

TOWN OF CORNWALL

PLANNING BOARD

January 3, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: NEIL NOVESKY, CHAIRMAN
LED KLOSKY
WYNN GOLD
KENN BRODMERKEL

ALSO PRESENT: AMY ZAMENICK, ESQ,
PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY

LESLIE DOTSON
PLANNING BOARD CONSULTANT

GARY VINSON
BUILDING INSPECTOR

ABSENT: MICHAEL LOBLANCO
WILLIAM GRABE
HELEN BUNT
MARK EDSALL, P.E.
PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER

REGULAR MEETING:

MR. NOVESKY: I'd like to call to order the regular meeting of the Town of Cornwall Planning Board for January 3, 2012. Absent is Helen Bunt, I have not heard from Helen, I don't know what the story is there. We heard from Mike that he called in and Bill is sick, he called me and Kenn is a little under the weather tonight as well.

CORRESPONDENCE

MR. NOVESKY: With that, we have correspondence from the Orange County Department of Health which we'll discuss. We have a copy of the adopted schedule for 2012, that's the adopted planning board schedule that has been deemed acceptable and the board voted on it last month. And everybody received a draft of the comprehensive plan of which we'll briefly, briefly discuss this evening. Other than that, there are no

items on the agenda, no old business.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. NOVESKY: Approval of the minutes. Everybody receive their minutes diligently done by Fran?

MR. KLOSKY: Move we approve the minutes

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

DISCUSSION

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

MR. KLOSKY: I'm in receipt of a letter about the comprehensive plan from the Orange County Department of Planning, it was on the desk when I arrived this evening. For the record, I have not had an opportunity to review their findings statement.

MR. NOVESKY: Duly noted. Anyone else have a comment on the receipt of the Orange County Department of Planning's review of the plan?

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'm in the same state.

MR. GOLD: As am I.

MR. NOVESKY: All members are in the same state having received this letter today, haven't had a chance to read it. I had a chance since I got here early to have a cursory review and I understand most of it but I think that would require further discussion at a later time. With that, we'll open up a brief discussion and Leslie, if we can do a very, very quick overview. I'm sure all the members have reviewed the comprehensive plan draft submitted, if you just want to do a very, maybe a five minute overview of the significant changes that would be great.

MS. DOTSON: Well, there weren't really a lot of significant changes from what you had looked at before. What we did we, there were more--

MR. KLOSKY: When you say before, 2005?

MS. DOTSON: Previously, no, no, from when you had looked at the previous draft after.

MR. KLOSKY: In 2010?

MS. DOTSON: Correct, in 2011, it was in August.

MR. BRODMERKEL: We asked questions about it and got no answers so we didn't get anyplace with the previous draft.

MS. DOTSON: You were not happy.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I got no answer to the questions we

asked, neither did the rest of the board so we didn't learn anything.

MS. DOTSON: The bottom line is that some of the changes from the existing 2005 plan are that the proposal to deal with some of the changes downtown. There's some discussions with how to, you know, reconsider some of the uses downtown to try to encourage historic destinations of the downtown in order to make the town eligible for some funding for historic preservation, that sort of thing. Also recommending making the approval process more streamlined if possible, again downtown with the aim of making land use turnover more expeditious. The other changes with respect to potentially large institutional uses it was suggested to provide for a Planned Unit Development concept which basically allows sort of a tailored specific zoning that would be specific to the particular use. So, in other words, it's not something that's set in advance, it's something that would be refined at the time and the affects of it would have to be evaluated at the time. So that was that proposal. What else?

MS. ZAMENICK: That was the change a lot of the downtown, you said that.

MS. DOTSON: There were a few little tweaks. Some of the environmental things, you know, proposal to look at corridors, wildlife corridors to try to provide for those considering the movement of wildlife in the context of a land use approval. So, for example, if you're looking at the large project consider that, you know, that you can preserve a way for wildlife that may already be moving across it to continue moving across it so that they don't wind up isolating and vulcanizing habitat areas so that's an important change.

MR. KLOSKY: Are there any proposed changes in the PRD?

MS. DOTSON: The thing with this particular plan is that it does not propose any specific zoning changes.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Or anything specific.

