

Kim McDowell: Hi everybody, this is Kim. I am going to call your name, when I call you name can you please say here because I am going to take roll call.

Unknown: Hi Kim

Unknown: Hi Kim

Kim McDowell: Brian Glise

Brian Glise: Here

Kim McDowell: I know Lance is here.

Kim McDowell: Jeff Mulligan

Kim McDowell: Jeff Passarell

Kim McDowell: Cindy

Cindy Kellen: I'm here

Kevin McIntee: Kevin McIntee here, opps, sorry.

Kim McDowell: Bob Westfall

Bob Westfall: I am here.

Kim McDowell: Alright Kevin you are here

Kim McDowell: Diane you are here correct

Diane Attea: Correct

Kim McDowell: Kathy Cole

Kathy Cole: I am here

Kim McDowell: Kathy Mannix

Kathy Mannix: Here

Kim McDowell: Clara

Kim McDowell: Brian Thorn

Brian Thorn: Here

Kim McDowell: Randy

Randy Kozlowski: Here

Kim McDowell: Mike Miles

Kim McDowell: Tom McGovern

Kim McDowell: Ok so I am missing both Jeff's

Jeff Passarell: No, I am here, Jeff Passarell

Kim McDowell: OK, so Jeff Mulligan, Clara, Mike Miles and Tom McGovern are missing. Ok. So, tonight I think Lance or Brian is going to run it and start discussing stuff. But please remember to say your name before you speak and always put your phones on mute when you are not speaking because it will help with the echoing. So who wants to start?

Jeff Mulligan: Jeff Mulligan calling in here.

Kim McDowell: Ok perfect Jeff.

Jeff Mulligan: So, I am here.

Lance Brabant: So, I guess, sorry, this is Lance with MRB Group. I just kind of want to go over tonight's purpose and what we are basing on the agenda, what expectations are and what we are trying to accomplish being that the executive order has just changed. The purpose at tonight's Board meeting was to identify those projects prior to COVID-19 situation that was on the agenda for both the ZBA and Planning Board and start processing those applications that we were going through at that time. As part of those procedures and processes that were in place at that time we were going through several public hearings or requirements of public hearing was to be achieved so tonight was to one identify those projects that were in the process, schedule a public hearing for them so that we can continue with our review in accordance with the OML laws and then also to begin processing new applications that have been received during this time. So that's what the purpose of tonight. There really isn't a lot of dialogue opportunity because some of the applications require public hearings so if we are going to have dialogue we are going to have to have the ability to have public comments at that time so the gist of tonight is really to identify the project, can explain where we are in the process and then continue it and set a public hearing to that date and time. Does that make sense for the members?

Diane Attea: Yes it does

Unknown: Yes it does

Kathy Cole: Yes

Unknown: Yep

Lance Brabant: Kim what I think what we need to do is we need to have both Board's Chairperson open, open their meeting and accept whatever minutes they have maybe out there I don't know that there is

Kim McDowell: There are no minutes out there yet

Lance Brabant: Perfect cause we did it at our workshop correct?

Kim McDowell: Yes, well no, we didn't do anything yet. I haven't done any minutes until the March meeting like we haven't approved anything since, so I figure the next time that we are in person, that we would approve it.

Lance Brabant: Ok that is fine, I have no problems with that, I just was making sure I was following process. Ok. So I think we can move on to the first application I think, what I would, I don't believe the Board has any comments. But I guess if they have any questions ask the question and then we will move on to the process as it relates to each application when they come up.

Kathy Cole: Jeff do you want me to or Lance do you want me to just go ahead and ask for a motion to open the meeting? This is Kathy.

Lance Brabant: Um, yea I mean I guess technically we have already opened the meeting but I guess I would do that again and then just run through each application as you normally would.

Kathy Cole: Ok so, again this is Kathy Cole and I am asking for a motion to open the meeting?

Randy Kozlowski: Randy Kozlowski will make the motion.

Kathy Cole: Second?

Jeff Passarell: Jeff Passarell

Kathy Cole: OK all in favor?

All AYE's said

Kathy Cole: So moved

Lance Brabant: Alright so, um, the first application that is on your agenda tonight is Charles & Robin Smith, it is the subdivision. I believe this, is this a new application correct Kim?

Kim McDowell: It is

Lance Brabant: Ok, so tonight's purpose would be to set a public hearing date for this application and move the application to that date and time to give everybody a chance to review and then we would comment on it like we normally would at the Board meeting.

Kim McDowell: OK

Lance Brabant: I believe our, Kim maybe I need your help on this one, but I was under the impression that most of these applications were going to get forward to the ZBA meeting, typical ZBA meeting of the month.

Kim McDowell: So, I spoke with David this morning and he said we can have an in person meeting on June 22nd. We just have to figure out a procedure on how to do it.

Lance Brabant: Yep and I have some thoughts on that that I maybe to help Avon out with

Kim McDowell: OK

Lance Brabant: And I will forward them to you guys as for your review but in the meantime, my understanding is that tonight, um, at least I think for these applications are going to get forwarded to that June 22nd Board meeting. Being that one we don't anticipate a large number of people uh come in for those four applications and that the Town Hall can accommodate them in person. Um, and then we will go over some of the other procedures that we are looking to do as part of that to help cut down the numbers if need be and then I believe we will ask the application on your agenda tonight will get forwarded and continued out to your regular scheduled July meeting. So that the Town can accommodate any and all people who are interested in that project.

Kim McDowell: OK

Kathy Cole: Lance this is Kathy Cole.

Lance Brabant: Yes

Kathy Cole: On the um very first one, Charles and Robin Smith, that one was new to me so I am just wondering Kim does that have to go to the County or has it been to the County already?

Kim McDowell: I sent it to the County just the other day. I didn't do anything with it because I hadn't received everything up front and I didn't know when we were going to resume anything. So, I just sent it. It is new, this is the women over on Marshall Road who has been wanting this to go through since January, but we never got any information from it. So, I don't know, I was trying to speed her along a little bit by having you guys review and if there wasn't any questions than just have a public hearing for her. But you can do whatever you want; she can come in on June 22nd and have it be a conceptual meeting and then has to go out again.

Lance Brabant: Yea I guess, this is Lance with MRB Group, I guess you know we could set the public hearing for the 22nd: have whatever comments and entertain whatever comments we received and if the Board feels that they are not in a position to move forward with this application at that time than we would continue it like we would with some of these other projects that are before us tonight to the next meeting to accommodate that time. I believe that to be a legitimate option for this as well.

