

Planning Board
TOWN OF BRUNSWICK
336 Town Office Road
Troy, New York 12180

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JUNE 18, 2020

PRESENT were RUSSELL OSTER, CHAIRMAN, DAVID TARBOX, LINDA STANCLIFFE, J. EMIL KREIGER, DONALD HENDERSON, and KEVIN MAINELLO.

ABSENT was ANDREW PETERSEN

ALSO PRESENT were ANDREW GILCHRIST, Planning Board Attorney, CHARLES GOLDEN, Brunswick Building Department, and WAYNE BONESTEEL, P.E., Review Engineer to the Planning Board.

Recording begins.

Chairman Oster: OK this is Chairman Oster. I'd like to bring the regular meeting of the Planning Board of the Town of Brunswick to order for Thursday, June 18, 2020. At this time if everybody could please do the Pledge of Allegiance.

[Pledge recited]

Chairman Oster: Thank you. Pat I'm going to turn the meeting right over to you and you can give us our usual ground rules for the Zoom website.

Pat Poletto: Governor Cuomo's Executive Order has authorized us to hold the regular meetings over the internet. To facilitate and run smoothly with as little technology interruptions as possible, we are asking the following: When not speaking, please mute your audio. When speaking, please state your name and during the public hearing please state your name and address for the record. You are encouraged to use headphones, in particular headphones with a microphone so that there is really not feedback loop created. If two or more of you are watching the meeting in the same room, make sure only one person's audio is on. Back to you, Chairman.

Chairman Oster: OK, thank you. At this time we will do the attendance roll call. Chuck Golden, would you please take care of that for us?

Chuck Golden: Member Donald Henderson?

Member Henderson: Present.

Chuck Golden: Member Krieger?

Member Krieger: Here.

Chuck Golden: Member Mainello?

Member Mainello: Here.

Chuck Golden: Chairman Oster is here. Member Petersen?

Chuck Golden: Member Stancliffe?

Member Stancliffe: Here.

Chuck Golden: Member Tarbox?

Member Tarbox: Here.

Chuck Golden: Thank you, you can proceed.

Chairman Oster: Thank you, Chuck. I had mine on mute so you probably didn't hear me, but I'm here. This time we will review the agenda, which is as follows: First is the Farrell special use permit and site plan. This applicant proposed to construct two duplexes on lots located at 392 and 394 Brunswick Road. Charles Farrell is the applicant and there is a public hearing to commence at 7:00pm on that item. Second is the Godell waiver of subdivision in which the applicant seeks to divide a 10-acre portion of his property located at 121 Deepkill Road in order to construct a single family home. Bob Godell is the applicant. Third is the Blue Sky Towers III, LLC and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless special use permit and site plan application, which is strictly an update on the cell tower being proposed off Creek Road on the lands of Zouky on Menemsha Lane. So with that being said, we will start our meeting tonight with the public hearing. At this time I would like to review our public hearing procedure. The purpose of the public hearing is to hear concerns, comments and views from the general public regarding a particular proposal or application. All public hearings in this case are transcribed through the Zoom platform and a written record of the proceedings is generated. In most cases this record is included with the minutes of the Planning Board regular meeting, which is conducted immediately after the public hearing. The applicant will be required to respond to all concerns and comments give at the public hearing subsequently the Planning Board will consider all concerns and comments when evaluating the application to ensure that the applicant has addressed all the issues in question. The public hearing will be conducted as follows: the notice of public hearing will be read by the Planning Board attorney. Next, the applicant will give a brief presentation on the proposal and will give us any updates. Upon completion of the applicant's remarks, the Chairman of the Planning Board will recognize persons from the public and these individuals will be allowed to speak and offer their concerns, comments and views. Since these proceedings are generated into a transcript for this hearing, it is requested that speakers address with their names and their addresses for the record before they make their comments. So at this time I'll have the notice of public hearing read by the Planning Board attorney Andrew Gilchrist.

Attorney Gilchrist: Notice of public hearing. Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held by the Planning Board of the Town of Brunswick at 7:00pm on Thursday, June 18, 2020 to review the application for special use permit and site plan submitted by Charles Farrell for property located at 392 and 394 Brunswick Road. Applicant seeks approval to construct two duplex homes on property at this location. Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Orders 202.1 and

202.15, the Town of Brunswick will be holding the June 18, 2020 Planning Board meeting over the internet accessible to the general public through the Zoom video conferencing platform. Direction on participating in the June 18 remote Planning Board meeting as well as copies of the special use permit and site plan applications for public inspection will be available on the Town of Brunswick website. All interested persons will be heard at the public hearing. This was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town signboard and posted on the Town website and mailed to owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site.

Chairman Oster: Thank you. I'll have Brian Holbriiter, who is representing the applicant, give us a brief presentation and any updates on the project please.

Brian Holbriiter: Good evening. Brian Holbriiter, licensed land surveyor representing Charles Farrell on this project. This project is the conversion of two residential building lots. These lots were approved as residential building lots a couple of years ago and we want to convert them to lots with duplex homes. The original lots were approved to support either three or four bedroom homes at that time and we are simply going to convert each of those to a duplex lot having two bedrooms each, so it will still just have four bedrooms. It'll be the same amount of water usage, same amount of septic disposal need as was originally planned. The only difference is we needed to provide some additional parking, and all that has been taken care of with submitted plans by Carl Aiken, professional engineer. We've received permits from the State of New York for the two proposed driveway locations that are shown on the plan and I think that's about it.

Chairman Oster: Thank you. At this time, I will open the platform to anyone who wishes to make comments from the general public.

Maureen Madden: I live at 385 Brunswick Road. My comments are pretty limited. I wanted to go on record as opposing this application for a special use permit and just highlight a couple of the reasons why I am in opposition. First, the applicant here has the burden to show why the special use permit should be granted, including as is requested in question 1 on the application to explain why the proposed special use is reasonably necessary for the public health or general interest or welfare. When I looked at the application, I didn't see even an attempt to explain why the special use permit was reasonably necessary. There's nothing at all in the record that I have seen to support that. I think that's because there's really no credible reason to argue that it is necessary. I don't think that it is needed, that two duplexes are needed here. The neighborhood is largely if not completely single-family residences fairly well established and, by and large, I believe they are owner occupied. I just feel like the applicant has not met his burden in demonstrating why he should be granted a special use permit. Secondly, I just also want to go on record as very strongly disagreeing with the statement that the duplexes would be consistent with the present character of the adjacent properties. The rendering that was provided to the public on the Town's website is pretty rough, I'll admit. But when I looked at it, the first thought I had was that it looked like a Motel 6 and maybe it's not quite that bad but it looks very commercial and very unattractive. When I look at the site plan and see all the parking on the site and the front face as presented in the rendering, I strongly disagree that it fits in with the neighborhood. So for those reasons I oppose the application and I urge the Board to deny the application. Thank you.

