

A Public Hearing was held on Monday, November 5 2007 at 6:30 pm in the Tannersville Village Hall for the purpose of passing proposed Law # 4 regarding eliminating the assessment board of the Village of Tannersville.

Present: Lee McGunnigle, Mayor
Linda Kline, Trustee
Greg Landers, Trustee (absent)
Tony Lucido, Trustee (absent)
Mary Sue Timpson, Trustee
Mark Hyer, Planning Administrator
Catherine Palmieri, Deputy Clerk

Also present: Frank Marotto, David Kukle, Jim Planck, Daily Mail

The Mayor opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and asked for a moment of silence to honor the passing of John J. Leach, a former trustee of the Village, a veteran and committed citizen who served his community very well.

The Mayor opened the Public Hearing on proposed Law #4 of 2007 abolishing the Village of Tannersville as an assessing unit. The Mayor indicated that the Board of Trustees has been in agreement that having two assessments is redundant and exposes the Village to litigation. This has been discussed previously during the Public Hearing for the Budget when the assessing unit was eliminated as a line item. At that time the assessor had also resigned. We want to formally pass a law to accomplish this.

The Mayor invited comments from the public. Mr. Bates asked who is going to be doing the assessing? The Mayor replied that it is going to be the Town of Hunter. The Mayor continued that one single location for assessing seems to make sense to this Board and makes sense to him. If the Town is deficient on any records they will be able to get them from our office. We would still have a building department, building inspector and code enforcement person. We would just not be doing individual assessments. There was no comment from the Board and the Public Hearing was closed.

The Mayor made a motion to adopt the Proposed Local Law #4 of 2007 abolishing the Village of Tannersville as an assessing unit - subject to permissive referendum. Trustee Kline seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried. The Public Hearing was adjourned. The Mayor turned the meeting over to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Mark Hyer called the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting to order.

Present: Karen Terns, Zoning Board Member
Mark Hyer, Zoning Board Chairman

The first item on the agenda was to have been the Wiltse variance request. Mr. Hyer said Mr. Wiltse told him that he was withdrawing his application for an area use variance because he no longer wished to do a commercial building in the back. The building was to have been a garage to house construction equipment and to do business out of. Mr. Hyer said he advised Mr. Wiltse that the litmus test for a commercial site is that it is a place out of which business is conducted, commercial equipment is stored, etc. Regarding owners of commercial businesses who park their trucks at their homes or in back of their homes in the Village of Tannersville and the Town of Hunter, Mr. Hyer said this alone does not cause them to be considered commercial sites. The litmus test in the past has been the conduct of business...in other words customers would come there and seek your services. Just the act of parking a commercial truck at the site has not triggered it in the past to be viewed as a commercial site. Mr. Hyer stated that letters were received from two contiguous neighbors, who are present this evening, and at this time it is a moot point as Mr. Wiltse is no longer applying for a commercial building permit. Mr. Wiltse would not be prohibited from subdividing the land in back, building a house or applying for a residential garage. One of the neighbors asked 'can you define a residential garage, as opposed to a commercial garage? Mr. Hyer replied that you would have to go to the Code

Enforcement Officer for that. In response to a question, Mr. Hyer said that Mr. Wiltse would be permitted to put up whatever kind of garage the building code allows for residential use.

Mr. Hyer stated that the Wiltse application has been withdrawn. Were there were any further questions? There were none. Mr. Hyer closed the Wiltse discussion.

Mr. Prince asked what exactly is the Zoning Document in the Village of Tannersville. Mr. Hyer explained that it is basically a set back ordinance defining how far back a building must be set from the front, the back and the side lines as follows: 40 feet from the front and 20 feet from the sides. Regarding use, it's also dependent on where you are located in the Village. Mr. Hyer gave him a copy of the document and said it's all spelled out within.

Weinschneider Set Back Variance Request for Town House Subdivision.

Mr. Hyer asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. As there was no representative present, Mr. Hyer made a motion to close the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. All in favor, motion carried. Mr. Hyer turned the meeting over to the Mayor for the Planning Board Meeting.

The Mayor re-opened the Planning Board Meeting.

