

**VILLAGE OF CHATHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
JUNE 22, 2020
7:30 P.M.
MINUTES**

Call to Order at 7:35 p.m.

Present: Chairman D. Herrick; Members L. Ponter, L. Korda, F. Iaconetti; Village Attorney Ken Dow; Building Inspector E. Reis; Village Deputy Clerk P. DeLong; Timothy and Michelle Carr, NiMax LLC representative R. Lagonia, B. Wallace of Wallace Architecture and attorney J. Catalano, AG Carpentry Inc Representative A. Gaylord, Railyards LLC representative K. Kneller, Milap Seema Realty Corporation Representatives B. Patel and M. Patel, Mike Duval of NYS DOT; Multiple Residents.

- 1) Application # 2020-037: 11 Coleman Street, Chatham, NY; Timothy Carr, Applicant; Application/Suburban Residential/Special Use Permit – *Approved.***
- 2) Application # 2020-038: 15-19 Hudson Ave, Chatham, NY; NiMax LLC, Applicant; Application/Site Plan for Restaurant - *Tabled to next meeting on July 27, 2020 for remaining requests.***
- 3) Application # 2020-061: 35 Main Street, Chatham, NY; Aaron Gaylord/AG Carpentry Inc, Applicant; Application/Historic Review – *Approved.***
- 4) Application # 2020-027: 90 Hudson Ave, Chatham, NY; Railyards LLC, Applicant; Application/Minor Site Plan/Commercial Review - *Tabled to next meeting on July 27, 2020 for remaining requests.***
- 5) Application # 2019-170: 2 Church Street, Chatham, NY; Milap Seema Realty Corporation, Applicant; Application/Site Plan for Fence – *Approved***
- 6) Approve Minutes from May 18, 2020 Meeting – *Approved.***

Other Business:

- 1. None**

L. Ponter makes a request that all in attendance mute their microphones until they need to speak to the Chairman. D. Herrick agrees.

1) D. Herrick starts by reading the application number noting proposed use is for animal husbandry. T. Carr and M. Carr are present. L. Ponter references the letter from the CCPB noting there is no countywide or intercommunity impact. D. Herrick reads the letter from the CCPB noting that the Board may make take final action with a majority vote.

D. Herrick opens the meeting to the Public. No comments are made

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to close the Public Hearing, seconded by L. Ponter.

L. Korda-yes, L. Ponter-yes, F. Iaconetti-yes, D. Herrick-yes: Approved by all

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to recommend the approval of application 2020-37 based on the original application, additions to the application and the response from the CCPB, seconded by L. Ponter.

L. Korda-aye, L. Ponter-aye, F. Iaconetti-aye, D. Herrick-aye: Approved by all

2) D. Herrick reads 2020-038 and asks if the Board members have any questions or comments. L. Ponter references the drawing and asks if the ramp in the back of the building will be for deliveries. He voices his concern that there may not be enough room for delivery trucks. D. Herrick adds that School Street is a one-way street. B. Wallace explains that the ramp is for someone who has a hand truck, that deliveries will be made in the front on Hudson Ave., how there are no planned deliveries in the back but how someone with a large delivery and a hand truck can use the ramp. F. Iaconetti states he has questions. He states this is in the Historic over zone and while it was not addressed at the last meeting, that this is something the applicant must comply with. He questions the building front as the façade faces Route 66. He observes there are alterations to the first floor of the building with a new entrance door on the take-out side, noting that any associated work must be detailed, and the information provided as to what is being done. Adding showing the materials used, application talks about painting but he does not know what the extent of the painting is, the only information about painting is the aspect of the wires that run along the front of the building but, he is inclined to believe painting would be more extensive. He adds they will need to identify locations, colors, provide paint chips and everything else for any painting that is being done outside. Existing sign on the side of the building talks about being re-lettered. Not a sign application, no details, no colors, no nothing to show what actually that sign is going to look like. He adds they did talk about the fact it could be done and submitted at a later date. He states he did not want the applicant to think because it is mentioned in this application that they are approving it as a sign. On the front of the building there are light fixtures on both sides of the restaurant doors. He observes there isn't any for the apartment door which he thought by building code there might have been. He adds those lighting fixtures need to be identified and manufactures cuts need to be provided to show what those lights are going to be. He asks if there is anything being done to the plywood covered windows and the wooden door on the side of the building. He states there is nothing indicated but wants it clarified for the Board as to whether in fact anything is being done. He adds in the rear of the building the fencing shown says pressure treated fencing, nothing about the design of the fence, the appearance of the fence, solid fence or partially open fence, nothing about the color; if it is going to be colored. The dumpster that is getting enclosed with fencing, that information needs to be provided. He asks about the neighbor, if the fence is

existing, and if it will extend further than what is currently there. He observes the neighbor will be looking out toward the dumpster along the side of his property.

