petitioner's attorney, Mindy Westrick Brown (300 North Meridian Street, Suite 2500, Indianapolis, IN), noted DC BLOX, founded in 2014 with over 10 locations in the southeast, was proposing two edge node facilities on the site. She described the 32-acre site as having 22 developable acres in the northwest corner of the Thunderbird Commerce Center, the former Ford Visteon plant, zoned I-3 since 1956, and explained that a use variance was required because edge node facilities hosting optical network gear were not a defined use, that the requested development standards would reduce required parking, and that the replat would align parcels with development phases. She stated that Phase One and Building One are planned to be operational within 24 months, with AES able to serve Building One at 10 megawatts with only minor substation updates; that Building Two already has a tenant and would be a low-density edge node facility rather than an AI data center; and that Building Three had been eliminated, with additional green space added, the remaining building shifted further south, and 25 backup generators and 28 megawatts of associated power demand removed. Ms. Westrick Brown characterized the surrounding area as industrial, citing the Monarch facility to the south (37 truck bays on Fintail Drive), the Kittly industrial corridor and a racetrack to the

west, the English facility to the south, an AES easement/substation to the north separating the site from the Pensy Trail, highway-like interchanges to the east near Shalen, and the ABF truck terminal (96 terminals, 560 parking spaces) as an immediate neighbor, and noted the site is less than a mile from the long-operating, non-disruptive Eastgate data center. She cited broad community support (Tabs 17–25, 26–32), including from the Warren Township Development Association, an Irvington Community Council member, and area residents, trades, and civic leaders, and referenced the Community Protection Pledge (Tab 3), including a \$2.5 million charitable community benefit commitment separate from any tax discussion, and a United Way listening session with Councilor Hart planned for August 5. Comparing the site to DC BLOX's Huntsville, Alabama facility (234 feet from a school), she noted the proposed building would be more than 817 feet from the school here, with generators on the building's far side and an existing substation/easement already separating the facility from the trail and school; Ms. Westrick Brown cited a Huntsville school letter (Tab 26) reporting no issues in eight years, wind and sound data (Tabs 55, 60–63) showing wind moving away from the school, and noted school and school board members toured Building One in Atlanta, with additional commitments, including direct enforcement authority, added for the school. On environmental matters, she noted DC BLOX's brownfield experience, including a comparable Birmingham site where neighbors independently visited and testified to its positive impact; dust commitments have been added consistent with an IDEM-approved plan; Plews Shadley was present on remediation (Tabs 51–52); DC BLOX would be the third entity to remediate this site; and a walking tour with Lauth and Plews occurred in June. Ms. Westrick Brown argued the project compares favorably to I-3 by-right uses (Tab 44), citing a traffic memo (Tab 43) showing up to an 80% reduction in traffic, and lower traffic with higher wages and assessed value generally, supported by expert reports (Tabs 51–59); she noted expert Tara Khan was present for questions. Ms. Westrick Brown closed by stating DC BLOX would apply for the smallest available air permit category and intended to use only one-fourth of its capacity given generator restrictions.

Jon Hooker (1828 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, IN) was introduced by Ms. Westrick Brown as President and Executive Director of the Central Indiana Building Trades Council, representing over 35,000 members of the union construction industry in Indianapolis. Mr. Hooker stated that a project labor agreement had been executed and signed for the project.

Ms. Westrick Brown asked that the findings of fact (Tab 33) and the full exhibit book be incorporated into the record, and stated the Petitioner's agreement with the Staff Report, noting the site's industrial reserve designation and its suitability for an edge node facility given fiber access and proximity to an AES substation and utility easement. She cited the traffic memo showing fewer trips, less daily activity, and less visual impact than other I-3 uses, and two independent Indiana appraisals (Tabs 47–48) plus a George Mason University study (Tab 49) finding no substantial adverse effect on surrounding property values; appraiser Terzo was present for questions. Ms. Westrick Brown detailed DC BLOX's commitments to pay for all energy infrastructure so costs would not be passed on to ratepayers; to use green power through an AES offset program; and, per data in Tabs 73–85, noted other Indiana utilities projecting rate savings from data center load offsetting residential costs. Ms. Westrick Brown stated the project would use waterless, closed-loop cooling (less water than a single restaurant, Tabs 56, 58) and described berm and evergreen landscaping along the Pensy Trail. She stated generators, inspected by the Petitioner in Atlanta and Birmingham, would run only for outages or testing, with no testing during the school year, and that DC BLOX is committed to diesel particulate filters capturing 95% of emissions. Ms. Westrick Brown referenced three sound studies, a commitment for an additional study at equipment selection to guarantee 65 dB at the property line, and a commitment addressing low-frequency noise; the Epsilon acoustic engineer