Kathy Cole: This is Kathy Cole. I agree, I mean I don't. I looked it over and I don't see any major issue with it from my perspective, I just didn't know of where we stood with the whole County thing on it.

Lance Brabant: Gottcha

Kim McDowell: Well I am hoping that they, this is Kim; I am hoping that they will respond but I don't know whose working over there and whose not. So I sent it to the three people that I think are in the Planning Department and I haven't heard anything back from anybody.

Lance Brabant: So this is Lance with MRB Group, we can between now and our June 22 Board meeting if that is the continuation we can always follow up with an email to them to have them and find out if they received it and if they got any questions.

Kim McDowell: OK

Kathy Cole: Sounds good to me. Thank you

Lance Brabant: So I believe the first motion tonight would be to just set a public hearing for this application for your joint board meeting on June 22.

Kathy Cole: Sounds good, I will make a motion to do that, may I have a second? This is Kathy Cole by the way.

Kathy Mannix: I will second that.

Randy Kozlowski: Randy Kozlowski, I will second.

Kathy Cole: All in favor?

All AYE's said

Kathy Cole: So moved.

Lance Brabant: OK. That application. I am not sure, go for it.

Jeff Mulligan: Yea, Jeff Mulligan. The next is a sign variance for MGIN Property Holdings for Matthew's Buses. Does anybody have anything to say about this project? We knew they were coming back for this since the last time we talked to them. They got the one obviously up on their building which is quite large. Um, this looks like it is going to be almost the same size only on three different signs. So, it doesn't the one thing it doesn't show is what the sign is going to look like on route 15.

Kim McDowell: Lance go to the bottom page. That Matthews Buses, that is the sign that is actually going on, they are taking it from their Dansville office and just putting it on Route 15, the last one.

Jeff Mulligan: OK so the other would be, where the New Beginning is Pride and Joy that is going to be repurposed for a regular sign for them right?

Kim McDowell: Correct

Jeff Mulligan: Ok will it be similar to the Matthews Buses one below?

Kim McDowell: I believe so

Jeff Mulligan: OK. Well it is pretty much, pretty cut and dry to think in terms of the way they want to do it. Does anybody have any comments?

Lance Brabant: Board this is Lance with MRB Group. Just for the record this is, they Kim, did they submit a colored rendering of this to the Town?

Kim McDowell: No, the only color

Lance Brabant: I would think, sorry

Kim McDowell: Go ahead

Lance Brabant: I was just going to say, if they didn't submit a color rendering, I would request that one be provided just so that you have an accurate representation of what it looks like.

Kim McDowell: Alright, actually let me look in my email.

Jeff Mulligan: I bet it is blue and white like the one on their building

Lance Brabant: I would hope so but you know, maybe they

Jeff Mulligan: Right

Lance Brabant: bright pink and bright green, you know I don't know

Jeff Mulligan: Yea. So we have to set a public hearing, does anybody have anything, comments?

Bob Westfall: This is Bob Westfall. I am looking at a picture and it is, it just has a big M and a circle and it says Matthews Buses Inc. that is the one they are moving from Dansville?

Jeff Mulligan: Yes, sounds like it

Kim McDowell: Um

Lance Brabant: Yea, that is the last picture in the packet.

Bob Westfall: Yes

Jeff Mulligan: Right

Lance Brabant: I believe that to be the sign that is going to be going along the roadway.

Bob Westfall: On 15?

Lance Brabant: Correct

Bob Westfall: OK. Um, have they, did they, should be easy for them to supply a color picture than I would think

Lance Brabant: I would believe so. I would think you guys on the Board would want to have a colored rendering.

Jeff Mulligan: Yea, I think that is a good idea

Bob Westfall: Yea, I agree, it's Bob again

Brian Glise: This is Brian. I think the other sign is going to be like maybe the other companies that are going to be in the mall also. So it might not have Matthews Buses on it or it might be included with a couple other companies that are, might be moving in.

Bob Westfall: Well isn't that the one on 5 & 20?

Brian Glise: Yes

Jeff Mulligan: Yea. Well we would have to have an accurate representation of what it is going to look like in order for us to make any kind of decision, I think. If there is going to be a hearing do we need to have that beforehand, I mean I would hope that we do. It has got to be in the application right?

Kim McDowell: Let me see, I am looking. This is Kim. I am looking at what they sent me but they are usually, I can send him an email and they are very quick to respond to me. Is not, they don't take very long, but I will keep looking in my emails.

Lance Brabant: Yea, just for the record and I don't know if I have the answer, I am just going to read the application states that we are looking to repurpose the two current signs located on 5&20 and install a new sign on route 15. So, in addition to the previously approved sign on our building which we previously approved for them totaling 290 square feet, they are requesting a variance for an additional 283 square feet of signage as shown in the pictures below. And the pictures that they provided they show one freestanding sign and then there is another, what appears to be like and Brian correct where I am wrong, like a plaza sign. I am assuming those two signs as they stand are what they are going to change and reuse. Now what is going to go on them I do not know, they only show us the Matthews Buses logo. So we may want to reach out to them and have them provide to us what will the overall sign going to look like.

Kim McDowell: This is Kim. I will reach out to them tomorrow.

Jeff Mulligan: Is there any point in setting a hearing without the copy of the sign so we know what we are setting the hearing for?

Lance Brabant: Well, I am, um, I guess

Jeff Mulligan: We know what to look at to make a decision I guess

Lance Brabant: I guess we can give them a deadline and I guess my thought is the Board set the hearing for the 22nd with a deadline of this new information being provided by a date that gives us enough time to publish it. Um, if they miss it, we can send a notice out saying that we are not going to have it and then at the meeting we can identify why we cancelled that public hearing for that application. Does that make sense to the Board? Ok I would say that Kim when do you need to have everything into your possession by in order to set a public hearing?

Kim McDowell: Friday. I have to have the notices to the paper by Friday for them to go in next week's paper.

Lance Brabant: Alright, so, we the Board could set up a public hearing for the 22nd with the understanding that this requested information is to be submitted to you by Thursday, noon on Thursday? Does that work for you Kim? Or do you need it earlier?

Kim McDowell: No, honestly, I thought I saw a colored picture of it but I just can't find it and John who I usually deal with at Matthews Buses is very prompt. If I ask him for something I usually get it later that day or the next day.