Chairman Oster: Thank you very much for your comments. Is there anyone else that wishes to make any comments?

Paul Jones: I also live on Brunswick Road near the project and I have a little bit of a different twist on my dissatisfaction with this plan. I feel that we have a master plan and we're tossing it out based on the fact that Mr. Farrell needs to, and I'm not sure if this is true but, needs to gain greater profit from those two lots. I don't think that we as a Planning Board, and as members of the community, should really make that consideration and say that it's in the interest of other homes in the area. Mr. Farrell has done a whole bunch of single-family homes at the top of the hill on Pinewoods Avenue and he's done a nice job with those. But I guess my question would be why didn't he put in his two family homes up there? There must be some reason for that. I believe that he also did the McChesney Town road development, not sure what it's called but there's a perfect place for two-family homes if that's what he wanted. I feel like that would be really inappropriate for him to do that there. It would devalue the other homes that he built. As far as the top of the hill, I just think he's taking the easy route and asking us to do an exception to the comprehensive plan that's been established and that's a huge favor to do him considering the fact that they were approved as single-family lots and they're more appropriate as single-family lots and our neighborhood really is a great neighborhood. It's got homes that are all similar in nature in this area. Fairly high end homes that are in this area and I just feel like what's the purpose of having this plan if we're just going to toss it out because a builder wants to enhance his profits? Again, please don't think I'm criticizing Mr. Farrell. I know him, he's a great guy. But I don't approve of this and I think that we should stand firm and say no we're not going to do this. It should be single-family homes as it was planned originally and that we should hold the line on that and just explain to him that what it was and that's what it will be and that's where your profits will be. Anyways, that's it for me. Thanks.

Chairman Oster: Thank you for your comments. Are there any other comments that wish to be made at this time?

Maureen Evers: I live at 379 Brunswick Road and I have a few comments as well and I will try to differ them from the previous comments but I do support what was previously said. First I really would like to address the comments earlier about the sewer and water use claiming that a duplex home two bedrooms each is similar to that of a three-bedroom or four-bedroom single home. I don't understand how that claim can be made when we're having an extra kitchen and extra laundry facilities, which I assume would draw greater water than if it was just a four-bedroom home with one kitchen and one laundry facility. Also the driveway application that was referenced when I read it online, the driveway application was actually made for a single-family home. It says it right on the application itself or the letter that came back. I guess I should actually say on the record I am obviously opposed to this plan. I also wanted to address the zoning. So this zoning is considered R-15 and according to the Zoning Law, R-15 it indicates that it's intended that development will have both public sewer and public water. And I don't think that is necessarily being met with this new build. That whole area has been zoned as R-15 so I would make the assumption as I've read it in the Comprehensive Plan that the intent was to bring somehow sewers in so that we could provide for smaller lots. The other is that the Comprehensive Plan, if you look on it, although this area is still shaded as agriculture, it is adjacent to what is designated as single-family homes. So I think the intent as the farm was sold and is being broken up into smaller parcels that it is a single-family home that was the intent to be done here. I also noted there are three additional acres owned that is contiguous to these properties and I am concerned that this would set an inappropriate precedent as to what would be built on these additional properties. So I guess

it's clear that I do strongly disagree with the design that has been presented and proposed although I am not opposed to homes being built on the lot.

Chairman Oster: Thank you for your comments. Is there anyone else who wishes to make any comments?

Mary Krenceski: I live at 387 Brunswick Road which would be across from the properties and I am also in opposition to the plan mostly because in two places on the application that we got it states that this is a dense development area and that is simply not true. Most of us live here because it is not a densely developed area, that's what we like about it. So I would like to register my opposition and would also like to read from neighbor who is a friend who is at 377 Brunswick Road. Her name is Martha Colangelo. She is a 50-year resident of this neighborhood and she just wanted me to communicate her opposition because it is not consistent with the character of the neighborhood. She's been here for 50 years. She is also opposed to the special use permit application. I'd also like to know, is there is an address where we can send her comments? She does not have access to Zoom or to a computer, so can we write something and send it in, and where would we send that?

Chairman Oster: To answer your question about an address I would send it to the Town of Brunswick, the address there you could probably get, to the attention of the Building Department and that would be forwarded to the Planning Board and to the applicant.

Chuck Golden: It's 336 Town Office Road in Troy NY 12180.

Mary Krenceski: OK, thank you.

Chairman Oster: Is there anyone else who wishes to make any comments?

Danielle Brendese: I reside at 3 Heather Lane, which is right down the road from the proposed site of the new homes. I am strongly opposed to this. I'm in agreement with what everyone else pretty much has said. My only other concern is that with two duplexes I think it's going to add a lot more traffic there. It's already in an area where the farm is right there, it's 55. That's the only other additional concern that I had. I'm not opposed to having single-family homes there like Mr. Farrell had done up on top, but the duplexes do not go with the character of the neighborhood. Thank you.

Chairman Oster: Thank you for your comments. Is there anyone else who wishes to make any additional comments or just to possibly reiterate on comments that are made at this point.

Jim Tkacik: I live at 387 Brunswick Road. We're across and diagonal from the proposed project and I agree with just about all the statements that have been made. There's been no need or justification for this project. I'd just like to look at the zoning regulations of the Town concerning these special use permits. I just want to read one part of this. "The intent of these regulations is to ensure that the development and use will not have an adverse impact on the immediate neighborhood or on the character of the community. These such regulations are designed to protect the community from inappropriate design and other matters like scenic and aesthetic significance." And also in the special use general standards: "The character and appearance of the proposed use shall be in general harmony with the character and appearance of

the surrounding neighborhood.” So I think these things are intangible. But some of the tangible things are aesthetics and the appearance as has been noted the very large parking areas in front of the duplexes. The area of the parking area, I’m not talking about the area of the driveways, the area of the parking areas for each duplex is about the same size as the house. I think it’s 1,600 square feet for the parking area and like 1,750 square foot for the duplex. Additionally, there are no garages here. So if there are four adults in each of these duplexes, there are almost certainly going to be four cars parked in those parking spots all the time. In other words, this is going to present an appearance of a parking lot in front of these buildings. And my other point about the aesthetics, as it was pointed out that the really badly copied photographs included with this is not these buildings. If you look at that photograph very carefully, is that available here? But anyway, that photograph shows approximate...