The cooler proposed on the deck says "to be determined" but the height, color and size need to be known. Exhaust shown in the works of the building for the kitchen area, need to know the location on the building and the appearance of them. He observes that the deck on the back is above ground and states they need to know the height and if it is a solid surface deck or an open type. He adds it says pressure treated, so he is assuming it is pressure treated, but assumptions are not so great. He asks if there is anything being done with those bored up windows, etcetera that are on that side of the building. He adds, there is an area before the deck from School Street that is very broken up. It is dirt, rocks, concrete, whatever and is curious to know if this is a loading, unloading, delivery area and is any surface treatment will be done to that. He states again, lighting fixtures on the back of the building, no details for the lighting fixtures. He adds it has to do with the Historic over zone component of the project. He states regarding the survey provided; page 3 is very concerning because of a question at the last meeting that had to do with the tables and chairs in front of the building, whose property are they on. He reads note 3 from the surveyor that the right of way is assumed to be 30 feet. He states he does not accept assumptions on something of this nature. He asserts that one can contact NYS DOT and they will provide their highway boundary maps to show where the highway boundary is and where it is located in relation to that structure. He asks about the accessibility of the disabled people noting there is no indication of any ramps at any of the entrances of those buildings. He adds that they are putting in a brand-new door on the one side of the building and completely gutting, renovating, reestablishing, and creating a whole brand new 1st floor. He states that he would like to see a letter from the appropriate State agency of the review of the proposed project with their decision and request of compliance if they have any. He voices his concern that the Planning Board could be in jeopardy by approving a project without having true clarity as to whether this project requires addressing the ADA. He then asks how they have a building permit already, remarks that there is a building permit posted in the window, notes there is considerable construction going on inside the building, declares there is a dumpster parked outside the building full of construction material, and observed people coming in and out of the building with construction material. L.Ponter references the drawing as asks for clarification of the stairwell on the 1st floor plan layout. B. Wallace confirms that is just to show the width of the existing stairwell, that there are no new changes. He responds there is no new painting on the front of the building, that is just to show the existing lines painted the same color as the background and they do not plan on painting anything new on the front of the building. F. Iaconetti asks about the existing electric service wires being painted the trim color. B. Wallace replies that the existing service wires are painted the exact color of the trim, so they blend in, no change. F. Iaconetti responds, no painting on the front of the building. B. Wallace confirms there is no painting on the building unless it is the same exact color. F. Iaconetti expresses that paint chips would still have to be presented for the new doorway as it will result in construction that will require painting, that chips and things need to be provided and it need to be identified what that is. B. Wallace asks even though it is the same exact colors that are on the building. F. Iaconetti affirms they need to be sure so that they have something on record. B. Wallace asks; so that is the Boards' decision then? F. Iaconetti affirms that is the Boards' decision. D. Herrick recalls an instance where the Board was told it would be the exact

