

Town of Bethel
Planning Board

PO Box 300, 3454 Route 55
White Lake, NY 12786
845-583-4649 Ext 15
845-583-4710 Fax
Email: bldgdept@libertybiz.rr.com

The Town of Bethel Planning Board held its Work Session on July 14, 2009 at 7 PM at the Bethel Senior Center, 3594 State Route 55, Kauneonga Lake. A regular meeting of the Planning Board followed on the same date at 7:30 PM. On the agenda at this time are the following:

Pledge to the flag

In attendance: Dan Gettel Chairman, Steve Simpson, Bill Brey, David Biren, Michael Cassaro, Susan Brown Otto, David Slater, Alt #1, Tim Dexter - Code Enforcement Officer, BJ Gettel Asst. Code Enforcement Officer, Vicky Simpson Councilwoman, Jannetta MacArthur – Recording Secretary, and Kimberly Shaw-Rea – Attorney, Michael Weeks – Engineer

Excused Wilfred Hughson

Seat David Slater - Alternate in Wilfred Hughson's seat

Motion by Bill Brey, second by Steve Simpson to approve June minutes

All in favor –7

All opposed –0

Agreed and carried

Dan Gettel: BJ, I understand a resolution was read at the Town Board meeting, Herman Bressler passed away, he was a past Planning Board member as well as long-term Chairman.

BJ: Also one of the founders of the Planning Board as well

Moment of silence for Herman Bressler

Resolution of Respect
In Memoriam to

Herman Bressler
March 3, 1923 – June 17, 2009

Whereas, Almighty God in his wisdom has seen fit to call from our midst one of our past public officials who served with honor and dignity, ***Herman Bressler***, who had served the Town of Bethel as a founding member of the Planning Board where he also served as Chairman, and

Whereas, Herman also served his community as a founding member of the Bethel Volunteer Ambulance Corp, member for the Monticello Chapter of the Kiwanis International, a member and past Vice President of the Sullivan County Audubon Society and was a lifetime resident of the Town of Bethel.

During his years of service he had diligently performed his duties and had always exhibited those qualities essential as a public servant; and

Herman had the respect and admiration of all who worked or who became associated with him and he will always be remembered for his dignity, honor and kindness toward his fellow man and for the welfare of the Town; and

Now Therefore Be it Resolved, that the Town of Bethel Town Board, Planning Board expresses their most sincere sympathy at the passing of *Herman Bressler* on June 17, 2009, and extends their condolences to his family and friends, and in respect of his memory cause this Memorial Resolution to become a part of the official minutes of the Town of Bethel, distributed to family members and published in the Sullivan County Democrat.

Resolution Adopted: June 24, 2009

Town of Bethel Town Board
Planning Board

1) Public Hearing for a 2 lot subdivision located at 114 Butrick Road, Ferndale, known as Bethel Tax Map #: 14-1-5.2, proposed by Karen Young. (Fulton)

Dan Gettel: First I need a motion from the board to go into public hearing

Motion by David Biren, second by Steve Simpson

All in favor –7

All opposed –0

Agreed and carried

George Fulton: I represent Karen Young – Butrick Road – the parcel presently contains two older homes. Each having its own well and own sewer system. We are proposing to cut out one of the houses on the 3.17-acre parcel and the remainder 24.12 acres. If you recall the last time we had a problem with a woodshed. What the client did they nailed runners on two posts on each side, cut the post off and slid it over. It now clears the line by 10 ft. There are no sides on it, just a little roof to protect the wood. We labeled on the map as being 11.5 ft off the line that is actually the edge of the tin on the roof. We should be in good shape with everything.

Dan Gettel: This is a public hearing, does any one from the public have a question in regards to this specific project?

No questions..... then I would like a motion from the board that we close the public hearing, and go back into our regular session

Motion by David Biren, second by Susan Brown Otto

All in favor –7

All opposed –0

Agreed and carried

Dan Gettel: The only concern, Michael, your concern last time - we read your letter - was the location of the wood shed. The rest of it is the two lot subdivision, both lots already have houses, wells and septic, did you have any other concerns?

Michael Weeks: This is the first time I am seeing this plan, but it seems as though that has been rectified.

Dan Gettel: Okay. Any questions from the board?

Susan Brown Otto: Just in view of all the recent zoning changes, does it comply with the new zoning rules?