Pat Poletto: What document was it, do you know, Jim?

Jim Tkacik: Um, no I don’t.

Chuck Golden: Keep going, Pat, you’ll get to it.

[inaudible]

Jim Tkacik: There we go, this one. If you cock your head sideways, you’ll see that this building has this big porch. If you look at the photograph, the edge of that porch is about at the window, you see it on each side? It’s symmetrical. Pat if you could go back to that floor plan, if you see where that it on there and you measure that, it comes out to be like a 21-foot porch which is a significant architectural feature. If you go back to the site plan drawings, there is no porch on the front of these houses. You have about a 6-foot by 6-foot stoop, which is probably covered. If you look at the front of that, looking toward Brunswick Road, there’s no big porch there. Just a stoop. You couldn’t even put a chair on there. If you just look at the regular outline of the duplex houses, you’ll see that. And so this is not going to have a good appearance. This is what I call an austere or spartan style. It just doesn’t fit into the neighborhood. For example, if you take a chance to drive past there and look at the Galuzzo’s house, which is directly next door if you’re looking at the side, it’s to the west or the left. And this is a very stately two-story, first story stone, second story clapboard, slate roof house. And I couldn’t imagine a more unlikely pairing of two buildings for these compared to the very direct next door neighbors. And I just don’t think it fits into the neighborhood. And as other people have mentioned, if they fit into the neighborhood I’m sure Farrell could probably put these in any of his properties or developments. But I don’t think anybody would like them. If he put these up on Doubleday Acres or whatever the name of this place is, I think they’d have a rebellion of the people who bought houses from him. These are what I consider some of the tangible things you’re going to see. Also the fact that there are no garages there, where are people going to put all the stuff you usually see in a garage? Like, motorcycles, bikes, all kinds of things like that. Think of all the things you have in your garages and sheds, these things might end up on the lawn or people will put up tent garages with no frame. These just don’t fit here from those points of view. And the other thing, I think the more important thing, these are not going to be family houses. What I mean by family houses is residents where people live for a long time and raise a family. These are short-term rental properties. People are going to move in and out of these like apartments. I mean there’s a place for this. Starting out, everybody’s lived in an apartment or a rental house. But this is just not necessary.

Chairman Oster: You seem to be fading on me. I don't know whether I'm losing audio here or what. Is there some setting or something that I'm missing here Pat? Excuse me for interrupting.

Pat Poletto: No, he's going in and out. He's moving back and forth I think.

Jim Tkacik: OK I'll speak up. I'm just about done here. As other people said, I happen to like Mr. Farrell's houses up on the hill up on Pinewood. I think they're very sensibly-sized houses. They seem to be very well built. Those houses are family houses, you can see for example the improvements people have done on those houses, for example the solar collectors on one house. These are places people are planning to go in and stay there for a significant amount of time. I think that's one of the biggest things, because in this area on the two sides of Brunswick Road then going down Shine Road then going up Village Drive and then Heather Lane, there are 27 houses. People may not notice that going by us on Route 2. There are 27 houses and all of them are pretty much compatible. Not very many big mansions, but they're all very compatible places and it's a very nice neighborhood. This just wouldn't fit in. I'm sorry and I guess you can tell by my tone that I oppose the project. Mr. Oster could I make a general question here? Mr. Oster? Anybody else there?

Bill (participant): I can hear you fine.

Jim Tkacik: I had a question for the Chairman.

Chuck Golden: I still have you Jim. I'm not sure what's wrong with Chairman Oster's audio. It just doesn't appear as if his audio is working. He doesn't show muted but for some reason his audio is not coming through.

Jim Tkacik: OK I just have a general comment beyond the project. I'd like to see the possibility of getting minutes for the meetings also. I think it's important to have, they're a lot easier to follow. I know this is a difficult time for running meetings and I really commend you guys for being able to show all the building plans. I think this is probably preferable to how we do it in person. But I'd like to just be able to see minutes for this. It's easier to follow discussion of a project rather than a Zoom meeting.

Attorney Gilchrist: Just let me explain for the record that we are operating under the Governor's Executive Order which does suspend the Open Meetings Law requirement and another Executive Order which does allow public hearings without being in person and to allow them over the internet over a video conferencing platform. But the Governor's Executive Order allowing that does require not only real time public participation but that a transcript of the meeting be prepared. Not summary minutes, but a transcript of the meeting. What the Town Planning Board and also in Brunswick the Town Zoning Board of Appeals have been doing are recording these Zoom meetings and transcripts are being prepared. They will look different than the minutes. They are more of a transcript format which identifies the person speaking and it is more of a word for word transcript. But in order to comply with the Governor's orders, that's what is being prepared. Those are in preparation right now and they should be available shortly.

Jim Tkacik: Like I said before, I prefer your very succinct and accurate minutes.

Attorney Gilchrist: Well we do appreciate that, but in this interim period we have to comply with the Governor's orders and then once we're back in person we will have the regular minutes prepared.

Jim Tkacik: As we discussed before, people are always referring back to the minutes for information and details on projects. OK that's all I have to say about the project. Thank you very much.