same color, it was painted, and what they thought was going to be the exact same color was not. F. Iaconetti mentions applicants painting in one area, discovered it made the rest of the building look poor, then decided to paint the rest of the building. B. Wallace responds to the existing sign, if it is an issue they don't have to do the sign, the idea was it was already there. F. Iaconetti affirms they have the right to redo the sign if they provide the information in terms of the information needed for a sign application. B. Wallace responds regarding the light fixtures and confirms they are traditional lights and can get manufactures cuts, there is nothing planned to be done to the School Street side. F. Iaconetti reminds that nothing planned now is fine, but if they in fact do something, they need to come back before the Board to make us aware of what is planning on being done. B. Wallace responds to the fencing design, they can provide a design of the fence which is pressure treated lattice work. F. Iaconetti states, going back to the front, they didn't mention anything about the new doorway. B. Wallace confirms it will match the existing doorway on the opposite side, that the intent was that everything would be exactly the same and wouldn't change the outside of the look of the building, except for replacing the plate glass door and the pilasters on either side. F. Iaconetti states the other Board members may want a manufactures cut of the door. D. Herrick asks if the new door is going to match the old door exactly. B. Wallace confirms that the door to the right side of the front elevation along with the pilasters, will match the new entry door along with the same transom unit above it. L. Korda asks if there will be a ramp for the disabled. B. Wallace responds that the elevation difference is 4 inches. F. Iaconetti interjects that the elevation difference is 7 inches as he measured it himself. B. Wallace replies that the right side door is 7 inches, the new entry is only 4 inches. F. Iaconetti states he did measure the existing door. B. Wallace explains that it is up to code, but if a ramp is required, they could put in a 4 inch, simple grade type of ramp as anything under 6 inches does not require rails. F. Iaconetti asks what if they take the takeout side out, what about a customer who wants to go into the restaurant side. B. Wallace confirms that a disabled person can get from the takeout side to the restaurant side. R. Lagonia notes they had intended on using the right side once the restaurant opened with no changes to the right side. F. Iaconetti asks if there will be an ADA compliant pathway for them to get through and voices concern that the right side needs to be changed because of the magnitude of the work that is taking place in the building. He states he is not an authority, so he is asking a State agency to review to confirm if a ramp is necessary on both doors. B. Wallace confirms the building is in the Historic over zone. F. Iaconetti states that ADA talks about being in a historic area. R. Lagonia points out other buildings on Main Street that have had new construction and do not have ramps. F. Iaconetti states that the whole point in getting a state agency who is responsible to review it, so that it is clear, so the applicant does not get into a situation with a civil rights case. B. Wallace asks to confirm if this is a building code issue. F. Iaconetti reiterates compliance with ADA. K. Dow explains how Federal and State laws are not enforceable by the Planning Board as it is not within the scope and purview of the local Planning Board as they are evaluating the compliance with Chatham Zoning Code. F. Iaconetti reads the general provisions of article 1, No. 3 regarding the aspect of a step up being a safety issue. K. Dow affirms that has to be applied within the context of the Chatham code. F. Iaconetti redirects to the aspects of the rear of the building before B. Wallace was interrupted, regarding the fence, cooler, height of the deck and surface, windows in the back, surface treatment in area, light fixtures and location of exhaust fans. R. Lagonia explains that the plywood is rotted and does not cover an

actual window. He states he will just pull and replace it. He conveys that he is just trying to fix up the building to make it look nice, be a good neighbor, and comply to the requests made at the last meeting. He adds that he intended on black top, so the area looked nice. He explains the exhaust fan will go out the back of the building and go straight up 30' so it will not affect the neighbors as far as sound and odor; it will be just above the roof line. F. Iaconetti remarks that the proposed work is not indicated on the plans. R. Lagonia replies that he provided everything on the list of 15 plus items, did provide what was requested, and that the additional information is different. F. Iaconetti states that the Historic review was left out of the application, that these questions are related to being in the over zone. J. Catalano explains the over zone interpretation, observes that the only thing changing is the 1st floor façade, states he agrees with the door paint, and explains that the historic over zone does not extend to the lot. F. Iaconetti suggests that he review the sections of the zoning as Historic over zone deals with anything that takes place on the outside of the building that can be viewed in a public way. D. Herrick notes that the deck in the back can be seen from the road is a change, the cooler on the deck can be seen from the road is a change, the fence is a change. J. Catalano observes that this is all shown on the plans. L. Ponter asks if the exhaust fan will be visible from the road and looks to confirm the height. R. Lagonia affirms if they are on School Street looking at the back of the building, it is not visible from Hudson Ave. F. Iaconetti returns to the notation of the assumed 30' right of way on the survey, explaining that the surveyor needs to confirm the boundary lines with NYS DOT, stating this is not acceptable to him in terms of this issue. B. Wallace explains how the bearing was determined by deed and the lot lines complied to the survey. F. Iaconetti reiterates that the surveyor can go down to NYS DOT in Poughkeepsie and they will provide a document that shows where the highway boundary line is. J. Catalano explains highway boundaries are based on how the road was acquired by DOT. F. Iaconetti, K. Dow, and J. Catalano discuss the highway boundaries. K. Dow observes that the map is stamped by a licensed surveyor and they are basing it on the best information. F. Iaconetti voices concern that the tables and chairs may not be legally within the bounds of their property. K. Dow confirms this burden is on the applicant. D. Herrick confirms that the survey map provided is signed and sealed, only if there is proof this is wrong that this is the map they should go by. K. Dow confirms that is correct and how it is within the purview of the Planning Board. R. Lagonia explains the deck, at current it is a rickety metal structure, how he would like to replace that with a new platform to get into the back door, and how it does not go along the whole back. F. Iaconetti states that the new deck appears to go along the whole back area, the drawing needs to be revised. F. Iaconetti asks why a building permit has been issued for the property. E. Reis explains how it is strictly to start demo in the interior which is a permitted use by right. She confirmed this by inspection. D. Herrick clarifies that the deck in the drawing does not cover the whole back. F. Iaconetti confirms 20' wide, 18' x 10 ½' and remarks about article 8 under the new zoning things, he reads article 8. J. Catalano observes that refers to changing structures on the lot, this is in the interior. K. Dow confirms internal renovations are exempt under article 6, 110-15C. R. Lagonia asks for a list of the information being requested at this point. F. Iaconetti lists new door, new entrance paint, new sign, light fixtures with manufactures cuts, fencing, cooler, deck, exhaust fan. L. Korda verifies the height of the building, if the exhaust fan will be 30' above the roofline. R. Lagonia confirms it will be just above the roof line. J. Catalano explains that most restaurants have the exhaust straight out the back on the 1st floor, Mr.

