

THE REGULAR MEETING of the ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS of the Town of Cortlandt was conducted at the Town Hall, 1 Heady St., Cortlandt Manor, NY on *Wednesday, July 20th, 2016*. The meeting was called to order, and began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

David S. Douglas, Chairman presided and other members of the Board were in attendance as follows:

Wai Man Chin, Vice Chairman (absent)
Charles P. Heady, Jr.
James Seirmarco (absent)
John Mattis
Adrian C. Hunte
Raymond Reber

Also Present

Ken Hoch, Clerk of the Zoning Board
John Klarl, Deputy Town attorney

* * *

ADOPTION OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JUNE 15, 2016

Mr. John Mattis stated I move that we approve the minutes of the June 15th meeting.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated the minutes are adopted.

* * *

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARINGS TO AUG. 17:

- A. **CASE NO. 2016-10 New York SMSA Limited Partnership /d/b/a Verizon Wireless** for a Special Permit to install a wireless telecommunication facility on property located at **1065 Quaker Bridge Rd. East, Croton-on-Hudson, NY.**

Mr. David Douglas stated that's been adjourned until August.

* * *

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

**A. CASE NO. 2016-09 Building Permit Services on behalf of
Kieran and Kathleen Beltran** for Area Variances for the height of an
accessory structure, the height from finished floor to the underside of framing,
and the total square footage of the accessory structures on property located at
106 Kings Ferry Rd., Montrose, NY.

Mr. David Douglas asked do you want to come up? Before you begin, I'm going to remind you and everybody else to talk into the microphone because apparently last month the person transcribing things had quite a difficult time, so that's just a reminder to everyone.

Mr. Beltran stated subsequent to the last meeting, Mr. Mattis and Mr. Reber came over to the property and reviewed the barn area with us which was very helpful. I appreciate that. As a result thereof, I requested the architect to revise the drawings in what I believe is in accord with that which was, if you wouldn't mind, my apologies Mr. Hoch if you could just move us forward. Thank you. It has a 6'8" or 6'9" reduction in the length – the depth from the existing barn area and reduces the ridge height by a foot so it's at 22 foot depth and I believe, it was originally, we had it on the original set of plans at 28.9 or something and now it's at 22 foot. If you wouldn't mind just jumping back to the previous. I think now that – you'll notice if you see in the upper right corner, that's the barn area and is still is less than the existing accessory areas. Essentially, that's the basic layout and I think we tried to do what was asked of us. The last two slides you'll see the square footage of the existing barn which includes that back piece and the shed areas. I think this still comes in less than that actually. From an accessory structure, I think it's less square footage. You'll notice, I think he's superimposed the existing ridge line and the – I think it's the 6 or 7 foot and change reduction in the size and generally keeps us consistent with what I believe we agreed. I think the last shot is – these are the metrics itself. I'm assuming that those have been adjusted accordingly.

Mr. John Mattis stated the one thing we noticed that we had to contact the architect on: he never gave the front height which we found out was 14 feet 6 inches.

Mr. Beltran stated I thought that was on the plans, no?

Mr. John Mattis stated a lot of the dimensions are not on here. Is there any reason for 14 feet 6. With 14 feet you don't need a Variance. The slope was changed just a little bit. It doesn't go as far back.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated you still need a Variance because the formula requires calculating around the building but we said we would ignore that if they met the normal height.

Mr. John Mattis stated because it would meet the normal height in the front and in the back because it slopes down, yes you'd still need a Variance but we were considering – because I

think we talked about the 14 feet and he came back and we didn't have it on here and he was contacted and said it's 14 feet 6 inches.

Mr. Beltran stated I know the dimension I took away from the discussion was; bring the ridge down a foot and that's what instructed him.

Mr. John Mattis stated it had originally said it was 15 feet. Could we bring that down 6 more inches? As long as he's changing the slope might as well bring it down to 14.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated you should be able to get the same footprint just change the slight slope pitch and you'll be there. I have a question for Code Enforcement. Mr. Hoch, looking at his numbers: average height calculations for the barn, I assume these are elevation heights that he uses and then he does the math. Have you checked these? Does it make sense because I can't reconcile those numbers and heights versus his end number which is the 20 feet and 4 inches or whatever he comes up with.