Carrie Galluzzo: I know we're having a problem hearing Chairman Oster but, I live directly next door at 390 Brunswick Road to the proposed properties. I'd like to second everything that my neighbors said about this. I don't know how this will look for us. We moved into our house for a reason, and it wasn't to be boxed in by a few duplexes, that's for sure. I'm also curious about the easement. The Town of Brunswick has a 30-foot easement that they're allowing the parking lot to be built over, which will directly be on our property line. So I'm concerned about that. Aesthetically, it certainly does not fit in with every other house in this neighborhood. I'm not opposed to the houses that have been put up in the back. I think they're great. The people that live up there, although I don't know them personally, I've been doing a lot of work and drive by there on a regular basis. One of the homes even put out a free lending library, which I think is amazing for the neighborhood. They built a little box that has free books in it. I think it's pretty amazing. I'm concerned about our water table. We have a hard time as it is. The fact that this is on a well I think is directly going to affect our water table. We've already seen it happen. Our well runs dry all the time and it's not because our well is inappropriate for our space. I also would back up the concerns that Jim had about not having any garage space and all the stuff that would be out there. I'm also concerned with the fact that these aren't family homes, people are going to be in and out of here. Are there going to be any landlords available? Is there going to be anybody watching this property to make sure that stuff isn't happening? I just don't think aesthetically that it fits in. There's a farm directly across the street. I'm also concerned about the speed limit, as usual. That's always been a big concern. If people were out here more they would understand that the straightaway that's right across from the farm and that little bit of empty space there, motorcycles race it on a regular basis. I don't really have anything else.

David Galluzzo: I also live at 390 Brunswick Road. Like we said, the water table we are concerned about. We just replaced our well and everything last November and the well is still running dry. I have no proof that it's the new houses up on Pinewoods but there's definitely a correlation there. But other than that, I'm just opposed to the duplexes. I have no problem with houses going up. My other main concern which Carrie just mentioned is the landlord. Is the landlord going to be local, are they going to be absentee landlords? I grew up in a family where my parents were landlords and even though they were within the same city, they had multiple problems with tenants. I just have a personal experience with the nightmare tenants so I have a hard time seeing the same thing not happening here at some point. That's all I have.

Carrie Galluzzo: I think it's a lot to be asking to put two duplexes in that space. Like I said, single-family homes are ok. But I think putting two duplexes right there is packing a whole lot into a relatively tight space in my opinion. And like I said that the parking lot is allowed to go over the Town's easement, I don't understand that. Like, why is the Town allowing a parking lot to be built over their easement? I don't understand what people are gaining from that? And like I said so their parking spaces are going to be directly, there are cars going to starting up, my

bedroom window is right there. Cars starting at whatever time of night? It's going to be impeding my general life on a daily basis and I didn't move out here to have a neighbor that I can reach out and touch, so to speak.

Attorney Gilchrist: Pat, do we know if Chairman Oster is still on the meeting?

Pat Poletto: Yes he is. He's having problems with his audio. I texted him and said maybe he wants to reboot.

Attorney Gilchrist: So in the interim I think we should have one other member of the Planning Board just act as Acting Chair until Chairman Oster is back to keep the meeting running and run the public hearing.

Member Stancliffe: I can do that, so I'll act as Chairman until Chairman Oster can get his audio working again. Ms. Galluzzo, was there anything else you wanted to say for or against the application.

Carrie Galluzzo: No I think I'm done saying what I need to say, I'm just very opposed to this and don't think it fits in at all. I don't get it. I'm not, like I said, opposed to the...whatever plan we're on now. That was single-family homes and that's perfectly fine with me, but these duplexes don't make any sense to me. I can't imagine my house directly being next door to a couple of duplexes or to a couple of apartments really when there are...I mean if you're looking to move into the district for the school, that's great. I work at the elementary school but I think I wrote down there are plenty of apartments and town homes available right on McChesney Avenue extension. I know the Glen at Sugar Hill has three units. Duncan Meadows has eight units. Sugar Hill has four units. Highland Creek has three and the Woods has four and they're all Brunswick school district so if you're looking for an apartment, those are some great options. I don't think it has to come courtesy of a duplex on Route 2 next to single-family living and a well-established neighborhood. I know my next door neighbor's not on right now, but he and his mom Helen I'm sure if she was still alive would be super opposed to this as well. They've been here for as long as I can remember. I know personally that a couple of my co-workers went to school with her sons and they're a well-established family here as well. The Snyders. So it just makes no sense to me. I know we're on the younger end of the spectrum compared to everybody else but we moved out here in 2007. We raised our kids here for the most part, and I'd like to see grandkids raised here and I just, like I said, don't think the duplexes fit in with that kind of living. That's all we had. Thanks.

Member Stancliffe: Are there any other comments for the public hearing?

Maureen Evers: I just wanted to reiterate the comment I just heard about the well problems and how we're proposing in this zoned area to put more houses with more wells. I think that's an undue burden on our neighbors. And I think the Board should seriously consider wells and septic in this area as well. I mentioned that before but I guess I just wanted to bring it around again with my neighbor mentioning their problems with their well.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Are there any other comments?

Enza Bove: I live at 3 Village Drive in Brunswick and I am in full agreement with everyone's comments and I would like to add the word transients. Hotel 6. That's all I can think of when everybody mentioned that there's going to be people in and out probably leaving all kinds of stuff outside and we won't have no contact with the owners of these apartments, who do we complain to? It's not feasible at all and we moved out here back in 1993. That's almost 30 years and we lived in this area because of the surrounding beautiful quiet farm-like life. And that's going to be disrupted. Especially with the water problem, we don't have sewers, we all have septic systems and wells. It's just not acceptable. That's it. Thank you very much.

Carrie Galluzzo: I would like to add one more thing to that. I know when we were looking to do an addition even though we have a four-bedroom, 2.5 bathroom house, when we were looking to do our own addition I know that we got denied without redoing a whole new septic and well just adding an in-law space and it wasn't even a full kitchen. But I just wanted to state that too. That, I mean, we already have that space and we're going to have to redo everything and we weren't allowed to do that so I don't know how you can put up duplexes and have two kitchens and everything else and still expect the water to be the same.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Chairman Oster, are you back up? Still no audio for Chairman Oster.

Paul Jones: 385 Brunswick Road. Double dipping here. One of the things that keeps going around in my head is, you know, this whole idea of doing this master plan and then deviating from it. I ask of the Board, is it common to change from a single lot to a double lot and to make them both multi-family homes. I guess my question then is, who does the Board work for? What is their interest? What mandate do they have to then uphold the master plan that was established? I mean I go so far as to say who are they fiscally responsible to, if at all?

Pat Poletto: Do you have something open in the background there? We're hearing double of you.

