

April 2, 2007

1

TOWN OF CORNWALL

PLANNING BOARD

APRIL 2, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT: NEIL NOVESKY, CHAIRMAN
JANE DEANS
KENNETH BRODMERKEL
WYNN GOLD
LED KLOSKY
DEKE HAZIRJIAN
WILLIAM GRABE

ALSO PRESENT: DOMINIC CORDISCO, ESQ.
PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY

ERIC DENEGA/MARK EDSALL, P.E.
PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER

LESLIE DOTSON
PLANNING BOARD CONSULTANT

GARY VINSON
BUILDING INSPECTOR

REGULAR_MEETING

MR. NOVESKY: I'd like to call the April 2, 2007 meeting of the Cornwall Planning Board to order.

CORRESPONDENCE

MR. NOVEKSY: Correspondence, Fran, I'll be sending some correspondence over to you for the file. All members present and accounted for. No discussion, no

old business.

APPROVAL_OF_MINUTES_DATED_MARCH_5,_2007

MR. NOVESKY: Everyone receive their minutes from Fran?
I'll take a motion to accept them.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: So moved.

MRS. DEANS: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL AYE

MR. HAZIRJIAN AYE

MR. GOLD AYE

MR. KLOSKY AYE

MRS. DEANS AYE

MR. GRABE AYE

MR. NOVESKY AYE

MR. NOVESKY: No resolutions, Dominic?

MR. CORDISCO: No, sir.

QUAKER_&_MAIN,_LLC_#2007-01

MR. NOVESKY: At 7:32, I'd like to open the door for a public hearing on Quaker & Main, LLC. Joe Minuta, the architect, will be making a brief up to five minute presentation. Mr. Hazirjian will recuse himself from the board and Mr. Minuta will give a brief presentation to the public at which point we'll open the public hearing. At that point, I'd like anyone wishing to speak to introduce themselves by name and address and limit your presentation to three minutes and second if there's necessarily that much time we'll allow for a second round if it's appropriate. Mr. Minuta?

MR. CORDISCO: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if it's noted for the record that a member of the board stepped down.

MR. NOVESKY: I think I did note that, you weren't paying attention, Dominic. Okay.

MR. MINUTA: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Affidavit of Publication needs to be provided to you.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you.

MR. MINUTA: My name is Joe Minuta, I'm the architect for the project for Quaker & Main, LLC. The project is Woody's All Natural Burgers and Fries. We'll also have the secondary component which is the Baker's Dozen. The applicant's come in to take this existing residence that has a tailor shop component to it utilized as a residential commercial facility for many, many years and convert this to an all natural beef burger type of restaurant and bagel place. The plans consist of a new site plan showing site improvements, we have the existing two story building here, we'd be demolishing the existing one story dwelling on the perimeter and the front porch so three sides would be demolished and rebuilt. The plan shows to provide ingress to the property at this location on the far left one way

coming there one way coming out, we'd have a stop location here which would be directly across from the existing curb cut. We have the required number of parking spaces, we have ample snow and refuse storage. We also have a fence around this portion of the lot, this side of the lot to the west will not have a fence. This is primarily to protect the residential component from the commercial component for headlights or other illuminating type situations. Overall, it's a pretty handsome plan as far as the improvement to the sidewalk area, actually raise the sidewalk up to the level of the street at that point rather than being depressed. This will be brand new through here, we'll have a crosswalk, this will be converted to a turning lane at this point to access the location, it's a pretty self-explanatory plan. There will be some site drainage, the entire property drains to the north to the back of the site where we'll have a drainage catch basin here and here and out to the existing storm sewer. These are various details that I'm sure if anybody would like they can take a look at but they're relatively generic in nature. We have lighting and foot candles which seems to be a concern to most people so we provided that and basically what we have done here is provided exterior post bollards, this is the type of lamp fixture which would be conducive to the aesthetics of the building that we're proposing. And for those of you who don't read graphic grid detailed decimal point foot candles, there's another chart here that shows the isolux which is a foot candle of .5 and .25 at the farthest perimeter, we do have a fence on this side so it reduces quite a bit of that light that may come over here. You have a 16 foot lamp post and lamp fixture itself. With regard to the interior, it will be comprised of two cooking areas and three different environments for seating and eating. There will be a component which is going to be awaiting area, there will primarily be a lounge area, they will have a fireplace component as well as an eating location. The perimeter of the building will be an enclosed porch on

three sides providing ample room for both winter and summertime and this is what it would look like as a rendering from the exterior as far as this enclosed porch is concerned and that's essentially the project. And I'd be happy to answer any questions the board or public may have.

MR. NOVESKY: We'll open up for public input. Please introduce yourself and say where you're from, if you have comments directed specifically with regard to this project they'll be taken and noted in the minutes.

MR. ROSSI: Good evening, my name is Achilles Rossi, R-O-S-S-I, together with my wife and daughter we own the adjoining property, the residential property at 28 Quaker Avenue. At the conclusion of last month's meeting, I had the opportunity to talk to Mr. Minuta and he was very polite and forthcoming responding to our questions. I would like to get into the record his responses to me and should I have misinterpreted him, I apologize and I will stand corrected. He said that the drainage from the Quaker Avenue overflow will be directed away from our property at 28 Quaker Avenue, okay, that's what he stated. He said that the lighting from the various light poles and the freestanding illuminated signs will be diminished in the vicinity of our residence as pertains to the bedroom side of the house. He stated that the garbage dumpster will be located in the rear from our property line will be entirely enclosed by a block wall and fence. And that there will be a 6 foot tall fence along that perimeter around the back of the property. He said that the trees along the border of the driveway all the way back will be removed. I have no problem with that, even though they're somewhere near our line because they really don't provide any kind of buffer for tall, canopy is weak and some of the branches may fall down. A few questions I have now are these. The transformer and refrigeration equipment make any type of noise or continual humming sound during the night when people

are sleeping? If you'd like me to ask them all at once or answer them individually it's up to you.

