



Historic Town of Hyde Park

Planning Board
4383 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park, NY 12538
(845) 229-5111, Ext. 2, (845) 229-0349 Fax
"Working with you for a better Hyde Park"

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE June 3, 2020
PUBLIC HEARING/WORKSHOP/REGULAR MEETING OF THE HYDE PARK
PLANNING BOARD**

MEMBERS PRESENT VIA LIVE STREAMED MEETING:

**MICHAEL DUPREE, CHAIRMAN
ANNE DEXTER - VICE CHAIR
CHRISTOPHER OLIVER
BRENT PICKETT
STEPHANIE WASSER
ANN WEISER**

MEMBERS ABSENT: DIANE DI NAPOLI

**OTHERS PRESENT: VICTORIA POLIDORO, PB CONSULTING ATTORNEY
LIZ AXELSON, PB CONSULTING PLANNER
BILL JOHNSON, PB CONSULTING RF ENGINEER
KATHLEEN MOSS, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
CYNTHIA WITMAN, PB SECRETARY
COUNCILMAN KRUPNICK, TOWN WEBMASTER**

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
VERIZON CELL TOWER-ANDERSON	2-7
VERIZON CELL TOWER-113 SOUTH QUAKER LANE	7-31
PLT STORAGAE YAARD RECONSTRUCTION	31-32
HUTCHINS STAATSBURG STORAGE ADDITIONAL UNITS	32
DISCUSSION OUTDOOR DINING TEMPORARY PERMIT	33-36

Chairman Dupree: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the June 3rd, 2020 meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board. Let me start by noting that this meeting is being conducted as authorized under the Executive Order 202.1 by Governor Andrew Cuomo and the state of New York, which I believe has been updated now and extended by 202.34 to June 27th regarding the open meetings law. Let me ask each of you or Ms. Witman to call the roll, to make sure that each of you is alone and not under any duress in order to make a decision. Ms. Witman.

Ms. Witman confirmed that each Board Member was alone.

Ms. Weiser: I am alone.

Ms. Wasser: I am alone.

Mr. Pickett: I am alone.

Mr. Oliver: I am alone.

Ms. DiNapoli: Absent

Vice-Chair Dexter: I am alone.

Chairman Dupree: I'm alone.

So a quick bit of housekeeping before I start with the Pledge of Allegiance. For any viewers, you may note that our engineering consultant, Mr. Setaro and one of our Board Members, Diane DiNapoli are both absent tonight. I'm happy to say they're both recuperating from some health issues, recuperating nicely. And I think I can speak on behalf of everyone present tonight to say we love them and miss them and wish them a very speedy recovery so we can have them back here in our virtual meeting. Please join me as we pledge allegiance to the United States Flag.

The Chairman led the Pledge.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING:

VERIZON CELL TOWER-ANDERSON

Site Plan & Special Use Permit Approvals (2019-37)

Location: 11 Hudson Lane, Staatsburg

Grid#: 6066-02-778644

In Attendance via Zoom:

*Scott Olson, Young/Sommer LLC
Andrea Armstrong, Airosmith Development
Sara Colman, Airosmith Development
Mike Crosby, Tectonic Engineering*

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. The first item on the agenda is a new public hearing for Verizon Cell Tower located at Anderson Center for Autism. Who is also doing a pool cover for a large pool already located there. May I get a motion from Ms. Weiser to open the public hearing?

MOTION: **Ms. Weiser**

SECOND: **Mr. Oliver**

To open the Public Hearing for Verizon Cell Tower at Anderson.

Ms. Witman called the roll.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Absent	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

ROLL CALL VOTE

6-Aye 1-Absent 0-Nay Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Yes. Public hearing is open. The applicants are here. So I'm going to turn this over to Scott Olson, who I believe will be leading the charge so to speak. Mr. Olson, welcome back.