Paul Jones: Sorry, yeah Maureen has hers open. She's coming off now. There can you hear me now? Is that better? Good. So again it's kind of a touchy subject to say who is your fiduciary obligation to, maybe you don't have any fiduciary obligation. But our community here is special, it's not super wealthy but it's a good all-American division that sort of reflects the school, it reflects other little communities that are around Eagle Mills area and it's pretty cool. It's a pretty unique thing and I feel that it's special and to put these two-families in there is really going to compromise the uniqueness and the strong community that we have here. I'm sure you've all been up to see it, it's beautiful. And it's very neighborly, and to suddenly put in like people have said a transient...a rental situation is never going to be a situation that's tied to the community and to come off of a single-family lot to put these two properties in I think is kind of ridiculous and I'm a little bit surprised to think that they would even entertain something like that. But in the meantime, that's enough from me. I won't double dip anymore. Thanks.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Russ Oster, we still cannot hear your audio. Is there anyone else who would like to give comments for this public hearing?

Matt Perfetti: I'm at 380 Brunswick Road. I echo the comments of the neighbors here that have voiced their opinions. I disagree with the application which is describing the area as a densely populated area. I disagree that the type of building proposed is in alignment with the surrounding area. I'm not aware of any duplexes in this area on this road in this stretch of neighborhood. I likewise would not oppose single-family homes in alignment with the surrounding area to be placed if that was part of the original plan. And I share the similar concerns with the shared resources and the water table as well. Thank you.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Anyone else speaking for or against the application?

Chuck Golden: I looked at my records and there is a duplex at 486 Brunswick Road. I'm just stating that for the record.

Paul Jones: Just wanted to chime in on that a little bit. I live at 385 Brunswick Road and I've been thinking about that as well, what properties are similar to these. And these are new construction, these are not properties that are long-existing and more or less just part of the community over the years. They're quite different in nature. You have a property that's probably 70 years old that's been here and lived in owner occupied ever since as opposed to either of these two duplexes. So I just wanted to address that because it does not set an example in their community because it's always been there. And in our community it is going to set an example and it's going to have a fairly substantial impact in my opinion. Thanks.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Any more comments?

Carrie Galluzzo: I would like to weigh in on the house that was just brought up. I live at 390 Brunswick Road. My son was friends with people who lived in that house and like I said it was a long-standing house that I think they had converted. It wasn't originally built as a duplex. Um, you can't tell it's a duplex from looking at it from the front. Nor does it have any excessive parking. All of the parking is down a long driveway in the back. It's not noticeable from the road. So aesthetically I don't think it ruins that particular area of the neighborhood. Like I said, these two duplexes right here on Route 2, they're out here. There's nothing surrounding them, they're open. Like I said, the other house I was mentioning that was a duplex is surrounded by woods in the back. On the sides it has, you know, one or two neighbors but like I said all the properties are separate. This isn't going to be like that. So, like I said, I don't think you can take that house and use it as an example for this neighborhood. It's one and the next closest house that I think even has apartments in it that you would never know either is all the way down the street by the green bridge. Other than that one example, I don't think you can say these duplexes that are brand new and going up with all this open parking and this open field fit in with the area or with this neighborhood. That's just my opinion. Thanks.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you, any other comments?

Maureen Evers: 379 Brunswick Road. Just for clarification, that address 486 Brunswick Road...actually the stuff I read in the zoning law we classify things as a single residential, a single residential with an apartment which would be considered single residential I believe, a two-family and a multi-family. So is this indeed a two-family or was that actually a single

family with an apartment. Which, as I said, I think in the record that would be considered a single-family home.

Chuck Golden: What I remember of it, there were two distinct separate apartments side by side, two separate kitchens, that's what I remember of that property. It does set back quite a ways from the road.

Maureen Evers: I do agree though, I don't think something that's been established that long should be in comparison with the new build.

Chuck Golden: No my point was just that it was the closest one. While everyone was talking I just went on a search to see where the closest one was. As I said it's simply for the record.

Maureen Evers: That's great, thank you.

Member Stancliffe: Are there any new comments that have not been vetted yet? That being said, would the Board like to have discussion about closing the meeting? Hearing none, I'll make a motion to close the public hearing.

Member Krieger: I'll second that.

Member Stancliffe: Mr. Golden, could you take a roll call vote?

Chuck Golden: Roll call vote to close the public hearing. Member Henderson is absent. Member Krieger?

Member Krieger: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Mainello?

Member Mainello: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Chairman Oster? Russ can give us a thumbs up. Member Petersen is absent. Member Stancliffe?

Member Stancliffe: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Tarbox?

Member Tarbox: Aye.

Chuck Golden: The public hearing is closed.

Member Stancliffe: For the public's knowledge, the applicant will need to respond to these comments and the applicant is also on the agenda for tonight so they may respond if you want to stay tuned in as we move into the formal agenda of the meeting, then you may hear responses to some of the comments that were raised today. With that being said....we will now move into our

regular meeting. Number 1 is the Farrell special use permit. The applicant's surveyor is on the line I believe. Would you like to take control of the conversation, Brian?

Brian Holbriiter: In lieu of the many comments that were made tonight, I would request that we are given time to respond to all of these comments in writing and get those to the Planning Board members for their review and I think it would do the Planning Board good as well as my client a chance to digest all of these different comments that were made by the public and to try and respond to them all respectfully and give the Planning Board a chance to review those comments without trying to do it at tonight's meeting. So I would like to request that we be allowed to submit our comments or answers to the public comments in writing to the Planning Board over the next week.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. That being said we'll put the Farrell special use permit on the agenda for the first meeting in the month of July and we'll make the transcript available when it is completed so that you have the comments in writing.

Brian Holbriiter: Andy, could you please see that I get a copy of that once it's ready? Thank you.

Attorney Gilchrist: Certainly there simply is a bit of a time lag between the audio and making a full transcript and I'm not sure it's going to be available within the next week. That's just a logistical and practical issue. It may take a little bit to get the transcript put together.

Brian Holbriiter: I took pretty extensive notes and although I would really love to have the transcript to be sure that I didn't miss anything, I guess we'll get to work on responding to these concerns and hopefully be able to just brush them up once the comments are made available. Thank you.

Attorney Gilchrist: Appreciate that. We'll make every effort to get the transcript turned around as soon as possible.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you very much.

Jim Tkacik: Are you still receiving written comments?

Member Stancliffe: We'll receive the comment letter that was mentioned in the public hearing, but being that the public hearing is closed, no further written comments will be accepted.