Dan Gettel: Best of my knowledge, it conforms to the new zoning

BJ: This is going for a County 239, came back as a local determination. Ag data statements were sent out. I need the mailings –

George Fulton: I'm sorry, you asked for a list of all of the adjoiningers with addresses

BJ: I never send them out. You need to do that. The neighboring properties were not notified.

George Fulton: No I didn't.

Dan Gettel: Kimberly, your comments?

Kimberly Rae: My comments are that I am afraid this public hearing will have to be redone.

George Fulton: I would ask the board, if I went to each of the adjoiningers, and got a letter from them stating that they have been notified and have no objections to the subdivision.....

Kimberly Rae: We have to have given them the chance to come to a public hearing. I'm sorry, that has to be on the record

George Fulton: I'm sorry too. This was the first time I was asked for full names and addresses.

BJ: We always ask for that

Kimberly Rae: I'm sorry, but it is very strict regulatory rules. You don't want your subdivision.....

George Fulton: Well if all neighbors sign something that they reviewed the subdivision map and have no objection, you only have 3 adjoiningers, one of which is on the board.

Kimberly Rae: And that seems like a solution tonight, but unfortunately the law requires doing a public process

George Fulton: Okay

BJ: We will readvertise for next month.

George Fulton: You did the Ag notice.

BJ: Yes, I did.

George Fulton: The 239 you have to do. The Ag notice I usually do myself.

2) Application for a Special Use Permit for a commercial business located at the corner of Royce Rd and State Route 17B, known as Bethel Tax Map #: 37-1-15.1, proposed by Zaccari. (Rettew & Orseck)

Dan Gettel: Just for the record, before you start, I had a discussion with counsel; she advised me that I should put it on the record that I have done business with the Zaccari brothers in the past. Prior to the meeting we discussed with the counsel, with the Zaccari counsel, and well as Mr. Zaccari, and no one sees a reason why I need to recues myself from reviewing this project. In that case I would to continue with this project. Mr. Orseck, please.

Gerald Orseck: We confirm we see no conflict.

Kimberly Rae: Could you please state the nature of your work with the Zaccari's, what you were doing for them and when.

Dan Gettel: Prior to the Zacarri selling which is now the Citgo station, I did do work on that particular building getting it approved by the Town Board, or by the Town Planning board as well as a little bit of work in Lake Huntington on a project that never materialized. That was a number of years ago. Mr. Zaccari has since sold off the Citgo station. I know of nothing going on at the Lake Huntington site

Gerry Orseck: There has been some time lapse between the last appearance in front of the Planning Board and now. But things have happened. I was asked to see to it that there was a response to your engineer's letter of about a year ago, that June letter. I wrote to the board on July 6th. I hope the letter was circulated, my response. In any event, at the last real substance meeting we had back in the late winter the board seemed to have two main concerns. One was the sewer connection system, and the other was ingress and egress to the project. Happily for quite some time the sewer issue has been resolved. We entered into an agreement, which was prepared and negotiated with not the board's attorney, but with the town attorney. That has been signed, sealed and delivered. In so far as the ingress and egress of the project is concerned our engineer Don Schmalze from Rettew will have a little diagram to show you. We are committed to ingress and egress being through Royce Road, which is a town road, and 17B. The other items on the list are all very very minor and there was a meeting only yesterday with the McGoey firm and our firm in Port Jervis. A lot of the items on the June letter from last year were ironed out, I'm sure you will be getting a report from McGoey. Certainly there are some things that our engineers have to provide to McGoey and we are going to try to get everything to McGoey well in advance of the August meeting.

Michael Weeks: I would like to respond to your opening statement. First and foremost last June I issued a letter to the board, 3 pages. Many of the items are not minor in nature. I did meet yesterday with the applicant and the engineer and discussed many of the outstanding items that I still need to review. I did tell the applicants engineer that really until we get a complete

application of all of the things that are still outstanding, I don't see a reason to review piece meal parts that we have so far, so to make the statement that I ironed out a lot of things yesterday, I think would be grossly incorrect, again to state that there are minor issues left outstanding, is also incorrect.

Gerald Orseck: It is in the eyes in the beholder. To me the main issues were the sewer and the access. The other stuff we are powerless, when I say we, I mean the developer is to do anything about that is strictly between the engineers.

Michael Weeks: There is a lot of additional engineering that still needs to be completed and submitted that I have yet to even see. So I got the impression from your opening statement that we were getting close, and I don't believe we are yet. There is a lot of information I have yet to ever see. I wanted to clarify those things with the board before you went any farther.

