

December 7, 2009

1

TOWN OF CORNWALL

PLANNING BOARD

DECEMBER 7, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: NEIL NOVESKY, CHAIRMAN
KENNETH BRODMERKEL
WYNN GOLD
LED KLOSKY
WILLIAM GRABE
HELEN BUNT
MICHAEL LOBLANCO

ALSO PRESENT: DOMINIC CORDISCO, ESQ.
PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY

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 meeting to order at 7:31. All members present and accounted for.

DISCUSSION _____

MR. NOVESKY: Discussion, we're going to be asked to adopt are we not the 2010 planning board schedule. Anybody have any questions about that? And Mr. Edsall

has arrived.

LANDS_OF_COMITO _____

MR. NOVESKY: I also have a letter from Ryan McGuire asking for an extension of Mark Edsall's favorite, the lands of Comito, they're looking to extend the approval by six months. We'll discuss that under discussion?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MILL_POND _____

MR. CORDISCO: And you should also have a letter from Michele Babcock for the Mill Pond condominium approval.

MR. NOVESKY: I have a letter and Helen took it back, another extension for the Mill Pond, so we have, correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Cordisco, that we have two requests for extensions, one from the Comito Brothers and the other from the Mill Pond condominiums?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, Comito Brothers' request came in just recently but there's no reason why we could not consider it tonight.

MR. NOVESKY: We could consider it and extend it by six months is my understanding maximum and I would prefer to begin the extension immediately since they have requested it and would allow for--

MR. CORDISCO: It would be timely, you never know what the weather's going to be like in January.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'd like to make a motion that we grant both of these extensions.

MR. LOBLANCO: Second it.

ROLL CALL

December 7, 2009

3

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE.

MR. EDSALL: I just wanted the record to be clear for Mill Pond, the applicant is working with the town on that pump station actively we have been working with them.

MR. NOVESKY: That will make Mr. Brodmerkel very happy.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I don't live down there, I don't care.

MR. EDSALL: They're working.

APPROVAL_OF_MINUTES_DATED_OCTOBER_5,_2009

MR. NOVESKY: Before we proceed, approval of the minutes. Everybody receive the minutes for October? Anybody have any objections to them? Fran, that means you've done a good job. Accept a motion.

MR. LOBLANCO: So moved.

MS. BUNT: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

DISCUSSION

MR. NOVESKY: Discussion, we do have one item to discuss, Dominic, we'll ask that you explain the wind turbine issue. Mr. Brodmerkel had some questions.

MR. BRODMERKEL: If I could suggest that we allow the gentleman here to go first and he can go home.

MR. NOVESKY: Very good, thank you for suggesting that.

ZIEGLER_#2009-14

MR. NOVESKY: We know that this is going to be referred to the next work session, we'll keep the explanation brief and planning board's questions will be very brief.

MR. YANOSH: Again, my name is Dan Yanosh, surveyor for the Ziegler family. A subdivision was done back in 1988, two lots off Ziegler Lane, William and Pat Ziegler on the lot which is 6 Ziegler Lane and Frank and William on the front lot which is 5.19 acres. Right now, the lot line going across perpendicular to the property behind the sheds William and Patricia are looking to sell the property, move to Florida, they want to readjust the lot line back to where the stream is just to give the big lot in front more acreage. It's a better defined line for a property line. There's lawn in the back here, it's mowed, it's taken care of, just to clean it up a little bit, make it a little nicer, that's all.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you. Comments? Leslie?

MS. DOTSON: I faxed these to you but my concern with this is that, well, one of my concerns dealt with that he's submitted the proxies but my other concern was that there were lines missing from the zoning compliance table on one of them and one of them was a problem because it looked, it didn't show gross, it only showed gross lot area instead of net so he needs to show the deductions. And I'm aware of that property having a rather vivid memory of the original subdivision and how flat it was by the stream and how wet it was so I'm concerned about the possibility of federal wetlands associated with the stream and that would need to get looked at. So this also requires referral to Orange County Planning and they have not responded yet so--

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you, Leslie. Mark?