Lance Brabant: I think that is fair. So I guess, my thought is we set the public hearing for June 22nd and we give them until Thursday to supply us with this additional information so that we are in a position to do something on the 22nd. Now we just need a Board motion.

Jeff Mulligan: Can I um, I would like to ask for a motion to set a public hearing for June 22nd for Matthews Buses on the sign proposition/proposal?

Cindy Kellen: This is Cindy Kellen, I will make that motion.

Bob Westfall: This is Bob Westfall, I will second it

Jeff Mulligan: All in favor? Provide by saying AYE

All AYE's said

Jeff Mulligan: OK, any opposed nah that say nah? OK motion carried. So we have a public hearing set for the 22nd for Matthews Buses provided they provide, they give you the sign, pictures of the sign so we can see them before that. OK. So we move to Palermo, Daniel Palermo, who we are still working on, has he fulfilled all the obligations that we have asked for? It is mostly with parking issues and oil reclaiming, um, is there anything else Lance, I am trying to remember.

Lance Brabant: Yea, I was it has been a while but I was trying to go back to, I saw he supplied us, I am sorry.

Jeff Mulligan: It was mostly the parking issue I think we were concerned about.

Lance Brabant: Correct and then he provided an updated, I think ultimately what we are looking for is two things. One, the latest and greatest map which is hard to describe because there is not a date on it but he identifies very specific parking locations along what is the North side of the building and in front of the building. Um, I believe he identified stall sizes, um, which is fine but I thought he mentioned that he has the ability to park elsewhere on the site and store items elsewhere on the site. So what I think we need him to do is take this plan that he provided us the latest and greatest and identify those locations on the plan for us. Where he could also be parking vehicles and storing vehicles and then that should satisfy what our comments were.

At least from the site perspective, I don't believe there is any other improvements that he is proposing to make to the building at this time or signage that I am aware of.

Brian Glise: Lance this is Brian, there was a fire suppression paint booth or something

Lance Brabant: Yes, yes

Brian Glise: That he was going to call or looking into. I haven't heard anything back about that.

Lance Brabant: So, we have a notice from February 28th that says fire suppression system and installation service with an approximate cost, I don't know if he means he is going to do it or if he is just showing us a quote. But it says advanced hood cleaning solutions is proposed to provide fire suppression system installation service to Palermo's Auto Works and then they have a quote for us, for him. And that was dated February 28, 2020 and that is part of the application.

Brian Glise: OK

Lance Brabant: I know there where some questions about the clean out on the floor, I am pretty sure we received a response from water and sewer authority on that. I would just have to go back and take a look before the next Board meeting to make sure that was addressed. I don't believe there is one so they didn't have to make changes to it. But I will double check that and respond accordingly but I think at this point the applicant, I would suggest that the Board consider requiring him to go back and just identifying any and all parking locations and storage locations that he can do stuff in on that plan he provided us. A simple note can be added and then we should be able to continue this and set a public hearing to the June 22nd Board meeting. If the Board is open to that idea.

Jeff Mulligan: Does anybody have any problems with that? It seems like we have dragged this one on for a while, I think it looks like he has done a lot of what we have asked for and certainly working in that direction. Any problems with it, if not can I have a motion to set a public hearing for, I guess it would be called Lakeville

Brian Glise: Palermo's Auto Body

Jeff Mulligan: Palermo's Auto Works or something like that

Diane Attea: I'll make, this is Diane, I will make a motion to for Palermo's Auto works hearing.

Jeff Passarell: This is Jeff Passarell, I 'll second

Jeff Mulligan: Can I have second

Bob Westfall: Yea, this is Bob, I will second it

Jeff Mulligan: All signify by saying Aye to who is in favor?

All AYE's said

Jeff Mulligan: All opposed, Nay? Motion carried. So we also have a public hearing for this on, now I just lost everything, sorry, I am still going through my screen for Palermo Auto Works. Now if I can get back to my agenda, I can find out, I think we have another one.

Kim McDowell: Yes, this is Kim.

Jeff Mulligan: I have lost my um, what was the next, there we go.

Lance Brabant: Woolaver?

Jeff Mulligan: Woolaver, OK. Sorry about that folks. So they are requesting to build a garage on their property. I was wondering whether that can't be moved over looking at the picture I don't know. And do we know if they got any kind of discussion with their neighbor. Five feet is pretty close to the neighbor, it is a very small lot.

Kim McDowell: This is Kim. What I sent you is what they sent me.

Jeff Mulligan: Right, I am sure. I am just looking, um, seeing as the garage, are they taking out the current garage? Is that what they are doing? Replacing it?

Brian Glise: This is Brian.

Jeff Mulligan: It may be part of the house.

Brian Glise: This is Brian. In the past this was a house that the woman had started renovating the garage, the attached garage she made into a bedroom and a bathroom and then half way through it she stopped working on it and her father had to come in and finish everything up and it was vacant for a while and then they were finally able to sell the house. And these are new owners.

Jeff Mulligan: I see, so the garage is currently there is now a usable room.

Brian Glise: Yes, it is part of the house.

Jeff Mulligan: Right

Lance Brabant: Brian, um, this is Lance with MRB Group, just out of more curiosity, um, does that driveway go all the way, are they going to propose to extend the driveway as part of this approval or don't we know that answer. It looks short on the plans that provided so I am just asking.

Brian Glise: I do not know the answer to that. No

Lance Brabant: OK.

Kim McDowell: This is Kim and I believe when I spoke with her the reason that they are doing it that way is because they do want the garage to go right to the driveway. So, I don't know if that is really a current picture, like their driveway stops there or if it is going to go all the way. But even on the thing it says our garage way, to build our garage at the end of the driveway.

Lance Brabant: Ok, so it is possible the driveway goes farther than what it does on this picture.

Kim McDowell: Yes, it is possible. But I don't know.

Jeff Mulligan: It looks like an old drawing and they just drew the garage on to it and probably part of their original deed.

Lance Brabant: It is simple enough for us to provide an aerial photograph, I can't guarantee you, you know, how old the old aerial photograph will be but they usually do it every four or five years or so. I can print one out and supply it to you guys for your record on this property and then we can at least have it for our record.

Bob Westfall: This is Bob Westfall. I just have one question for clarification. The former garage that they made part of the house that still that remains there?

Brian Glise: This is Brian. I don't really understand the question. It was a garage, an attached garage to the house and they converted that garage into a room with a bathroom.

Bob Westfall: So, that will remain to exist right. I mean that, doesn't have anything to do with the new garage.

Brian Glise: No that is part of the house now.