MR. NOVESKY: Just a matter of going on the record.

MR. ROSSI: What are the days and hours of operation? I don't think I asked you that question. Will liquor and/or beer be served? And another question I'm concerned about and I alluded to it before about the drainage how are you going to tie in the sidewalk improvement or transition to the sidewalk in front of 28 Quaker Avenue? What there is of that sidewalk in front of our house is very depressed, okay, very poor, sunk down, there's no curbing there and the water that comes off Quaker Avenue runs right into our driveway and into the basement, every time we have flooding rain, we have a flood and we have to have a sump pump. This might not be, this projects concern when the Town improved the sidewalks and the road coming from Elm and Quaker coming east they put new sidewalks in, beautiful high curbs and stops right about where the trail or sign is picked up the last house on that row just before Oak, the corner of Oak, so three houses, my house and two other houses and the tailor house have no curbing or no sidewalk to speak of. There's something but it's kind of sunk down and lumpy. My concern that Mr.--

MR. NOVESKY: When you refer to the tailor's, who's that?

MR. RUSSO: That's the tailor property. I'm concerned some comment was made that with the design of the sidewalk and the curbing for this project it's going to kind of eliminate our water problem. I'm not so certain that may happen. I'm concerned that the Town never put curbs or sidewalks in from the first house at Oak Avenue to the sign that said Tailor Shop that's there's, no curb there, the water just flows off the road. When they redesigned the road in front of the

shopping center the hump just throws it right at us, I don't know if it's a concern for planning board or this Town or these people since you're going to be putting sidewalks, why not finish the job whatever you think can be done. And that's about all I have to say right now. I'm going to listen to what other people have to say.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. CHEVERE: Good evening, my name is Vidal Matos Chevere, I live at 28 Elm Street, I'm right over on the north side of this fence, that's my adjacent property. My concern is I've got a fence to look at from my deck and any provision if there is to put kind of shrubbery in front of the fence. Another one of my concerns is I've got bad drainage in that area, they're putting in blacktop, how's that going to affect me? Will it drain into my property. And that's basically it. Oh, yes on and the lighting, I have concerns about that if I sit out on a summer night on my back porch I don't want to be illuminated with all this lighting coming from there, what about the noise from the balcony on the outside, you said it's going to be all enclosed?

MR. MINUTA: Yes.

MR. CHEVERE: So I shouldn't be able to hear any noise generating from there?

MR. MINUTA: I wouldn't anticipate you'd hear anymore noise than you would from a residential person who's having a party or having a gathering for eating purposes.

MR. CHEVERE: Every day?

MR. MINUTA: With regard to some of that--

MR. NOVESKY: Excuse me, sir, you're out of order in

the back.

MR. MINUTA: With regard to some of the acoustics, you'll have some mitigation by the fence that's being put up, shrubs do not block noise, structures do that, will mitigate some of the sound that may come from this area. As with regard to the rest of this, I really can't comment on that because I'm not an acoustical engineer and acoustics are something that are very tricky type of situation.

MR. CHEVERE: But I'm also concerned about the fence from that back porch, I see a big 6 foot fence running the whole length of my property back there. My question to that is does he intend to put in shrubbery? He's got to hide that and make it more presentable.

MR. MINUTA: With regard to this plan if I may the plan shows the fence along this side, the finished side of the fence will be to your property so you'll have a finished look to your side which I'm not sure if that's Town Code but that's generically what we did for most properties so you'll have a finished fence look like a wood stockade type fence which would be a decorative wood fence. With regard to the shrubbery, it would be on Quaker & Main's property and we would not be impeding on your property whatsoever for this project. With regard to your drainage issue, as I stated before, we're going to be regrading, perhaps I did not, we'll be regrading this area, filling this portion of it and with the curbs that are being placed here we'll actually be changing the grade so that water that flows from this point down will actually flow toward the central point here where there will be a catch basin and secondary point here. The flow of that storm water would then go through a culvert pipe underneath the ground into the existing storm water to the property to the west.

MR. CHEVERE: To the west that would be Dr. Mahar's

property?

MR. MINUTA: That's correct.

MR. CHEVERE: I guess that's all I have to say on it, thank you.

MR. NOVESKY: Any other public?

MR. LICARDO: My name is Richard Licardo, I live at 27 Elm Street right behind Woody's and that wraparound deck you're going to have is that going totally around the whole, in the back too?

MR. MINUTA: Three sides.

MR. LICARDO: On what, both sides this way and in the back?

MR. MINUTA: The deck will come across the back here, and this is the entrance point, there will be windows along here and windows along here, this is about four seats, excuse me, four tables or four tables at the location and the majority of the tables and seating are towards the interior.

MR. LICARDO: How many tables?

MR. MINUTA: Total number of seating is 69.

MR. LICARDO: Sixty-nine on the outside deck?

MR. MINUTA: No, it's not an outside deck, it's an enclosed porch that has windows.

MR. LICARDO: Windows or screens?

MR. MINUTA: Windows and screens.

MR. LICARDO: So it will be open?

MR. MINUTA: It may be, yes.

MR. LICARDO: Now, is this place going to serve alcohol?

MR. MINUTA: That will be to the discretion--no, I'm being told no.

MR. LICARDO: Otherwise the 6 foot fence it's not going to block this porch that all the houses around are going to be seeing people sitting out, when I sit on my front porch, I'm going to see people eating hamburgers, is that what it's going to be?

MR. MINUTA: Not technically, from the rear you're going to have windows and you're going to have a fence depending on where your vantage point is. If you're standing on the top of the roof you may have a good look from other perspectives. Unless we get an analysis, we wouldn't be able to tell that it wouldn't be more than anybody, let's say somebody has a bathroom to the rear and they're taking a shower.