Mr. Olson: Great. Thank you, Chairman. I appreciate it. It's good to see everybody. So we have a public hearing. This is for Verizon Wireless at the Anderson School. I believe it's 11 Hudson Lane. It is proposed to be a 62-foot wooden utility pole. We would have two antennas at the top of the pole and it's located not too far away from the existing AT&T pole. We've explained in the past why we can't put our antennas on that pole. It's located generally on the western portion of the campus. The property is not used by the school right now. We will access the facility through the internal roads. We have an easement for that and I know there's an issue about the easement for the possible removal down the road. So, you know, we're prepared to talk about that tonight. Just to recap where we are, the Zoning Board of Appeals closed its public hearing on the 26th of May. They have a 10-day comment period and there were no comments at the last public hearing, but I believe the first hearing may have been in March and there may have been one person there that was complaining that we couldn't provide more service. That he really wanted this to provide additional service to where he was located. So we had a little discussion and we said, we're still working on other things, but right now this is just where we're at. And this Board, as you recall, on April 15th, issued a Negative Declaration under SEQRA. You have the County recommendation

that was back in March and they basically said local decision. So we are here tonight for the public hearing. The one last thing I would add, the visibility is extremely minor. We've given the Board a viewshed analysis that shows you that this will not be seen from the Hudson river. This will not be seen from areas far away. It's pretty much located to just, the visibility to the campus and slightly just, just outside of the campus area. So the visibility is extremely minor. And, I guess with that, if you have any questions, I'm happy to entertain them. Just so you know, I don't know if you're aware. We do have Mike Crosby, Verizon Wireless's RF Engineer tonight. We do have Sara Coleman from Airosmith. She's the siting person. She's actually been at all the meetings that we've had for Zoning. And I don't know if we have Steve Matthews for this one. I think we do.

Chairman Dupree: He can come in if you'd like, but I thought he was here for the other application.

Mr. Olson: If you have questions for him, I don't know that we will, but...there he is.

Chairman Dupree: Let him come join the party nonetheless.

Mr. Olson: Thank you. So we are happy to entertain any questions from the Board and or public.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Mr. Olson. I'll just point out that as of the start of this meeting, no one from the public had registered yet to offer public comment, but I will be making certain, that somehow someone didn't slip in. We did receive comments from the Conservation Advisory Council a while back, Mr. Olson has addressed them, fully in my opinion, but the rest of the Board can weigh in on that. We do have an easement issue, but I think this can be resolved with discussion with Victoria and Mr. Olson. As we go forward, I'd like to do it offline or tonight. Then in addition, we will likely close the public hearing tonight, but I wanted to point out that just like the ZBA, we will stipulate that persons will be allowed to submit written comments for 10 additional days - and to confirm that's 10 days, not 10 business days. So that needs to be received within 10 calendar days. Also the area variance they're expecting to, I believe, consider granting it on June 24th, that would be after our next meeting. So that we will likely schedule you for our July 1st meeting to consider approval once the ZBA takes action. Let me start with first our consultant, Liz Axelson. Ms. Axelson, comments or questions?

Ms. Axelson: Okay. I'm unmuted. Hi, I'm Liz Axelson, CPL. Most of my comments were fairly minor and could be addressed as conditions of approval. We'd done a thorough review and a lot of the comments were addressed. There are a couple in there that I'm deferring to Victoria, regarding easements and such. Then we had requested a survey, and there's a note added to the plans

and I figured maybe we'd do some offline consultation with Tad to figure out what, if anything we need about that.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Let me go next to Ms. Polidoro, any comments or questions?

Ms. Polidoro: Well, just this easement that keeps coming up. The issue is that, if the Town ever has to step in to decommission the tower, the Town needs the right to enter the property. And Mr. Olson proposed a three-way agreement earlier today. I think that would be satisfactory if we can get Anderson Center to sign off on it.

Ms. Axelson: Would that address inspections also?

Ms. Polidoro: It could, yes. Do you mean inspections while it's constructed or inspections on a general basis?