Lagonia is bringing it to the roof which will disburse the heat and odor above the average building height. D. Herrick explains how they need to know what it will look like, description of the pipe and color. He clarifies the size of the windows with the plywood being replaced. F. Iaconetti describes the windows. R. Lagonia conveys how he is just trying to make it look nice, how he has been in the community for 30-40 years, how Covid could potentially put him out of business, and how he is willing to do what he needs to. J. Catalano adds that Rob is in a situation where he has to decide if he should relocate or enter into a long term lease at his present location and needs to know if this is a viable project. F. Iaconetti states they need to address the concerns of the historic over zone.

D. Herrick opens to Public Comment.

E. Watson states his property is about 26' away, that side is a patio he does relax on, he has no concerns about a restaurant going in, he notes the venting is being taken care of, he is happy with the improvements to the black top and fencing, and asks if there will be a grease bin in the back that might smell. He adds he has been a business owner for 35 years and understands, he has no objection. K. Kneller adds that R. Lagonia's restaurant would be an asset to the Village.

D. Herrick asks for the information to be provided on the fence and the vent to get the application taken care of.

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to table to the next meeting contingent on the applicant providing the information requested, seconded by L. Ponter.

L. Korda-aye, L. Ponter-aye, F. Iaconetti-aye, D. Herrick-aye: Approved by all

3) A. Gaylord is on the call. D. Herrick reads and describes application 2020-061. The Board Members discuss the proposed colors submitted for painting the building. L. Korda asks what is meant by highlights and notes the layered brick relief at the top of the windows. A. Gaylord explains the building does not have traditional wood bracketry like the rest of the street, it is inset brick, that is the color intended for the recessed part. D. Herrick asks about the color at the very top of the building. A. Gaylord explains the projected brick is the trim color and the recessed brick is the highlight. F. Iaconetti states that the application is confusing. A. Gaylord explains 5-9 Main is not moving forward at this point. F. Iaconetti asks if only the front of the building is being painted, what preparation needs to be done to surfaces prior to being painted and if there will be sand blasting. A. Gaylord confirms only the front, existing paint needs to be cleaned off, repointing involved, surface needs to be cleaned and dried, new paint is applied and there will be no sand blasting. F. Iaconetti asks if the existing paint has been tested for lead, if it covered up older paint on the building, stating it is a simple test, how older paint could have lead and he is concerned about lead dust and scrapings going all over the place, adding if the will cleanup daily. A. Gaylord explains that the building was painted in 2003 by VanAlstyne Brothers, there was no older paint on the building that was covered up by that paint and they will cleanup daily. F. Iaconetti asks how will they go about working on the façade, scaffolding or lifts? A. Gaylord states this has not been decided, most likely scaffolding. F. Iaconetti asks how will they protect people on the street and if disabled people can get through. A. Gaylord confirms he has a contractor install OSHA approved scaffolding which includes decks and above walkways. F. Iaconetti states that the agenda said this is for Public Hearing, how he looked at the minutes from the previous meeting, it does not indicate that this was for Public Hearing. A. Gaylord explains this application was not tabled, not in front of the Board in the past, is for