Jim Tkacik: OK because there were other people who had no access to Zoom or a computer. I know of two specifically.

Chuck Golden: With the notices, there is a phone number which individuals can call in. They will not have the advantage of having video, but they certainly can listen and comment. If they own a phone.

Jim Tkacik: But the phone information was not on the website until today, right? In other words, if they looked at this yesterday they would have no idea that would be accessible.

Member Stancliffe: Attorney Gilchrist, would you like to weigh in on this conversation?

Attorney Gilchrist: Yes, the public hearing was noticed through the mail as well as the newspaper and on the website. It does indicate that instructions on connecting into the Zoom meeting would be available day of meeting, so that was noticed. And there's a reason why that's done in a lot of municipal cases, what a lot of municipalities have found is that these Zoom meetings unfortunately in some cases have been taken over by uninterested third parties that just want to take over and disrupt the meeting. So to reduce the likelihood of that, many municipalities have gone through the procedure of making the internet connection as well as the phone number available day of meeting. And that's what Brunswick has done here so there was an indication that the link and the phone number would be available day of meeting.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Next on our agenda is the Godell waiver of subdivision.

Bill Godell: Yes, I'm here.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you, Mr. Godell. Will you please review the application and newly submitted documents?

Bill Godell: OK I believe from the last meeting...

Attorney Gilchrist: I'm sorry to interrupt, I do think I need to make the record, clear certainly for the benefit of the record on the previous application. I did advise Chairman Oster today by telephone that I did receive a call from Mr. Tkacik earlier in the week and he did raise the same concern with me about people not having available internet access and I did review that with Chairman Oster today and I wish he were available to link into the meeting. It's certainly within the Board's discretion to allow a short period of time for additional written comments if it desires to do so on that application and then afford the applicant adequate opportunity to respond to those comments. I just wanted the record clear on that, it was raised directly with me prior to the meeting today and I did review that with Chairman Oster. It is certainly within the discretion of the Planning Board to allow a limited period of time for written comments from the public, of course affording the applicant an opportunity to receive those and fully respond as well. I just wanted to make the record clear on that.

Member Stancliffe: Do we have discussion among the Board members, or would someone like to make a motion to extend the written comment period for this public hearing?

Member Tarbox: I'd like to make a motion to extend the public comment period for one week.

Member Mainello: I'll second that.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you, can we have a roll call vote please?

Chuck Golden: Roll call vote to extend the public hearing. Member Henderson absent.
Member Krieger?

Member Krieger: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Mainello?

Member Mainello: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Chairman Oster? Where is Mr. Oster? I don't see Mr. Oster, I think he might be getting his computer going again. Member Petersen, absent. Member Stancliffe?

Member Stancliffe: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Tarbox?

Member Tarbox: Aye.

Chuck Golden: We will extend the public hearing for one week.

Attorney Gilchrist: Just to make the record clear, this is a one-week extension for the receipt of written comments from the public to be received by the Town office one calendar week from today. Is that correct?

Member Stancliffe: That was the motion. Thank you. Mr. Golden, could you repeat the address please?

Chuck Golden: The address for the mailings will be Town of Brunswick Building Department, 336 Town Office Road, Troy NY 12180.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you.

Member Henderson: Are you hearing me? OK because apparently Mr. Golden thinks I'm absent from the meeting and I'm not. I was just a little bit late.

Chuck Golden: I will note that you're present, Don. Are you in a power outage?

Member Henderson: Well I've been having some internet connectivity issues. But I've been here since almost the beginning. So I know you missed me. I'm here.

Chuck Golden: You will be part of the roll call votes from here on out. Sorry about that.

Member Stancliffe: We'll move on to the Godell waiver of subdivision on 121 Deepkill Road.

William Godell: Yes I believe you just wanted some explanation of the three documents I submitted after the last Planning Board meeting. There was a request for some supporting documentation. So, basically, the first page if you still have them in order when I submitted them, was a septic layout. It would be the house well/septic layout with the topography lines on the lot and the driveway line to Deepkill Road. That also indicates the septic system layout and it's approved conventional with a perc in the County test with the holes for 5 laterals at 55 feet. That would be page one. Page two would be basically the same layout as that only it's an entire survey view of the lot which would show the topo lines and test holes with the driveway out to Deepkill. And the third sheet would be the actual survey also. Just the basic survey without the supporting documentation sheets on that survey. So you can see the subdivided lot according to

Deepkill Road. So that's basically the three supporting documents that we discussed at the last meeting that were requested. And I guess I'll open it up for questions if you have any. Thank you. Oh I also would like to add as of today, Army Corps of Engineers have approved my permit to put the driveway in and DEC got back to me today with an email that they are about to approve the permit so they told me I'll have a permit next week. So all the due diligence I had to do with regulatory agencies is complete and all approved.

Chuck Golden: If you could get those documents when received in to us, it would be great.

William Godell: OK I can drop them off to you, Chuck.

Member Stancliffe: Are there any comments on the application?

Member Krieger: I am a neighboring property owner and I can be impartial in a vote on this.

Attorney Gilchrist: Member Krieger, we'll just confirm, you don't have any direct or indirect economic involvement with the application, and you're merely a nearby or adjacent property owner, is that correct?

Member Krieger: Correct, just an adjacent property owner.

Attorney Gilchrist: OK and certainly no legal requirement to recuse yourself and you've noted for the record that you can review the application and act objectively so no basis for recusal. Thank you.

Member Tarbox: As I mentioned in the previous meeting I also am a joint landowner and I am impartial and can act properly on this case.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you for your comments. I did have one question for the applicant. The length of the driveway, do you happen to know the approximate length of the driveway?

William Godell: Can you hear me? OK I didn't know if I was muted or not. Yes the approximate length is probably 300 to 350 feet.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Mr. Golden could you review the length of driveway to a private drive from the code?

Chuck Golden: I believe this one will be just about there. 300 feet. There are distinction break at 150, 300, then again I believe it's 700. There will have to be special provisions for the fire department access, dependent upon the train.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you.

William Godell: Can I just add that in the past I've done a lot of real estate and looking at properties and so on and I think...is it the fire restrictions, every 250 feet I have to have a pull off for tankers or pumpers? I could be wrong, but that's what I thought in the past and I can certainly put that in.