Gerald Orseck: I know that there is an Archeology study, our responsibility to get which the reason I can say that I consider it minor is because we have been in touch with the archeologist. He is going to be coming down very very shortly. I think that some of the..... I wasn't at that meeting, but the project has been downsized. Are you aware of that?

Michael Weeks: The last time we reviewed things a lot of your documents all conflicted. Some of them stated future plans for hotels, some of them didn't. Some of them talked about residential. That was one of the directions I gave the engineer that all of the documents before the board need to be consistent. So if we are eliminating the hotel we are eliminating the potential for residential, we need all the documents to be consistent.

Dan Gettel: I agree with Michael. A year ago at the board meeting it was unclear exactly what was being proposed. You were asking us to review a project. A carwash was included in some papers, and not in others. We would like that clarified tonight.

Gerald Orseck: I think that if you go back to the minutes it's a year ago, where I specifically stated before all of you that there was never going to be a hotel. Do you remember that any of you?

Michael Weeks: I remember that, but the documents do not reflect that. The fact that you stood in front of the board and told the board that the hotel is not included doesn't take away from the fact that the traffic impact study talks about a hotel, yet the seqr we were asked to act on doesn't talk about a hotel.

Dan Gettel: There is a conflict

Michael Weeks: The board can't approve a mish mosh of information. It all needs to be consistent of what is proposed. The documents all need to be consistent

Gerald Orseck: The ill if you want to call it, is that the water supply, storm drainage, parking, sewer capacity, it is all over designed. Again, you are the engineer; you say the problems are more than minor.

Michael Weeks: We haven't seen a storm water plan yet. These are things that I am saying; all we have really ever seen is a sketch plan.

Gerald Orseck: Okay, rather than for me to address any of these engineering questions, why

don't I turn this over to Don.

Don Schmalzle: We have submitted a full set of plans for review, and that's basically what this review letter is based upon.

Michael Weeks: When you say a full set of plans was submitted, are you saying a year ago?

Don Schmalzle: Yes. We have not submitted anything since then. Also part of that letter we had also provided you with a full SWPPP. If you have comments on that also. I agree with you, there are some design concerns that we still need to work out, and get your resolution on. That's not without saying. We realize that. We have not done the engineering for the revised downsized project. So yes, we need to provide that documentation. I'll agree with you completely on that. What my client I think is trying say here is that since it is downsizing that a lot of the impacts are going to be reduced. Understanding completely that the paperwork needs to be consistent throughout, so there is a clear understanding about what approval we are obtaining for this project. So there is no misunderstanding later at a later date, stating oh well it is sized for this, we want to build that. We want to make sure that everything, if we have oversized we want to make sure that stipulated of what we have oversized, how much it has been oversized, so later if there's been change some of those issues can be worked out in a less intense manner. Because the design is there, and it would just then go through the approval process of approving a site plan change as opposed to coming in with a new and complete different site plan. I understand what you are asking for Mike, I think that was the biggest portion of our meeting was to come to that understanding of what we need to provide you and in what format so that the board can make an approval on a project.

Michael Weeks: Maybe I overstated lack of some of the information, but we still certainly had a number of comments, and a number of issues that still remain outstanding.

Don Schmalzle: Correct. I think what the client's attorney was saying is that we have those identified. So therefore we can begin working on them and hopefully have them resolved fairly rapidly.

Dan Gettel: If you don't mind could you take a step back and tell us what you are proposing at this time as far as the buildings go, number of parking, access to 17B, just try to update us

Don Schmalzle: Okay. Some of the issues have not completely worked out. Because we just received the different uses for the facility. First of all these two commercial pads are now (showing on map) not going to be part of the project.

Dan Gettel: For the record, those are two pads that were shown along 17B on the North side.

Don Schmalzle: Right. The 5,000 square pads right in the corner of Royce Road and Rt 17B. As the attorney, as Gerry said, the hotel is out. It's not proposed.

Kimberly Rae: Has that been eliminated graphically?

Don Schmalzle: Not yet.

Kimberly Rae: But you are going to resubmit.

Don Schmalzle: We have to resubmit. Originally, this was all one building, and some of what

we had.. we scaled it back but we submitted this (showing on map) and we taking the floor space out in the corners of this U shaped building, and running the rough continually along hoping in the future the business would be there, some of that infrastructure would be there.