Mr. John Mattis stated no, it's 18.83, that's revised.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated the chart, that's not what's on the plans. Like I said, have you gone through and reconciled?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded no we have not.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated I would suggest sitting down with him – not that it's critical to us. If we get the 14 feet on the front then we're going to ignore the rest so it's okay it's just that I couldn't reconcile the calcs.

Mr. John Mattis stated we have a number of abstract numbers with no calculations so we're going to accept that subject to the review of Code Enforcement just to make sure it's okay because they usually show us how they do it. You've cut down the back somewhat so it's not going as deep. It's going to look nice too. We're going to approve this to 14 feet and then he'll just have to bring it down to 6 inches but since he's changing the slope anyway it shouldn't be a problem. Okay? Other board members?

Mr. David Douglas asked anybody else want to be heard?

Mr. John Mattis asked anybody in the audience want to be heard? On case #2016-09 I move that we close the public hearing.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated public hearing is closed. That's only the first vote.

Mr. John Mattis stated we have to approve it now. We just closed the public hearing. Now you

can't speak anymore. On case #2016-09 I move that we approve an Area Variance for the height of an accessory structure – well we don't need that from a 14 feet to 22.3. We will say that will be 14 feet...

Mr. David Douglas stated actually, we're not approving a Variance on the height.

Mr. John Mattis stated the height – we don't have to do the height because it's 14 feet. It will be the average building height as calculated though, due to the formula, will be 18.83 feet and that will be subject to the approval of Code Enforcement and also the proposed coverage will go from an allowable for the accessory structures from 15,125.08 feet to 22,094.89 square feet. This is a type II SEQRA and no further compliance is required.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated now it's granted.

Mr. John Mattis stated you're all set.

Mr. David Douglas asked can somebody from Code Enforcement do the necessary to make sure that it's 14 feet?

Mr. Ken Hoch stated when he submits the revised plan to get the permit then we'll double check the calculations.

*

*

*

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- A. CASE NO. 2016-11 Graphik Identities on behalf of Physician One Urgent Care** for an Area Variances for front, rear and side wall signage at **3121 E Main St. at the Cortlandt Town Center, Mohegan Lake, NY.**

Ms. Karen stated with Graphik Identities and we're looking for a size Variance for the Physician One signage. Their name is so long that the letters end up being too small so we're hoping to get a slight variation in size so that they'll be more legible and we're also looking for a side sign and there is no visibility of the tenant space coming from the Wal-Mart direction unless we put a sign on the side.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated this is my case. Just about every tenant that comes into the Town Center has to come before us for Variances. We've spent a lot of time looking at signage and specifically to the different locations within the Town Center. We can see a sign on the front and a sign on the back. Your neighbors have those. We do have a question about the sign in the

front as we see it. First you're asking for a sign larger than the one that you're asking for in the back yet the one in the back looks like it fits nicely with what we've got on the building. The one you're proposing for the front looks to be larger. If you look at it in the way it's presented, it actually hangs over the rails more than the neighbor's.

Ms. Karen stated it would actually be moved down on the rails.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated this board is thinking it should be – what we're saying is we don't see a reason for a Variance for the front sign. You get 32 square feet. That's what you're asking for in the back which does require a Variance and we're willing to consider that. Our proposal is use the same size sign front and back. Then, as far as the side wall, as you noticed there are none all on that particular building. You show us the building across the street with the side signs. Our logic here is that the businesses in the strip where you're in, people can see it when they come off of Route 6 as they come down, that's the back signs, people that come up from Home Depot, obviously can see it because you're approaching the front. Your concern is about coming from Wal-Mart and the east and generally we have found that maybe, maybe not, but still as you approach and you're supposed to stop at that intersection, that's a stop intersection, they can look up on the wall and see...

Ms. Karen stated can't see it. There's trees in the way.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated the only reason why the people on that other building have the signs is doesn't matter where you come, it's very difficult to see. For example, you've got that Children of America and you've got DSW. It's very difficult to spot those businesses so we conceded to that but this board has not conceded that the building that you're in really requires a third sign. That's my understanding on where the board is. I leave it to the rest of the board to give their thoughts and you can counter as you see appropriate.