MR. EDSALL: Very short, just to make sure that the bulk table has pre and post areas on the table to reflect the give and take between the lots. And I don't believe lot 30.22 has the well shown on it, just wondered if he could add that on the final plan.

MR. YANOSH: Okay.

MR. EDSALL: That's it.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you, Mark. Dominic?

MR. CORDISCO: Mr. Chairman, as Leslie pointed out, the application required referral to the County Planning Department and this board cannot act at this time, the applicant's engineer has received comments and I would suggest that he schedule time at the Planning Board's work session so we can go over comments on moving the project forward.

MR. NOVESKY: Is that okay with you?

MR. YANOSH: No problem.

MR. NOVESKY: With that, I don't know, unless any board member has any particular comments that they would like to add. Very good, planning board, I think that we'll just wait until you get through the work session and take care of that.

MR. VINSON: It's the 17th this month.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Thank you.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you.

MR. YANOSH: Thank you.

DISCUSSION _____

WIND_TURBINE _____

MR. NOVESKY: Dominic, now we'll ask you to discuss the wind turbine thing and Mr. Brodmerkel will have some interesting questions and then we'll cut him off.

MR. CORDISCO: Yes. The Town Board has referred to you a proposed local law that would allow the placement of single turbine, wind turbines, wind mills for lack of a better term in certain districts within the town. Those districts being ARR, MRC and PIO. Those are the less dense more rural districts where presumably there would be less of a visual impact or impact to neighbors as a result from the wind turbines. The Town Board has a public hearing on this matter on next Monday and they would like, they have requested your report and any comments that you may have prior to the public hearing. The Town Board asked us to take a look at this a number of months ago and it had some genesis in the fact that Black Rock had come to the work session and had talked about placing one or possibly two wind turbines as part of its educational program and that got us thinking about this particular issue. As you know, the town zoning code is a restrictive code so if it's not something that's actually allowed and written specifically in the code, it's not something that you could do. Of course one of primary issues that people are concerned with these days are renewable energy resources, wind is renewable energy, there are a number of grants that are available including up to a 50% installation grant from the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority and so there are funds that are available. These are very costly endeavors to put up, it doesn't cost \$5,000, I think it costs closer to \$20,000 per wind turbine and with those grants, it's an important part of the factor because it takes a long time for these kinds of facilities to pay off in terms of offsetting your cost of using

electricity from standard sources.

MR. LOBLANCO: At least ten years.

MR. CORDISCO: Right, we didn't re-invent the wheel however when we were asked to look at this local law, what we did is we took what we thought was already working which is the town's cell tower law and used that as a model here so that if someone's proposing to put up a wind turbine at their location, the first thing they have to show is that they are in an area of the town where it's allowed and secondly, they have to come in to this board and apply for a special use permit which is not there just for the asking, they have to provide that there's, they have to show that their proposed wind tower or wind turbine is not going to have a detrimental affect either from safety, health or environmental viewpoint on any of their neighbors. And so that's how the, how we couched it and that's what's before the town at this time. So I think I could probably keep on talking about this but then I get paid by the word so I'll stop at this point and address any questions you have. And of course Leslie and Mark took part in this even though they're being quiet at the moment, they do have some ownership of this document so that's what's before you.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, with that, I think Kenn you had a question?

MR. BRODMERKEL: My comment is since it's an aspect that would be allowed not automatically but as an application, Dominic, the term for that is what again?

MR. CORDISCO: Special use permit.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Since that is what we're talking about the SLR which is minimum two acre property should be included in the allowable areas, i.e., you'd have to go through the same number of gyrations to show that it's

not going to affect your neighbors as you currently do but if you met those qualifications you could put one up.

MR. NOVESKY: Well, knowing the territory as I do as well I think this is a reasonable suggesting, I would agree with it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Thank you.

MR. LOBLANCO: So do I.

MR. NOVESKY: Anyone else?