was present for questions. She noted lighting mitigation, a nearest residence over 743 feet away, and a decommissioning plan requested by Councilor Nielsen and Irvington. She described ongoing community engagement, including a recent meeting with trail users and supporter Doreen Crenshaw (8436 East 13th Street, Indianapolis, IN) on pedestrian connectivity, and noted over 3,000 doors canvassed. Closing, Ms. Westrick Brown argued the project met all findings of fact: that intensity and neighborhood character would not substantially change from permitted uses; that the site was uniquely suited given its utility and fiber access; that strict application of the Ordinance created unnecessary hardship since data centers are undefined in any district, arising from the ordinance itself rather than any Petitioner action; that the property had sat vacant for 20 years; and that the petition aligned with the Comprehensive Plan. She corrected the Staff Report, noting that projected jobs had increased from 17 to 21.

Commissioner Murphy asked Ms. Westrick Brown to confirm the distance from the protected district or school, and she confirmed 817 feet from the building, with the generators positioned behind the building. Commissioner Murphy then asked about the Petitioner's low-frequency noise commitment. Ms. Westrick Brown directed the Commission to Tab 35, Page 3 of 11, Commitment E, explaining that Epsilon had conducted three sound studies already in the record (an ambient sound study of the Thunderbird Commerce Center, a review confirming the original 65 dB property-line commitment remained achievable, and a study of the operational Atlanta building), with a fourth study to follow equipment selection to confirm the specific equipment would not exceed 65 dB and would not create low-frequency issues. She stated that a fixed decibel number for low-frequency noise had been rejected in favor of equipment-specific sound engineering analysis, with the resulting method submitted to the Administrator and an annual compliance test reported to the district councilor and Administrator. She noted DC BLOX facilities have not experienced low-frequency issues and that a known data center remonstrator had emailed the day before stating satisfaction with the commitment. Commissioner Murphy confirmed the referenced subsections were E-I, E-II, and E-III, which Ms. Westrick Brown affirmed.

Commissioner West referenced the Epsilon report (Tab 62) concluding that 65 dBA was a realistic goal, and the sound data graphs in Tab 60 showing the Atlanta facility operating under both the 65 dBA and roughly 80 dBC limits. He asked whether a low-frequency remedy could be tied to a specific threshold (for example, an 85 dBA ceiling combined with a complaint from school staff or students of rattling glass or chalkboards) that would trigger a required remedy such as additional dirt or concrete berming, and asked whether DBC compliance requirements existed elsewhere in the country. Ms. Westrick Brown responded that no such DBC requirement exists elsewhere, which was why DC BLOX had worked with Epsilon to develop its approach, and that discrete-tone and other methods had also been considered. In response to Commissioner West's concern, she offered to commit to conducting an additional sound study within a set number of days or months of any complaint, capped at no more than two additional studies per year, and noted that the district councilor, the Warren Township Development Association, and Irvington schools had also been added as enforcement bodies under the commitments.

Commissioner West asked whether any such sound study would include a chart similar to the one in Tab 60. Clint Cyr (Epsilon Associates, 3 Mill & Main Place, Suite 250, Maynard, MA), sworn in, stated that the details of a post-construction sound study had not been finalized but that the presentation would depend on the duration of the measurement (shorter measurements would likely not be presented as a plot, while longer-duration measurements would be). Commissioner West clarified he meant duration over days, weeks, and months rather than fast/slow measurement scale, which Mr. Cyr confirmed. Commissioner West stated he did not

find the answer fully responsive to his request for a specific numeric hedge. Ms. Westrick Brown then confirmed that the Petitioner would commit to providing the same study format shown in Tab 60, with the methodology subject to approval by the Current Planning Administrator, and that this commitment would be provided to Staff. Kathleen Blackham (Staff) confirmed the commitment was already reflected in the commitments as drafted. Commissioner West indicated he had no further questions.