Present: Lee McGunnigle, Mayor

Linda Kline, Trustee

Greg Landers, Trustee (absent)

Tony Lucido, Trustee (absent)

Mary Sue Timpson, Trustee

Mark Hyer, Planning Administrator Catherine Palmieri, Deputy Clerk

Also present: Howard Bates, Jeff Prince, Frank Marotto, David Kukle, Barbara Mattson, Peter Barker

The Mayor called upon Barbara Mattson to talk about the Shared Municipal Services Grant. Ms. Mattson said that this grant has been offered several times in the past. Its major purpose is to save municipalities money by encouraging projects in several different areas: 1: Consolidation, 2: Merger, 3: Dissolution, 4: Cooperative Agreement and, 5: Shared Services.

Shared Services is what we are going to talk about tonight. This is defined as a joint provision, performance or delivery of a service, facility, activity, product or undertaking by two or more municipalities which each may lawfully undertake separately. An example they give is two or more municipalities joining together to hire a consultant to prepare a joint plan or feasibility study for the provision of, for example, water services for the potential of cost savings through shared services in areas of maintenance, purchasing, technology and administrative staff. Through Shared Services you are able to plan or create a study which will tell you what the Shared Services might be and how there might be savings. What we are talking about is a feasibility study which would explore the different options available to a town or village to find cost savings which might benefit both of them by undertaking this study. There is funding available up to \$200,000 per municipality. The feasibility study generally runs in the \$50,000 range. The expectation would be that 90% of the cost would be funded by the grant. For example, for the \$50,000 study, \$45,000 would be funded by the grant and \$5000 would be what the town or village would pay.

The Mayor asked who normally does this type of study? Ms. Mattson replied that it would be done by a certified planner or planning group and she knows several. The Mayor asked if the Board had any questions. Trustee Timpson asked Ms. Mattson if she understood correctly that the purpose of this grant would be to provide funding to hire a planner who would tell the Village where money could be saved by combining services. Trustee Timpson continued, after the planner tells us how money could be saved, would

there be another grant to implement the savings? Ms. Mattson replied that after the planning grant is awarded, there is also money available under the other items: Consolidation, Merger, Dissolution and Cooperative Agreement. You can obtain recommendations from the study to do any of the other items that are applicable to the two municipalities. Trustee Timpson: so there would be another grant? Ms. Mattson responded you might find out that you don't need funding to do this. But, yes, you could then apply for additional funding to actually follow through with the recommendations. Trustee Timpson: would you be writing the grant? Ms. Mattson: yes, I would be writing the grant. The Mayor asked for which municipalities have you written grants? Ms. Mattson said she has written grants for County Route One and the Town of Trenton.

The Mayor said currently we formally or informally share services with the Town of Hunter recreation-wise and with certain renovations that we will be doing to the Lake. Might there be additional funding for recreation available if we do the study?

Ms. Mattson said it's a somewhat flexible grant program. What they want to encourage is being careful and frugal. Ms. Mattson said that if the Village and Town were to do this grant, she thinks it would be looked upon favorably. The Mayor asked in the event we received the grant to do the study, would we direct the scope of the planners? How many different areas would they explore as far as shared services? Ms. Mattson read a number of areas from her paperwork, several of which are: reduction of payroll, payroll taxes, fringe benefits, reduction in staffing, improved qualifications of efficiency of existing staff, etc.

Mr. Jeff Prince mentioned that at the last Regular Board Meeting reference was made to the 2004 Master Plan. His feeling is that what is being discussed tonight, hiring someone to tell the Village what is needed, was already laid out in the Master Plan. It might be a good idea to have a grant writer, such as Ms. Mattson, look to obtain grant monies for items which have been already targeted as needing updating and changing, specifically, the Lake, the playground, etc. The Mayor called upon Ms. Karen Terns who wished to make a comment. She said she agreed with Mr. Prince and asked do we really need to apply for a grant to do a study? It might be better to apply for grants to obtain money to take care of things already known to be needed. Trustee Kline said that agencies to whom we may apply for funds like to see that a study has been done and this might put us in a better position to be viewed favorably.

The Mayor asked Ms. Mattson about the time frame. She responded that the application is due on December 14th. What would need to get done right away would be a resolution. I can give you a copy by your next meeting on November 20. Requests for support letters to Lopez, Gillibrand, Greene County Planning, etc. should be sent out as soon as possible once you know that you are going ahead with this. Ms. Mattson said she writes the letter (provides you with the template of the letter) and they are sent out by the Village Clerk and included in the grant package.