Bob Westfall: Ok, alright.

Lance Brabant: It is, this is Lance, the plat map that they provided has a big X through the garage, almost, almost as if their proposing to remove it but that is not the case.

Jeff Mulligan: That is what I was wondering.

Kim McDowell: This is Kim, I think she just meant to cross out the word garage because then she wrote living room.

Lance Brabant: Yes I see that

Jeff Mulligan: Yep

Bob Westfall: Ok, thank you

Kathy Cole: Um, this is Kathy Cole and I know this is a ZBA thing but I drove by their today and I mean it is obvious that that is a living area for the former garage, living area for the home. I also believe that there is some kind of shrubs or pines or something maybe on the property line. So that might help you guys decide the variance for it because I do believe that there was some pines or shrubs or something there just as an FYI.

Jeff Mulligan: Gotcha. I was wondering if, because if there is nothing there than I was wondering if they could put, tuck the garage behind the house and then come in and turn into it. But that would be I mean it doesn't it's probably the way they want to build it. I guess I don't have a big problem with it. It looks as if there is 20 feet between the house and the garage, is that the way, does that 20 means, not really to scale but it must be.

Brian Glise: Yes it looks that way, this is Brian.

Jeff Mulligan: So it looks like, there is not even a full 20 – 30 feet from the house to the property line. Looks like 24 feet or something, to that close to that. If there is an arrow there, right in front of the garage or proposed garage to end of the driveway. I don't know what that is exactly but it looks like it is, I was wondering if that was a measurement.

Brian Glise: Yea, it looks like the garage is 24x26.

Jeff Mulligan: Yea just some above the 24 in the garage, is another two something with an arrow. I was wondering if that was the distance from the old garage now a bedroom, living room to the property line.

Brian Glise: Yes that what it looks like

Jeff Mulligan: I see, I mean we are all, I guess, as long as, I think they need to talk to David Heard or formerly Rebecca and David Heard, to see whether they got any, you know, issue with this thing done. Anybody else have any comments about this?

Cindy Kellen: This is Cindy. I was wondering if maybe we would want to bring them in for informational meeting first so that we can see if they can move it at all.

Kim McDowell: this is Kim.

Jeff Mulligan: I don't have a problem with that.

Kim McDowell: This is Kim. Lance can you set up like if we do a public hearing and I mean they are going to come in and if we decide at that point we do not want to make a decision we can always continue it, correct?

Lance Brabant: Correct. SO, every ZBA meeting is technically a public hearing anyway because they are all variances applications. So I would say yea we set the public hearing up, bring them in, we have open dialogue on, you probably ask if there is any objections from the residents to this application here them out and if there is opportunity to the Board to make changes to it like you are suggesting tonight we will continue it to another meeting and keep the public hearing open. That would be the easiest way to do it in my opinion.

Kim McDowell: This is Kim. I can also, she sent this stuff to me via email, I can send her an email and ask her to go speak to her neighbors and supply us with letters from her neighbors um before the meeting too.

Jeff Mulligan: Kathy when you drove by, where is this property, right tight is it on the East side of the road, yea, it must be.

Lance Brabant: Yea it is on the East side of the road just north of East Avon Lima Road.

Kathy Cole: Yea it is like the second or third house in and actually, um, Lance you just had the google map up of that didn't you.

Lance Brabant: Yes so if you click the link I have it on my screen which you should be able to see right now, it does appear to be the third house in, it does appear to be well vegetated on both property lines. I don't know if you can see it but that what I went to, Google Maps and looked at it.

Kim McDowell: This is Kim. In her variance questions that she answered, she did say that they are going to build our garage where our driveway ends.

Lance Brabant: OK

Kim McDowell: And it will cost a significant amount of money for us to extend and curve our driveway.

Jeff Mulligan: Certainly

Clara Mulligan: This is Clara calling in, I know I am not on the Zoning Board but I am just noticing that the neighbors to the South there they have a garage basically in the same position. Very close to the property line.

Lance Brabant: Yes, that is a good point, doesn't look to be any further than whether they are forward or behind their proposed location, I agree

Clara Mulligan: This seems really close

Jeff Mulligan: Should we, do we want to set a public hearing? Anybody have any comments on that? I guess it is not that complicated; there is no really good reason to draw it out unless somebody has one.

Lance Brabant: For the record, setting a public hearing doesn't hold you guys to having to make a decision at your next Board meeting on it. It just simply gives you guys the option.

Jeff Mulligan: OK

Cindy Kellen: This is Cindy. I will make a motion to

Jeff Mulligan: Thank you.

Cindy Kellen: You're welcome.

Jeff Mulligan: Can I have a second?

Diane Attea: This is Diane, I will second.

Jeff Mulligan: All in favor signify by saying Aye.

All AYE's said

Jeff Mulligan: Opposed Nay?

Jeff Mulligan: Motion carried. Ok. I think we are onto, back to

Kim McDowell: Solar

Lance Brabant: Solar

Jeff Mulligan: Go for it Kathy, I talked enough.

Kathy Cole: Well I, Lance, um this is Kathy. So, really it is just to review. You haven't heard back from your letter to them have you?

Lance Brabant: So, yea, I guess if I can provide just a kind of quick summary of where I believe we are and then I will let the Board chime in with any questions they may have then we will go from there: if that is Ok with you?

Kathy Cole: Yep, sound good.

Lance Brabant: OK, so from our last time we were all together we would continue the public hearing and we continued our SEQR dialogue on the application to provide the applicant at that time, time to respond to public comments received to date, comments received by the Board and comments received from other agencies as part of the SEQR coordinated review. Since that time the SEQR coordinator review had ended; but the Board has not physically yet declared themselves lead agency on this action due to the COVID-19 situation. The Board has also not received or I shouldn't say received, has not reviewed the application materials due to the COVID-19 situation and since that time MRG Group has issued a comment letter on the application requesting additional information to be provided. Based on that, I had reached out to the applicant, to kind of go over where I believed we were to make sure I wasn't missing anything from their perspective and they, let me back up, I apologize. During this time, the applicant did supply the Board and our staff with a little bit more detailed site plan on the second option and provided some additional information in response to public comments. I don't have it open at this moment but I believe it was beginning of May that was stuff that was submitted; maybe that was end of April beginning of May. So, that stuff has been provided since MRB's comment letter was issued. I followed up with the applicant, I went over some comments and at this time what we are looking for them to do is update the plans, update the SWPPP, update drainage stuff based on our review letter, MRB comments, and public comments received to date and then they are going to provide revisions to that to the Town for review. The point of tonight's meeting would be to continue this application and the public comment period to our July Board meeting. The July Board meeting would be July 7th; I believe I am correct, if I am correct. And at that Board meeting we would continue where we left off with our review of the application, their responses to the comments received to date, both again from the public and from MRB Group, and then any remaining Board comments on the application before you. I believe at that point and time, we would be at the same spot that we have then left off of back in early March, where we were looking to potentially declaring ourselves Lead Agency and take SEQR action on the application. But obviously we need to make sure we have all the information we requested, require of the applicant to be provided, which they are working on and make sure the Board is confident and comfortable moving forward at that time. So, that is a quick summary of where we are in the process, what has been provided and what is looking to be provided between now and our next Board meeting.

