

Minutes
Regular/Work Session of the Planning Board
Village/Town of Mount Kisco
Tuesday, August 24, 2010

The Regular/Work Session meeting of the Village/Town of Mount Kisco was called to order at 8:10 P.M. by Chairman Cosentino at the Municipal Building.

Members Present: **Chairman Joseph Cosentino**
 Vice Chairman Sturniolo
 Stanley Bernstein
 Ralph Vigliotti
 Joseph Morreale

Members Absent: **Sol Gibbons**
 Doug Hertz

Staff Present: **Nanette Bourne**
 Anthony Oliveri
 Whitney Singleton
 Austin Cassidy

Acceptance of Minutes May 25, 2010:

Motion: **Stanley Bernstein**
Second: **Joseph Morreale**
Aye: **Ralph Vigliotti**
Aye: **Vice Chairman Sturniolo**
Aye: **Chairman Cosentino**

Public Hearing:

Gail and Ed Smilkstein
330/340 Spring Street
PB2010-4

There was no one in the public present for or against the lot line change. There were no signatures on the sign-up sheet to speak at this public hearing.

Chairman Cosentino: This is a lot line change of 25 feet on the left side of their house.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: On page one, Second "Whereas," is it correct where it says "N/A" for the site plan application fee?

Nanette Bourne: There was no site plan application fee, and I need to confirm whether or not there was a subdivision application fee taken before.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: Once we find that answer, if we look on page two, #2, where it makes reference to deficiencies in Planning Board application fees, should we modify the language to reflect that we are investigating the fees for the subdivision, or does that cover it?

Whitney Singleton: With regard to the fact that you used the terminology "site plan" as opposed to subdivision? A lot line change is considered a

subdivision. There is no site plan required for single family homes, so clearly the terminology is incorrect there. Obviously there is an application fee. There may have been a discussion as to modification of that. I am not aware of anything in that regard. They are simply going to have to pay any outstanding fees to the extent that they are required. It refers to application fees in a generic sense of all village application fees without enumerating specifics.

Austin Cassidy: I can factually state there is an established escrow, and it will only logically follow that it would invent an application fee along with that which needs to be verified. The application fee applicable to an action such as this would be the base filing fee only insofar as there is no newly created lot.

Chairman Cosentino: For the record, on June 28, 2010 the Village Board approved this application. We can vote on this tonight if the board so chooses. It is a Type 2 Action.

Motion to Close Public Hearing:

Motion: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Second: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Chairman Cosentino

Motion for the Approval of the Application of Gail and Ed Smilkstein
330/340 Spring Street
PB2010-4

Motion: Ralph Vigliotti
Second: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Chairman Cosentino

Re-Zoning Referral:

Diamond Properties
333 North Bedford Road
PB2005-21

Present: James Diamond, Diamond Properties
David Steinmetz, Zarin & Steinmetz, representing
Diamond Properties

Of Counsel: Michael Lender (for David Stolman)

Whitney Singleton: Your board is currently entertaining an application for an amended site plan special use permit as well as a zoning referral from the Village Board of Trustees for a petition that was submitted by Mr. Diamond. The plan is/was to address comprehensive zoning for the property and introduce new uses and/or means by which uses can affirm the property. They conducted a lot of internal meetings with the Chairman, the applicant,

staff and consultants, and we've been exploring different ways of addressing this application. As the Chairman himself recalls, as it was his idea, there was an opportunity here to really scale back the scope of what Mr. Diamond was proposing and limit what can be done on the property so that we didn't have a proverbial Pandora's Box. With the size of the property and the size of the building, it is a little bit of trepidation as to what could potentially belong to the changes. As you recall, Mr. Stolman has given you a list of activities that could go on under the proposed zoning, and I think everyone was a little taken back by what people want. Mr. Diamond has indicated a willingness based upon prior meetings with village representatives to withdraw his application and petition and simply scale back the scope of what he is proposing to a mere Change of a Special Use Permit. That is a lengthy way of stating that he simply is going to make interior changes for the existing GPNY space if that is amenable to your board. It will obviate the need for a zoning petition, and it will limit the environmental review and zoning review. There will be no complication for the Village Board of Trustees. He will operate under the existing zoning regulations. The proposal would be to change some of the interior configuration by eliminating some of the racetrack portion in substitution of proposed limited number of bowling alleys. Whether it is in the context of a petition for a zoning amendment or in the context of a petition to amend the existing special use permit, there will still be impacts associated with it. These impacts need to be reviewed and evaluated by your board. Mr. Lander is here tonight to continue that review. As part of that you have a memo in your package regarding trip generation.