Ms. Karen stated where we have ambulances that come in and it would be very difficult to find, if they came in – and it seems that a lot of the traffic comes in through the Wal-Mart entrance. It seems to be the main entrance to the plaza.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated those that are coming from the east.

Ms. Karen stated yes and the reason why we wanted a larger sign on the front of the building was because if you're traveling from Home Depot, there's a much farther distance for visibility versus just the side sign, the rear sign, you actually drive right by it and we actually couldn't ask for anything larger for the rear or the side because there's a restrictions as to how large you can go.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated I, myself...

Ms. Karen stated at the 44 ¼ square feet, you're looking at a 9 ¼ inch letter for the Urgent Care and a 12 inch letter for the Physician Care. The 'Bread' in Panera is about 14 inches. As you

can tell, they're very small, even with the 44 square feet.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated there are other members of this board that are more concerned than I am about some of these signs so maybe they would like to chime in and take over.

Mr. James Seirmarco stated in a minute I will.

Mr. David Douglas stated anybody else want to make comments – I know Mr. Seirmarco does, does anybody else want to say anything before he does?

Mr. John Mattis stated we've had cases before on this very building where they wanted the signs on the side there...

Ms. Karen stated Moe's does have one.

Ms. Adrian Hunte stated but Moe's is actually on the corner.

Mr. John Mattis stated and the interior ones, not the corner one, we've turned them all down and we're trying to be consistent. Coming from Wal-Mart you don't really see that sign on the side until you're up at the stop sign anyway.

Ms. Karen stated right, but at least it's visibility so that people know that they're there. I mean if people are sick or ambulance is coming in they're not going to have any idea they're there.

Mr. John Mattis stated for instance, Panera is very happy and their sign is further behind those trees as you say, you know. People see that.

Mr. Raymond Reber asked a question for Code Enforcement. Don't we, in some cases, allow directional signs so that people – for something like this would it be possible to put a small directional sign at the intersection?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded yes, if the Town Center has room on their pylons to give them one.

Ms. Karen stated the pylon doesn't actually face...

Mr. Raymond Reber stated I don't mean the big pylons. Don't we have sometimes, separate – we allow a small directional sign...

Mr. Ken Hoch stated not for the merchant. They're all grouped in various little monuments around...

Mr. Raymond Reber stated they have to be on the pylons?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded we've never let anybody put a single sign up.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated just a sign saying “Emergency Care” with an arrow pointing or something like that?

Mr. John Mattis stated like the size of the stop sign or something.

Ms. Adrian Hunte asked there’s no more space on the pylon there as you come in...

Ms. Karen responded there is no directional for that. There’s one if you’re coming in that entrance where you’ll see the sign in the rear of the building but it faces traffic coming in, it doesn’t face the traffic coming from Wal-Mart. There is no directional at all for that.

Mr. John Mattis stated it just shows some of the establishments that are there but it doesn’t show where they are, that pylon.

Ms. Karen stated there actually really isn’t a directional coming from that direction.

Mr. David Douglas asked somebody coming in an ambulance; the ambulance is going to know where they’re going.

Ms. Karen stated we hope so.

Mr. David Douglas stated the fact that there’s ambulances involved to me that’s cut the other way of the necessity for a sign. It’s not your average person just driving around. It’s the ambulance. They know exactly where they’re going. Hopefully they know without you.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated the other thing to consider too is the fact that nowadays it seems that everybody is using GPS so they just program it and...

Ms. Karen stated you really need it there. That’s a tough shopping center.

Mr. James Seirmarco stated Ray, you probably mentioned the fact that the sign on the back is 32 square feet and the one in the front, I think that should be 32 square feet also. It doesn’t have to be any bigger.

Mr. David Douglas stated that’s my personal view too. I don’t see any reason why the front sign needs to be bigger than the rear sign that you’ve got.

Mr. Raymond Reber asked anybody else in the audience want to comment on this? We -- is the consensus that the front sign should be held to the limit of the 32?