MR. LICARDO: That's one person, not 69 people looking in my front yard and my front house.

MR. MINUTA: Where is your property in relation to this?

MR. LICARDO: Right in the back of this place.

MR. MINUTA: Here?

MR. LICARDO: Where is the back?

MR. MINUTA: Here's the rear of the lot.

MR. LICARDO: I'm the house right there.

April 2, 2007

11

MR. MINUTA: You're right here?

MR. LICARDO: Yes.

MR. MINUTA: So in relation to the gentleman who just spoke, are you also in this location?

MR. LICARDO: Yes, his house is right next to the fence you're putting on. I'm right here.

MR. MINUTA: This is not Elm, this is this gentleman's property, this here is the sewer easement that runs underneath so his property is--so you're on the opposite side.

MR. LICARDO: I'll be seeing the porch that's going to be out there, yes, I will, because I can see the house clearly right now and a 6 foot fence is not going to cover that.

MR. MINUTA: With regard to your application being on the other side of the street, I don't live in your house, I haven't been there, I don't see it but with regard to that, it would appear to me that if you're on the other side of the street you're much further away than--

MR. KLOSKY: Mr. Chairman, really, we're supposed to be getting comments from the public rather than a conversation with the developer at this time.

MR. NOVESKY: Good point, Led, we'll restrict our comments to comments.

MR. LICARDO: I'd like to know the hours, what time you're opening and closing?

MR. MINUTA: They'd be whatever hours would be recognized by the Town for this type of establishment.

MR. LICARDO: That's all I got to say.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you. Any other public comments?

MR. CHEVERE: Just one question, I understand on the doctor's side there will be no fence?

MR. MINUTA: On this side there will be no fence but there will be shrubbery.

MR. CHEVERE: Cause one of my concerns I wanted to mention earlier is the people will be cutting across my property just to get to that establishment, how do, how can we resolve that?

MR. MINUTA: Is there a path that leads to it? I don't know of any--

MR. CHEVERE: A lot of people do cut across basically around the doctor's property to go to the mall or to the like to CVS or something like that, they cut right across but they'll be cutting more and more through my property just to get to it to go there to eat.

MR. MINUTA: Those are hypotheticals, I really can't answer to that. You have your own property, you're the owner, you can do what you wish with your property so you can mitigate that to your own liking.

MR. CHEVERE: Thank you.

MR. NOVESKY: Are there any other public comments?

MRS. LEWITT: Nancy Lewitt, 22 Hazen Street. I'd just like to know if Dr. Mahar knows about this?

MR. MINUTA: Yes, Dr. Mahar--may I address?

MR. NOVESKY: Yes.

MR. MINUTA: Dr. Mahar does know about this, we have discussed the project with Dr. Mahar.

MRS. LEWITT: Thank you.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you. Any other public comments? I'll take a motion to close the public hearing.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So moved.

MRS. DEANS: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	ABSTAIN
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: Close the public hearing at 7:51. Thank you very much. Okay, Dominic.

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, at this point if the board has any additional concerns you could authorize the resolution to be prepared for next month's meeting for consideration.

MR. NOVESKY: I think I'll defer discussion on that until the close of the meeting. Is that okay?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Discussion on?

MR. NOVESKY: On next action taken, Mark Edsall's expected to be here, he may have some suggestions.

April 2, 2007

14

MR. BRODMERKEL: So we'll bring this up again later?

MR. NOVESKY: Yes.

MR. CORDISCO: I might add you also had technical comments from the other consultants related to this project.

MR. NOVESKY: We have several projects to cover, I think we can address them.

PENNINGS_ENTERPRISES,_INC._#2007-03

MR. NOVESKY: With Pennings we have lot line change. Is Pennings represented here? We understand this is a lot line change issue, correct? We'll give you a brief moment to please basically it's a lot change from the rear of the property.

MS. YOUNIE: Laura Younie.

MR. NOVESKY: Your relationship to the project?

MS. YOUNIE: I work for the Pennings and Fred would like to take, this is the existing lot line right here and he would like to move it over and square it off to this line here and then in the future he would like to be able to sell that property cause he doesn't have a use for it but we do need more space for growing mums in the back yard.

MR. NOVESKY: Does anyone have any questions?

MRS. DEANS: Am I reading this map right, this part is that what you're going to move over, is that where you've been putting all the fill in the last few years?

MS. YOUNIE: That would be out in this section over here, Route 94 is out there and it would be over in that section there, this has been a flat level section.

MR. NOVESKY: Leslie, do you have any comments?

MS. DOTSON: Just seemed to me that it was a fairly straightforward lot line change to convey additional land to the greenhouse operation. They put together a zoning compliance table use group C applies, it's default residential use in the residential district, they have shown the deductions for the presence of the pond. I noted that there were no well, there's no well or septic system laid out for the sending parcel but

comment 3 just notes that this required referral to the Orange County Planning Department. I have given you a copy of the County Planning Department's response, they left it to local determination, they had no comments on that. So comment 4 just noting that it does not require a public hearing and that you would be free to act as long as the County's responded so we're suggesting you could do so if you desired.

MR. NOVESKY: Engineering comments?

MR. DENEGA: No.

MR. NOVESKY: Any legal comments?

MR. CORDISCO: Just to reiterate the board can determine whether or not the public hearing is required.

MR. NOVESKY: I will defer them to the board, ask that we discuss whether or not a public hearing should be required.

MR. BRODMERKEL: We have been notified that there's a concern from the public, therefore, I'd like to schedule a public hearing next month.

MR. NOVESKY: Is that in the form of a motion?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Yes.

MR. KLOSKY: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE

April 2, 2007

17

MR. GRABE AYE
MR. NOVESKY AYE

MR. NOVESKY: We'll schedule a public hearing for next month.

MS. YOUNIE: Thank you.

LATIMER_SUBDIVISION_(ZBA_REFERRAL)_#2006-16

MR. NOVESKY: Latimer subdivision up on the agenda to number 2, are they represented here?