David Steinmetz: Mr. Singleton's characterization is fair and accurate. You will remember when I first came with Jim in front of you on this matter; we were candid and told you that the impetus for everything we were doing was a desire to bring a bowling alley into the facility. That was the jumping off point – which was kind of married to the notion that had been discussed with your board and your consultants at prior meetings. Mr. Lander's colleague, Mr. Stolman, and others had said maybe we should look at dealing with the zoning and dealing with it all at one time and changing it. So, Jim ambitiously decided to look at whole picture and come forward and try to do this cooperatively with the village. We've been doing that with your board and with the trustees since the outset. I don't think we feel any differently about it. We are certainly glad we are taking, as a matter of formality, a legitimate, genuine examination of the zoning and seeing if there are things that are to be done. Taking all of that and pushing it to the side - from a practical standpoint, Diamond Properties would really like to bring a bowling alley to the facility. We told you a couple of months back that there were some time considerations in doing that. We are now ready to try and figure out if there is a more streamline process to focus on the main ball that is coming at us, without trying to use a bowling metaphor by accident here - that is the ball that is coming down the alley at us. Tonight, we are not going to tell you right now we are formally withdrawing everything we've done, because we were hoping we'd get some feedback from you. We do not want to be disrespectful to this board or the Board of Trustees, since both of you have put a considerable amount of time in (at our urging) looking at the zoning. You can do that without Mr. Diamond standing before you. I know you have discussed that with us, and not all of you thought all of our recommendations were something that you wanted to pursue. That policy discussion can be had another day. Right now, we would like to move forward with your board and your professional staff on bowling. I agree with Whitney that there are some issues that have been raised in the technical memos of the consultants. Jim, Dr. Collins and I are confident that can be resolved between our team and will be addressed, obviously, not tonight.

Mr. Galante is not here, and I know traffic is not Mr. Lander's specialty. We know we have to deal with Dr. Collins and Mr. Galante to resolve the trip generation issue. Jim and I are confident that it will work. If your board has some trepidation about our focusing on the bowling, we want to know that. If not, that is likely going to be the decision that we make. We would send it in a letter to your board and the Village Board of Trustees thanking everyone for what we've done in a macro level and begin to focus on the micro level.

Michael Lander: The main issue is the trips. As discussed earlier, we need to gather our information and see what the final outcome is.

Ralph Vigliotti: Was the trip generation conducted on the one light, or at both?

Jim Diamond: They were conducted and measured on both entry points. There were automatic counters and manual counts, which is the process that was delineated in the original site plan approval. We also count the turns where people are turning from. That was in Dr. Collins report done at the 80% occupancy point.

Ralph Vigliotti: If the light at the north entrance/exit were adjusted and brought up to a standard in which that could be a more active exit/entrance, would that help the trip generations for that site? We know that there really isn't a light at that entrance/exit. It's 20 or 30 yards south. If there were a second light and it was cued to match the southern light, would that help your case with trip generations?

Jim Diamond: We cannot address the technicalities of the light, but Dr. Collins before had studied the 450 trips for the site being supported by the existing access points to the site. We believe that with bowling and the balance of the site filled, we will be below the cap. That was the conclusion of Dr. Collins' letter. We need to clarify some points with F.B. Clarke on that, but we do not believe there needs to be any increase in capacity for the site. The current cap should stay as is.

David Steinmetz: With this modified approach, we would not need to seek any modification of the trip generation cap.