Chuck Golden: That I'm not certain of, the number. I have to look. We have just come into a new code cycle so I need to confirm that in the new code of 2020 but I believe it was 250 previously, yes.

William Godell: OK.

Member Stancliffe: I just wanted to get that information on the record so they'll need to be a driveway application with the Town because this is a Town-owned road. The Building Department can discuss that with you further when the application comes before them.

Chairman Oster: Can anyone hear me? OK I'm on my phone right now.

Pat Poletto: Can you mute your speakers on your computer? You're getting feedback.

Chairman Oster: I am muted, but you have a feedback?

Pat Poletto: A little but keep going.

Chairman Oster: At this point if Linda wants to continue as the Acting Chair, since I got this audio problem, I'm OK with that.

Member Stancliffe: I will continue as Acting Chair, thank you. Waiver of subdivision, we a SEQRA.

Attorney Gilchrist: That is correct. Absent any further discussion or unless Mr. Bonesteel has any comments, the first order of business would be your SEQRA determination.

Member Stancliffe: Mr. Bonesteel, do you have any comments for the applicant?

Wayne Bonesteel: I'm the Planning Board engineer. He's provided a lot more information than we typically see for a waiver of subdivision. We did want to know that the lot was buildable, that's why we requested additional information. He's proven that the lot created by this waiver would be a buildable lot, so I'm good with it and don't have any additional questions.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you, Mr. Bonesteel. Is there a motion on the SEQRA short form?

Member Tarbox: I'll make a motion on SEQRA for a negative declaration.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you, is there a second?

Member Krieger: I'll second that motion.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you, a roll call vote on the SEQRA negative declaration determination for this waiver of subdivision please?

Chuck Golden: Member Henderson, how do you vote?

Member Henderson: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Krieger?

Member Krieger: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Mainello?

Member Mainello: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Chairman Oster?

Chairman Oster: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Petersen absent. Member Stancliffe?

Member Stancliffe: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Tarbox?

Member Tarbox: Aye.

Chuck Golden: The negative declaration is approved.

Member Stancliffe: Is there a motion on the table for approval of the waiver of subdivision then? 121 Deepkill Road.

Member Mainello: I'll make the motion.

Attorney Gilchrist: If I could interject, based on the discussion for consideration, a few conditions. Obviously requirement for the Town driveway permit application, compliance with any fire department requirements for the private road or length of driveway, and filing of the wetlands permit with the Building Department and any required approvals from the Rensselaer County Health Department.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Is there a second with the conditions?

Member Tarbox: I'll second the motion.

Member Stancliffe: Roll call vote please.

Chuck Golden: Member Henderson?

Member Henderson: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Krieger?

Member Krieger: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Mainello?

Member Mainello: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Chairman Oster?

Chairman Oster: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Petersen absent. Member Stancliffe?

Member Stancliffe: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Tarbox?

Member Tarbox: Aye.

Chuck Golden: The waiver of subdivision carries.

Member Stancliffe: Mr. Godell, you are set to go. Just, as stated in the conditions, we'll need the documentation submitted to the Building Department when received. Thank you.

William Godell: Thank you very much everyone. I would just like to thank all the members.

Member Stancliffe: You're welcome, good luck. Number three on our agenda is the Blue Sky Towers III application. Attorney Brennan?

Allyson Phillips: Hi, I'm an attorney with Young Sommer filling in for Dave this evening who is unable to attend.

Member Stancliffe: You're a little bit in and out, so if you could just stay in one position with the microphone, it would be appreciated. Thank you.

Attorney Gilchrist: Member Stancliffe we'll also note for the record that, I believe he's on the call, Ron Laberge, the Town's designated review engineer on the application.

Ron Laberge: Yes I am.

Allyson Phillips: I can just provide a brief overview on where we are and what we have submitted to the Town since we last appeared before the Planning Board. On June 8th we had submitted a response to the comments received at the public hearing. We have also since submitted photosimulation showing the stealth monopine option that was discussed at a prior meeting. I believe that the Town engineer has had a chance to review the response to public hearing comments and we did receive a letter dated June 15 which provides the engineer's comments on those responses. I know at the time that the letter was written that the engineer did not have yet the photosimulations of the stealth monopine and so the comments were not able to specifically address that. But those have since been provided to the Planning Board. So I'm here to answer any questions that you might have and to receive any feedback that the Town engineer may have on those submissions.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you very much. Mr. Laberge, do you have any comments?

Ron Laberge: Good evening, Ron Laberge. Hopefully the Planning Board received our packet of comments. I tried to make sure we commented on all of them. I can provide maybe a little bit of additional information to help with the decision-making process. But as I view this, the technical data, the promulgations, studies and when this application was first presented, [inaudible], there is a need for a tower in this area based upon all that data. So we kind of addressed that in our review of the comments. For the Planning Commission though I see this as more of a location and visibility issue. The stealth monopole information that was submitted the other day, I did receive it but haven't had a chance to look through it. I wasn't really sure what the applicant was trying to present because the stealth portion is only on the upper edges of the monopole, so that's something I think you should ask the applicant to clarify. Is this stealth monopole actually going to be top of surrounding tree line, top of pole, so that it all kind of looks like [inaudible]. One of the issues that we're not capable of actually viewing is the market analysis. I think that's something actually Attorney Gilchrist and I spoke about briefly the other day. While the applicant did present market analysis saying property values won't necessarily decrease, potentially increase, some of the neighbors actually presented completely opposite evidence so to speak in terms of reports. So I think the property value question might best be addressed by performing some type of market study or [inaudible] be able to provide the Board with information in that regard. Some of the items that were left unanswered, well I don't want to say unanswered, more of a question of how detailed the application materials are. There were questions about the site plan and should they have three of them with three strips, etc. I do concur with the applicant in the regard that I think the Planning Commission does know enough information about the installations in general that the detail could be presented once or if the location is finally identified. We know the footprint of the layout, etc. Really the only big question is how many arrays are going to be on the tower. If it's two like I think Mr. Brennan mentioned for the stealth monopoles, obviously that changes with generators on-site, number of fuel storage on-site, etc. So I didn't really intend to go through each of my responses or comments on the comments, but I'd be happy to answer any questions the Board may have if you've had a chance to go through it or need some clarification.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you very much. Is there any comment from Attorney Gilchrist? My question was specific to the Zoning Board, but if you have any other comments or information that you'd like to share with the Board.