Commissioner Murphy asked Ms. Westrick Brown to clarify and confirm the commitment that a sound study would be conducted upon receipt of a noise complaint, but capped at no more than two sound studies per year. Ms. Westrick Brown confirmed that a sound study could be completed within two months of a complaint, with an annual cap of two studies. Commissioner Murphy asked Staff to confirm the commitment was being noted, and Kathleen Blackham (Staff) confirmed that it was.

Commissioner Lyle noted his appreciation for the decommissioning discussion, referencing the former Ford Visteon plant, which sat vacant after closing in 2007, and asked whether decommissioning plan dollars would be allocated for a future scenario in which the community was left with an empty building similar to that prior experience. Ms. Westrick Brown responded that the Petitioner had considered this, noting the land itself holds value and that after execution of the decommissioning plan, the building would remain as a concrete industrial shell that would also retain value. She stated that Irvington neighbors who provided direct feedback did not request demolition given that retained value, that no city bond exists on this project as with some other developments, and that the Petitioner had considered specific bonding but concluded it fell outside the norm for industrial projects, with those funds better directed toward direct community economic impact. Commissioner Lyle followed up, noting that circumstances change over time (citing the shift away from car manufacturing and the vacant plant's 25 years of disuse) and stated that as computing technology, including quantum computing, evolves, he wanted to ensure a conversation about allocating decommissioning dollars so the community would not be burdened by an unused facility in the future.

Mark Masi (Chief Development Officer, DC BLOX, 1040 Crown Point Parkway, Suite 800, Atlanta, GA) was sworn in and testified. Mr. Masi stated that the buildings are long-term assets built of insulated precast concrete with an 80- to 100-year lifespan, and that if the project were ever abandoned, the structure could serve a multitude of future industrial or manufacturing uses; he noted the Petitioner's decommissioning focus was on removing environmental contaminants such as batteries and fuel, since the structure itself would remain a viable industrial asset.

President Dillon clarified that the Commission's request was for a commitment to budget funds on an ongoing basis in the Petitioner's pro forma, visible to the Commission, in the event of future abandonment, and asked whether that addressed Commissioner Lyle's concern. Commissioner Lyle confirmed it did, but noted that his question was not limited to environmental abatement; rather, given that the site was previously assumed to have unending industrial use and instead sat vacant for 25 years, and given that this was a new and rapidly evolving project type, he wanted assurance that funds were budgeted now (similar to how infrastructure such as bridges is budgeted for eventual replacement) to protect against the structure becoming a future, unproductive burden. Ms. Westrick Brown committed on behalf of the Petitioner to budget annual reserves for that purpose and to reduce the commitment to writing. President Dillon confirmed with Kathleen Blackham (Staff) that the commitment was noted, and Commissioner Lyle confirmed he was satisfied.

Commissioner Murphy asked whether the structures were of tilt-up concrete panel construction similar to an Amazon distribution warehouse. Mr. Masi clarified that the buildings would use structural precast insulated panels, which were superior to tilt-up construction, though generally comparable to distribution center warehouses in type, offering greater robustness for security, environmental containment, and efficiency. Commissioner Murphy asked Staff whether decommissioning plans were required for many similar warehouse structures already existing in Marion County; Kathleen Blackham (Staff) stated she was not aware of any such decommissioning plans. Commissioner Murphy noted he was not aware of any either, and while acknowledging the Petitioner's point that planning for demolition of this type of structure may not make sense, stated that budgeting funding for that purpose was not unreasonable and appreciated the commitment being made.