MR. KLOSKY: My only comment has to do with the viewshed impacts, I mean, I'd like to know that pretty much where in the Town of Cornwall they're talking about putting these things up that we'll be able to if appropriate ask for a visual impact statement and then if we believe the visual impacts are severe we can turn them down. I mean, I think that we owe it to the neighbors certainly to make sure that somebody doesn't put up 100 meter monster that's going to degrade their own enjoyment of their property.

MR. CORDISCO: On that particular point, what the law proposes is that any wind turbine are going to be considered a Type I action and requires a long form EAF which has some viewshed analysis in it. But then the board would have a discretion to require a full visual impact assessment if you feel that it's warranted, if there are sensitive receptors that are in the area but if it's a wind turbine located in the ridge preservation overlay district where viewshed is a primary concern, visual impact assessment must be provided, it's not discretionary at all in that scenario.

MS. DOTSON: And to go further--

MR. KLOSLY: We could deny an application in the event that we felt like the visual impacts were severe in the ridge line preservation district or any of the districts?

MS. DOTSON: Only in the ridge line preservation district. That was one of my concerns because right now the way the regulations are written for the ridge line preservation overlay district is such that this is a residential district so you can put a house so we didn't want to say you can't use your residential to put a house. However, we did realize that while a house is not optional in a residential district, a wind turbine is. So we do say that you may deny approval for any wind turbine if you find that there's a significant adverse impact and hasn't been adequately mitigated with respect to idea of the height, you're probably aware that the level of productivity--

MR. KLOSLY: Yes, the higher you make it the better they work, I got that.

MS. DOTSON: Right but the maximum height limit that's in the law for this is 100 feet as measured to the edge of the top most blade so we--

MR. KLOSKY: Is that enough?

MS. DOTSON: Depends on where you are.

MR. BRODMERKEL: The new ones it's more than enough.

MS. DOTSON: It depends on how far it's sited from trees and because you have to have it so many feet from anything that's going to create turbulence so if you're near an 80 foot tree then that's not going to be a great location. So you're probably going to be taking down trees in order to do it.

MR. GOLD: Is this just dealing with the design that

we're accustomed to the big fan design or also deal with the vertical turbine design?

MR. CORDISCO: Well, it measures from the--

MR. EDSALL: The ones that are vertical turbines.

MR. GOLD: Is that in here?

MR. EDSALL: That was one of the things that I had brought up that's become more popular the vertical turbines mounted to the structures.

MR. KLOSLY: You have an axis like this and it spins like this, an axis like that and spins like that, vertical access wind turbines are mechanically much less complex, people like them cause they're cheaper.

MR. EDSALL: They look like a ventilator fan on your roof and they aren't as noticeable if I can use that word but they do provide some electrical benefit.

MR. GOLD: Is there a provision for that designing in here?

MR. CORDISCO: And there's also a provision for the freestanding signs, not only is the 100 foot height limitation there but there's also a requirement that they be set back from all property lines or easements or any right-of-ways, public thoroughfares one and a half times the maximum height.

MR. GOLD: The only other question does this deal with and I've read it twice now and I don't pretend to be a lawyer or even play one on television, does it deal with the possibility of building mounted ones?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, it does.

MR. GOLD: Okay.

MR. KLOSLY: Someone seeking a greater height could always apply for a, go to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

MR. CORDISCO: They could apply either for a variance or this board could consider a waiver of certain requirements but only upon showing of two things, one they would have to show that there would be no detrimental, they would have to show a need for it to go higher, for instance, because let's say someone needed to go to 120 feet rather than 100 feet, they would have to show a need for that and secondly, they would also have to show, this board would have to find that there would be no detrimental impact associated with that either visually, safety or environmental.

MR. LOBLANCO: Gary, anybody approached you with an idea of doing one of these things?

MR. VINSON: Yes, Black Rock.

MR. LOBLANCO: Aside from them?

MR. VINSON: No, they're the only ones.

MR. NOVESKY: Pursuant to Kenn's question about the SLR district being incorporated into that, is that in the form of a recommendation from the planning board?