Jim Diamond: There was a conclusion in John Collins' letter that one of the things he had looked at was that the proposed zoning change potentially allowed up to 35% of the site to be recreation/leisure time. In that scenario, if the peaks for the whole building and for office warehouse and recreation leisure time both overlapped at 5 to 6 P.M., we might be a 465 vs. 450, but practically speaking, recreation and leisure time would be at later peak than the 5 to 6 P.M. hour. In any case, if the zoning process doesn't go forward, it becomes a moot point because we would be well below that 35%.

David Steinmetz: All of these are issues that we think will flush themselves out over the next month. If presentations are necessary from your consultants and/or ours, that can take place in September.

Chairman Cosentino: It's not over 'till it's over. I think there is a lot of work and questions that have to be answered before we do anything.

Joseph Morreale: For the record, we are talking about 24 lanes, which are 100 people. That will replace maybe ten people that drive on the track? Then you're adding the athletic club. Just looking at the numbers,

personally I can't imagine you'll be under the cap. The amount of traffic that that generates, to me, is significantly higher. We already know that North Bedford Road is pretty heavily traveled. I would like to say that I would really like to see this carefully analyzed so that we are very clear about the volume of traffic that is going to be on that road, so there are no surprises like last time. I was concerned last time when you spoke of the synchronization of the lights and how wonderful it was going to be, and it was not. It turned out the synchronization was not as helpful as we thought, and the traffic really slowed. I do not want to see that complicated. As much as I would like to see you successful, I want this carefully presented to us and resolved.

Chairman Cosentino: Today we were talking about 12 lanes. We got to the number of 72 total. It is 24 lanes. You are now going to have a total of 144 instead of 72.

Jim Diamond: That would be 12 pairs of 2.

Chairman Cosentino: On Page 4, #12, "all law enforcement personnel of the City." "City" needs to be changed to "Village." Also, on #14, "On Fridays and Saturdays for all hours between the hours of 5 P.M. and closing of the day of operation." We need to have a closure of 11:00 P.M. Also, the "day of operation" is not a good word.

David Steinmetz: In defense, Mr. Lander's and Mr. Stolman's memo was just giving you a series of possible things to consider. I do not believe these were recommended conditions.

Stanley Bernstein: As I understand this memo, David had cherry picked many regulations from other municipalities in order to present them as possibilities to mull over.

Michael Lander: The wording is not specific for here.

Chairman Cosentino: I have to correct what I read, for the record. I would like to set the public hearing for the second meeting in September.

Whitney Singleton: Mr. Stolman is out of the country right now, and I would like to make sure he would be available for that public hearing. I want to confirm that the representative for the board in conjunction with this application be here.

Chairman Cosentino: I don't want to put off a public hearing which I can't possibly hear for another month because a representative can't make it.
Whitney Singleton: For potentially two weeks, yes.

Chairman Cosentino: That doesn't make sense.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: Michael can you email David tomorrow morning and see if he can give us an answer.

Chairman Cosentino: He maybe could send someone else.

Whitney Singleton: Whatever is the pleasure of the board.

David Steinmetz: If Dr. Morreale and others have comments and questions about traffic – you may recall I had suggested that tonight might have been

a great meeting for Michael Galante to be here, because I knew traffic would be a germane issue.

Chairman Cosentino: It's important to keep the ball rolling here.

Whitney Singleton: Mr. Stolman has been unable to attend the last two meetings. The concept the applicant is bringing to you tonight is simply to narrow the scope of what he is proposing. It is not in anyway a complete avoidance of impacts associated with the application. As everyone knows, the impacts associated with this application – although we hyper-focused on trip generation and the ability to handle the public.

Chairman Cosentino: I would like him to be here if possible. I think it's important.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: Regarding the July 23 letter, Page 3, are we comfortable with #7, where it says "under the age of 18?"

Michael Lander: I'm not sure where that one came from.

Whitney Singleton: That may be internal within the code.

Michael Lander: Are you saying it should say "the age of 21?"

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: I'm leaning toward that.