Remonstrance:

Attorney Alexandra Curlin (8510 Evergreen, Indianapolis, IN) appeared on behalf of the Remonstrator, Irvington Community Schools (ICS). Ms. Curlin stated she had not been sworn in since she would not be providing substantive testimony and introduced members of the school's Board of Governors (Heather Rodriguez, Board Chair; Madison Monfreda; and Eric Serrano) who would testify as Irvington community residents.

Heather Rodriguez (Board Chair, Irvington Community Schools, 5751 East University Avenue, Indianapolis, IN) testified and was sworn. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the school's elementary building sits immediately next to the subject property and that the school's students, families, and staff are the closest neighbors to the project. She noted that Irvington Community Schools was the appellant, having timely filed its appeal, and that its position had not changed. She addressed the board's recent tour of DC BLOX's Atlanta facility, describing it as a fact-finding mission only, with no funds, gifts, or promises accepted and no endorsement given, and noted the building toured was only 30% complete, with construction noise obscuring the generators such that no meaningful facts were gathered. She stated that the burden of proof on a use variance rested entirely on the Petitioner and that her colleagues would address the five required findings in turn.

Eric Serrano (5751 East University Avenue, Indianapolis, IN), Chief Information Officer of the Jane Pauley Community Health Center and a member of the Irvington Community Schools Board of Governors, testified and was sworn. Mr. Serrano framed the legal standard, stating that the Commission must find in writing that the Petitioner had met all five required findings for a use variance, that the burden rested entirely on the Petitioner, and that failure of even one finding required denial. He acknowledged recent project changes (the reduction from three buildings to two, the reduction in power from 78 to 50 megawatts, and the first mention of the school) but argued a smaller version of the wrong use in the wrong proceeding still failed to satisfy the findings. On Finding One (the use would not be injurious to public health and safety), he argued the submitted sound study was based on a 10-megawatt Atlanta facility (one-fifth the size of the proposed Indianapolis project), the same undersized comparison used for the Huntsville facility, and that the berm, landscaping, and building placement did not meaningfully mitigate low-frequency noise. He stated the 65 dB property-line figure had not been independently verified and that requested generator operating logs had not been provided. He argued the "edge node facility" label did not restrict actual site operation, and proposed that the site be capped at 15 megawatts with a 15-kilowatt limit per rack, written into the commitments. He argued the "emergency use" definition for the generators remained undefined and could allow their use for grid-stress relief or economic dispatch (demand response, peak shaving, load shedding) rather than genuine emergencies, and urged that economic dispatch be expressly

prohibited in the commitments. He also cited documented arsenic and thallium soil contamination on the parcel under a state environmental covenant. On Finding Two (the use would not substantially or adversely affect adjacent property values), he argued neither the Staff Report nor the Hearing Examiner's findings addressed the school at all, that the roughly 280-foot setback added for Building Two in the last two weeks was only an estimate not yet recorded, and that the conclusion of no substantial adverse effect rests on the same unverified noise data. He stated the Petitioner had admitted in a recent meeting that a relevant sound study could not be completed before groundbreaking, and reiterated the Remonstrator's request for a continuance given the project's continued evolution.

Madison Monfreda (5751 East University Avenue, Indianapolis, IN), an alumna and member of the ICS Board of Governors, testified and was sworn. Ms. Monfreda addressed Findings Three, Four, and Five. On Finding Three (the need for the variance arises from a condition peculiar to the property), she argued the standard required a condition of the land itself (shape, size, or topography) rather than a business's preferred use, and that the Petitioner's need arises from its own business plan rather than any physical condition of the parcel; she noted the one unique condition (that the site was a contaminated former factory under an environmental covenant) argued for greater caution, not approval. She also noted that information regarding the buildings' lifespan had changed during the proceeding, having been told 50 years while touring the Atlanta facility and now 80 to 100 years. On Finding Four (strict application of the Ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship), she argued there was no hardship because the land was already zoned industrial with many permitted uses available, and that wanting a more profitable reuse was not a hardship recognized under Indiana law; she characterized the request as effectively seeking a rezoning, which belonged before the City-County Council on a full legislative record rather than in a variance proceeding. On Finding Five (approval would not substantially interfere with the Comprehensive Plan), she noted the City was currently drafting standards for this type of facility, including a required school buffer and a firm noise cap, and argued granting the variance now would leapfrog those protections. She concluded that the burden rested on the Petitioner as to all five findings and that each failed, that recent project reductions did not cure the deficiencies since the commitments remain in draft and unrecorded, and that a smaller project did not convert a rezoning into a variance.