MR. VINSON: That's where Jones Farm is right now, they wouldn't be allowed to do this.

MR. NOVESKY: Right, that's what I'm saying so correct me if I'm wrong, you're saying that we make the recommendation and Mike, you agreed with that, any other members that agree with that?

MR. VINSON: Can I throw something at you? The concern with the SLR would be that you have a lot of small residential properties so I agree that Jones Farm

should be able to do a wind turbine, it's an ideal place. I would think that if you're going to adopt the SLR you'd want to put a minimum acreage requirement because it's a large parcel thereby eliminating say residential parcels eight acres or less so you're allowing Jones Farm to have it but still eliminating the small residential properties that it's really not feasible to be on. Just a thought for you.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'm not in favor of having anybody in particular of having it or not but I think the confines of the way this is written meaning you can't affect your neighbors or anything like that says if you can do that on two acres you can do that on two acres. Why not?

MR. NOVESKY: Depending on the configuration of the property.

MR. KLOSLY: I would be comfortable as long as we can consider the aesthetic impact on the neighbor and disallow one if it, which I'm not clear it's possible outside the ridge line preservation so I don't think we can deny an application on a deleterious viewshed.

MR. CORDISCO: I have a different opinion. The law is crafted to type this as a Type 1 action requiring long form EAF and you can include whatever analysis, you can require them to provide an analysis including visual analysis as part of the application and SEQRA gives you the toolbox to say that someone has not mitigated their environmental impacts, including visual impact to the maximum extent practicable.

MR. NOVESKY: And you're comfortable with that?

MS. DOTSON: I think what troubles me about that I hear what he's saying but an individual residence your residence does not count as a significant visual resource, you're just a neighbor.

MR. KLOSLY: Right.

MS. DOTSON: So they don't have what we have been protected with so far in the zoning code is where we have specific flagged areas as being visual resources, you know, if you happen to be in a historic home or something you'd be covered by. Just your house if you're not historic I have questions whether you'd count.

MR. EDSALL: I tend to think from a practical standpoint that when you're saying you're going to have the biggest issues with these propagating up like trees in the forest would be in a residential district. So I think if you do want to have it SLR that you're suggesting you may want to suggest to the Town Board consider a minimum acreage so that there's a cut list so that you don't have to do the battle on 40 applications a year for people who say they're beautiful, you just don't like them. If you have a minimum acreage and there's a minimum cut that creates less problems for you.

MR. NOVESKY: Isn't there an economic cut, is it practical in certain cases cause they cost \$20,000 a piece?

MR. EDSALL: I'm looking at it from the standpoint if somebody has the wherewithal if they can afford it they'd piss off their neighbor, it has a lot of noise, terribly affects their viewshed.

MR. BRODMERKEL: It deals with noise?

MR. EDSALL: It does but in clearly a one or two acre lot it's going to become questionable.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Two acre lot is the minimum in this particular zone that we're discussing.

MR. GOLD: There is a lot of property that's grandfathered in like mine which is only one and a third.

MR. EDSALL: Even if it's two or three it means that enough smaller lots it's just not possible because the zoning doesn't allow it. That would just help you.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I would cut it off at two acres because that's what that is understood to be. So if it's grandfathered in as smaller that would be but I also want to say that one way or another I want to encourage this type of resources to be utilized so I don't want to automatically say no.

MR. EDSALL: Well, on real small lots you may want to.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Not if they meet the other requirements.

MR. LOBLANCO: I wouldn't be able to put one up at my house but certainly larger areas, two acres, I mean, I think is fair.

MR. EDSALL: It may be that the ones that you want to object to are the freestanding in lots two acres or less, a vertical one mounted to a building may have not been objectionable on a smaller lot, it may not be a problem at all, people have air conditioners that make more noise.

MR. LOBLANCO: True.

MR. NOVESKY: So do we want to make the recommendation that that SLR area be included?

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'll make a motion that the SLR area be recommended to be included in the zoning specifications within this law change.