MS. DOTSON: No, well, it provides some general goals and guidelines and so that's something where, you know, unlike the previous plan which included some very specific recommendations and several recommendations specifically to the zoning a lot of which were already

adopted the change in the lot size and the way you calculate the lot sizes and massive changes in the whole acreage requirements for specific zones, none of that is included within this. So there's no specific zoning amendments and no specific map changes that are proposed.

MR. KLOSKY: So our task tonight, Mr. Chairman, if I may, our task tonight is to send a recommendation forward to the town board as to our opinion on the draft or what is the outcome of tonight's contemplations.

MS. DOTSON: Amy, do you want to speak to that?

MS. ZAMENICK: It's part of the town, it has come here for a review, it has to be referred here, you review it, if the board has any comments and concerns then you could authorize one of us, either Leslie or myself, to prepare a letter that would then go back to the town board for consideration. It's really something to just, it gives everybody the opportunity to see material and express their areas of interest and concern.

MR. NOVESKY: There is no requirement for any type of approvals or recommendations other than suggestions?

MS. ZAMENICK: Other than suggestions.

MR. KLOSKY: Send a letter with our concerns.

MR. BRODMERKEL: There's a sheet which you check off we've seen it and go.

MR. GOLD: What's the expectation of the town board's action, you know, other than there's very little in here as Leslie just said, very little specific? I mean, there's one thing I saw in here that I question, it's not all that critical and a few other comments that are in here but the rest of it is just kind of suggestions. One of the suggestions form a business improvement district. That suggestion, the first time I heard that was probably the second meeting I chaired on the Economic Development Advisory Committee.

MR. BRODMERKEL: And one before that.

MR. GOLD: It was ruled impractical then, it was ruled impractical when Gerry chaired that committee because

there aren't enough businesses to form it. So I don't understand, I mean, I know why we can't say why they undertook this exercise but I understand but there's no call to action in this thing.

MS. DOTSON: There's some specific goals and guidelines that are proposed within this, every plan has a different approach to things. The last plan was much more specific. This plan just sets forth some specific overarching goals and suggested possible means of achieving them. There are lots of ways to bake a cake which is why it doesn't specifically look at particular solutions to achieving the goals because that it was decided to include that within this, however, at such time as any specific implementation action is taken those affects would need to be looked at in much more detail. In fact, one of the comments in fact that the county had made was not one of the binding comments, they only made two binding comments. One of their advisory comments did say basically gee, we'd really like it if you had something more specific and you, you know, mapped out some particular worded zone changes and that's not something that's intended for this so--

MR. NOVESKY: I note in the county's comments they do say something to the tune limiting all housing in one defined area or project to a certain age group or income would not be economically sustainable. I think that discussion has been an ongoing discussion last year or so hasn't it?

MS. ZAMENICK: Yes.

MS. DOTSON: This is honestly no surprise for the county to be saying this.

MR. NOVESKY: No discussion within the town in terms of changing some of the zoning from 55 and over to diversifying it?

MS. DOTSON: Right, although you may recall that when the county had referred to restricted, age restricted projects they were less than enthusiastic about them to begin with, the county looks to have projects that are balanced and sustainable. They don't like anything that's particularly restricted to one and so they're consistent. So this came as no surprise and it's consistent with everything they have been saying over the past several years, you know, that the town diverged from and overrode some of those specific

concerns of theirs previously because you didn't necessarily agree. I think--

MR. NOVESKY: But that's one of the binding comments, is it not?

MS. DOTSON: Well, yes.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Talking about the county's document again?

MR. NOVESKY: Yes. I know members haven't read it but this is kind of a freewheeling discussion.

MS. ZAMENICK: It doesn't, it's not a binding comment, we don't have anything in here that's contrary to recommendation number two. So I think it's almost a binding comment to make sure we don't do anything to number two because there isn't anything--

MR. NOVESKY: If there isn't anything in the plan that relates to that specific issue why do they bring it up?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Because they like to do it.

MS. DOTSON: Because of the demographics, they read the whole plan and they referenced that, talks about we don't like very specific projects, they also spoke particularly to the conclusions that were made in the 2010 census, the talks about the high percentage of older age groups, young adults moving elsewhere and more white collar than blue color within the town. This is not something that just happened within the 2010 census, this is something also present in the previous census and some of that can get down to a question of, you know, how much of a role does any municipality intend to play to try to nudge the demographics within the town in a particular direction, you know. So the county's comments come from their specific point of view but there are lots of factors that have made up the town's demographics, you know, and I had a very long discussion with them on this because I wanted to make sure that I understand exactly what they were saying and where they were coming from and they did say specifically that it was more just an overarching philosophy of theirs.