Ms. Rodriguez returned to close, stating that the Petitioner could not meet the findings required by law, and acknowledging the changes made while characterizing the request as a permanent land-use change dressed as a variance rather than a genuine variance (one that belongs before the City-County Council with the full legislative record that process requires). She asked that the Commission deny the variance, or, in the alternative, hold the matter open and decline to approve it on an incomplete record until final recorded commitment terms existed and the school had had a fair opportunity to review them, reiterating the Remonstrator's request for a continuance.

Megan Lapa (6155 Oak Avenue, Indianapolis, IN), who said she lived one-third of a mile from the site, testified and was sworn. She stated that leaving a business card at the school's front office did not constitute meaningful outreach, and that the Petitioner had not contacted the school board until after the first hearing had already passed, and only after public pressure, noting the school's 5- to 11-year-old students as particularly vulnerable stakeholders. She reiterated that failure of even one of the five required findings required denial of the variance. On Finding One, she noted the school board's previously stated concerns remained unaddressed. On Finding Two, she argued the Petitioner's primary property value report opened with a disclaimer as to its own limited basis and relied on comparables of which 40% never operated during the study period, none of which involved a brownfield with an active

environmental restrictive covenant or documented carcinogen exposure pathways such as vinyl chloride migrating through groundwater toward a public greenway and elementary school, and she questioned the independence of the second property value report given its similarity in framing to the Petitioner's counsel. On Finding Three, she argued that Staff's cited peculiarity factors (size, depth, easement access) described the entire Thunderbird campus generally, as evidenced by Monarch's success as a conforming I-3 use under the same conditions, meaning those factors impose no real development limitation. On Finding Four, she argued Staff's hardship reasoning rests solely on the absence of a listed land use classification, which was a regulatory gap applying equally to any Marion County parcel and not a hardship recognized under Indiana law, particularly since loss of profit was not a cognizable hardship and the Petitioner knowingly sought land not zoned for its intended use. On Finding Five, she argued the Comprehensive Plan's medium industrial designation was increasingly constrained within the I-465 loop, that Staff's characterization of data centers as light industrial was inconsistent with recommending approval of this heavier use, and that granting the variance would remove a by-right-suited I-3 parcel from other local Hoosier businesses in exchange for 21 long-term jobs. She concluded that Marion County and Indiana land use law provided ample basis for denial and asked the Commission to deny the petition.

Rye Steinhart (11532 Newport Drive, Indianapolis, IN) testified and was sworn. Responding to a point raised earlier by Commissioner Lyle, Ms. Steinhart expressed concern that this edge node/hyperscaler business model could leave the community exposed in a manner similar to the collapse of the auto industry, citing Microsoft's recent pause of Wisconsin data center construction as a market signal.

City-County Council Testimony:

City-County Councilor Andy Nielsen (CD #14) appeared and requested denial. He noted that 97% of the nearly 1,800 residents within a half-mile of the site live in District #14 despite the site sitting on the district border, and described extensive constituent engagement (an April 2026 community forum and a month-long survey) showing 83% of respondents opposed the development. He characterized the community's opposition as informed rather than reflexively anti-development, and argued the Petitioner's engagement had been transactional, limited largely to the most favorable stakeholders, citing the Irvington Community Council's written opposition (despite one member's individual support) and stating he learned of the August community listening session only when the public did. He argued the record supported denial on two of the five findings. On Finding One, he pointed to language in the Staff Report acknowledging public concerns about noise, generator operation, and energy consumption, arguing this acknowledgment gave the Commission discretion to weigh community opposition against the Petitioner's incomplete commitments and concluded the finding was not satisfied, noting the Petitioner had devoted significant presentation time to demonstrating support rather than proving the finding itself. On Finding Four, he argued no unnecessary hardship existed, noting other parcels within the Thunderbird Commerce Center (including the Monarch Beverage and Dandy/Lauth developments) have all found viable I-3 uses without needing a variance, and that the Petitioner could alternatively pursue a special commercial district classification rather than claiming hardship. He concluded that failure of even one finding required denial, and asked the Commission to deny the petition.