Attorney Gilchrist: Yes, we're at the point where the joint public hearing with the Zoning Board has been held. List of those comments prepared that were received at the public hearing, there were some additional written comments received during the written comment period. Ron Laberge has had a chance to go through the applicant's response to comments and you see his review letter on that. We really want to make sure that the record is complete in terms of full applicant responses to the public comments. Ron did raise one issues about the issue of impact to property values which was raised during the public hearing and in the written comments, and there was material submitted by the applicant on that. I think we should follow up with the applicant and see if we can get some information particular to this location as opposed to a more general study concerning impact to property values from the tower. And I think Ron and I should have that discussion with the applicant's representatives. On the issue of the photosimulations of the stealth monopole that were submitted, the Board will note that there were two sets of photosimulations submitted. One was 60ish pages and one was 30ish pages and it went through the whole photosimulation that was previously done. One thing for the Board to

consider and possibly request from the applicant is more tailored presentation particularly with regard to those two locations at top of slope with the 80 and 90-foot tower proposals and what a stealth monopole looking like a pine tree would actually look like from various vantage points there and have a more targeted, tailored visual assessment of that. I concur with Ron that one of the significant issues here is going to be visual and final location. And I think the more information the Board has on the stealth monopole two proposed locations and more tailored photosimulations would be helpful for your determination. And that's where we're at. Recall that this is also pending before the Zoning Board of Appeals on the variance application and likewise the Zoning Board will be reviewing those responses as well.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you, Attorney Gilchrist. Are there comments or questions from the Board members for the applicant? Crickets. I will echo Attorney Gilchrist's request and the Town engineer's request for some kind of market study relative to the subject location, the details of which can be sorted out by the attorney and engineer and applicant. I also do think it's important that we see the visual simulations for both the 80 and 90 foot towers that are more tailored to the project proposal. And while I agree that probably the stormwater, I didn't get through all the 260-odd pages but, at some point we will need to deal with the stormwater management and the sound of the generators and refueling. But I feel comfortable that can be dealt with at a later date when the actual site is, if chose, is chosen. Are there any other comments from the Board members? Just for the record, I did go see the site up on Route 40 that was presented as an example, and I did take photographs from Route 40 but you wouldn't be able to pick it out because in that location the top of the monopine sits just above the existing tree line and you're quite a distance away from the subject property. I drove up some of the side roads, I believe the access to the monopine is off Route 40 but I didn't access the site and I didn't see it on any of the residential or commercial properties east of Route 40 when I drove through those neighborhoods. So while it's still a monopine, its location is a bit different from this applicant's location being that it's not directly adjacent to houses that don't have mature vegetation around them. I don't know if any of the other members got to see any of the other towers. There was one mentioned in Halfmoon, two in Halfmoon, and the one on Route 40. Having heard no other comments, would somebody like to table this application to the first meeting of the month of July?

Member Henderson: I'll make the motion.

Member Tarbox: I second.

Member Stancliffe: I don't know that we need a roll call vote but we'll take one just in case.

Chuck Golden: Member Henderson?

Member Henderson: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Krieger?

Member Krieger: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Mainello?

Member Mainello: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Chairman Oster? We lost the audio again.

Chuck Golden: Member Petersen absent. Member Stancliffe?

Member Stancliffe: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Tarbox?

Member Tarbox: Aye.

Member Stancliffe: OK so if you could address those comments and work with the attorney and engineer regarding the market study. We'll move you onto the next meeting, the first meeting in month of July.

Chuck Golden: That meeting will be July 2.

Allyson Phillips: We will coordinate with the attorney and get you response to those follow-up comments.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Is there any new issues for the Board?

Chuck Golden: We have no new business.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Attorney Gilchrist was there any comments back from the applicant for the Brunswick/Hoosick Street project behind Planet Fitness?

Attorney Gilchrist: No further submissions at this time. The applicant on that project did submit a variance application to the Zoning Board of Appeals on a parking area near the proposed Kentucky Fried Chicken. That does remain pending and we're looking at a few issues in connection with that variance application.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. If there's no other comments, we'll entertain the motion...

Member Henderson: I would just like to thank you, Linda, for stepping in and running the meeting tonight. I know we're all experiencing, well most of us are, well some of us are, technical difficulties and this is not easy in this format, and I'd just like to say thank you for taking over when Russ faded.

Member Stancliffe: You're welcome. So does that mean you're going to make the motion to adjourn?

Attorney Gilchrist: Before you adjourn, Acting Chair Stancliffe, just to confirm the July 2 agenda for the members. There are two public hearings that are noticed for that meeting. The Gallivan minor subdivision as well as the Currier special use permit. And from tonight's meeting the Farrell special use permit and site plan as well as the Blue Sky Tower application. I think that's the entirety of the July 2 agenda.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you, Attorney Gilchrist.

Member Tarbox: I drove by the Gallivan property. There's quite a bit of wetlands, more than I thought was there, adjacent to the road. I'm just concerned about the 100-foot setback interfering with the proposed lots. When you go from the pond, it's visible and there's a high spot and then from that high spot to the Godell house there's quite a stretch, maybe a couple hundred feet, that's standing water that's part of the swamp. So I think we have to make sure that the DEC questions are answered on that property.

Member Stancliffe: Since I'm recused on that application, I think somebody else should step in perhaps.

Attorney Gilchrist: Well for purposes of this meeting, we'll just note that the comment has been raised and that will be reviewed and looked at by Mr. Bonesteel. And I'm sure comments may come in on that in the public hearing on July 2. So it's noted for the record.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you. Any other comments? If not, we'll entertain a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Member Tarbox: I'll make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Member Henderson: I'll second that.

Member Stancliffe: Mr. Golden, please call the roll call.

Chuck Golden: Member Henderson?

Member Henderson: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Krieger?

Member Krieger: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Mainello?

Member Mainello: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Chairman Oster?

Chuck Golden: Member Petersen absent. Member Stancliffe?

Member Stancliffe: Aye.

Chuck Golden: Member Tarbox?

Member Tarbox: Aye.

Chuck Golden: The motion passes.

Member Stancliffe: Thank you all, see you in a few weeks.

Pat Poletto: Goodnight everyone.