Ms. Axelson: Whatever Tad would need to do in terms of construction and if there's any issue down the line. Would she need to have access to the site? So that's a question that legal folks can figure out and Tad, if you have any input?

Chairman Dupree: Tad, I'm going to call on you next for any comments or questions. Do you typically have to visit cell tower sites?

Ms. Moss: I do typically before the CO is issued and periodically. You know, if there is an issue down the line and if it is abandoned, we would need to get in, but I guess that other, agreement easement would take care of that.

Chairman Dupree: Well, we can make sure, Ms. Polidoro can make certain of that.

Ms. Moss: I think there may be an annual update also that I may need to go check on occasionally. I haven't had any difficulties accessing Anderson. I call and they're happy to greet me and, you know, escort me through the property. So I don't anticipate a problem.

Chairman Dupree: I also just want to point out that the Board did do a site walk. Not all of the Board, but we had a majority, so we were distanced, as well, for different reasons other than just social distancing because of COVID-19. That was part of our SEQR analysis. I can confirm that what Mr. Olson said earlier, this is part of the land that is not used by the campus. It's quite near access roadways and other areas. And it's not, as was pointed out by Mr. Olson, is not in the Critical Environmental Area, that was adopted by the Town known as Hogback Hill. It doesn't extend this close to the river. So for comments from the Board, let me start with Ms. Weiser, to my virtual left.

Ms. Weiser: No, my only comment is I am satisfied that the CAC issues have been addressed quite well.

Chairman Dupree: Okay. Thank you for stating that. Ms. Wasser?

Ms. Weiser: I concur with your remarks and Anne Weiser's remarks. I have no further questions or comments.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Mr. Pickett?

Mr. Pickett: No comment. Glad to see it going in.

Chairman Dupree: Vice-Chair Dexter?

Vice-Chair Dexter: No additional comments.

Chairman Dupree: And Mr. Oliver?

Mr. Oliver: No additional comments.

Chairman Dupree: So, I think at this point I need to ask our moderator Councilman Krupnick. If there's anyone in the waiting room who somehow might offer public comment.

Councilman Krupnick: There is not.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Then may I get a motion from Ms. Weiser to close the public hearing with the stipulation that it's going to be held open for 10 days only to receive written comment.

MOTION: Ms. Weiser

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To close the Public Hearing for Verizon Cell Tower at Anderson, with the exception of written comments for 10 days.

Ms. Witman called the roll.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Absent	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

ROLL CALL VOTE

6-Aye 1-Absent 0-Nay Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Yes. So we'll schedule you for July 1st. I'm sorry, Liz, yes?

Ms. Axelson: How would public commenters submit things in writing?

Chairman Dupree: By email or mail? Cynthia, you want to answer that?

Ms. Witman: They'll be sending it to me by email or mail. That's in the public notice. It's also published on our website with the agenda for today, it's listed and separately in the procedure for submitting public comment for any of the Town's public hearings.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. So we'll schedule for July 1st, Mr. Olson, anything else?

Mr. Olson: No. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Chairman Dupree: You're welcome. I believe all of you heard positive comments about this. We're looking forward to see it going through on July 1st.

Mr. Olson: Great. Thank you.

WORKSHOP:

VERIZON CELL TOWER-113 SOUTH QUAKER

Site Plan & Special Use Permit Approvals (#2020-03)

Location: 113 South Quaker Ln & 115 Melanie Way, Hyde Park, NY 12538

Grid#s: 6264-04-710450 & 6264-02-59558

In Attendance via Zoom:

*Scott Olson, Young/Sommer LLC
Andrea Armstrong, Airosmith Development
Sara Colman, Airosmith Development
Mike Crosby, Tectonic Engineering*

Bill Johnson, PB Consulting RF Engineer

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda is a workshop for another Verizon cell tower. This would be located at 113 South Quaker Lane and a private road Melanie Way as well. I believe that Mr. Olson has submitted a PowerPoint presentation. I want to point out for anybody viewing that the rest of the Board is very familiar with this application. We have required a visual assessment, which when the balloon was floated up and pictures were taken by the professionals, a majority of the Board was actually out observing from the receptor sites. Ms. Wasser and I actually kept running into each other as we drove around, waving out to look at sites. So, this will be the first time that the

public will have sort of a view of what the visual survey presented themselves. So Mr. Olson I'm turning it over to you.