MR. NOVESKY: I have a motion for additional--

MR. CORDISCO: If I could, just to clarify, however, based on discussion you're talking about adding the SLR or are you adding SLR and an acreage requirement in the SLR?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Okay, can I amend what I said to say that it would be any SLR residence with a two acre minimum.

MR. LOBLANCO: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. KLOSKY: I would also like to see language included which specifically allows us to reject an application if we feel the visual impacts are deleterious to their neighbors. My concern specifically is we have not been allowed to ask these even in a Type I action I can't ask unless there's a historic structure adjacent or structure of significance. So if you're in the middle of a residential neighborhood and somebody wants to hang it between me and the train trestle, I've got a good view and somebody wants to hang a windmill--

MR. EDSALL: You may not want to limit it to just visual, you might say impacts because if it's a case where--

MR. KLOSLY: I don't doubt what you're saying but I

just don't want to end up in court.

MR. EDSALL: Could be a noise issue.

MR. KLOSLY: But I guess I would like to see language included which allowed us to say in the event that you have detrimental environmental impact to include noise, whatever, whatever zone you're in, I can just turn you down.

MR. CORDISCO: Then if I could, I suggest you make a motion and take a vote on that particular issue that there's an issue but I think what we need to do is incorporate that in a report, we have a written report which I'm already going to have to amend which is not a problem to consider including the SLR.

MR. NOVESKY: We'll take that motion.

MR. KLOSLY: I move that we direct our report to contain languages which allows us to reject an applicant if they have deleterious environmental affects on their neighbors in any and all of the zones, not just the ridge line preservation.

MR. EDSALL: That they have it mitigated.

MR. KLOSLY: Right.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. CORDISCO: At this point unless you have any additional comments I'd--

MR. BRODMERKEL: I have one question. What does it cost for an individual to do an Environmental Impact Study?

MR. CORDISCO: Well, a study or the environment, an assessment long form, the long form is like--

MR. VINSON: Five hours at whatever rate they charge.

MR. CORDISCO: Right, it's like a thousand bucks to do the form itself. Now to do visual impact assessments requires more work so that's more work.

MR. KLOSLY: Wouldn't have to require it in all cases.

MR. VINSON: Long form is required on all cases.

MR. CORDISCO: Long form is required.

MR. KLOSKY: Right, but the visual impact is only required in the ridge line preservation district or where we can say no, we don't need one.

MR. CORDISCO: Right, but when you're talking about an environmental impact statement, my client just got a quote for \$100,000, you know, for one of those.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That's not what we're talking about.

MR. CORDISCO: Not here, no.

MR. EDSALL: Just a full EAF, long form EAF.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Again, in order to encourage this type of resource, I don't want to be throwing a lot of money on it, that's just procedural and I would, is there

another way to do that?

MR. CORDISCO: The way it's written right now is that like I said, the long form EAF has to be submitted and I think that there's justification for that because that helps you identify if there's anything else that you should be looking at closely. One of those things is visual, you have the discretion as it's written right now you have the discretion to require more visual analysis but if it's in the ridge preservation overlay district they have to provide it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: We're not going to change the ridge overlay.

MS. DOTSON: But the thing is you don't need anything very complicated in the ridge preservation overlay, you have accepted people's photo studies just looking, I mean, DEC has a procedure whereby you can set up and draw lines on a topo map and look at the features that are there and you can take photos from certain locations and you can do it yourself, it's probably helpful if you know what you're doing but it's something you can still do yourself.

MR. BRODMERKEL: My only point if I could to the board since it's up to our recommendation I will just speak to the board for a second is to say that we're trying to encourage reusable resources, to throw another thousand, \$2,000 bill on top of what's already a costly endeavor seems if it's not necessary I'm not in favor of it.

MR. KLOSLY: I don't think we should require visual impact studies for every windmill absolutely, not, it should only be for those where we look at the topo and say geez, or the public hearing comes up. As it's written right now, I think if somebody came in at the public hearing and said geez, this is going to block my views, we could not reject an application unless they

were in the ridge line preservation district or there was a historic structure next to it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: What you did was good, that's not my question, we did that, we voted on that and that was good. But my question now is you want to put a turbine up, you've got the acreage, your neighbors, you don't, you'll meet all the requirements, but we want to throw another \$2,000 bill in your way just for doing the long form, just because we want.