Chairman Cosentino: If there is nothing else, we will set the Public Hearing for the second meeting in September.

Continuing Review

**Draft Resolution
Review and Comments
Final Action Documents**

**Jim Han Bon Ann LLC
117 Smith Avenue
PB2010-07**

Present: Thomas Nugent, Architect for the Project

Chairman Cosentino: We have a resolution for approval before us on this.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: My only point is that the photometric lighting plan is submitted late.

Thomas Nugent: Yes, it was submitted late.

Nanette Bourne: With regards to the lighting plan, the applicant has submitted several lighting plans. He was first submitting them to me to get a read on whether or not they met the guidelines. I cannot tell you when the first one was submitted. It was awhile ago. The applicant continued to work to modify the lighting plan so that it was consistent with the guidelines and met the needs of the project. There were a number of changes. That may have contributed towards the lateness of the lighting plan. The lighting plan that was finally submitted makes the modifications the board has been asking for. At the same time it uses the existing lights to the best extent possible. One of the last changes that the applicant wanted to make was

that we noticed that there was inadequate lighting for the two back parking lots. We were testing various light levels and changes to get some light to the very back without having it spill over. This is where it ended up.

Chairman Cosentino: Does this please everyone?

Nanette Bourne: It's not perfect, but it is what it is.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: I agree it is not perfect. If you could show me where it says in the cut sheets that these are full cut off fixtures?

Thomas Nugent: The designer has indicated that they are full cut off. I don't know if it says so.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: Tell me where I should be reading it.

Nanette Bourne: It says they are dark sky.

Thomas Nugent: It says "cut off visor included" under "E" in the specifications.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: It doesn't say, "full cut off," but it's not worth making a big deal out of it, since the photometric plan is not right on the money as far as the village code. You could make it a condition that it's a full cut-off and change the wording in the resolution to say all lighting fixtures must provide full cut off features.

Nanette Bourne: I have that.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: On Page One, the second "Whereas," where it talks about fees. There is a parking fee that says \$375 is to be paid. What is the status of that? Are we going to approve something that says, "To be paid?"

Whitney Singleton: The application of that requirement is a function of whether or not it's a major or a minor site plan. That is a determination that has to be made by the building inspector. It is a function of what percentage of improvements are being made relative to the overall assessed value of the property. If someone comes in and changes mums to marigolds, that does not require them to pay an entirely new parking fee. It's a function of how extensive a site plan it is. That will have to be determined by the building inspector in concert with the assessor's office. I think it should say "shall be paid to the extent that is required as so determined by the building inspector."

Nanette Bourne: I will take the \$375 out.

Joseph Morreale: The fee is \$375.

Whitney Singleton: The fee is \$75 per parking space. It is only applicable in the event that the nature of the site plans application.

Joseph Morreale: So the whole fee is in question?

Whitney Singleton: Yes. For point of reference, we should add another Condition of Approval that should state "There shall be compliance at all times with the terms and conditions of the variance granted on July 20, 2010 by the Zoning Board of Appeals under Application Number 2010-2,"

just so there is a reference within this resolution of approval that there are outstanding conditions relative to the variance.

Nanette Bourne: I added those in as a "Whereas."

Whitney Singleton: I would rather see it as a condition.

Chairman Cosentino: Are you happy with the wording regarding the use of the second floor that is in the resolution?

Whitney Singleton: I am comfortable with it. I think it adequately reflects that there could be no active occupancy of office space on the second floor, basement and attic. The attic and basement are similarly identified as being unoccupied spaces as well.

Chairman Cosentino: That is understood?

Thomas Nugent: That is understood.