Kathy Cole: Lance, this is Kathy. Um, do you know if the PILOT has been completed yet?

Lance Brabant: To my knowledge, it has not but when we left off on March they were working with the Town Board but being as the situation is I am not sure how far they got but that is obviously something that we are going to have to consider as part of our review. And making sure that the Town Board has reached a comfort level with the applicant as we required on previous solar applications that before you and make sure they have addressed those comments and we are in a good standing with them with the PILOT.

Kathy Cole: Great, OK, thank you.

Jeff Mulligan: So no decision has been made on phase, on choice of one or two, correct?

Lance Brabant: It was submitted to you guys for your review, I don't believe there has been any feedback the first time it was provided. I believe it was kind of a 50/50 as to which one the Board has preferred, um, at this point we completed SEQR on the first one, first one being what was provided as part of the application with the solar panels closer to the property line, the driveway in the same location, I just want to make it for the record, either choice that the obligations and requirements that this Board, the Town, and MRB requires of them will still have to be met, they will still have to address drainage, still have to address screening, they still have to meet the Special Use Permit criteria. They don't get out from those requirements on either of those locations, they would have to do both or all, excuse me, all requirements.

Jeff Mulligan: So, Lance, when we get back to the drainage issue. The drainage goes down between two house property lines for major part of the drainage for this property that they are proposing, doesn't matter whether it is option one or two. How is that being dealt with because that is, um, that is on, I believe that probably goes through private property.

Lance Brabant: So, I have to be careful because we don't have a public hearing tonight and I can't give, divulge too much information in that otherwise should be available to the public, but at this time that is what they exactly, that is what they are working on. They are working on to address the drainage concerns identified both by the Town Board, Planning Board and ZBA which is how does run off can be controlled in a manner that doesn't impact the neighboring properties and then also how they control the run off that is generated from their site. So, they are working on that information and they are going to provide an updated site plan with more detail for our review, for your review in hopes that they satisfy that concern. That information has not yet been provided but that is what they are working on. But to be fair they are also they were hesitant to move forward with a design because they weren't quite sure which option the Board was going to go with. Option one being the current application, Option two being the alternative. At this point I believe, they are moving forward with Option one so that they can continue the application but I guess if the Board has any objections to that, uh, I would suggest we identify that and send that information to the applicant.

Kathy Cole: Lance, this is Kathy. Um, I think at the last time when we all meet it actually was option two was the voted by like one or two votes more than option one. But I don't think an actual decision was made at that time.

Lance Brabant: I believe you are correct, I believe you are correct. I think it was like 6-5 or 7-5 or 6-5 not all the Board members were there I don't believe. I believe you are correct.

Kathy Cole: So given that should we, I mean, it looks like we got quite a few people on this call, should we take another, um, like straw vote or can't we do that tonight to see who prefers what?

Lance Brabant: So, I guess if, I guess my suggestion is that we don't make a decision but I understand if that is the concern of the Board, um, what I can do is, I can reach back out to the applicant and let him know that based on the voting from the last Board meeting which was in fact a public hearing that the Board is more in favor of the secondary option which is putting the solar panels further from the property line and that they would prefer you to move forward with that application, that design, if I am hearing you correctly.

Kathy Cole: Well I just don't want them to be misled or whatever that they are moving forward with one when it appeared that maybe two was really going to be the preferred option based on both Boards vote and they were reluctant to do the work like you just said on option two if you know they didn't have to.

Lance Brabant: Correct

Kathy Cole: So what does the rest of the Board members think of this then?

Jeff Mulligan: I'll have to, this is Jeff, I will chime in. There are two things that we have concerns about, one is the residents obviously they're the ones, they don't want it, I don't think they are going to be happy no matter what you do, Um, from a land perspective, um, I think it was brought up that Bruce Howlett considered brought it up was that the reason for the option one was down in the wetter area of the farm which was already not as usable for farming and therefore it was more desirable for something like this it wasn't going to be using up good farm land. Um if he used option two, um, it is going to be taking up good farm land as well as leaving wet land that is pretty much unusable for farming. So it becomes a, that may just go up to scrub or something I don't know what he will do with it because it doesn't, it pretty uneconomical to farm especially considering there is no drainage unless they figure out some other form of drainage on this property you know in dispute here.

So that was my preference was for option one, um, I know that there is, um, some difficulty from the residents and, um, I empathize with them but at the same time this is property that is owned by somebody else that they don't own the view which was the one thing they kept saying was about the view and I guess that is the one thing that is very difficult to do anything about. So, all that I will leave that is my vote so everybody else can have their say or whatever.

Randy Kozlowski: This is Randy. Yea, Randy Kozlowski, just ask a question or clarification I mean to Jeff's point about the residents and their opinions and feeling towards this particular project. My belief as a Planning Board member that their opinions should only be directed towards the application process itself and the criteria of the applicant, um, as opposed to just personal feelings. The Planning Board member, as a Planning Board member my obligation is just ensure that all of the ordinances, processes, and site planning, etc., etc. are followed. Am I correct in that assumption?

Jim Campbell: This is Jim Campbell. Hello everyone.

Lance Brabant: Jim how are you doing?

Jim Campbell: Good. Um, Randy, you know I thank that is a pretty good summary statement of what your duty is and primarily what I am hearing you say is your duty is to follow the code and the law.

Randy Kozlowski: Yes

Jim Campbell: The code in regard to details associated with a particular application as well as procedure and of course to a greater extent or to a larger extent not greater but larger following State law and that is a fair statement. That is what sometimes, um, is unfortunately what you are restricted to do and certainly there members of both Boards who can, uh, reflect back on applications that they wish they could do something different than that but that is what your job is, you're function. I think that is accurate.