MR. QUEENAN: My name is John Queenan from Lanc & Tully Engineering representing the applicant, John Latimer. We're before you tonight, I don't know if you're familiar, we were before you I believe in December, we were a 2 lot subdivision. Since that time, we have addressed most of the consultants' comments, one of them being providing topo for the whole lot. When we did the topo for the whole lot through the construction of the existing house on lot 1 we're no longer able to provide two acres of net usable area for each lot, I believe we're about 16,000 square feet short for the entire subdivision so we're before you tonight to ask for a referral to the Zoning Board.

MR. NOVESKY: Leslie, do you have comments?

MS. DOTSON: Question, this is more for your benefit just to note that you had indicated the federal wetlands specialist was waiting to conduct a site visit. I suggested that you might want to wait for those results before you go to the ZBA because if there are any deductions then you don't want to discover that you need to go back to the ZBA.

(Whereupon, Mark Edsall entered the room.)

MS. DOTSON: All sheets of the plan should show all recorded easements. I was a little concerned because sheet 2 of the plan seemed to show the proposed well for the new lot either directly adjacent to or perhaps extending into the drainage easement. I'm not sure if that's a problem legally, I wasn't sure if there are any legal restrictions against locating a portion of the proposed swale in the drainage easement as is proposed, so I had referred that to Dominic's

attention.

MR. QUEENAN: If need be we'll move everything out of the easement.

MR. CORDISCO: I'd be happy to take a look at the language of the easements if that becomes a problem just provide us with that or move it either way.

MR. QUEENAN: I'll try to move it, if not, then we'll be back.

MS. DOTSON: That was it.

MR. NOVESKY: Any other issues that need to be covered on this? Hello, Mark, nice of you to join us, congratulations on your swearing in as council person.

MR. EDSALL: I don't know if Eric told you there are some outstanding issues relative to the sanitary systems, the applicant's requested that you authorize installation of a curtain drain, that's a reasonable request given the slope, we need to get a true reading on the soils versus ground water and we'll work with the applicant on the balance of the issues as long as you authorize that installation.

MR. NOVESKY: Make a motion on that.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: Before we do that, do you want to ask about the--

MR. KLOSKY: We resolved that earlier.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: About the curtain issue?

MR. KLOSKY: The curtain drain installation, does anyone witness that?

MR. EDSALL: No, actually, the curtain drain is

intended to redirect ground water so when they do the soils test, they get a more realistic value, it's very common, in fact, the testing will occur anyway now they're going to attempt to redirect ground water before the testing is finished.

MR. KLOSKEY: Is the intent of the installed curtain drain for the purposes of the test only or for purposes of the long term establishment of the leach field?

MR. EDSALL: I would suggest you let them put in the curtain drain as shown on the design plan. At worst, if it isn't developed, it's just going to redirect ground water.

MR. BRODMERKEL: It will help later.

MR. EDSALL: Yes.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: That doesn't affect the leach testing at all?

MR. EDSALL: It does, it helps, it will effectively get a true reading and the soil permeability capacity versus right now it's picking up ground water, we have done that many times in the past, very common when you have this type of situation.

MR. CORDISCO: The only thing I would ask in the discussion is that of course the applicant's doing this at their own risk and they need to acknowledge that because it might be that whatever they're planning on putting there.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Still doesn't hurt.

MS. DOTSON: If the Zoning Board doesn't act in their favor they have no subdivision.

MR. QUEENAN: We're fully aware.

MR. EDSALL: Any property on record if they did not have an application before the board they go out there and dig a trench any time they want, the only reason they need the authority of this board once you make an application under the code you can't do work without asking permission.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Make a motion we forward this to the ZBA.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

OMNIPOINT_COMMUNICATIONS,_INC._#2007-02

MR. NOVESKY: Omnipoint Communications, are you here?

MS. BONOMOLO: Good evening, my name is Cara Bonomolo, I'm an attorney with the law firm of Schneider and Schneider LLP representing Omnipoint Communications, Inc. Omnipoint is seeking a special permit and site plan approval for a co-located structurally mounted wireless communications facility on the existing building at 70 Pleasant Hill Road, also known as the Tectonic building. The facility will consist of 6 small panel antennas co-located on the roof, the existing building together with related equipment cabinets on the ground adjacent to the building. Pursuant to Section 158-22 (F) of the zoning code, the facility is entitled to expedited review procedure, since it's a structurally mounted facility in accordance with that expedited review procedure we have submitted certain required materials such as an affidavit from Omnipoint's radio frequency engineer demonstrating that the facility is going to remedy a significant gap in Omnipoint's reliable wireless coverage. We have also submitted a structural certification which certifies that the existing building has the capacity to structurally support the proposed facility and that the facility will be designed in accordance with all the applicable structural standards. We have submitted visual renderings which depict how the facility would appear if it was constructed on the building and we have submitted a report which demonstrates that the facility will operate in compliance with the FCC standards regarding radio frequency exposure so I'd be happy to answer any questions you have.

MR. NOVESKY: I think you should be complimented on the quality of this work, very good. Leslie?

MS. DOTSON: I won't reiterate the applicant's

representative's comments, I think that she's fairly well stated what the situation is. This does trigger a mandatory referral to Orange County Planning Department under General Municipal Law. I have made that recommendation. We have received comments back from the County, they encourage the antennas to be similar to the sky, I think the board would require and they made a local recommendation, local determination. I was a little confused Exhibit 2 stated the letter report will be prepared verifying that the structural integrity of the existing building will not be impaired by the additional loading.

MS. BONOMOLO: In the meantime when that letter was written the calculations were done and that's the second part of that exhibit which includes that.

MS. DOTSON: It was a little confusing.

MS. BONOMOLO: I apologize.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you, Leslie. Mark?