Mr. Olson: Right, thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, if I could, I think I'll just summarize kind of where we are and then I have materials. I don't know if I should be able to share my screen or not. The PowerPoint, I'm no expert on that. I tried to put something together and I don't think it worked all that well, but I have the ability to share separate documents if that's what we would like to do. Again, so we have Verizon Wireless folks here for the record. Michael Crosby is Verizon Wireless's RF engineer and Steven Matthew, Tectonic surveyor; visual guru. Andrea Armstrong is with Airosmith Development and she is the site acquisition specialist. So if any questions come up with their expertise, I will just refer to them. So we submitted on February 18, I'm sorry, May 18th, what we consider a detailed response to Liz Axelson's comments that I think were dated back in February. Included with our answers we provided a new set of site plans that were revised to reflect the comments that Liz put together. We provided the all-important visual analysis that was conducted. The balloon test was done back, I think on April 4th, if I remember it was a very nice day actually. And a draft removal agreement, revised environmental assessment form, some NEPA information, a removal bond letter. And like I said, if we would like, as we discussed, I can certainly share my screen so that we can all view those. Speaking about the visual analysis, I mean, I know I was quite pleased. We are talking about 175 ft tower and until you see the balloon and everything, you know, you're never sure what it's going to look like, but, when I drove around there for the most part, the visibility was rather limited considering the height of the tower. And so we were pleased with that. The next thing I would just point out and I don't want to steal Mr. Johnson's thunder, I just saw that he joined, but we did receive, a review letter from Bill Johnson, a quite detailed comprehensive letter. I believe it was 26 pages. And you know, from our point of view, Mr. Johnson seemed to confirm that we needed this site and that this location was a viable location and there were no other viable alternatives. But again, I think Mr. Johnson will be happy to discuss his findings with the Board. So that's, in summary, kind of where we stand right now. I know that Ms. Axelson submitted a letter in response to our May letter. We obviously haven't put a response to that yet. We just got it a few days ago, but we will be reviewing that and providing a written response. But I know that we're prepared to talk about some of those issues tonight, if, if the board would like us to.

Chairman Dupree: Scott, I believe that you have your presentation now on the screen.

Mr. Olson: Okay. And let's see. Yeah. I'm not controlling it though. I don't believe.

Ms. Weiser: You can ask for the next slide.

Mr. Olson: Yeah. Okay. We can try the next slide. The next slide, if you can give that, it's going to be a document. So because the visual analysis is like 50 pages long. I didn't go in and put each page into a separate slide. I just thought that that was kind of counterproductive.

Councilman Krupnick: If you'd like, I can stop the share and you can start sharing.

Mr. Olson: Sure. Yeah. Okay, so let's see if I can share my screen. Is that working?

Ms. Moss: Seems to be.

Mr. Olson: Okay. So you see this visual, this is the visual resource evaluation. I'm assuming that, you know, the Planning Board and everybody had a chance to review it. I wasn't going to scroll through each and every picture, unless there's something specific that anybody wants to point out, but, you know, we have the methodology that was done by Tectonic Engineering. You know, Liz was there, I was there and I think I saw a couple of the Planning Board members driving around also. And like I said, you know, we were pretty happy with the overall visibility. I know that Liz, that one neighborhood that we were in, that was kind of directly across from the site. I wasn't sure what the view would be like. And we were able to just see it through the trees. But to me that was really nothing. There are a couple of views where it's...You can see it and we show that in the individual analysis. I know there was some comments about what we simulated and Steve can certainly address it, but we did simulate a lattice tower. It just looks like it's a monopole because some of these pictures were taken almost two miles away. But we simulated a lattice tower and two different fire ranger stations. We didn't do the flag pole because I thought we discussed that a flag pole of 175 feet is really not, is really not a good idea. So we didn't do that. And we typically won't build a monopole that tall because you're getting into structural issues. I mean, I'm not saying you physically can't do it, but we tend to cut them off at about 150 feet give or take. So that's why you have the simulations that you have in there. So if there are any comments on these, we can certainly scroll through them or go through them. It's up to the Board.