Randy Kozlowski: Yea, OK, thank you, Jim. I just for point of clarification, I mean if a resident approaches a Planning or Zoning Board member and says you need to kill this project, um, technically, we can't do it just based on, you know, personnel feelings.

Jim Campbell: That is correct. It really, the process is designed to move beyond personnel feelings and look at the proper application of your code and the criteria set forth in your code.

Jeff Passarell: Hi Jim, this is Jeff Passarell. I just have a question on the subject, so are you saying we have no obligation to the counterable members of this, of Avon?

Jim Campbell: No, no I am not saying that at all. I am saying that you have an obligation to hear them in the context of a public hearing, you have an obligation to take their comments and concerns and make that a part of your review process. But, I think personnel feelings aside, I think that is what I was getting from Randy, um, you know, you may personnel feel one way about any given application but your job as a Board member is to set that aside and utilize the information that is before you from an application standpoint from a public input standpoint and from your code to make a determination on the given application. So I am not saying at all that you ignore public input, um, however, I think to, to, uh, to kill a project or an application simply because your asked to do that and that is a preference is probably not defensible. Um, whereas, the public might give you input that would suggest that a project presented shouldn't be developed or that there should be changes to make it a better project that has less negative impact, um, that achieves more of what the goals of the code are, um, public input that that really the purpose of public input. But killing a project simply because the public wants you to or not even the public really generally it is more the neighbors, right, it is the immediate neighbors that tend to, uh, have objection and want a project killed not the public but your job is to represent the entire public and that is reflected in your code, in your particular zoning classifications, what is allowed and not allowed based on legislative acts of the Town Board.

Jeff Passarell: Thank you.

Bob Westfall: Um, Jim, this is Bob Westfall. Um, just for a second I'd like to read from our, the introduction to our, when we adopted the, the law on the first page. It says, however, the Town Board finds it necessary to properly site and regulate solar energy systems within the boundaries of the Town in Avon to protect the residential uses, business areas and other land uses to preserve the overall beauty and nature of character of the Town of Avon to promote effective and efficient use of solar energy resources and to protect the health, safety and the general welfare of the citizens of the Town of Avon. Now reading that, does that not, should that not be taken into consideration in regards to the, um, what the neighbors, you know what, there is this almost unanimous objection to going into this particular area and does it not address the, um, overall beauty, nature and character of the Town of Avon. I just, I mean I just want to know how much weight we should give that particular part of the, of the introductory of the solar law.

Jim Campbell: So, that particular language, Bob, was it is what we call precatory language; it is the beginning language that sets up a mindset of why a particular decision is made. You are correct about that but that language sets up the decisions that were made by the Town Board, that language isn't designed to become part of the standards that the Planning Board or the Zoning Board of Appeals uses to review, it was the language in the, um, I guess the lenses through which in theory decisions of the Town Board were made on where to allow or disallow and what things to preserve and not preserve as far as the community is concerned. So, the Town Board when they adopted the local law said taking all this stuff into consideration we determined that solar development is appropriate in the following fashion. So, that would indicate that the Town Board has already done that in determining how and, um, where in terms of zoning districts, large scale solar is acceptable. I am not sure I am being clear but does, am I making the distinction clearly enough?

Bob Westfall: Well, you are but I guess my, my question is playing devil's advocate here is, is whether we are, whether we have an obligation to live up to that, that language.

Jim Campbell: And I would say you don't, um, because the language, it talks about the Town Board using its legislative authority which is something you don't have. Um, the Zoning Board of Appeals, I guess, arguably, can through the variance process, uh, change what has been put on the books legislatively but other than that, the legislative authority to determine by local law what does or doesn't happen in a broad brush stroke in the community rests solely with the Town Board. So, they're saying as part of that legislature determination with regard to the rules and regulations associated with large scale solar, these are the things we took into consideration, you'll note that that language is not verbatim repeated where it comes to the processes of the special use permit and site plan approval, um, those aren't added as conditions for the Planning Board or the Zoning Board of Appeals to make determinations on, so, I think probably not. That would be my legal interpretation.

Bob Westfall: I have on other question that kind of relates to it. You made the statement about, um, somebody coming up to you outside of the, outside of the, um, of a meeting and saying you need to kill this project, um, that, that, I have had some concerns about, um, mail that we receive at home, um, or, or a phone calls that we receive at home and that's, that's happened to me in both forms, not on this particular, oh, I have received two or three different things in the mail regarding this project. Um, on a previous project I received a phone call from someone while I was on vacation and they left a long rambling message on my, my voicemail. Are they, are these things that should be reported to like either our, our, uh, our Chairmen or someone?

Jim Campbell: You know I think it is never a bad idea to share the communications that you received regarding a given application with your Board, um, you know transparency is one of the corner stones of this process and I think it is safe for you to assume if a neighbor or a citizen comes to you in your official capacity as a Board member and says here is what I think, here is what I feel, here is what I am asking you to do, to share that, um, makes sense to me, if they are asking you not to share that, than I think it becomes suspect and so

Bob Westfall: I, um, sorry, go ahead.

Jim Campbell: No, so I think it is a good idea to share that kind of information.

Bob Westfall: Ok, I am just a little concerned that, um, to me these things should come to us in the context of a, of a, of a, an official meeting and, you know.

Jim Campbell: I agree and you're certainly within right and it would be, uh, certainly appropriate for you to say, you know I appreciate that you are interested but what I would like to ask you to do is to send an email to me and copy the rest of the Board in so that this becomes an effective public comment that we can all take into consideration. Um, you know I certainly don't have any problem with you asking that. Sometimes practically someone is going to stop you at Tops and, you know, you don't want to be rude you give them a few minutes of your time because that is your nature and that is good, um, but you're certainly well, well within your appropriate right to say please help me pass this on to the rest of the Board members by making it an official communication.

Bob Westfall: Right, OK. I just remember my initial training, we were told that anything discussed outside the confines of a meeting are something that we absolutely shouldn't do.

Jim Campbell: It is not a good thing to, um, to go out of your way to have these discussions and certainly to instigate them, um, puts you in a position of having to explain yourself possibly in a way that you don't want to. But practically speaking, in a small community, like yours you know people and people know you and feel that they might have the ability to come up and speak their mind to you as friend or an acquaintance.

Bob Westfall: Exactly, OK, thanks.