City-County Councilor Michael-Paul Hart (CD #20) testified in support of the Petitions. He described his extensive involvement in vetting the project (weekly coverage in his newsletter since March, regular meetings with the Petitioner and community members, and site visits) and noted this was the second data center petition he had experienced in his district, allowing direct

comparison. He distinguished the highly industrial site, surrounded by truck bays, metal recycling, and bakeries, from the prior Google hyperscaler petition's agricultural, residential-adjacent setting, noting his home sits roughly the same distance from both sites. He stated he evaluated such projects on quality of life, energy, environmental, and financial impact, and described the Petitioner as highly responsive to communication compared to his prior experience.

Councilor Hart described personally measuring sound levels with a consumer-grade decibel meter at the Atlanta facility (at 75, 150, and 475 feet from generators), at his own home, and at the Irvington school site, finding readings broadly consistent with the Petitioner's later sound studies, and noted he had submitted two detailed memos to the Hearing Examiner. He identified the school and noise as the two primary objections, stating noise concerns had been substantially addressed through mitigation commitments and that recent changes (eliminating a building and increasing the setback to roughly 800 feet) improved the school's situation; he noted the school had located there after the Ford Visteon plant and other industrial uses were already operating nearby. Drawing on his professional IT background, he described personally touring the facility and confirming it functions as an edge node co-location facility, not a hyperscaler, and noted the Thunderbird Commerce Center's history of zero dust-related remonstrance across prior developments.

On economic impact, Councilor Hart noted the broader site already supported significant truck traffic and roughly 1,000 jobs, making the addition of comparatively few jobs at this building less significant in context, and voiced strong support for the project's labor agreement with the Building Trades (a distinguishing factor from the earlier Google project, which lacked one). He cited the project's estimated \$30 million in tax base over ten years, with \$10 million directed to Warren Township School Corporation and \$10 million remaining in the local TIF district, additional community impact commitments including \$2.5 million toward community programming, and \$5 million toward redevelopment of Washington Square Mall. He noted that other uses permitted by right under I-3 zoning, such as chemical facilities, would be more invasive. He closed with his view that AI-driven data center demand remained in an early growth phase, predicting the facility would remain a productive, revenue-generating asset for the City for the long term, and restated his support for the project.

Staff Presentation:

Kathleen Blackham (Staff) addressed both Petitions. On **Petition No. 2026-CPL-815**, she reiterated that plat approval was ministerial, subject to the standards outlined on Pages 52–53 of the Staff Report. On the variance of development standards, she noted the request would reduce required parking from 330 to no more than 100 spaces; Staff supported this reduction as it decreased impervious surface and allowed more land for buffering, transitional yards, and other industrial uses. On the variance of use, Staff addressed the five required findings. On Finding One (public health, safety, and general welfare), she noted the Petitioner's amended commitments directly regulated generator testing hours, sound levels, and buffering/screening, including insulated generators, and that the Petitioner would fund electrical infrastructure so costs would not be borne by ratepayers; she cited a 72% reduction in daily trip generation given the limited categories of on-site staff (security, technical, and maintenance), and noted traffic would primarily flow internally via Fintail Drive and English Avenue, resulting in minimal external impact. On adjacent property impacts, she noted the 80-foot-wide Pensy Trail, additional easement buffering to the north, and building placement to the south together create an approximate 817-foot separation from the protected district. On the property's uniqueness, she cited its history as a large-scale former heavy manufacturing site and the absence of a data

center definition in the Zoning Ordinance as creating an unusual situation. On Finding Five (Comprehensive Plan consistency), she stated Staff considered the proposed data center a light industrial use (comparable to I-1 or I-2) and, despite the property's I-3 zoning and heavy industrial Comprehensive Plan designation, found the use consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the industrial overlay. On Finding Four (unnecessary hardship), she stated the absence of a listed data center use in the Ordinance constituted the hardship, noting other jurisdictions face similar definitional gaps. Staff recommended approval on this basis.