Ms. Axelson: Do you want me to chime in?

Chairman Dupree: Yes. Liz, can you go ahead and chime in?

Ms. Axelson: Okay. So, um, because I've been on the other side of the table, I've prepared visual assessments before and sat with the person who did the graphics. And usually they would show me a small version of the image that they were using to represent whatever the proposed development was, so that I could see that it sort of looked like it so that when they zoomed in on it or, you

know, squeezed it down and zoomed away from it, that it was accurate. And so when I saw, first of all, the photographs, for the simulations, it says monopole. So I assumed that because you had mentioned you weren't going to use the flagpole that you just used monopole instead. And that's because there are some similarities in terms of the shape and girth of flagpole and monopole primarily because the antennas are inside of the structure typically. So I didn't see anything that said lattice simulation and there was nothing in the text that explained that you did that. One way that we can try to look at this is I think it would make sense to submit whatever it was you think was the lattice tower. It's just not clear to me why it wasn't labeled as lattice that's what threw me off. So I assumed, Oh, they're not doing flagpoles, so they substituted monopole and they've got the ranger. So those are three camouflage things, but we don't have the lattice. And also the thing that was labeled as monopole, when it could be detected, looked just like a cylinder. And I know that the specifications in the plans show a lattice tower, which becomes narrow toward the top. But it has an array that when I attempt to scale, it appears to be about 16 feet wide at the widest point. It's a triangle. So I measured one of the edges. So the monopole image didn't make any sense. So anyway, go ahead. Sorry. I've spoken. I want to hear what you have to say.

Mr. Olson: No, and I will gladly defer to Steve Matthews on this.

Mr. Matthews: I am not sure if people can hear me.

Chairman Dupree: Yes.

Mr. Matthews: Okay, good. The monopole on the report was simply a typo. Our visual report craft person missed that. I missed it when I was reviewing it. It should've said tower. We did not simulate a monopole. The simulations that you see that are not a forest ranger tower, they are a self-support tower. The reason it looks so slender is because, two reasons, the distance, they're all over a mile away, so it will look very small at that distance. And the top 40 feet of the tower we're proposing is very slender. It's about five feet wide, so you're not going to see a traditional 10, 12, 20 ft wide tower at this height. Again for distance and just the design of the tower that will ultimately be built here. And I believe I had submitted a response to Michael's email and one of the things I mentioned in there was, especially in this one, I think this is S20, the backdrop for the tower, there is gray and white clouds, and that's the same color as a panel antenna, so the panel antennas themselves will be washed out with that backdrop. We, we did not submit, we did not simulate the monopole or a flagpole for that.

Mr. Olson: Steve, are we able to then provide the Planning Board with the specific structure that was used for the simulation? *[Inaudible]* Okay.

Chairman Dupree: So just to conclude on this, what you'd basically be saying is that what we're seeing right here is the top 40 feet, because it doesn't look as though it's tapering any, it looks like it's already tapered to five feet. Is that correct?

Mr. Matthews: That's correct. Yes.

Chairman Dupree: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Axelson: And it just doesn't seem that...there's nothing on the top. I mean, that's the part I'm not clear on, so that's why it would help be helpful to see what it was you were simulating, like what's the image you were simulating and it would be helpful to have it provided in a format so we can zoom in and out. For example, on the photographs, if we could have copies of the photographs that are zoomable, that would be helpful too. I think it would help review, simply because when I zoom in on these to try to get a better idea to try to verify it gets grainy. So that would be helpful.