The Mayor asked Ms. Mattson if it would still be possible if we hold off our decision until our next regular Board Meeting on November 20 when the full Board would be present? Ms. Mattson replied that it should be. The support letters should go out but I realize that they can't go out until you have decided that you are going to do it. Ms. Mattson said they may accept support letters after the fact. I can't be sure, but they have in the past.

The Mayor asked Trustee Timpson if she would be ready to move on this. She replied that in her opinion the Village is small enough that we already know what we share. We don't need a formal grant to tell us what we already know, but she would think about it. The Mayor said we will schedule it for review at the next Board Meeting on November 20. He thanked Ms. Mattson for her time this evening.

Peter Barker - Catskill Mountain Foundation: The Mayor welcomed Mr. Barker and thanked him for coming in such a timely fashion. He then told Mr. Barker that members of the community approached the Board at the last Regular Board Meeting with concerns about the condition of the Orpheum Theater, the look of it, and a dangerous situation that exists. With the approaching holidays, it is felt that the present condition would have an unfavorable effect on visitors and residents alike.

Mr. Barker introduced himself as Executive Director of the Catskill Mountain Foundation. He is a member of the Onteora Club and has been part of the community for the past 10 years. Mr. Barker said the CMF has been working with Greene County IDA and they presented to the IDA a bond proposal of up to six million dollars. The Greene County IDA Board approved the bond proposal, and the bulk of that, whether it turns out to be three million dollars or six million dollars, is earmarked for completion of the Orpheum project in full. Public hearings are expected to be in early December. That is the plan on how the building will be completed.

In the short time, Mr. Barker feels that the place looks horrible and he will get a crew there next week prior to the Thanksgiving holiday to take care of any dangerous situations. He wants to take down the fence in front of the building and replace it with new wood straight across. Perhaps the fence could accommodate Christmas decorations. Mr. Barker said he needs to winterize the facility and get heat in there to protect the foundation. There will be some work around the perimeter of the building to close in any openings as well as the repair of any facade work to make it look presentable to the community. The Mayor said it sounds like you'll be giving it a 'Hollywood Front,' and that is what he was hoping for. Mr. Barker agreed with that term and said weather permitting, they will be at the site next Monday. His hope is that by next Spring they will be able to finish the construction. Mr. Barker asked what the Village had in mind as far as decorations so he could think about how they could contribute something to make their building consistent with that. The Mayor responded that the Village does not have a dollar amount yet but it would be good if you just secure the building, have a fence where we could drape decorations, paint windows, etc. We understand it's a building site. The Mayor thanked Mr. Barker for coming this evening.

Approval of Minutes from October 1, 2007: The Mayor asked the Board if they have had a chance to review the above minutes. Trustee Timpson made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 1, 2007 meeting. Trustee Kline seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

Hand Out Proposed Night Sky Law: The Mayor asked Mr. Hyer to address the issue. Mr. Hyer said this is called the Village of Tannersville Lighting Ordinance. It started with Paul Slutzky as they are doing a Lighting Ordinance in the Village of Hunter. Basically the concept is that if you go to Central Park in New York City, you look up and you cannot see the stars due to what is called 'atmospheric pollution.' The Village of Hunter wanted to do something to prevent atmospheric pollution here and they asked if the Town would join in. What we have done is take Mr. Slutzky's document and adapted it to the Town needs. Mr. Slutzky asked if we could also do the same in the Village of Tannersville. Mr. Hyer told him he cannot speak for the Village, but what he has done is made up this proposed document for the Village of Tannersville. He asked that the Board Members present take it home and read it and he'll get copies to the Board Members who are absent this evening. The purpose is to see if the Board is interested in going forward with this proposal. Mr. Hyer said when we finish with the Subdivision Ordinance and adopt that, then we will work on this law if the Board is interested. Mr. Hyer asked the Board to review the document, mark it up in any way and we will discuss it after we finish with the Subdivision Law.