Public Hearing because all the letters went out. E. Reis confirms this is a whole new application where the Board can discuss the application, the colors on the building and have a Public Hearing. F. Iaconetti asks if there is a historical basis for the colors. A. Gaylord confirms he uses a colorist who is a good designer and normally bases on historic colors. F. Iaconetti voices his concern that the dark color is not keeping with the surrounding properties. L. Korda discusses the colors on the building. D. Herrick observes that the colors match other buildings on the street.

D. Herrick opens the public comment. No comments.

Motion made by L. Ponter to approve the application as submitted, seconded by L. Korda.

L. Korda-aye, L. Ponter-aye, F. Iaconetti-no, D. Herrick-aye: Approved

F. Iaconetti-no because the proposed color for the body of the building is not compatible to the other colors being proposed in keeping with the surrounding properties.

4) D. Herrick notes that application 2020-027 was not updated as requested.

F. Iaconetti asks K. Kneller if the addition is being built on a slab because he went down there and there was no slab on site and the floor elevation is 3' above the existing ground. He adds there were 13 vehicles parked in the location of the addition, applicant needs to address where those vehicles are going.

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to table the application as the information requested at the previous meeting has not been provided, seconded by L. Ponter.

L. Korda-aye, L. Ponter-aye, F. Iaconetti-aye, D. Herrick-aye: Approved by all

5) M. Patel starts by stating that he called the DOT engineer and asked him to be at the meeting as he was fine with a fence if they had a setback. M. Duval Clarifies that this was referred back to the safety group in Poughkeepsie, they don't have a lot of control what happens off the State right of way but are comfortable with an off set of 45-50' for the fence. He adds that the driveway in question has operated previously as a shared driveway, the intent is to continue to operate as it functions currently. He adds that ideally there would be an agreement between the 2 parties to legitimize, if the Village moves in this direction he would like to see it more clearly shown for the traveling public of how this is supposed to operate with arrows painted on the pavement and signs marking what is supposed to happen once they enter the driveway. His concern being cars come into the driveway and become confused, stop short, causing an accident on 203. M. Patel states to that end there will be arrows at the entrance to make sure customers know which way to go in and out, cones up now roughly where the fence will be, they will have signage up if required and planned on a 45' setback. L. Korda asks for clarification on the 45'. M. Patel explains this along the side of the building and a little bit before the building. L. Ponter asks M. Duval if they have a recommended minimum set back. M. Duval explains 65' to the corner of the building from the backside of the sidewalk, 45' in line with the end of the parking spaces, as designed currently cars in the spots does limit movement in that area, at least that far or greater would be inline with potential obstructions in front of the building. L. Korda voices a concern that 45' is not enough and would need to be further back 55 or 60'. D. Herrick adds 55 would be the minimum. M. Patel asks the reason for it being further back. L. Korda says looking at parking in front of the liquor store with cars backing up where there is a fence, more room may be needed. M. Patel notes the cones mark the fence, currently

they back up and miss the fence. F. Iaconetti references the site plan provided originally and remarks measurements from the highway boundary line back to the corner of the building is 65', the total length of the fence is 124.74'. He adds to eliminate confusion for motorists fence not beginning until 65', no question about maneuverability. He adds 45' is not much more than 2 car lengths, 2 cars trying to pull in waiting for someone to pull out, cars might be backed out onto the road. The fence portion, roughly 60' dimension far exceeds the entrance of the other side of the building which has an ingress and egress easement with Nancy Scans and a drive situation very similar is only 45' with no parking in that location. D. Herrick clarifies the 65'. F. Iaconetti adds that pavement marking are smart, unsure of signage and would like to know what Mr. Duval's thoughts are. M. Duval explains with this kind of arrangement circulation around the building becomes some what of a single lane driveway, smart to have signage out at 203 to direct. F. Iaconetti observes that the driveway off of 66 functions perfectly well, the reason for 65', if a car from Kneller's comes around the side of the building wants to proceed out on to 203 they can very easily get into that outbound lane. He adds that he does not think the State should be changing the aspect of the one way in, one way out, this might impede the business of the owner of that property, will affect both property owners. D. Herrick clarifies Francis's statement, 66 entrance should be 2 way, 203 2 way, make it a one way it will cause a traffic jam. F. Iaconetti adds a traffic jam and real confusion out on 66 or 203, people as a result of habit keep trying to come and out of the driveways the way they have historically. L. Korda observes that the cars parked in Kneller spaces will not have much room. M. Patel states the 2008 contract is void, technically the parking spaces should not be there. F. Iaconetti states it appears from the site plan that the cars at Kneller's are basically parking in Kneller's drive entrance, adding that is his creation and not the owner of Charron's. Being back 65' people could back out with no real difficulty.