Motion to Approve Resolution for the Site Plan for Jim Han Bon Am, LLC
117 Smith Avenue
PB2010-07

Motion (with modifications):	Joseph Morreale
Second:	Ralph Vigliotti
Aye:	Stanley Bernstein
Aye:	Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye:	Ralph Vigliotti
Aye:	Joseph Morreale
Aye:	Chairman Cosentino

Continuing Review
Draft Resolution
Review and Comments
Final Action Documents

Oakwood Cemetery
Re-Subdivision (Lot Line Change)
304 Lexington Avenue
PB2010-9
Present: Howard Kensing, President, Oakwood Cemetery

Howard Kensing: At the request of the village attorney, we commissioned and provided to the board a revised subdivision map noting, I believe, what the village attorney asked for - mainly, the lots of the county code. The health department wished that the property in question, the 25-foot strip, be noted as non-habitational. I believe the boundary has been properly established between St. Francis and Oakwood. I was not here for the Public Hearing, but I was advised there was no protest. Father Clark planned to be here. He was not sure of the time of the meeting. Is there a possibility we might get a resolution tonight in anticipation of moving forward with the sale?

Chairman Cosentino: Can we move this tonight?

Austin Cassidy: You're operating under a combined work session/regular meeting format. You have been provided with all necessary documents;

however, your board is seeing it for the first time so you may want to spend a few moments with it.

Chairman Cosentino: We are talking about a 25-foot line with no change of use. It is St. Francis purchasing 25 feet of Oakwood. If there is a possibility we can approve it tonight, I would appreciate it.

Nanette Bourne: I do not have the July 13, 2010 Public Hearing added. I will add that as a "Whereas."

Motion to Approve the Resolution of a Re-Subdivision for Oakwood Cemetery and St. Francis Cemetery

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: This resolution is predicated on the submission that we have in front of us tonight with the additional change that Nanette is adding to it.

**Motion: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Second: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Chairman Cosentino**

Continuing Review

**Draft Resolution
Review and Comments
Final Action Documents**

**Professional Indemnity Agency (P.I.A)
37 Radio Circle
PB2010-11**

Present: Scott Blakely, President, Insite Engineering

(Tape glitch – conversation not recorded)

Motion for Resolution of Approval – Professional Indemnity Agency

**Motion: Stanley Bernstein
Second: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Chairman Cosentino**

Continuing Review

**Draft Resolution
Review and Comments
Final Action Documents**

**Paul Krause Architect
130-132 Main Street
PB2010-6**

**Present: Paul Krause, Paul Krause Architects, Architect for the Applicant
Michael Tierney, Paul Krause Architects, Architect for the Applicant
Jim Attwood, Property Owner**

(Tape glitch – conversation not recorded)

Motion to Declare a Negative Declaration:

**Motion: Stanley Bernstein
Second: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Chairman Cosentino**

Motion to Approve Resolution:

**Motion: Joseph Morreale
Second: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Chairman Cosentino**

Special Discussion:

**Filippo Simone
127 Barker Street
PB2006-05**

Motion for Extension

**Motion: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Second: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Chairman Cosentino**

Special Discussion:

**Steve Finkelstein
156 North Bedford Road
PB-2009-15**

**Present: Steve Finkelstein, Property Owner
Andrew Baran, Project Manager**

(Tape glitch – beginning of conversation was not recorded)

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: How are you going to deal with the blacktopping Department of Transportation property with the winter season coming and the asphalt plant shutting down?

Steven Finkelstein: It should be done before the winter.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: How do we package this together, so that the village, over and above the cash bond, so that the village is absolutely protected? This has all the makings of it dragging on until next year, which is something I don't think anybody in this room wants to see. What are the mechanics of having us protected that this whole thing take place besides the bond?

Whitney Singleton: If they are in operation at the site, after the temporary Certificate of Occupancy expires, it will be subject to fines.

Andrew Baran: From what I also understand from Austin, the 30-day renewal of the TCO is to insure that we are continuing toward diligently on the subject.

Whitney Singleton: I took away from the prefatory language of the building inspector, which I want to re-emphasize. If Sherwin Williams is doing business, and their temporary Certificate of Occupancy has expired, it is the responsibility of you as the property owner for that violation. That violation could be several thousand dollars a day.

Steven Finkelstein: I understand.

Whitney Singleton: You are making representation to the board that this can be reasonably done within the time frame that you are representing here.

Steven Finkelstein: From last November when we have brought this to you, I have done nothing but work very diligently on all of this.