MR. NOVESKY: I'll try to clarify what the purpose of this thing is of the comprehensive plan in terms of--

MR. BRODMERKEL: Good question.

MR. NOVESKY: Why are we doing this? Not to throw a negative, I'm not being adversarial at all.

MS. ZAMENICK: It's common to, it's common and it's appropriate to revise your comprehensive plan every five to ten years, right now we're approaching on seven, it's a very appropriate time to update it. It removes some of the things that no longer are applicable especially with the current economic climate.

MR. NOVESKY: Let me ask you the last time it was revised and the time before that what's the, I guess what's the authority of the plan? And why if it has to be revised constantly is it reviewed for whether or not it was effective the first time or is it--

MS. DOTSON: That was one of the things that was looked at in this, as part of your review when you consider do you want an entirely new replacement plan or just want to update certain components of it. It was decided that some components of this really just needed to be updated, that's why this was a very targeted update.

MR. NOVESKY: Is that a guide to somebody?

MS. DOTSON: It's a policy guide to the town. But when this is adopted, whenever this is adopted by the town board, it becomes the guiding policy for the town and all actions of the town need to be consistent with this so, you know, whether it's a budget or whether it's a zoning law or whether it's even a land purchase.

MR. GOLD: Are we laboring under the assumption that the town board is going to adopt some version of this? I know they adopted the plan that I worked on six or seven years ago but the plan prior to that was never adopted, pieces of the zoning were put into place but the plan I have was not adopted. So I guess I come back to my question of expectation, other than it looks good in a binder and takes up space on my desk, we're all asking the same question, what's the point?

MS. DOTSON: The previous plan was adopted and, okay, and it's common for people to get rather frustrated because I think it's common to expect that the entire plan that every single recommendation within it is going to be diligently pursued and implemented all at

the same timeframe and on the same scale and in fact, municipalities are no different than families, we all have priorities and so it's very common for plans to be implemented in kind of a disjointed or step-wise fashion so the things that are screaming bonzo, the big priorities do get implemented. That's one of the things that the committee did look at that there were an awful lot of the recommendations of the previous plan that did get implemented and we've had a chance to see how they worked.

MS. ZAMENICK: If I may cut in, that's a normal process of the plan because you're constantly updating it every five to ten years and because you do have so many recommendations in there when you do go and look at your plan, it's normal to say well, we implemented this, we did not implement that. Did we not do it because it didn't end up making sense or we didn't get to do what we want to do. In the next five or ten years it's common to see it be in a more non-specific form. I'm working on it in two other municipalities and they have all taken this approach, especially with the current economic situation and the changing demographics, it's a very common approach right now to the comprehensive plan. But I think that's also why you're seeing some of these advisory comments, I think a lot of them are things that are similar to what I'm seeing in other municipalities. These are some of other concerns, this is what you're doing, we just want to make sure everybody stays focused. It's not an uncommon approach, it's common not to get everything done, it grows with the town because if you put something in here that's hard and fast and the town, it doesn't end up working out, you can't go against it, it's binding. So that's just something to consider when you're kind of frustrated with the generalness of it.

MR. NOVESKY: Led did have a series of questions.

MR. KLOSKY: What I'd like to propose that we direct our attorney to prepare a letter to the town board reference our review of the draft to show due diligence by the board in our review and that each of us be provided an opportunity to comment on the plan that those comments rather than being attributed to the whole board or attributed to each individual in a letter that goes forward because there's no formal format to this thing as far as I know. That way, we don't have to debate whether I agree with a comment

that Kenn has or Kenn agrees with a comment that I have.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That could still happen.

MR. KLOSKY: So what I was going to say perhaps the letter could be as simple as the planning board members had the following statements and in alphabetical order by last name this member, this member and that way the members who aren't here this evening could be given a brief opportunity to provide their comments over the next week.

MR. NOVESKY: Amy?

MS. ZAMENICK: There's a time element on this.

MR. NOVESKY: We discussed earlier the requirement that the town board has an opportunity to review the plan, period, nothing further. There's no additional timeframe, just said that the requirement is that the planning board review the plan, period.