D. Herrick opens to public comment.

S. Kneller refers to and reads the conditions from July 2019 referencing the one-way and signage. F. Iaconetti observes that the driveway entrance width is not being changed by this project with the fence being back 65' and the fence not coming up to the highway boundary line. S. Kneller reads the condition regarding the trucks exiting onto highway. F. Iaconetti states that the Village Board does not have the right to address access to turn Left or turn Right onto a State highway. S. Kneller affirms it is on the conditions that were printed from the website. F. Iaconetti States he does not know if the Planning Board has the authority to address traffic coming out onto the State Highway. K. Kneller explains when the curb cuts were done DOT Supervisor Freeman required an agreement be made, the terms of the agreement from 2008, and the terms between the attorney's and the property owners. M. Patel states that on June 5th the agreement was void per a letter from their attorney. V. Mackowski, M. Patel, and K. Dow discuss the agreement, letters, and history of agreement from a legal standpoint. V. Mackowski states he is concerned about the Kneller property rights and clarifies the agreement in place. M. Duval states he is not an attorney, the assumption was the agreement on being a shared driveway was no longer valid, someone has to make that decision. K. Dow affirms it does not matter from the Planning Board point of view if the agreement is valid or not because it is a private agreement between people and not governing to the Planning Board. L. Korda confirms the easement has nothing to do with the Planning Board and how they vote. K. Dow explains how the Board needs to proceed as if there is no easement at as they can't enforce it as part of

the zoning review. V. Macowski and K. Dow discuss the easement and the limited jurisdiction of the Planning Board. M. Patel reads the contract and minutes from November 2018, asking if that would restrict use. K. Dow explains the scope of the Planning Board review and compliance with zoning code. V. Mackowski should take in DOT concerns and safety of granting approval. D. Herrick confirms that the village zoning law, according to the criteria is 1) adequate vehicle and traffic access and circulation, 2) adequacy of open space areas for intended use. S. Kneller and K. Kneller discuss the fence as a structure. K. Dow explains encroaching and the easement within the scope of the Planning Board. F. Iaconetti reads section 110-26 regarding fences and walls, adding that the turn is a DOT issue, not a Planning Board issue. S. Kneller voices concerns about the driveway being narrow with big trucks turning in and out. M. Patel explains the one way if it was created by the fence closing one side of the entrance. S. Kneller, D. Herrick, M. Patel, and K. Dow discuss the adequacy of arrangement of vehicles, access and circulation, minutes and conditions. F. Iaconetti states that signage, etcetera is not an issue in relation to the fence as back 65' does not impede circulation. K. Kneller and F. Iaconetti discuss vehicle circulation and traffic flow.

Motion made by L. Ponter to close the public comment, seconded by L. Korda.

L. Korda-aye, L. Ponter-aye, F. Iaconetti-aye, D. Herrick-aye: Approved by all

Motion made by F. Iaconetti for installation of the fence on the west side of the property beginning 65' back from the highway boundary line and continuing until it meets the corner post of the existing fence that was previously approved, fence shall be the same height, and the same material and shall look the same in appurtenance in terms of the yellow piece they put on top of it to make it more visible. seconded by L. Ponter

L. Korda-aye, L. Ponter-aye, F. Iaconetti-aye, D. Herrick-aye: Approved by all

Motion made by L. Ponter to approve the minutes from May 18, 2020, seconded by L. Korda.

L. Korda-aye, L. Ponter-aye, F. Iaconetti-aye, D. Herrick-aye: Approved by all

ADJOURNMENT: 10:25 p.m.

Meetings are being held through Webex as per state government regulations due to the pandemic.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia DeLong