MR. EDSALL: I have three comments but I will, first one may be a clarification, there's a plat, Exhibit A that shows the proposed coverage, is it the intent that you add that plat to plat Exhibit B to understand where your coverage is proposed?

MS. BONOMOLO: Exhibit A shows the existing coverage that's shown in green and then when you look at Exhibit B the blue coverage is the proposed coverage.

MR. EDSALL: What's the proposed on Exhibit A then?

MS. BONOMOLO: There's no proposed coverage on Exhibit A cause there's no blue that's shown there on the right here that's probably from another site that's proposed in another municipality.

MR. EDSALL: As opposed to something other than what we're looking at here?

MS. BONOMOLO: Right.

MR. EDSALL: So the point being is that that is really not proposed as part of to this application.

MS. BONOMOLO: That's correct.

MR. EDSALL: So the true proposal is Exhibit B?

MS. BONOMOLO: Yes.

MR. EDSALL: The second suggestion I had is that enclosure of the fence be in black vinyl coated chain link fence so that it's less of an eyesore as it maybe rather than just conventional galvanized chain link fence.

MS. BONOMOLO: We're proposing privacy slats, so would you like the black vinyl in addition to that?

MR. EDSALL: Privacy slats through--

MS. BONOMOLO: Black vinyl.

MR. EDSALL: Through galvanized looks horrendous, it's a zebra, so if you make it with the slats, it's a lot better. My only concern was on the side of what I believe is a Nextel enclosure the adjoining site there are two boxes, I don't know what they are, if they're electrical junction boxes or whatever, there's only three foot clearance to those boxes, I think we should know what they are, make sure there's adequate room to access or maintain those boxes.

MR. BODA: Those are the air conditioning units and they only need three foot clearance.

MR. NOVESKY: Your name?

MR. BODA: Anthony Boda, Tectonic Engineering, they're wall mounted.

MR. EDSALL: Okay, with that answer I have no other issues.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you, Mark. Then we have the issue of waiving or not waiving public hearing.

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, that's correct, Section 158-22 of the code deals with the citing of a telecommunications facilities and the code specifically encourages the co-location of facilities where there's already an either an existing tower or existing antennas, in this case, and the code does give the board the authority to waive public hearing where it feels it's appropriate.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, next question, does this board feel it's appropriate?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Just to confirm my understanding there's a very limited impact on visual from any direction at all in this particular case?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, the applicant did put together a comprehensive application package that included visual impact analysis and it clearly showed that there was very minimal impacts.

MR. BRODMERKEL: With that understanding, I'd like to make a motion to waive the public hearing.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: Yes, I'm just clarifying you're going to put six more antenna on the roof, they're going, they'll be identical in size?

MR. NOVESKY: There's a picture.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: Just checking, they'll be identical in size to what's already there?

MS. BONOMOLO: I don't know the specific dimensions of the Nextel antennas, they'll be similar in size and they will not be any higher than the Nextel.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: They'll be similar in color, sky color so there's six that would be in the middle of the roof, right now, they seem to be on the ends.

MS. BONOMOLO: No, actually, they'll have three sectors similar to Nextel, two antennas per sector, one sector will be towards the front of the building on the northwest portion of the roof and then the remaining four antennas, the other two sectors will be on the back of the building.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: Total of how many antennas they're adding?

MS. BONOMOLO: They're adding six.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: Just want to be clear. Can I ask you another question? I'm just curious, seems as though these are being added to increase your distance or your area to the north only, is that what this map shows us?

MS. BONOMOLO: No, the map shows that there's coverage to the south as well.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: So why are we doing this?

MS. BONOMOLO: Well, you can see here what's shown on the map is that there's not currently existing coverage along the Thruway and along Route 32 and the surrounding area there's a hole and then when you look at Exhibit B and you can see where there's blue, the

proposed coverage it provides coverage along the Thruway and along Route 32.

MR. HAZIRJIAN: Okay, just wanted to clarify, okay, thanks.

MR. NOVESKY: I have a motion on the floor and a second, is there anymore discussion? Roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: Then I'll ask for a motion to consider preparation of appropriate resolutions.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So moved.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. CORDISCO: I will prepare the resolutions for next month's meeting.

MS. BONOMOLO: Thank you very much.

VAILS_GATE_BUSINESS_PARK_#2006-17

MR. NOVESKY: Vails Gate Business Park.

Mr. Tom Depuy appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. DEPUY: Since the last meeting--

MR. NOVESKY: For the record, your name?

MR. DEPUY: Tom Depuy with Depuy Engineering.

MR. NOVESKY: I can actually cut you to the chase if you'd like me to.

MR. DEPUY: Sure.

MR. NOVESKY: There's a lot of questions related to the status of the mediation on the project site and I'm going to immediately defer to Led to ask the questions so we can get right to the heart of the issue.

MR. KLOSKY: Right, our concerns principally relate to what is the status of the ongoing remediations in terms of details because we just want to make sure that operationally the remediation doesn't conflict with the establishment of new site details, clearly some work is going to be done on the site as part of the new site plan and we're curious as to exactly how that work would interact with the work being done now. You have called out very well on the plan RF11 you have called out very clearly the 11 areas of concern. My specific question at this point is now I know the extent of those areas but I'm not sure exactly the sequencing of the remediation that's going to be taking place in those locations, that makes it difficult to understand how that remediation is going to fit in with the site work.

MR. DEPUY: Unfortunately, I'm not in charge of the cleanup, I'm the site engineer, we laid this over as was requested, I know it's an ongoing project with the state and basically if you look there they're installing monitoring wells and other stuff which are really temporary installations so they can finish their testing. Now when I talked to Keith from Clough Harbor, he said they expect to do the testing in early May to get the answers that they need, they don't anticipate anything in these areas but they're following through the work and that was set out with the DEC.