MS. ZAMENICK: I think that's all it is.

MR. NOVESKY: We don't have all that much.

MR. BRODMERKEL: We've done it, we can leave now.

MR. KLOSKY: Last time in 2005 I recall this board just sending a letter forward to the town board showing, with a few comments, that's all.

MR. NOVESKY: But Amy there's not an or else in this thing?

MS. ZAMENICK: We're just doublechecking, I'm thinking of the Town Law, she wants to doublecheck the Town of Cornwall's law.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Is there another public review of this document?

MS. ZAMENICK: Do you know the answer?

MR. BRODMERKEL: There's another public review mandated?

MS. DOTSON: No, there isn't, the town board has yet to discuss these comments from the County Planning

Department, I know tonight they have their reorganizational meeting, I don't believe that they were intending to discuss this but they will need to discuss what their approach to this is going to be, I understand that they're going to be asking for my commentary and analysis.

MR. KLOSKY: We can just read our comments into the minutes.

MS. ZAMENICK: I don't know that it's necessary to identify whose comments are whose, just simply to list that the planning board had the following comments, I think that gives it a more unified approach.

MR. NOVESKY: So you have them on the record.

MR. KLOSKY: Right, that's exactly it.

MS. ZAMENICK: There's nothing on the local law that sets a time limit but I think it's when they're done with public comments.

MS. DOTSON: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: What's the date of the end of the acceptance of public comments?

MS. ZAMENICK: I don't know off the top of my head.

MS. DOTSON: I'm not sure but I believe they closed that.

MS. ZAMENICK: Sooner's better than later, that's all we have right now.

MR. GOLD: Can we follow Led's suggestion, Mr. Chairman?

MR. NOVESKY: Yes.

MR. KLOSKY: All right, on page 46 the implementation plan calls for the establishment of a board of architectural review. I would beg the town not to establish another board but to use this planning board as its architectural review board and allow us to engage experts as needed if it comes to that, if the town judges it necessary to do this thing called an architectural review board rather than setting up another organization, let us do it. The second is and

I've said this many times before I think the plan needs to more specifically address pedestrian access, especially linking up the Moodna Creek corridor to the Main Street area. I think if you're going to approach tourism seriously we need to link the Moodna with the Main Street district.

MR. BRODMERKEL: If I can make a point, I think the town board, twice tried just to get them to connect the hospital with the sidewalk to the business district and they haven't done it so Moodna--

MR. KLOSKY: Pedestrian access needs to be taken seriously by the town board. And if this plan could more specifically address that I think that would be useful, especially the plan makes a statement with which I concur that tourism ought to be a more important pillar of the town's economy. And I think that's practical given our location, but not yet practiced upon. And pedestrian access is a big piece. I would like to say that I agree wholeheartedly with page 55 assertion about the need for a traffic light at Jackson Avenue and Route 94. Every time I'm given an opportunity I speak into the record about how distressed I am about our long term plan which seems to me to be, to wait until we have one of our high school students killed at the intersection going to school. Jackson Avenue and Route 94 is an extremely dangerous intersection, large numbers of high school kids go through there every morning and every afternoon and we ought to lower the speed limit.

MR. NOVESKY: I've almost been killed there, not that you'd miss me.

MS. DOTSON: This is something to put this into perspective of things that get repeated, you know, I wholeheartedly agree going over 9W and going towards the Town of Highlands this is something where both the Town of Cornwall and the Town of Highlands have been asking for safety improvements there.

MR. NOVESKY: But there are--

MS. DOTSON: This is a state highway.

MR. NOVESKY: 94 and Jackson Avenue intersection since we got sued last time it's been a long time.

MS. DOTSON: These are state highways and these are

something we can do.

MR. KLOSKY: I understand the futility of the town asking the state to take action on these safety matters but for my own conscience if nothing else I want to keep talking about this Route 9W southbound ought to be at a 45-mile an hour speed limit. There's no justification for keeping that speed limit 55.

MS. DOTSON: But this is why it's in here, it's one more way of saying this is what we feel.