Before concluding, Ms. Blackham returned to Commissioner Lyle's earlier comment regarding a decommissioning budget, stating Staff agreed that environmental remediation should be included as part of a decommissioning plan with a dedicated annual budget, but recommended the Commission establish clear, specific figures rather than a general blanket commitment.

Commissioner Schumacher confirmed with Ms. Blackham that the data center regulations the Commission had passed two weeks prior did not apply to this petition, since this Petition was already in the pipeline. He asked her to compare the Petitioner's commitments to those standards; Ms. Blackham stated the Petitioner's amended commitments offer meaningful protection and regulation, supporting Staff's recommendation. Asked whether anything was glaringly missing relative to the recently passed standards, she identified the need to expand the decommissioning commitment to include an annual budget and an environmental remediation plan. President Dillon clarified the request was for a budgeted figure rather than a general contribution, which Ms. Blackham confirmed. Commissioner Schumacher asked whether Staff could quantify that figure at this time; Ms. Blackham noted the request had only just been raised with the Petitioner's attorney. President Dillon agreed it would be difficult to quantify within the hearing's timeframe, indicating the Commission would require the environmental remediation commitment consistent with Commissioner Lyle's request while allowing the Petitioner to work out the specific annual budget figure with Staff; Ms. Blackham agreed.

Commissioner Murphy confirmed with Ms. Blackham that the SU-47 Ordinance provided for a 400-foot setback from protected districts, compared with this project's 800-foot setback, and that the SU-47 Ordinance's 65-decibel property-line limit was consistent with the Petitioner's commitment. He asked whether a permitted I-3 use by right would carry a minimum setback from a protected district; Ms. Blackham confirmed there would be, though she could not recall the exact figure and suggested Staff verify it. Commissioner Murphy noted his recollection that the by-right setback would be approximately 150 to 200 feet, meaning a by-right development could sit much closer to the protected district, which Ms. Blackham confirmed as correct. He also confirmed there is no decibel limit at the property line under the current Ordinance for medium industrial uses.

President Dillon then requested a commitment from the Petitioner to budget annual funds for decommissioning, inclusive of environmental remediation consistent with Commissioner Lyle's request, to be worked out with Staff. The Petitioner's representative confirmed the commitment, and Ms. Blackham confirmed Staff's agreement.

Rebuttal - Petitioner:

Ms. Westrick Brown stated that Staff's Report and the Hearing Examiner's memo both concluded the Petitioner met the required findings of fact, and that experts retained by the Petitioner had filed supporting materials in the record. She noted that the Irvington Community Council's land use chair had stated at the Council's June meeting that the Petitioner met the

legal findings of fact, citing Tab 88 and a video link included in the binder. She stated DC BLOX had built similar facilities in other jurisdictions, providing real-world outcomes on sound rather than speculation, and that the only wastewater returning to Citizens Energy from the site would come from employee restrooms, a kitchen sink, and landscaping, comparable to residential or commercial uses. She reiterated the Petitioner's agreement to incorporate a decommissioning plan and the additional commitments discussed during the hearing, and stated DC BLOX would be the third entity to clean up this brownfield, consistent with its Environmental Restrictive Covenant, framing brownfield remediation and returning the parcel to the tax base as community benefits. She noted the Irvington Community Council's letter did not oppose the construction of the neighboring Monarch, ABF, or Dandy facilities on the same brownfield.

She stated edge node facilities with optical network equipment provided a positive community benefit, noting Building Two had been moved an additional 237 feet further into the industrial complex after eliminating the third building, and that two independent property tax appraisers found no adverse effect on surrounding property values, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. She cited the completed sound studies, coordination with IFD, the traffic memo, and an air quality study conducted with TerraCon, referencing a Virginia environmental report finding Loudoun County (home to some of the nation's longest-serving data centers) to be among the healthiest counties in Virginia and the United States. Addressing Remonstrator concerns, she stated the Petitioner would continue engaging and educating the community, noting some concerns were already addressed within the commitments, though possibly difficult to locate. She stated generator use had been restricted, in coordination with Remonstrators, to testing and power outages only, subject to IDEM regulation, with a commitment to notify neighbors of outages and generator use.