Review and accept changes to the proposed Subdivision Law (Revised): The Mayor asked Mr. Hyer to review the proposed changes to the law. Mr. Hyer stated to the Board that we went over the proposed changes at the October meeting, as follows:

- 1) on page 3, we had that at present we are notifying everybody within 500 feet and we are changing that to 'all contiguous land owners, owners across the street, and

- others the Village Board may deem appropriate’,
- 2) on page 5, we are taking out ‘including proof that such municipal systems possess the capacity to achieve the intended service’
 - 3) on page 9, again as in 1) above, we are taking out ‘notifying everyone within 500 feet’ and are changing to ‘all contiguous land owners, owners across the street, and others the Village Board may deem appropriate’
 - 4) on page 9, again as in 2) above, we are taking out ‘including proof that such municipal systems possess the capacity to achieve the intended service’
 - 5) on page 20, Grades, it said ‘shall not be less than one (1) percent or greater than six (6) percent.’ We are changing to ‘shall not be less than one (1) percent or greater than ten (10) percent.’

The Mayor said why don't we move forward and review the changes at a Public Hearing. We will see if there is any public input on the grade or additional research by the Board. The Mayor made a motion that there be a Public Hearing at 6:30 p.m. prior to the Regular Board Meeting on November 20 to discuss the Revised Subdivision Law. Trustee Kline seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

NYMIR Training: Mr. Hyer asked if any Board Members had test packets to hand in. Trustee Timpson said she had two completed and two to go. Mr. Hyer asked her to bring in the two remaining tests to the Village Office when she had them ready. The Mayor said he could use two more to work on.

Privilege of the Floor: Trustee Timpson wanted to speak about the Halloween Curfew. She said there was a comment that the Village should change the curfew for Halloween.

The Mayor responded that was true but it would have required a change in the law and there was not enough time for a Public Hearing and a change in the law. The Mayor said it was not brought to the Board but was informally brought to the Mayor. He told Trustee Timpson the suggestion was that the curfew begin at 6:00 p.m. and, when he inquired of the municipal judicial system here, it was felt that it would cause more problems than good by trying to make that change. At this point, Jeff Prince made the comment that from his office on Main Street he was able to observe what was taking place this Halloween. He said the problem was with the high school kids who took the day as a time when they could get away with throwing eggs at cars and buildings and generally being rowdy and disorderly. He saw large numbers of high school kids on both sides of the street and he observed that some parents took young children home because it wasn't fun and it wasn't safe for them. Trustee Timpson said if the curfew were 6:00 p.m. it would give law enforcement authority to direct teenagers to go home if unaccompanied by an adult. The Mayor said the school had mistakenly announced that the Village of Tannersville had a 6:00 p.m. curfew, which is actually the Town curfew, and he had phone calls from unhappy parents. Now we have a whole year to analyze what would be an appropriate law, appropriate enforcement and appropriate message to teenagers to protect them and to keep them from getting into trouble. Maybe we can look into something like a Halloween Ball, a masquerade by the lake, egg-throwing targets, paint balls with helmets, etc.

Continuation of Subdivision Review for CC Lots: Mr. Prince said that at the previous Regular Board Meeting in October they handed out packets to the Board saying they would return this evening to review the packets after the Board has had time to look them over. Mr. Prince said that after reviewing the Master Plan of the Village of Tannersville he is more convinced now than before that the size and focus of the project is not out of the ordinary. He and Mr. Bates appreciate that the Village Board saw fit to establish Lead Agency at the last meeting. Mr. Bates is going to provide the necessary packets this week to be distributed to DEP, DEC, DOH, DOT. The packets are being printed now. If there were any comments on what we submitted that would alter anything, we would be receptive tonight to make those changes. I am anxious to hear what the Mayor's meeting with DEP brought out. The fact is that the SPDES permit is for 800,000 gallons a day.

They don't use 200,000 a day. Our project will use only 50,000 gallons a day when built out. This project will not get built out in a year or two years. It takes time so it enables the project to grow with the Village. We will add into the Village excess water, which is needed, and we are working on all the ways to accommodate our project and bring it into the Village's system. We hope that the City, and the DEP specifically, will agree that we are entitled to sewerage there. This project had sewerage on it already that was taken off. We think that we are entitled to have it put back on. And we think that the project is good for the Village and that it will increase your tax base. It's obvious that if you have a bigger tax base you have a bigger budget. Each lot is a tax bill; think of it that way. We are hoping that nobody found any great fault with the preliminary plat which was submitted. We are just looking forward to getting this project moving along on the path of the SEQR review and hearing what the agencies say. I talked with Jim Bachman from the DEP who is on the SEQR Task Force for the DEP. He told me that he saw no fatal flaws in the project, which was encouraging. He was instrumental in the sewer extension for Haines Falls. We are looking at this not as a new sewer connection but as a sewer extension and we hope that the Board backs us on that. We are not looking for one house or one connection. We are looking to put an infrastructure in, put the streets in, put the sidewalks in, put in downward lighting. We want to make this a good project, one that the Village can be proud of, that will help the Village and that will bring new people into the Village.