MR. KLOSKY: I don't like the references, there's a number of references within the plan to so-called floating zones, I would need those to be explained in more detail within the plan in order to support that assertion. On Section 7.1 page 70 town parking and recreation facilities, a mention needs to be made of the need for soccer and lacrosse fields both Cornwall United and the budding lacrosse teams end up playing in a wide variety of locations, none of them suitable. Surrounding municipalities are able to construct adequate recreational facilities for their youth, youth move out of the neighborhoods and are leaving our community, it says that elsewhere in the report, we aren't particularly family friendly in terms of recreational facilities within the town so we can use soccer fields.

MS. ZAMENICK: It's an interesting comment because the board did meet with them and their answer was no, we don't need more fields.

MR. NOVESKY: Who's that?

MR. KLOSKY: That's-

MR. NOVESKY: Who is that?

MS. ZAMENICK: We had representatives from Cornwall United and from the lacrosse league and they came in and said they had adequate fields.

MS. DOTSON: Which surprised the heck out of a lot of people.

MR. KLOSKY: I've coached in both leagues, my observation is that's not the case, we were shut down for most of the fall season.

MR. NOVESKY: What representatives from Cornwall United were there?

MS. ZAMENICK: I don't remember his name.

MS. DOTSON: I can't recognize a name. They said they don't need fields.

MR. KLOSKY: That's not consistent with the discussions on their own boards.

MR. VINSON: If the leader is saying they don't need it you're dead-ended.

MS. ZAMENICK: We had several meetings just on sports fields.

MS. DOTSON: It was discussed extensively and there was a great deal of surprise to hear the specifics of the answer that was given.

MR. KLOSKY: I wonder who was giving that answer?

MS. ZAMENICK: The board was too, I just wanted to convey that to this board because you realize the comprehensive plan committee did consider that.

MR. KLOSKY: Page 71, second bullet from the bottom they talk about developing a bicycle or pedestrian trail circuit and I can only say that personally I'm very much in support of continuing to develop that. I noticed that the bicycle development pedestrian trail development in the village along 218 though even a temporary measure was very well received by the business district in the village and was I think very much a success, I saw there were a lot of people using it. There's also on page 72 it mentions studying the feasibility of acquiring land for the construction of a new town hall. Myself, I question the prudence of such a maneuver given our current economic status and our town hall sits on a piece of property which would be suitable for expansion. And that's what I got.

MR. NOVESKY: Very well done job.

MR. KLOSKY: I only took six minutes.

MR. NOVESKY: Mr. Gold, your turn.

MR. GOLD: My first comment is I find the whole

discussion of revitalizing the business district thoroughly inadequate, it's a regurgitation of proposals that I've been hearing for 15 years on which no action has been taken and from the types of businesses we would like to attract to the parking that we need all of this discussion has been had before. There's nothing new there that tells us how to do it, just tells us that we ought to do it. On page 59 in a plan that's as non-specific as this is the recommendation eliminating local shopping for one specific building that's zoned for local shopping the little store, I don't understand why, what possible difference that could make to anyone if the people who live there decide to buy it or decide that they want to open up a deli. I live in the neighborhood, I would love to have a deli.

MR. BRODMERKEL: One that stayed up and actually served us.

MR. GOLD: What used to be the little store, I don't see any reason why that particular entity was singled out when this is as non-specific a plan as I've ever seen. And the other only other thing I echo Led's comments about the town hall, I don't know why we need another one. If we need more space, we can do what the county's doing, there's plenty of open space on Main Street.

MS. ZAMENICK: Just with the little store I think that that little store was addressed in the previous plan and because it was already in there and we knew it was changing because of the board knew it was changing back I think it was just mentioned as a sort of no longer necessary from the 2005 plan. I think it was more meant to be a mention of the changed use rather than a direct.

MR. GOLD: The use changed but the zoning didn't.

MS. ZAMENICK: Right and I think it was just mentioned because it was addressed in the last plan, is that correct?

MR. NOVESKY: Kenny Clearwater bought that house, that building.

MR. GOLD: I don't know, like 42 people lived there.

MR. BRODMERKEL: It's a busy place.

MS. DOTSON: Just mentioned because of the use that it didn't seem to be likely to be used for commercial purposes in the future, I mean, I think the trend it's not prohibiting it right now but I think the trend towards, I remember the same discussion going on with respect to the old Searsville Deli near my house in Searsville which is that a lot of people think gee, I drive passed here every day, it would be convenient but there aren't enough people going by there to really support a store that would be economically feasible so given the current economics of it, it just kind of ain't likely. So it was more an acknowledgment of sort of economic reality relative to the change of use.