Rebuttal - Remonstrators:

Ms. Steinhart returned to complete her earlier remarks. She expressed concern the project could leave the community economically exposed like the collapse of the auto industry, citing the shift to token-based AI billing, rapid budget overruns among AI-dependent companies, increased construction-debt risk ratings from major financial institutions, and the difficulty of repurposing rapidly depreciating equipment. She argued the volatility of the AI industry meant this use should proceed through standard rezoning procedures rather than a variance, and requested a performance bond to protect the community. She also raised concern that data center compute capacity could be leased to third-party AI systems he alleged have been associated with generating illegal content involving minors, and asked what commitments existed to revoke such use if discovered. She suggested shortening the tax abatement period given the pace of change in the industry, and requested the Petition be postponed, ideally for up to a year, until relevant ordinance standards are further developed.

Steve Key (346 North Kitley Avenue, Indianapolis, IN), who said he lived approximately one-half mile north of the proposed site, testified and was sworn. Mr. Key raised three questions: (1) whether Staff or the Commission had studied the effect on residential property values within a half-mile to one mile of the site; (2) how the Petitioner's numerous commitments would be enforced and what consequences would follow noncompliance; and (3) how AES's pledge that the data center would not impact individual ratepayers' bills would be monitored and enforced going forward. President Dillon responded that all commitments become part of the formal record and are enforced through Code and Ordinance enforcement and DMD follow-up, with the ability to shut down operations after repeated violations, and stated he would personally monitor compliance. On the AES question, President Dillon confirmed AES's commitment was regulated by the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC), which oversees how such costs

are assessed. On property values, President Dillon stated the Commission had reviewed the matter and had not seen evidence of adverse impact, and Kathleen Blackham (Staff) confirmed no formal Staff study had been conducted. Commissioner Murphy noted the Petitioner had submitted two independent appraisal analyses as part of the record, reviewed by Staff, supporting no adverse impact on neighboring property values.

Megan Lapa (6155 Oak Avenue, Indianapolis, IN) reappeared and, citing time constraints, gave a brief closing statement that the record reflects a pattern of the Petitioner's mischaracterizations being corrected only when caught rather than voluntarily, and that the Commitments' enforcement provisions notably excluded Councilor Nielsen, who represented 97% of residents within a half-mile of the site. She argued the Commission was being asked to grant permanent vested rights to a Petitioner that has not demonstrated its stated intentions could be relied upon, in addition to failing to satisfy the required findings for a variance, and reiterated the request for denial.

Commission Vote:

President Dillon directed the Commissioners to mark their ballots. The Commission voted on two ballots as follows:

President Dillon read the Motion for the Plat into the record, stating that "the Metropolitan Development Commission must approve and find that the plat filed dated May 28, 2026, complies with the standards of the subdivision regulations subject to the following conditions," referencing the eleven conditions on file and the Petitioner's commitments, as set forth on pages 52 and 53 of the Staff Report. Commissioner Murphy seconded the Motion.

The ballots for **Petition No. 2026-CPL-815** (Subdivision Plat) were marked as follows (7:0:0):

Ayes:	Dillon, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes:	None
Recusals:	None

The Commission approved Petition No. 2026-CPL-815.

The ballots for **Petition No. 2026-CVR-815 (Amended)** (Variance) were marked as follows (6:1:0):

Ayes:	Dillon, Herget, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes:	Lyle
Recusals:	None

The Commission approved Petition No. 2026-CVR-815 (Amended), subject to the commitments referenced and discussed during the hearing, including the commitment to budget annual funds for decommissioning and environmental remediation, to be worked out with Staff.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Seeing no additional business, President Dillon adjourned the meeting at 3:30 P.M.

José
President
Metropolitan Development Commission

Attest: B. S. M.
MDC Secretary

Date: August 19, 2026