MR. KLOSKY: Then it would be difficult without the monitoring without the completion of the monitoring as we discussed last month, without the completion of the monitoring it would be difficult to determine exactly the extent of the work proposed in each of these areas of concern, would that be a fair statement?

MR. DEPUY: Yes but it's an ongoing project.

MS. BABCOCK: Really there's only one area of remediation that's really a concern which affects the parking layout of the project and that's something that we have discussed and which Gary would be able to phase approval so we would not be able to put a tenant in a certain position of the building until that remediation was completed, otherwise, nothing shown on the plans should affect the board moving forward on the site plan application itself.

MR. KLOSKY: So for instance the former 20,000 gallon underground fuel tank that's shown here, is that an area of concern or not? I mean, I was having a little trouble exactly RFI1 you show something--

MR. BRODMERKEL: If I could ask a question here, I think we went over the impact and the legal significance of what we can do and can't do in this.

MR. KLOSKY: That's correct.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So getting into the details of what's going on here are not in our purview and is not something we can be involved in, am I incorrect?

MR. CORDISCO: Well, you don't have jurisdiction over the cleanup but it's really solely as it relates to the redevelopment of this site and I don't mean to be drawing too fine of a hair, you know, in that regard.

MR. BRODMERKEL: But in a discussion we had at length last month my understanding was that only thing that's impacting it is several parking spaces and the statement was made if I remember correctly that those parking spaces if they were withdrawn we'd still go ahead with this project.

MS. DOTSON: Actually, just to interrupt because they're not even there anymore, the plan is actually shifted so that was what was discussed last month, those comments aren't even relevant anymore because the parking was shifted, now it's the detention basin, I'm sorry, the storm water basin that's shifted in that area, the parking has been relocated elsewhere and it actually works fine so that's not an issue.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So then none of this impacts the project.

MR. CORDISCO: It doesn't appear to be the case, no.

MS. DOTSON: No but I did have some additional questions about some of the monitoring wells.

MR. NOVESKY: Go ahead.

MS. DOTSON: Which is they did change the plan and part of the problem is that all the plan sheets really need

to match now because--

MR. DEPUY: We only had one that was contradictory, we have made that change.

MS. DOTSON: That's the one everyone's looking at and so that's introducing some confusion here so I just wondered whether the presence and the functions of some of these monitoring wells, the one near relocated pond 2 would be compatible with it or whether that would create a problem.

MR. DEPUY: I went over that with Clough Harbor, they don't have a problem with that or the other one by the pond area, I went over concerning their monitoring of the ground water in those areas.

MS. DOTSON: My other concern just because there are several monitoring wells scattered as you can see throughout the parking area paved areas that need to be available for truck circulation I was just concerned if those are going to be either permanent or semi permanent site features that they, first of all, would need to be shown on all the plan sheets, not just the RF sheet and secondly that there would be need to be some way to show how these would be passable with the truck traffic.

MR. DEPUY: I went over that with Clough Harbor also, actually, these are temporary monitoring wells, however, I know your concern if we're out there and they're doing work so I had gone over them, they, we would cut them off flush and put accessible truck load type of cover on them in order to get into them.

MR. KLOSKY: So monitoring wells, this comes back to sequencing so the monitoring wells are in place now?

MR. DEPUY: Some of them are.

MR. KLOSKY: That's my main question, it seems to me like there's a lot of details about exactly, seems like the remediation and use of the site are going to be going on simultaneously, correct?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Could be.

MR. DEPUY: Yeah.

MR. BRODMERKEL: But it doesn't affect the project.

MR. KLOSKY: Maybe.

MS. DOTSON: That's what we need to determine.

MR. KLOSKY: I'm not convinced of that, I mean, they have to install the monitoring wells, they have to use the monitoring wells, I'm not sure how long they're going to be in place, what they're going to look like, there's no detail how they're going to cap them off to make sure when they're parking trucks on top of them they don't get destroyed. I've seen many monitoring wells backed over by trucks and destroyed, it makes it difficult to do any environmental work when the wells are halfway through the monitoring process the wells disappear. So it seems to me that there are some details related to the use of the site which is in our purview that I'm not clear exactly how it's going to happen.

MR. DEPUY: Basically, we'll cut them off flush and put an H2O loading cap on top of them, if you want to put a detail right on this drawing that will revolve your question with respect to the access and usability of them, if they're not there when we get there then we have to do it.

MS. DOTSON: That's fine.

MR. KLOSKY: All right, I'm satisfied with that.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, Leslie, are you finished with your comments?

MS. DOTSON: Just mentioned that they have completed their cultural resources study. Clearly, they have revised the plan in order to address one of the concerns that had been identified in the report, they had identified a specific area of disturbance and they studied specifically that they shifted the storm water basins over to remove it from an area that had not been studied so if the cultural resources study could be corrected and revised to conclusions and the supporting exhibits that would be fine, it certainly doesn't need to be done for the board to conclude this aspect of SEQRA, I'm just saying for SEQRA.

MR. DEPUY: I went over that with Chuck Thomas, he's going to clean up the report, make sure there's no ambiguities with respect to the application. We request that we do need the Town to request a review of the report.

MS. DOTSON: We do, I thought he sent it in directly.

MR. DEPUY: But they won't review it unless it comes from, it's their new rule, I had that in my letter, I just don't--

MS. DOTSON: Okay, I didn't realize it was that silly.

MR. DEPUY: I know, it's something new.

MS. DOTSON: That's fine, we can do that. Along with a negative declaration, I would hope. I just had a little correction, I think that your plans are slightly off on the actual parking count just a teensy bit under represented, even in the two different plan iterations between last month and this month you exceed what you need so that's not a problem, I'm just saying--

MR. DEPUY: I think you're missing the two on the corner here, they're existing those two.

MS. DOTSON: Okay, yup, you're right so now you're accurate, thank you.