If there is anything that you have seen in our package that needs to be addressed, we would like to address it. We know that there is going to be some give and take in this and we are certainly receptive to that. That is basically why we are here tonight. As a couple of Board Members aren't here tonight, we don't need to have the Preliminary Plat approved, but we would like to see it accepted so that we can say with confidence that the concept is decent and we can move forward. We'll have to slug it out with the various agencies during the SEQR process.

Mr. Hyer asked "what about the administrative issues that were not addressed in the Preliminary Plat...has Mr. Bates worked on that more? Mr. Bates said he thought the Plat that was submitted two weeks ago pretty much covered everything. Mr. Hyer added "but it didn't complete everything." Mr. Prince stated that the only thing he thought was missing was the Stormwater Plan because they were basically waiting to see that the map is acceptable in theory. This is because that Plan for Stormwater and Erosion Control would be based on the streets. Mr. Prince continued "I think that at the meeting between you, Howard and myself, and then with the Board, that in that packet we had addressed mostly all the issues." Mr. Hyer said "you are going to have to get a Board variance." Mr. Prince continued, "What we had talked about, to bring you all up to speed, is that in your Subdivision Regulation it calls for each lot to be staked. We are certainly willing to do that." Mr. Bates said "the issue is an updated survey and the property being pinned, as it is now, for subdivision--not after it is subdivided--the base piece of property." "The corner pins should also be located in the ground. An actual field survey etc" Mr. Prince said "we gave you Larry Vanucchi's certified map with the stakes put out..." Mayor: "of the parcel but not of the individual..." Mr. Hyer: "Mr. Vanucchi did a field survey with the stakes out in the field?" Mr. Bates: "Mr. Vanucchi did a survey update on the map back last winter when the previous Board requested it. I don't know if every corner has actually been pinned out there. Some of them have and I don't know that they all have.

Mr. Prince: "I talked with Larry Vanucchi when we bought this property. We obviously had to have the survey updated and he told me that he put the stakes in." Mr. Hyer: "Jeff, the only reason for that, you know and I know, is that we avoid property line disputes.

Mr. Prince: "Also, there were some boundary line discrepancies with Matt Leach on the upper parcel that we re-surveyed. Mr. Leach was paid for the adjustment on it. Larry and I are willing to walk the property with any neighbor if there is a question about the

boundaries. It is staked and will be staked. We wanted to avoid staking the individual lots until we had the final plat on this and knew we wouldn't have to alter our lot sizes and change them around."

Mr. Hyer: "My understanding from discussions with the Board regarding the Preliminary Plat is that they thought that the application would be out by now to the other

agencies so we would get feedback from them. You know and I know, Jeff, that if they come back with a curve ball it is possible that you could have to make major adjustments. We don't want to have to go through and re-do the Preliminary Plat. If they don't have any major issues that are going to change your Preliminary Plat, we can move forward." Mr. Prince: "We're going to do that. That's why we're not asking you to approve the Preliminary Plat tonight. We're giving you those packages to submit to everybody-- they're still being printed up--and, based on that, whether it be at your Regular Board Meeting on the 20th or at the next Planning Board Meeting in December, we are ready to address it and move forward."

Mayor: "I'll give you the skinny on the meeting with the City of New York. It was an informal meeting (no minutes taken) with the liason between the communities and the handling (?) of the treatment plant. The name of the liason is Debora DeGraw (formerly Wood). Ms. DeGraw was in accord with what I asked for.

1. I asked for the map which was on the wall in the old Sewer Treatment Plant before it was torn down. It was labeled 'Service Area.' The map would clear up who is in and who is out of the service area. Ms. DeGraw said someone has the map because it would not be thrown out.