Mr. David Douglas responded it was at the work session. I don’t know, two days have passed but at the work session it was.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated if that's the case and if we were going to vote on this, to get a favorable vote, we would say no Variance on the front sign and we would grant the Variance on the rear sign and we would not grant the side signs. Is that my understanding?

Mr. James Seirmarco and Mr. David Douglas responded yes.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated I guess we can vote on that or if you think there's some reason to adjourn and you want to make some adjustments and counter the offer but I think you're getting the gist of the sense of the board here because you need 4 votes to get an approval.

Ms. Karen stated I appreciate it. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Raymond Reber asked do you want us to vote on it and give you...

Mr. David Douglas asked which do you prefer? In other words, if you want to go back and speak with your representative – you're the sign company?

Ms. Karen responded correct.

Mr. David Douglas asked so if you want time to speak with your client, we'll adjourn it until next month but if you're willing to have us vote as we've done it then...

Ms. Karen responded no and I don't think anything's going to change.

Mr. David Douglas stated that's fine. We just want to give you that option.

Ms. Karen stated I appreciate that.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated I make a motion on case #2016-11 to adjourn the public hearing.

Mr. David Douglas stated no, no she said she wanted to go ahead with the vote.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated to close the public hearing, sorry.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated the public hearing is closed.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated on case #2016-11 for Graphik Identities on behalf of Physicians One for a new business location at the Cortlandt Town Center to deny a Variance for a front sign to exceed the allowable 32 square feet but to grant a Variance for the rear sign from an allowed 16 square feet up to the 32 square feet and to deny a request for a side sign. This is a SEQRA type II, no further compliance required.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated the Variance is partially granted consistent with what Mr. Reber said.

B. CASE NO. 2016-12 John Palumbo for an Area Variance for the side yard setback for a proposed addition on property located at 1090 Oregon Rd., Cortlandt Manor.

Ms. Adrian Hunte stated good evening.

Mr. Tom Palumbo stated I'm John's son. Unfortunately my father had to be away today so I'm just here in case you have any questions.

Ms. Adrian Hunte stated Mr. Palumbo, is this a two-family house or is it a three-family house?

Mr. Tom Palumbo responded two-family house.

Ms. Adrian Hunte stated two? Were we able to ascertain – it is two. This is an application for an Area Variance for the side yard setback for a proposed addition at 1090 Oregon Road, Cortlandt Manor. I think at the work session we were pretty much concerned whether this was a two-family or three and if it were three-family then it would be non-conforming and it would be denied but since it is two-family we, or at least I am of the opinion that it should be...

Mr. Tom Palumbo stated that was a concern because it would be – the third meter is for the garage...

Mr. David Douglas asked I just want to clarify Mr. Hoch, what is non-conforming? Is the two-family non-conforming or just if it's three?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded let me just check.

Mr. David Douglas asked what is the current zoning – the current allowed zoning is two-family?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded yes.

Mr. John Mattis stated the Decision and Order from 1985 says "the board interprets the house has been continually used as a two-family residence" so since prior to '51 is therefore a pre-existing non-conforming use? It's a pre-existing, non-conforming. Therefore we can't allow it to be expanded.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated unless the zoning was changed again from '85.

Mr. Ken Hoch stated I don't know if the zoning's been changed. It's an R10 now.

Mr. John Mattis asked and what is R10 allowed?

Mr. Raymond Reber responded single-family right?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded allowed two-family I believe. I don't have my book.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated you need a special permit for an accessory apartment.

Mr. Ken Hoch stated he can do an accessory but I think an R10, I'd have to go double check that.

Mr. John Mattis stated we're going to have to wait.

Mr. David Douglas stated I've got the book. I can either look at it or if you can do it faster.

Mr. John Mattis stated we're just trying to clarify what's allowed.

Mr. Ken Hoch stated I've got my book. Constructed prior to 1993.

Mr. John Mattis asked is what?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded is permitted.

Mr. John Mattis asked it is permitted so it's not a non-conforming?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded it's not a non-conforming because it was constructed before '93 in an R10 zone.