MR. GOLD: Okay.

MS. DOTSON: I don't know if that changes your recommendation at all.

MR. GOLD: No, absolutely not.

MR. NOVESKY: Kenn, do you have any suggestions?

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'd just like to mention that three quarters of this report was just statistics which were nothing new, just old information that was out there. The extraordinarily non-specificity of the report was quite amazing to me, everything was vague and non-specific. I think there were two times that things got a little specific but not directly. You said that some of this was in lieu of the economic situation yet a number of very expensive projects were suggested, bike routes connecting trails with Moodna and stuff like that, that's expensive stuff.

MS. DOTSON: A lot of these were carried over.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'm talking that's expensive stuff so it doesn't reflect what you said as far as the economics of the current situation. The Main Street and what's going on there, my colleague said it, it's everything in there has been suggested before, if you want to fix Main Street, it's very simple, fix the damn street. People are afraid to drive on it, they're scared to death when they meet a truck or a bus, if you don't fix that, cross off Main Street, it ain't ever going to happen. The need for a town hall I don't understand, I think Led is completely correct, there's no need for a town hall expansion that I'm aware of and

I did look around and don't see a particular need so, you know, buck up and make due with what you got is all I got to say. Because there's plenty of room if it's utilized correctly. The document is basically a document that says, you know, if we could do whatever we want to do this is what some of the things we'd like to do so, okay, now let's approve that says the town, the town approves that, they could do absolutely nothing or they can dream up zoning, they can dream up directions, boards and everything that would kind of be included with this but not really. And so this document and I'm sure we spent a boatload of money on it is a, talking about economics waste of economics as far as I'm concerned. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GOLD: Well, I just, my own personal opinion is that the role of the planning board is to take the existing Town Code and make sure that projects coming before the board are consistent with the Town Code, what the Town Code becomes is although it's our concern as citizens I don't think that as a board it's our role to provide input on recommendations for changes in the plan unless we're part of that committee. Therefore, I think ex post facto review of the results of this type of what shall we call it, projects, is kind of a waste of our time. I think that our role needs to be consistent, we are all members and the public, needs to be consistent and reminded as to what the role of the planning board is and I hate to use the term but to quote the New York State Planning Board Federation planning boards don't plan, we don't have a role in the evolution of plans for a town or code, we take the code and review it consistent with the plans that are presented to us by a project or someone proposing a new concept for the town or whatever. I don't think that we really should be directly involved in revising these things because I think that leads to a kind of conflict of interest in terms of when we review something that we have the role of preparing, there's something whether it's inappropriate, I just don't think we have a role. And to be asked after the fact to review and comment on it not that it's inappropriate, I'm not trying to condemn anyone, but I don't think we have a role. I think our role to play is to take that plan after it's approved, make sure anyone proposing a project that that plan is consistent with the Town Code, that's what our role is, that's what we were here for. We're not planners, I hate it when the press calls us planners, we're not really planners. You're our planner, we're not planners.

MS. DOTSON: Even the extent to which professional planners can plan is still limited by whatever rules exist. We're still bound by property rights and whatever a municipality chooses to do.

MR. NOVESKY: But we're bound by the existing Town Code, that's it, I don't think anything more than that. With that, we can move forward.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Motion to adjourn?

MR. GOLD: Second it.

MS. ZAMENICK: Just before we go, instead of listing it by person, I'll combine your comments that were similar and draft together a list from the board just saying your comments in general, we're comfortable with that.

MR. KLOSKY: We'll adopt that at next month's meeting.

MS. ZAMENICK: I don't think we'd let it go that long.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'd rather have what we said.

MS. ZAMENICK: We can absolutely get it to you for your review but I don't think waiting that long would be, it would be better to get the comments to the board sooner rather than later.

MR. KLOSKY: Perhaps simply append the minutes.

MS. ZAMENICK: That's up to you.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Send them a copy of the minutes, that would be fine.

MS. ZAMENICK: So rather than a letter we're going to submit the minutes.

MR. NOVESKY: Yes, thank you very much. We have a motion to adjourn. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE

January 3, 2012

19

MR. NOVESKY

AYE

Respectfully Submitted By:

Frances Roth
Stenographer