Jim Campbell: Sure

Kathy Cole: Jim, it is Kathy Cole, I don't know if you can still hear me. Um, I know that there was some information going on in Albany about changing some of the solar stuff as far as requirements and all that and I know things have been a little crazy the last couple of months. Do you know what the status is on that?

Jim Campbell: Yea, there were some changes that came down through the budget process relating to solar and by and large, um, they would not likely affect a project of this size certainly as you get towards the bigger projects and the projects that would typically be considered Article 10, you know, the 25 megawatts or larger, and now that numbers might even be less, um, that's where the changes are pretty profound. There is some possibility that the changes to the budget could impact how the PILOT negotiation process takes place, um, but I think that would likely be something that would be asserted by the applicant as part of that negotiation process, um, NYSERDA being involved in calculating values and approving PILOT payments and that kind of thing. But from your standpoint for a project of this size nothing that I am aware of that would change where we are.

Kathy Cole: OK, thank you.

Lance Brabant: Alright, so, this is Lance with MRB Group, just coming back around to the application that is on the agenda, ultimately we need a continuous and set a public hearing for the July, I apologize, I had the calendar up and then I got rid of it again, I think it is July 7th, did I say, um, July 7th Joint Board meeting, prior to making that motion, um, there was some dialogue about the two options that are provided to us and the Board previously at the public hearing had voted on either/or of those applications. Whether they wanted to move forward with option number two or option number one, option one being the current proposal option two being the alternative. Based on tonight's dialogue, um, I was reminded that they had actually there was more in favor of the alternative if I am correct and the question then became if that is the application, if that is the design the Board would prefer to see, I know the applicant is in favor of moving this project along. They did want some direction so they can start making mitigation and revisions to the plans in order to keep the process moving.

So, I think, I think, I just want to make sure I am correct before I reach back to the applicant, um, in an email and inform them, I just want to make sure I am correct that the Board is in fact in favor with the alternative as opposed to the proposed application, um, and then whatever those amendments that would come with that would be our new process that we would be following.

Kim McDowell: Um, this is Kim. So, I am looking at the minutes from March 3rd and Option B received 5 votes, Option A received 4 votes, two people were not ready to make a decision, and one person was absent.

Lance Brabant: OK. Do we know who those two people were that, were not, I believe one was Kathy if I am correct. I don't remember.

Kim McDowell: One was Kathy Mannix and one was Bob Westfall, Diane was absent.

Lance Brabant: I guess, I guess I will come back around and say are, and I don't mean to put them on the spot but I would think that in order to be fair, do any of those three people who have not previously voted one way or another have their opinions changed on either of the applications or the information provided?

Kathy Mannix: This is Kathy Mannix, can you hear me?

Lance Brabant: Yep we can hear you.

Kathy Mannix: OK, my concern was the drainage issues for this solar project, from what I can tell our Town responsibility is to fix for those homeowners. And it was unclear to me that the solar project, I know they are responsible not to add to the problem but I also, my big question was what is the Town going to do with the drainage problem in the area that they really are, the Town is responsible for, I think it was opening up a ditch or the farmer supposed to open up a ditch. I can't exactly remember but it seemed to have a parallel with this solar project and drainage.

Bob Westfall: Hi, this is Bob, if I recall I it didn't seem like either one of them wanted to take on the responsibility, I could be remembering it wrong but if I remember something they thought the Town should pay for it

Lance Brabant: Yea, I don't believe that there was a definite answer one way or another in terms of who is ultimately responsible for correcting the large picture, the big picture issue, which is drainage for the entire area. But what was determined was that this application would be required to meet the current requirements of the drainage requirements associated with the Town of Avon Town code in your solar law and New York State DEC requirements which is the highest that they can do. That is what they are working on to achieve, as part of that review, as part of that review, it was identified that there are several other areas that we wanted them to look into which was behind the neighboring properties and that drainage swill and what they could do to potentially mitigate that issue. One option was to potentially relocate the road further away from the property which we were told can't be done and so that is why both options show the road in its location. So, the option now becomes down to how can they mitigate that area and keep drainage from running onto their properties. That is something they are going to look into and address with either of the two options that are presented. The other way that we envisioned this addressing some of the concerns is to as part of this solar mitigation measures some water quality and quantity control devises would be designed for the project, we would envision that those facilities would potentially be over size in a manner, in a way that works to try to mitigate some of offsite run off that could be conveyed to those areas to the residents. That's not, that's not, to say that those are the only options, not to say those are the only concern but that's, that's what they are currently looking into, when I say they, I mean the applicant and the design engineers. Due to MRB comments, due to the residential comments received, the Board comments received that is what they are looking into trying to address. As it relates to what the Town responsibilities are, that's for the Town Board to decide and I don't believe we have that indicated that has been indicated yet.

Jeff Mulligan: Part of the problem with the drainage is it involves the Village and so what once you get, once you get across the road you have to involve the Village and the Village is the one that is going to have to accept that water which is a natural drainage from that whole parcel. So it becomes, it is my, if I remember right, the solar applicant was not willing to take the original, um, to satisfy the drainage, um, fix for all residents there and I kind of don't blame them, that's not really their process, their project, not really part of the project. I don't know whose responsibility that is, um, but somehow it's all got to come together and that is where Bruce said there has been problems for 10 years since he bought the place. It's not, it's not been able to be worked out cause the Village doesn't want to accept any more water than it already gets. Seems like a no win.

Lance Brabant: So, yea, so I guess we are back to 4-3 what is it a 4-5 vote, Kim, with no changes from the other two members?

Brian Glise: This is Brian, do you want to have another straw vote or something in case anybody changed their mind or does Kim want to take a roll call and see where everybody is, just for clarity?

Lance Brabant: Maybe, Brian I appreciate it, maybe that is what we need to do, um, as based on the two designs, option, let's call it option A or 1 being the current proposal, option B being the alternative proposal and then maybe we can do a roll call and just ask if anybody has changed their opinion just so we can give the applicant some, some, information as to which way they want to go with.

Jeff Passarell: I have a question about this one and two before we do a vote. This is Jeff Passarell. Yes, uh, what's the topography on both of these drawings, does that second drawing is that continuing to elevate or is that going back down?

Lance Brabant: So, I believe the elevation rises, um, I think I am looking at North being the top of the page. So it goes West to East across the site rises up so those solar panels on the second option would be a little bit higher elevated than the one as the current proposal, if that makes sense cause all drainage goes to the, what is the western property line, but then it also slopes toward 5 & 20 when you get to certain point on the site.