Dan Gettel: For the record we are going to call it the U shaped building or the mall.

Don Schmalzle: Correct. What we are going to be proposing now are three separate buildings. They will not be connected with a rough line. Those corner spots will be grass areas landscaped etc. possibly for loading areas as required for the code. Those sorts of things we still have to do that engineering. What we have come up with as far as uses. This main large portion here in the center building, is going to be designated for a 15,400 sq ft supermarket, to the east of that in the same building, is a 7,600 square foot retail, they are thinking possibly a pharmacy type thing, so those details are not identified or in concrete yet. That is what we are going to be designating it, as retail. And then on the west side of the supermarket portion there is a 3,800 square foot take out restaurant, and next to that is a 3,800 sq ft commercial retail area. Going to the separate building to the southwest of this main building which was the western side of the U – is a 4,600 sq ft office - half is going to be office, the other half is going to be commercial retail. Then on the eastside complex the other side of the U is going to be 9,500 sq feet of office space. Those are the uses that my client has given us for calculating all of our parking, recalculating our sewer flow, water flow requirements; we will be using that for our approval.

Dan Gettel: Just to clarify, going back quite a while, there were individual houses proposed.

Don Schmalzle: That has been abandoned also.

Someone in the Audience: That was never included in submission

Dan Gettel: That was on paperwork in a meeting that we had.

Don Schmalzle: That was the grandiose idea of things we were thinking about, and the reason we brought that in front of the board was to say these are things that may come up in the future and may materialize, they may not and to show that was part of the overall design of this. In the future that this wouldn't be in the way of further design of this property. Since this property isn't fully maxed out as far as use

Dan Gettel: Okay, number of parking that you are looking at, any idea at this time?

Don Schmalzle: No. We have not run calculations on parking.

Dan Gettel: Okay, access from Royce Road

Don Schmalzle: Access from Royce Road is the same as what we had proposed previously it was on the last submission is due to the topography right now I would say it's probably 300 – 350 ft from the intersection of Royce Road and Rt 17B. We will have two two-way entrances off of Royce Road. What we are proposing is a 3-lane access, again those are sorts of things we will have to work out as far as the configuration, and how that gets arranged. Since we only, since this property is an old property, and the property line is the centerline of the road, we are somewhat limited as to how we can realign that. Yes, we have our section that we have a lot of room which to align the roads, the other side we are limited to the right of way of what the town has. That we still have to do the design

Susan Brown Otto: Is there going to be any way if one wanted to go from the Mall through the Citgo station?

Don Schmalzle: No, there is not.

Susan Brown Otto: Because I think currently you can drive in the back there.

Don Schmalzle: No, this will all be curbed. There will be no curb cuts; there will be no interconnection between Citgo and the shopping center.

Michael Weeks: One of the things that I had suggested when we met yesterday, before we had two entrances, now the scope is reduced, now I think the TIS needs to be revised to reflect that all of the traffic is going to be on Royce Road. Not split between two entrances.

Dan Gettel: TIS means - Traffic Impact Study

Bill Brey: I have a question for Michael or the attorney. On page 2, Item #2 – Mr. Orseck's letter. I have a question that says – *letter dated July 6, 2009 reading letter*

“Since Royce Road is a town road, intersecting with 17B, a state road, the State is not a party to this application. The situation is the same as the Hurd Road intersection with 17B and the Bethel Woods project. Accordingly, all ingress and egress to and from the cite will be through Royce Road. This item is a matter of engineering and claimant's engineers Rettew, will be in consultation with McGoey.” Michael – Is this statement correct that they don't have a problem with the egress on 17B?

Michael Weeks: I don't believe it's correct because we need to assess whether or not there is going to be impacts.

Kimberly Rae: I was just going to say that when this is resubmitted there is going to have to be a very comprehensive seqr done on this project, and one of the impacts that Michael mentioned with the traffic egress and ingress, that will certainly have to be a very detailed.

Michael Weeks. They will probably be involved (DOT)

Bill Brey: There was a meeting with the State. There were at least 5 representatives there that were concerned; they did not approve the current traffic site and studies. They didn't approve the egress and ingress. They said it wouldn't work

Gerald Orseck: I don't think that my statement was answered. I state as I do now that you don't need State approvals.

Kimberly Rae: Oh, I do think you do need them.

Gerald Orseck: I'm sorry.....