Chairman Cosentino: We know that. That is why we are here tonight.

Steven Finkelstein: Thank you for that. The State is the State. They don't have any money. The surprise came when they asked us to do the additional work that was more than what everyone thought. We are absorbing that. I am making financial arrangements to cover that. The bond is there. None of us want to see the whole place done, and then eight feet of the old curb. I don't want to see that. I don't see how I can have a gun held to my head. What time frame are we talking about?

Austin Cassidy: The course of the TCO. The maximum of your TCO is 90 days at 30-day increments. You're saying October – that is not 90 days. You are speaking affirmatively to that and you are concerned that 90 are not enough.

Steven Finkelstein: Yes.

Austin Cassidy: So what is enough?

Andrew Baran: I think perhaps maybe finding out exactly where we are going based on our engineer doing additional work right now. It will be much easier to give an exact timeframe based on what his findings are.

Chairman Cosentino: That is not what we are looking for tonight. You need a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy, and we have to make up our mind. Our next meeting is September 14.

Steven Finkelstein: Austin asked a question – I would say December 31. I don't know. What I am deathly afraid of is the unknown. When was the last time that another curb was replaced on North Bedford Road that involved DOT? The Verizon building? What kind of bumps did they run into? We are getting bumps, but nothing that is not manageable. It's the State of New York.

Chairman Cosentino: I think once you let them know you have a deadline, they will push it.

Andrew Baran: I think the same. Mainly the reason why we are here is that we want to assure you that all of the funds are there and that we have every intention of making it look exactly as the plans do state.

Austin Cassidy: To follow through with your last comment, you and your contractor need to be aware that availability of blacktop gets very, very limited past the beginning of December. So, the end of December is virtually nill.

Steven Finkelstein: Most of it is being done Thursday.

Andrew Baran: I'm not expecting it to go as far as that. I am very much hoping to see it done well in advance of that.

Steven Finkelstein: Are we talking, November, 60 days from now, what the legal maximum is that you can offer?

Austin Cassidy: Yes. That's when the plants close.

Steven Finkelstein: I am thankful. I realize this is an exception.

Chairman Cosentino: We need to decide tonight if we want to go along with a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy with a Condition that Whitney, Anthony and Austin set the bond amount.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: When will you get the technical information to Anthony?

Andrew Baran: I am hoping that we will be able to push the engineers to receive his new evaluation of the site within the next week or two, and then we can continue to proceed with going back to the Department of Transportation.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: That is going to dictate the amount of the bond.

Austin Cassidy: The practically of that end is before I can issue the TCO, the bond needs to be in hand. If you want the TCO to start September 1, do not -----.

Andrew Baran: In theory, I would like September 1, but if it does come into September 3 or 4; yes.

Austin Cassidy: Be mindful that the amount needs to be communicated in writing to our engineer. He has to then concur, and we have to get the money deposited before I can release the TCO.

Andrew Baran: Absolutely.

Chairman Cosentino: This issue tonight, if the board votes for it, is to only authorize the TCO. The building inspector will then organize the paperwork.

Steven Finkelstein: We had a representative, Joe Birchinsky from Bibbo, who spoke to Anthony. They will come up with figure.

Motion to Authorize a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy Not to Exceed 90 Days from the Date of Issuance of the C. of O.

Steven Finkelstein
156 North Bedford Road

Question:

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: I would also like to get a weekly memo from you stating where we stand on the whole project, so everyone is on board.

Chairman Cosentino: I think the weekly memo should go to Austin and then to us.

Austin Cassidy: You can communicate electronically.

Andrew Baran: Yes, so you are updated on the process.

Motion: Joseph Morreale
Second: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Stanley Bernstein
Aye: Vice Chairman Sturniolo
Aye: Ralph Vigliotti
Aye: Joseph Morreale
Aye: Chairman Cosentino

Steven Finkelstein: Thank you very much.

Correspondence: None

There being no further business by the Board, on a motion by Dr. Morreale, seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley Bernstein
Recording Secretary

dm