Jeff Mulligan: That, that, the slope, the part that goes towards 5 & 20 is way North of where the solar project is.

Lance Brabant: I believe so as well

Jeff Mulligan: yea

Jeff Passarell: So with the buffer of the trees they are putting in there what would be better as far as people looking out their backyard, would they see more of the solar field with option one or option two?

Lance Brabant: So, they provides us some visual renderings back in March and you know I am trying to keep my opinion out of it and leave it to you guys but I believe in either instance you are going to see some solar panels from residential properties from 5 & 20. Um, but there is the ability the Board is to screen that so you mitigate that as much as possible, um, I believe that in both, both scenarios there is room to provide drainage to mitigate the site in accordance with the DEC requirements, um, with potential to do some additional mitigation to hopefully, um, achieve some of the Town's goals and Board's goals as well as either two options. I think in one of the concerns or one of the options that is hard to access is at this time is on one option the current proposal we know that the applicant, the land owner could continue farming from the road back to 5 & 20. We're, it is not quite sure if that same potential I guess for lack of a better word impact, um, is going to occur on the secondary option because it was identified that portions of that area that no longer shown with the solar panels were wet, so I don't know if he is going to be get back there to farm or not across that road but I believe that would be something the Board probably could way as part of the process. We may not know that answer.

So, I guess in option A or option 1 where the solar panels as part of the current proposal, everything around the solar panels for the most part are going to be covered by operation and maintenance plan and can be stabilized with greenery, grass stabilization and in option 2 where the pull the solar panels further to the East the least area I would imagine would change and the farmer would have rights to some of that area in between solar project and the residential project. So, I don't, I am not quite sure that the same achievements in terms of green and stabilization would occur. Um, you would have a larger buffer but you might still have disturbed farm land in that area.

Kathy Cole: So, this is Kathy. I, um, agree with Brian that maybe Kim should, can do a roll call and just take a second straw vote from everybody.

Kim McDowell: Um, this is Kim. Ok, so option A is going to be the original rendering and option B is going to be the second rendering. So, when I call your name just state option A or option B.

Kim McDowell: Jeff Mulligan

Jeff Mulligan: Option A

Kim McDowell: Jeff Passarell

Jeff Passarell: Um, I am going to go with A just cause I don't know what is going to be happen with B if it is going to be wide open

Kim McDowell: Cindy, Cindy Kellen

Cindy Kellen: Option B

Kim McDowell: Bob Westfall

Bob Westfall: Yea, my position hasn't changed. I want a little, I want a little more information about the drainage before I

Kim McDowell: Diane

Diane Attea: Option B

Kim McDowell: Kathy Cole

Kathy Cole: Option A

Kim McDowell: Kathy Mannix

Kathy Mannix: I'm going to, um, go with Option A based on our discussions or further discussion this evening.

Kim McDowell: Clara

Kim McDowell: Brian

Brian Thorn: Option A

Kim McDowell: Randy

Randy Kozlowski: Option A

Kim McDowell: Mike Miles, Tom McGovern. OK so there is 6 for option A, 2 for option B, 1 no decision and 3 absent.

Lance Brabant: So, even if the three absent voted B you would still have 6-5. So, I am not speaking for the Board, I am just pointing it out, so at this point sounds as if option A based on tonight's vote would be the preferred design which is the original and current application before you. So, if that is in fact correct, then I can reach out to the applicant and design engineer and inform them to move forward with making the revisions as requested by staff, residents and MRB Group to this point on those plans. And within

Kathy Cole: Sounds like a go, this is Kathy Cole

Lance Brabant: And with that said, the next thing that we would need to do is make a motion to continue the application and set a public hearing for the July 7th board meeting

Kathy Cole: OK, I will make a motion to do the, the continuance of the public hearing, um, to the July 7th Board meeting. May I have a second?

Randy Kozlowski: Randy

Jeff Mulligan: I will second that, Jeff Mulligan

Kathy Cole: All in favor?

All Aye's said

Kathy Cole: Any opposed? So moved

Brian Glise: Alright

Lance Brabant: So, I don't mean to, I am not trying to jump in so if I am please correct me. I am just trying to keep things moving. I believe the next Board meeting, both for the 22nd of June and for the July 7th Board meeting, based on the Governor's Executive Orders to date that the goal is to have these meetings back at Town Hall with set, with some set procedure requirements that the Town is still working on, with that being said MRB Group as we have done so far to date will continue to host the meetings on the Join Me app and we can publish the app and the call in number as we have been doing so that peoples, residents who would like to take part in the meeting and can't make it to the meeting or choose not to come to the meeting would still have an option of listening and partaking in the events from the meeting. I would be at the Town Hall recording as we have been doing, uh, running the procedure as we have been doing with Boards doing everything they would normally do, um, the only difference would be that we would still have some potential call ins that we would have to deal with. Is there any question on that or is there any corrections to that as stated? OK

Lance Brabant: Jim, did I, is there anything wrong with that Jim or our we good?

Jim Campbell: No you are good.

Lance Brabant: OK. Alright that is all I have for the Board's.

Brian Glise: This is Brian Glise. Um, I have two conceptual ideas also that want to come before the Board. One is for car sales on 15 and one is for a sign variance, um, in an Agricultural area. When could I tell them would be a good idea to get ready. I know things are kind of slammed right now with a lot of things going on but they do want to move forward with those.

Lance Brabant: I guess, I guess, we would probably have to put them on the next regular scheduled Board meeting night, if I am, unless I am incorrect with that but I would think that you would put them on for the July 7th Board meeting, um, for consideration the same night as the solar. Being that is your regular scheduled Planning Board meeting.

Kim McDowell: Uh, Lance this is Kim but the ones a variance so shouldn't that be on the June 22nd.

Lance Brabant: There you go, yup.

Kim McDowell: And that is pending if they send all the information in, if they don't send it in in time to be considered for the June 22nd, I can put them on the July 7th, correct?

Lance Brabant: I don't have a problem with that.

Kim McDowell: OK

Kathy Cole: Anything else Brian, this is Kathy.

Brian Glise: No that is all I got. Thank you,

Kathy Cole: If anybody doesn't have anything more, um, may I have a motion to close the meeting, this is Kathy Cole.

Randy Kozlowski: This is Randy Kozlowski, I will make a motion to close the meeting.

Kathy Cole: Second?

Kathy Mannix: This is Kathy Mannix, I will second

Kathy Cole: All in favor

All Aye's said

Kathy Cole: Any opposed? So moved