Kimberly Rae: I believe that you do need them. Maybe not in terms of a permit, but certainly the state has the right, and we have the legal requirement to notify the state when the seqr crosses our hands, so the agencies involved can supply their input. So absolutely. I understand your point that it isn't the sort of thing that you apply to them, but without any question they are going to have to provide their comments, and that will have to be weighed and that is all part of the

process.

Michael Weeks: Right now it shows improvements to RT 17B. Certainly those improvements will require DOT approval.

Dan Gettel: There is a right turn lane being added to 17B that has to be.....

Gerald Orseck: I want to repeat so that we are all speaking the same language. Anybody can have input at the public hearing, neighbors. The state will have the same right to have input. The state cannot not affect the right of property owners on Royce Road to use Royce Road to enter into the state highway. That is all I am trying to say. I don't disagree that the state may have some comments. Let's put it this way, do you agree that the state can't block the project because of the access?

Kimberly Rae: No, let me clarify something. I haven't seen this before. I am newer to the Planning Board than others. I did not realize – I am seeing for the first time, that there are improvements requested, so in addition to the notice and comment right that they have, Mr. Weeks has just pointed out that the state does have regulatory authority and jurisdiction over the granting of the permits and permitting authority over improvements.

Don Schmalzle: That is an old design.

Kimberly Rae: If you are going to resubmit a design that includes an application for improvements to the road there.....

Gerald Orseck: There will be improvements to Royce Road, but not to 17B

Michael Weeks: Right now your plans show improvements to Rt 17B

Gerald Orseck: I understand, I just wish we could..... Suppose we aren't showing any improvements on 17B, all right,

Dan Gettel: With all due respect, you presented us with a map that shows improvements to 17B.

Gerald Orseck: It also shows the pads.

Kimberly Rae: We can't speculate.

Gerald Orseck: I don't want anyone to speculate. All I want to do, I don't want anyone to speculate. When we submit the final plans when McGoey and Rettew get together on how Royce Road is going to be fixed up, we'll talk about it then. In answer to your question, I don't care what anybody says, I know that under these limited factors you don't need state approval, if the state highway isn't affected, the state has zero to say about this.

Bill Brey: How can you say it will not be affected, when you are going to have access to it

Gerald Orseck: Royce Road already accesses it. Just like Hurd Road accesses 17B

Kimberly Rae: But there are other issues. Traffic, and other impact that may require the state to weigh in on this and believe probably will. We are not going to know until you do actually submit and I think we should just probably suspend this discussion pending submission of until

we have new plans

Gerald Orseck: I don't want to quarrel with it, with counsel and engineers, but I made it clear in writing and it's on the record, my answer under the limited circumstances of my hypothesis I am 100% correct.

Bill Brey: But your answer doesn't agree with our counsel

Gerald Orseck: With all due respect, your counsel, what she is saying is we can't, she didn't contradict what I was saying, she said we can't hypothesize if the hypothetical question was answered, I'm sure the answer would be the same as mine, and that is if the design doesn't affect 17B.....

Bill Brey: You should work it out with our attorney

Kimberly Rae: I think it is really important that you resubmit.

David Biren: That is what we need, an updated map. We don't know what is staying on the map, and what is not staying on the map. I think it is more detrimental to you.

Dan Gettel: Any alteration of the intersection at 17B, you say there isn't going to be any, but the map says there is going to be, so we are somewhere..... It needs to be resolved on paper so we know exactly what we are looking at.

Michael Weeks: What I told the engineer yesterday, is what we need is a new submission of everything that reflects what is now proposed, The TIS needs to be revised to reflect what is proposed, storm water needs to be revised to reflect what is proposed, the well study needs to be revised to reflect what is proposed, the plans need to be revised, and when they resubmit that, I will do another review and then we can have a meaningful discussion at this level, but I don't know that tonight we are going to accomplish any of that.

David Slater: Dan, would we be smart and take counsel's advise and table this or suspend this for the next one? I mean we are not getting anywhere, would we better off and then we can look at things and deal with what Mike is saying?

Dan Gettel: My thought was that it has been a year and it hasn't been introduced to the board, they should be allowed to update the board on what their proposal is. I do agree that we are not getting anywhere reviewing a map that doesn't reflect exactly what you are planning on doing, but I do think you're appearing tonight and updating us on where you with the project are helpful. I think that is all we can get done tonight.