Ms. Adrian Hunte asked anyone else have any comments on the board? Anyone in the audience wish to be heard? Hearing none. On case #2016-12 I make a motion that we close the public hearing.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated public hearing is closed.

Ms. Adrian Hunte stated on case #2016-12 for an Area Variance for a side yard setback for a proposed addition from a required 7.47 feet down to 5.33 feet I make a motion that we approve or grant the Variance. This is a SEQRA type II action, no further compliance required.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated it's granted.

- C. CASE NO. 2016-13 Christopher Esposito** for An Interpretation that a proposed deck addition is not an expansion of a non-conforming use, and if approved, an Area Variance for the front yard setback on property located at **236 Kings Ferry Rd., Verplanck, NY.**

Mr. David Douglas stated it's my understanding that the applicant wanted to adjourn this.

Mr. Ken Hoch stated yes, I received an email today from the applicant requesting it be adjourned to the August meeting.

Mr. David Douglas stated as we discussed with the applicant at the work session on Monday it will be adjourned until – well we have to vote on that. Does somebody want to make a motion on this?

So moved, seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated case #2016-13 is adjourned until August.

- D. CASE NO. 2016-14 Michael Casolaro** Area Variances for the minimum lot size and lot width in the HC zone for a specialty trade contractor on property located at **2006 Albany Post Rd., Croton-on-Hudson.**

Mr. Joseph Riina stated good evening. I'm Joseph Riina [inaudible 25:49] Site Design Consultant and the engineer for the project. This project is currently before the Planning Board. It's zoned Highway/Commercial and the applicant is seeking a Special Use Permit as a Specialty Trade site. The site as it exists and has been in the past it uses as a commercial use, however, the fact that Mr. Casolaro is the roofing contractor and runs a roofing business, that falls under Specialty Trade requirement. There's an existing two and a half story building on the site. There's an existing driveway and parking area. There are no major improvements being proposed to the site other than delineating where the handicap parking space is going to be and in addition of a storage shed at the rear of the parking area where miscellaneous supplies and equipment might be stored. The site is 17,935 square feet where 20,000 square feet is required so it's shy 2,065 square feet which we are seeking a Variance. The minimum lot width is 100 feet, 56 is divided and therefore we're looking for relief on that also.

Ms. Adrian Hunte asked 58.5 or 56?

Mr. David Douglas stated our notes here say 58.5. I don't know if this is accurate.

Mr. Joseph Riina responded it could be. Lastly is the shed, the 12' x 20' shed and if that's considered an accessory building that would require a Variance also, a side yard Variance, of a

little less than 17 feet. Does that fall in that category on that side yard Variance? The shed...

Mr. Ken Hoch responded there was no shed proposed.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated the latest iteration of the plan has a shed.

Mr. Raymond Reber stated because there's an arrow on this property there's probably two Variances one, if the shed is large and the second is setbacks.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated the shed we're proposing is here at the rear end of the parking lot...

Mr. Raymond Reber asked that would have to be re-advertised wouldn't it?

Mr. Ken Hoch told me when I spoke with the applicant he told me he was going to drop the shed so I don't know...

Mr. Joseph Riina stated he did not.

Mr. Ken Hoch stated and then I think the board's going to have to do the coordinated review with the Planning Board before you adopt the Resolution. I don't know if they're going to change this or where the shed was with them.

Mr. John Mattis stated we generally don't vote on these until the Planning Board gives the okay.

Mr. John Klarl stated subject to.

Mr. John Mattis asked are they – they're not finished yet right?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded no they're not finished yet.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated there's a public hearing in August.

Mr. John Mattis stated and that's before us so we can keep this open until next month then if the shed's there...

Mr. Joseph Riina stated they can make a decision then, put a decision statement out conditional to your approval. Is that it?

Mr. John Klarl responded it would be subject to ZBA's approval.

Mr. John Mattis stated it's always subject to us afterwards.

Mr. John Klarl stated but the Planning Board was endorsing a larger shed. They had some colloquy going back-and-forth and the Planning Board said why don't you make it a little larger

so we don't see anything outside of the shed. There was that discussion. I don't know if you were aware of that.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated I was not aware of that, no.

Mr. John Klarl stated we'll see how it turns out.