2. Then Ms. DeGraw presented a preliminary application to me. On the first half, where you give basic information, she signed off the Village as the Lead before the application goes to the City. She indicated "Yes"...we approve this for hook up. It fell within their two perimeters of within 100 feet of the sewer main or within 250 feet of the sewer main.

3. The most important point... Ms. DeGraw used the term "in the bank." How much sewerage do we have "in the bank?" How much is allocated to Tannersville and how much is allocated to the Town of Hunter? Obviously, it is my job currently to protect the service area of the Village of Tannersville. I feel that it is fair and equitable to take that original "Service Map" and say, if there is 600,000 gallons and the service area is 90% of Tannersville, we should get 90% of the 600,000 gallons for the Village of Tannersville. I am rounding off the numbers. She felt that that made sense. They would give us a "bank." Then I would go to the planners of this Community, hopefully in the near future, and say we have been given this amount of gallonage. We have the Build Out Analysis that shows that Mr. Jones (for example) has a half acre lot. We have this many lots for build out which will want sewerage. Therefore, when we have another subdivision we can say "lot size should be this, or they would be entitled to this much gallonage of sewerage given the other vacant properties." I told her that the Village wants to take the lead in the development of this community. That is why she had on the front of the application that the Village signs off that we approve and that we would have a running "bank account" of sewerage.

The only curve ball in the meeting was 'infiltration' which they say still exists to a large degree. I asked why they didn't do something about it in the five years that they have known about it. I also said we know you have 'real numbers.' We can ask for them through the Freedom of Information Act. Ms. DeGraw said she would get back to me with the map, a few revisions of the application and what our sewerage 'bank account' is. Certainly it has been this Board's mission and mine to fix the water infrastructure, increase the water quality, expansion of the system and the availability of safe, quality drinking water for this community.

Mr. Prince asked to comment on the Mayor's statement. He said, "In our project, if we suddenly build 100 houses in one year it would amount to 50,000 gallons of sewerage based on a 3-bedroom house. 50,000 taken out of 800,000. If all the other lots were built out, and all the other projects, Colonial Golf Course, Villa Vosilla, any project that we all know what's out there, we still would have excess capacity for that sewer plant. And that's not Jeff Prince saying it, it's the engineers who worked on the sewer treatment plant." The Mayor said until he gets a letter to that effect from the City of New York, it is Jeff Prince saying it.

1. Mr. Hyer asked Mr. Bates if he could address house size. Jeff said 3 bedrooms and that's related to the water usage. Mr. Prince said "it's in the Covenants and Restrictions that I submitted, Mark, that no house would be built that's not at least 2000 square feet." Mr. Hyer said "What is the top limit?" Mr. Bates replied that it would be an average of 4 bedrooms per home. Mr. Hyer: "At some point in time the Planning Board is going to

have to state there is going to be so many bedrooms in the whole project. It's not the sky's the limit."

2. Mr. Hyer: "You said you didn't show the lights on the Plat because they were too small, but can't you just put dots for the streetlights?" Mr. Bates: "I actually have a better detail than what was submitted. I gave you a basic, really rough detail."

3. Set Back or Zoning Ordinance: 40 feet from the front, 20 feet from the sides. Mr. Hyer asked if they are going to be able to hold that with the topography on all those lots? Mr. Prince and Mr. Bates replied "yes."

To wrap up, Mr. Hyer said, "This Board needs to have a handle on the size of the houses and the total number of bedrooms that are going to be in the project. It has to be put into Covenants and Restrictions for the people who buy the houses that they cannot build a mega mansion with ten bedrooms. Jeff may want to say we want to be able to sell six bedrooms in one house and two in another. I don't know what the mix is going to be, but I think the Board needs some kind of formula of what the total build out is going to be."

Mr. Prince replied "In the Master Plan it called for this to be single family as opposed to two-family, an example being you can take a 3-bedroom house, put it on a raised foundation and make it a 6-bedroom house. We don't propose to do that."

Mr. Prince: "We'll get you the maps by the end of this week for you to send out to the agencies and then we'll be ready to review." Mr. Hyer to Mr. Bates: "You don't have to incorporate the build out and bedroom analyses in the packet that's going out. We can address these at the next meeting."

The Mayor made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Trustee Kline seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

Minutes submitted by Catherine Palmieri, Deputy Clerk

Lee McGunnigle, Mayor