MR. KLOSKY: I think many people can fill out the long form without assistance.

MR. VINSON: Why not accept the short form if you honestly don't think, in other words, it comes in, this is a great place for it, why couldn't they just submit the short form?

MR. CORDISCO: On that particular point, if I can address that, all of provisions of the code there's an escape valve for all the provisions of the code saying that this board can waive them and waive those requirements if they make a showing that it's not necessary and that there it won't involve any environmental harmful affects.

MR. KLOSLY: Can we include language in this law?

MR. CORDISCO: It's in it, we put it in there specifically.

MR. EDSALL: Isn't the law written to require the application to include the full EAF?

MR. CORDISCO: It does but then it goes on to say--

MR. EDSALL: If you've already done it and waive it maybe what Kenn's saying your initial application has to include short form and that unless waived by the

board second meeting you have to submit the full.

MR. CORDISCO: But this is what it says right now, if I may, it's on page 10, waiver of requirements, the planning board in its sole discretion may waive or modify the requirements of this sub chapter upon good cause shown and upon a showing and determination that such waiver modification will not adversely affect the public safety, health or welfare. If someone comes in to you and says I don't have the money to do a long form EAF or I don't need to do one because it would be overkill in this particular situation, then this board could say short form EAF would suffice.

MR. EDSALL: But what's listed as the application content?

MR. CORDISCO: Is the long form EAF.

MR. EDSALL: So when they submit they're going to read it and spend the money.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I would like to have that language changed.

MR. GOLD: I think Mark's proposal--

MR. EDSALL: You can't get in the door without a short form and it says that you have to do a long form as a followup after you've introduced the project.

MS. DOTSON: Unless they come to the workshop.

MR. EDSALL: We have no right to waive it.

MS. DOTSON: We can suggest coming to the board.

MR. VINSON: People really need real direction, they need to know what step A, B and C is.

MR. EDSALL: Consultant reads the law the way it's written, they'll do a full EAF.

MR. GOLD: Can I move we adopt Mark's suggestion to require a short form and whatever else you've said?

MR. EDSALL: A short form in your initial application and you must submit a full EAF at the subsequent meeting unless waived by the board.

MR. GOLD: What he said.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'll second that.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: I need one final motion.

MR. CORDISCO: You should have one final motion directing me to modify the report that was previously written and that would authorize me to make the modifications to the report and send it to the Town Board.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That wording did change the fact that it is not required upon the initial to have a long form.

MR. CORDISCO: What it is it's making the recommendation to the Town Board that they make those changes.

MR. GRABE: Can I ask something, a question please? Once this law is adopted because this is all new to everybody in this state actually can it be changed easily?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MR. GRABE: Can I add, make an amendment?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MR. GRABE: As you see it's progress.

MR. VINSON: The Town Board can.

MR. CORDISCO: The Town Board can and it was written conservatively.

MR. GRABE: Town Board can at our recommendation.

MR. VINSON: You can suggest that they make changes.

MR. CORDISCO: It was written conservatively because of that, because it's easier to slightly open the door rather than to throw it wide and try to close it later on.

MR. LOBLANCO: Need that in the form of a motion?

MR. CORDISCO: Motion to authorize me to make the changes.

MR. KLOSKY: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

December 7, 2009

24

MS. BUNT AYE
MR. GOLD AYE
MR. NOVESKY AYE

MR. NOVESKY: With that, I don't know that we have anything else to talk about. Motion to adjourn?

MR. BRODMERKEL: So moved.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY AYE
MR. LOBLANCO AYE
MR. GRABE AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL AYE
MS. BUNT AYE
MR. GOLD AYE
MR. NOVESKY AYE

Respectfully Submitted By:

Frances Roth
Stenographer