MR. EDSALL: First just a typo number 2, I think Eric told you that's not SEQRA code, I just omitted the number 2, there's two outstanding issues we're waiting for the completion of the storm water pollution prevention plan that would be reviewed both by DEC and our office. We have been talking with Tom about that so that's he's aware of that and DOT it's been referred up to DOT for comments on Route 94, I have not seen any correspondence from DOT as of yet.

MR. GREELEY: It was sent to you at the Town of New Windsor.

MR. EDSALL: Oh, it's a nice place. In all honesty, that was referred from New Windsor because that was where the access was located, so they're purely commenting relative to SEQRA and that they agree with the improvements, conceptually agree and it looks as if they're suggesting that I move on to the highway work permit stage. So based on that this is the best we're going to get guys is a concept approval, that's their procedure, it looks as if they have no objection to what's proposed.

MR. CORDISCO: And at this point, the public hearing was held in February and was closed very same night. There were no public comments as I recall, the matter has been referred to the County Planning Department which came back with a recommendation for approval with specific comments, I believe that those comments have either been addressed at this point and I think the next step is for the board to consider making its determination under SEQRA.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I have one question, the one question I do have is there are trenches internally in the building that obviously do impact this site and if I remember correctly again somehow they didn't impact what we wanted to do but I don't understand that anymore.

MS. DOTSON: They didn't affect what the planning board wanted to do, in other words, you could approve something.

MR. BRODMERKEL: It's existing already.

MS. DOTSON: Because it's inside of the building that falls between DEC to the extent that DEC is involved and Gary's office to say that the building is safe to use, as silly as it sounds, you can approve something today they could never get built because it's architecturally unsustainable or whatever.

MR. BRODMERKEL: My only question--

MR. KLOSKY: I have another question, monitoring well C-H-A, is that actually in the pond in what is now pond number 2, I guess I'm starting to finally understand what Leslie was saying, plan ES2 shows a plan called pond 2 looks like it's in the pond.

MS. DOTSON: I scaled that, it's on the edge, it's on the slope going out.

MR. KLOSKY: So the pond that's shown on RFI1 is not in the right spot?

MR. DEPUY: That's right, that was the one correction.

MR. KLOSKY: I think I now get it.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, so our question is do we ask the honorable counsel to ask him to prepare a negative dec, can I have a motion that would be a request for a motion?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Make a motion we ask counsel to prepare a negative dec.

MR. KLOSKY: Pending the changes to the monitoring well detail.

MR. DEPUY: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: Do you want to amend your motion?

MR. BRODMERKEL: If I have a second then we can amend it.

MR. GRABE: Second it.

MR. NOVESKY: We'll make an amendment.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Amendment stands as stated.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. DEPUY: Are we going to take any action with respect to site plan?

MR. NOVESKY: Resolution prepared for site plan approval next month.

MR. CORDISCO: I think that that's certainly possible, I think that it would be a conditional site plan approval, I believe there's obviously outstanding issues regarding the storm water, the SWPPP and also obviously need DOT approval as well.

MR. NOVESKY: I'll ask for conditional approval.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So moved.

MRS. DEANS: Second it.

MR. NOVESKY: With the conditions as stated by Dominic, all in favor?

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

QUAKER_&_MAIN,_LLC_(CONTINUED)

MR. NOVESKY: We have a discussion for Quaker & Main.

MR. EDSALL: Yes, I apologize for being detained.

MR. NOVESKY: For the record, Mr. Hazirjian is stepping down from discussion on this topic.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, Mark?

MR. EDSALL: I'm assuming that you have reviewed the plan and received public comments, if anyone has any questions, I can tell you that my comment included a number of corrections, some of them as I have for those board members that I had e-mail addresses I advised you of some additional progress that was made by the project surveyor to resolve some open issues. The rest of the comments I truly believe are cleanup comments. I don't believe any of them are, they would modify the layout of the plan. All of them really deal with technicalities, the one that involves kind of a new review is the lighting I believe that should be approached with a different type of format in the drawings so I can verify spacing and proper lighting coverage but as I said the rest of the comments aren't earth shaking.

MR. KLOSKY: So you would say that none of the extra work that you're asking for from the applicant is substantial or would in any way sort of hamper the use of this site as intended.

MR. EDSALL: Oh, absolutely not, these are all issues that I just think it will resolve in a better functioning site, a lot of the corrections.

MR. NOVESKY: Any other comments?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Couple questions, public comment

brought up a question regarding water south, excuse me, east of this property on Quaker and the impact of mitigating the problem to this property, what's the impact down the road on the three properties between here and the end of the street?

MR. EDSALL: Is it ground water?

MR. KLOSKY: Surface water was brought up by a member of the public.

MR. CORDISCO: There's no curbing.

MR. EDSALL: I don't know that we can add anymore burden on this applicant beyond what we're doing, what we're doing is asking that he's part of the site development, reconstruct the curb and sidewalk in front of his property, including an extension for transition to the east and the west. Bob Conley and I have suggested and the Town Board is considering the completion of the remaining sidewalk and curb such that the Oak Street to the new intersection of the traffic signal and Elm would be complete.

MR. NOVESKY: For the record, that would mitigate a lot of the concerns.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Has the Town committed to that?

MR. EDSALL: They have not and I think it would be appropriate for this board to just issue a short note to the Town Board saying that this improvement is being accomplished in front of this site plan which now results in a small area that needs to be completed and ask that the board seriously consider moving forward with that.

MR. NOVESKY: Leslie, would you make that note?

MR. KLOSKY: Could I maybe ask the rest of the board

would it be appropriate for us to ask Mr. Edsall to draft such a letter in our name for the board?

MR. EDSALL: I can do a short memo.

MR. KLOSKY: I'd like to move that we instruct the planning board engineer to draft such a letter.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	ABSTAIN
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. EDSALL: Just an update why I'm sure we'll have this discussion is that you may recall that there was objection to the fact that the crosswalk had been eliminated, we have no choice because it was, I won't call it unsafe, but it should never have been there because of grade problems.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Improperly built.