Don Schmalzle: No sense talking about details that hasn't been designed yet

Dan Gettel: I have one question from the board, Susan

Susan Brown Otto: This is with regards to the letter the Orseck Law Office letter, dated July 6th, letter, under general comments, I know this is something that we discussed back and forth several times, the letter states reading

“There are no future potential phases of development. This has been made clear a number of times”

So when I read this I think you could add the word there are *currently* no future potential phases of development. This may be a true statement that there are right now to date no future potential phases of development, but I read this that one could say well there could be future potential phases of development. It's not saying that there will never be future phases of development

Dan Gettel: As far as this application goes, this is going to be the limit of it. If they want to change this application, and change what they are going to do, they are going to come back with a new application.

David Biren: This is the scope of it

Susan Brown Otto: Right, but this is something that was debated back and forth when we had this discussion whether the project was going through, whether there were other phases of development

Dan Gettel: I think they are limiting themselves pretty much tonight by saying there will be no more phases, and that this is what they are proposing.

Don Schmalzle: For this application.

Dan Gettel: For this application.

Susan Brown Otto: For this application. That doesn't mean.....

Dan Gettel: They can come back with a new application next month if they like.

Susan Brown Otto: Or that there could be additional phases could be developed, so that would need to be.....

Gerald Orseck: Let's assume that the limited project goes up, and it's a success in White Lake – you have the supermarket, you have a drugstore, and another bank, and the place is a thriving success, and we then come back and say we do want to build two pads and have two other facilities. If we have sufficient parking, if there are sufficient traffic accommodations, you are going to let us. The attitude of everybody is going to be much more favorable to us, everybody is going to want if it is a success, and it could even be more of a success not only to the developer but to the community. Right now in the real world, as the economy is now and anybody sees it, the next 10 years, I don't think the pads will be subject for a future application. We are going to get the tenants for the U building, but in the real world where are they going to come from. And suppose there are stores and facilities. There are only so many people, only so much population, I think any concerns of being a Jersey mall of some kind, and it just doesn't make any sense. This is a small to moderate size mall. It's not a strip mall; I just hope we can make it a success of the plans as they now exist.

Dan Gettel: Thank you Mr. Orseck. I think it is clear we are not getting anywhere, reviewing this tonight, but before, and I don't want to open a can of worms, but Mr. Orseck, Mr. Zacarri, please go through the minutes from the last meeting you were here, a number of items were raised, removal of the monuments were supposed to go to the Boy Scouts, there are a number of items that were promised in the past to be done at this particular site that has not been done. I think it shows good faith if those are completed.

Michael Zaccari: (from the audience) I'm not moving those monuments at all until we get some kind of preliminary approval. If we don't get preliminary approval I'll build more statues.

Dan Gettel: Well that's fine, but your brother had stated at the last meeting they would be moved.

Michael Zaccari: We will move them, the question is when

Dan Gettel: I can't tell you what was said at the last meeting as far as when.

Michael Zaccari: We definitely agreed to move them.

Dan Gettel: We will look through the old minutes and see what was said. Don, if you don't mind, new application, new plans

Don Schmalzle: Not a new application, but new design

Dan Gettel: I think it has to be a new application since it has changed from the original design

Kimberly Rae: It is a year old, and it has changed pretty radically.

BJ: Don, the last submission for the application was August 31, 2007. It is almost 2 years old. Can I get a new application stating more specifics? Because this is the old application, the new one is 8 pages long, the checklist and everything. I'll send it to you via email.

Dan Gettel: If there is no other question from the board, I would like a motion to table this until a new application and new plans are submitted.

Motion by David Biren, second by Susan Brown Otto

All in favor -7

All opposed-0

Agreed and carried

Dan Gettel: Vicky if could update us on zoning.

Vicky Vassmer Simpson: At our June 24th meeting the zoning passed at the Town Board. We have our new zoning in place. Has everyone been given copies?

BJ: Not yet. We are waiting for them to come back from E codes. Because E codes have to do the comparisons. Once we get them back, we will schedule a training session

David Biren: One favor, if we don't have all of the written material by next month, would you be kind enough to supply us with the all of the setbacks?

BJ: I have the bulk table done. I can email that to everybody.

Dan Gettel: We are looking at a training session.

Motion to adjourn by Steve Simpson, second by Bill Brey

All in favor -7

All opposed -0

Agreed and carried

8:15 pm

Respectively submitted,

Jannetta MacArthur

Jannetta MacArthur
Recording secretary