Mr. David Douglas stated so the Planning Board wants to have a larger shed.

Mr. John Klarl stated they want to make it a little larger shed because they don't want to see...

Mr. John Mattis stated we'll give them the Variance.

Mr. John Klarl stated they also a couple advocated of getting rid of some trees. Some people on the Planning Board were advocating getting rid of some trees.

Mr. Joseph Riina asked getting rid of some trees?

Mr. John Klarl stated you ought to check with the Planning Board on that.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated I guess so.

Mr. John Mattis stated we better keep this open then.

Mr. David Douglas stated this sounds like the opposite of the usual Planning Board comments which is usually smaller and preserve trees.

Mr. John Mattis stated we still have some questions what the final plan is. The Planning Board will finish it and then it will come back to us and if there's a shed it will show where it is, what size, etc.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated so we really didn't have to be here tonight?

Mr. John Mattis stated it's good to get it started. We pretty much know what's going on we just need the final and then we should probably have that next month I would guess. If the Planning Board's finished next month, we'll be able to finish next month.

Mr. John Klarl stated for further edification Mr. Riina, the Planning Board discussed it back-and-forth and in doing so they said maybe you should have a larger shed because we don't want to see stuff outside the shed and the guy testified that he had trucks that went out in the morning, they had the materials at the job site, came back with just some shingles left but there was no real outside store the materials on that property, but they're advocating to make sure it will go inside some kind of enclosure.

Mr. John Mattis asked how many parking spaces will there be?

Mr. Joseph Riina responded 7 parking spaces, 5 are required.

Mr. John Mattis asked 5 are required?

Mr. Joseph Riina responded yes.

Mr. John Mattis asked how many trucks does he have? Two?

Mr. Joseph Riina responded he generally runs two crews, sometimes three crews.

Mr. John Mattis stated so there'll be two or three trucks.

Mr. Joseph Riina responded yes.

Mr. John Klarl stated and he said they go out in the morning and then come back at night.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated yes, basically, they come in the morning, get the tools in the trucks, leave – there's really no need for customers to visit. They don't have any type of sales type operations just administrative office that they're going to have.

Mr. John Klarl stated any approval by the Planning Board will be subject to this board's approval.

Mr. Ken Hoch stated and I would just add that if there is going to be a shed, I can check with Planning if that's on the latest plan and if it doesn't need a Variance then I can re-advertise it for the August meeting.

Mr. David Douglas right, because they're coming back anyway.

Mr. Joseph Riina asked but we do meet in August again?

Mr. David Douglas responded yes.

Ms. Adrian Hunte stated August 17th.

Mr. John Mattis stated August 17th. It's always the third Wednesday.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated okay, August 17th.

Mr. David Douglas stated our work session is on August 15th and you should probably advise Ken by when?

Mr. Ken Hoch responded within a week of what they're really doing with the shed.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated I'll clarify it – some of this is new. I'll clarify that.

Mr. John Mattis stated if we approve this tonight they may change it. That way – they're not going to do anything until both parties approve. We have to wait for their approval in August and we can probably finish this in August then.

Mr. Joseph Riina stated okay, very good. Thank you very much.

Mr. John Mattis stated since there's nobody in the audience I'm going to ask that we adjourn case #2016-14 to the August meeting.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated this case is adjourned to next month. We'll see you next month.

*

*

*

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. David Douglas stated I think there's a request that we go into executive session.

Mr. John Mattis stated we have a memo, a resolution here that we're not sure what it is. It has to do with some new laws or something. I'm going to suggest that we go into executive session to discuss that.

Mr. Raymond Reber asked should we close?

Mr. David Douglas stated we'll close the meeting and I guess we can just say we're not going to do anything else after the executive session.

Mr. John Mattis stated I move that we close the meeting then.

Seconded with all in favor saying "aye."

Mr. David Douglas stated just noting for the video and the web and all the rest that we're going to go into executive session but we're not going to conduct anymore business out here after that.

Mr. John Klarl stated when we come out of executive session we'll be adjourning the meeting for the night.

*

*

*

**NEXT MEETING DATE:
WEDNESDAY, AUG. 17, 2016**