MR. EDSALL: So I have been working with Phil Greeley who was just here because Phil was involved with the striping all the way through this section, we now have a composite map that covers all the way from the firehouse property up to Cedar and we're rearranging striping not only to address this application but to put this crosswalk back in, create a left turn lane into Oak heading toward the traffic circle which doesn't exist now so I'm sure we'll be discussing this stretch of road not this coming but the following meeting scheduled I will have that memo ready.

MR. KLOSKY: You might mention--

MR. BRODMERKEL: For the board meeting next week you're saying?

MR. EDSALL: No, the Supervisor, I have sent him a note suggesting some investment into striping and even some of the reflectors on the roadway to delineate.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That will be a meeting with you and the Supervisor?

MR. EDSALL: And the highway superintendent and I don't know if you're normally the contact with the Town Board if Mr. Brodmerkel would be authorized.

MR. BRODMERKEL: If the board would be inclined, I would like to attend that meeting.

MR. NOVESKY: Why don't we direct Mr. Brodmerkel to attend that meeting since you're such a willing volunteer. All in favor?

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	ABSTAIN
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. KLOSKY: In your letter you might mention the likely increase in pedestrian traffic, even the desirable increase through that section with the completion of the assisted living and senior living facility going up now adjacent to CVS, I think the chances for increased pedestrian traffic is desirable

and highly likely.

MR. EDSALL: That's why we're--

MR. BRODMERKEL: The other question I would ask is the crosswalk as I see it proposed is a good location, does the Town then put in a new barrier or walkway across what is now mulch for the access?

MR. EDSALL: I can tell you that this applicant has agreed to provide the handicapped drop on his side, we have currently at the workshop Cornwall Plaza who are preparing a plan to come back and see you folks, I have already warned them that they need to work on this entrance and providing connection to the crosswalk, crosswalk is not going to be as shown here, it's going to be slightly different. But the answer is we have already told Cornwall Plaza to expect us knocking on their door and I'm sure when you see their application you'll be happy to see that it's been addressed.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you, Mr. Edsall.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Last question on the left-hand side I queried last week the driveway that's proposed on the left-hand side or the west side of the project will be I would guess three feet in the air as to the property next door.

MR. EDSALL: The plan that I alluded to which was the updated plan was not available for submission because they were still in negotiations with Dr. Mahar who's to the west. We had a field meeting with Dr. Mahar, the applicant for this project, Steve Drabick, myself and Bob Conley to go over both the storm water connection, how it could be affected and also to discuss grading and let's call it the grade conflicts for the hole that exists to the west of this application, they have obtained a temporary grading easement filling in that hole and going quite a bit into the probably 50 feet

into the neighbor's property so those grades will be softened quite a bit.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That property, whose is that?

MR. EDSALL: It's Dr. Mahar's with a paper road that as I understand it when you do a title search comes up as being owned still by Dr. Mahar so that grading problem goes away.

MR. BRODMERKEL: But there's some kind of a drawing or whatever that makes you confident that that driveway--

MR. EDSALL: I will be making sure that the plan that convinced me that it will work will be part of the final set that Joe submits.

MR. NOVESKY: Any other questions?

MR. BRODMERKEL: No.

MR. NOVESKY: Any other questions from the board?

MR. GRABE: I have one, Mr. Rossi had a question about the transformer on his side of the building, is it possible the transformer can get on the west side of the building?

MR. EDSALL: What was the concern because it's behind the fence because it's on the far side of the fence, you won't see it.

MS. DOTSON: It's the noise.

MR. EDSALL: Okay.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Is that an applicant problem or Central Hudson problem?

MR. EDSALL: I imagine you can put it on this other

side.

MR. MINUTA: We'd have to coordinate with Central Hudson but I don't foresee that being a substantive issue, Central Hudson would concur.

MR. EDSALL: You can try to move it in what would be the northwest corner of the building in that back corner of the building.

MR. NOVESKY: If you can figure that out.

MR. MINUTA: There's a sidewalk area there which is an enlarged sidewalk area, it could potentially be placed there, again, it's going to require some coordination from Central Hudson, it will be underground service coming up to a transformer.

MR. GRABE: Did they coordinate this one on your plan?

MR. MINUTA: Yes, we discussed this with Central Hudson.

MR. GRABE: They gave you a location already?

MR. MINUTA: Yes, we discussed where this was going, the type of service that was at the pole, how we might better serve this location.

MR. KLOSKY: I guess that while I'm sensitive to the neighbors' issues at the same time this isn't a, this is in the central commercial district of our Town so if it is possible to relocate the transformer I think that would be great if the applicant could do that at the same time I hesitate to require of the applicant.

MR. GRABE: We're just trying to answer the neighbors' questions here, I think.

MR. MINUTA: Clearly my applicant wants to be a good

neighbor so we're all working towards the same goals.

MR. NOVESKY: If it can be done, it will be done.

MR. MINUTA: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: Dominic, what's your recommendation for the next move?

MR. CORDISCO: Well, at this point, the public hearing is closed, it seems that the various issues have been discussed and now if you want you can authorize the negative declaration and site plan approval resolutions for next month.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I would make a motion that we authorize Dominic to go ahead with the motions, how do I say pending the items that we have discussed tonight showing up on the plans as Mark has mentioned.

MR. NOVESKY: You said it exactly the way you should say it.

MR. CORDISCO: Subject to the comments.

MRS. DEANS: I will second the motion.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	ABSTAIN
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: I will note Mr. Hazirjian did recuse himself from voting and discussion. Thank you. With that, at 8:36.

April 2, 2007

46

MR. BRODMERKEL: Make a motion we adjourn.

MR. GOLD: I'll second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. HAZIRJIAN	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MRS. DEANS	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

Respectfully Submitted By:

Frances Roth
Stenographer