Mr. Matthews: That's actually an accurate representation of what we'll see. Because at 55 millimeters, which is the human eye, if you zoom in from a mile away or a mile plus, or close to two miles, you won't see a clear image. You will see a blurry image because it's so far.

Ms. Axelson: Yeah. And actually, it probably would be very helpful to have all this put down in writing, answers to all of this. My suggestion is to provide some more narrative about the methodology in the VRE to explain how did you do this? For example, with the lattice tower, you could provide that image right in the document, refer to it and do a little bit more explaining about these are the images that we used to, you know, plant these things in landscape. A little more detail on that would be helpful.

Mr. Matthews: So I can see if I can add some enhancements.

Ms. Axelson: That would be great.

Mr. Olson: And I just wanted to add one thing I'm always very sensitive to when I hear zooming in and I hear what you're saying. So we should provide you that picture though that we used to simulate, but when we start allowing this to be released, and if people can start zooming in, and then if you zoom in, you just went away from what the perspective of your eye is. You know, so then people can use this image and say, well, here's, it's zoomed in 200%. It looks horrible, whatever. And then we have to be very careful about that. That's why I think we take great pains to make sure that it's taken at a specific focal length based upon the camera that's used, et cetera. We had that discussion early on in March before this was conducted.

Chairman Dupree: Right.

Ms. Axelson: That's all understood. I guess I would feel that the Planning Board and I have pretty good judgment. It's helpful in terms of understanding the image we're looking at.

Mr. Olson: Sure. I agree. I think you need to see the base image that was used. I agree.

Ms. Axelson: This is not about throwing up roadblocks here. I think that the Planning Board and my office, our RF consultant, Mr. Johnson have tried to be very upfront and be very comprehensive getting our reviews out, getting the visual demonstration done. I think the message that I'm getting from my client, the Planning Board is that we need to move this thing along. So put it all out on the table as soon as possible, get it in the record so that when the Board goes to make their decision, they feel very confident. That's my intention.

Mr. Olson: And I agree. I agree 100%. I am not suggesting in any way the Board is dragging its feet on this. No, no, and my concerns are to protect the record. That's all. I'm the gatekeeper of this record because let's say the Board comes and approves this after we get through the review, but we have neighbors that sue. Again, I'm just thinking, I don't want certain documents out there that may not be completely accurate. My comments have nothing to do with you, Liz or the Board. I'm just trying to protect the record to make sure that it's as accurate and fair as possible.

Ms. Axelson: And I think Victoria and I feel the same way about the Board having a great record.

Mr. Olson: I agree. I agree. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Scott. I think I mentioned before that the Board has been sued twice before and won both times, including on appeal to the second department. I'm very concerned about making sure we have a great record. I promise you, so don't worry. So do you want to continue with your PowerPoint?

Mr. Olson: Yeah. I mean, if we want, I mean, do you want to see any more? I think we talked about the photos. Liz, do you have any more...I know you have comments in your review letter, your new review letter, and we will address those. Do you want to talk about anything else or should we move on to the other issues?

Ms. Axelson: You know, only that mentioning Honeywell [*Lane*] had more to do with acknowledging that for the Board's record, I understand you guys didn't take a photograph. I don't expect that to be done. There are Board members that took photographs. We're aware of your sensitivity about using

photographs where we couldn't tell you, you know, what camera it was taken with and all that and it doesn't, it doesn't change the visibility, it just means it's one more place. That's all.

Mr. Olson: Right.

Chairman Dupree: I have a quick question. Before we move on from this, did you say it's five meters wide or five feet wide at the top?

Mr. Olson: Feet.

Chairman Dupree: So I'm seeing this from a mile away, only five feet wide, and I'm seeing that big of an image?

Mr. Olson: Well, what you're looking at right there is actually the...I'm sorry. So this is the fire ranger tower. I think that's painted rust color.

Chairman Dupree: I'm sorry. That's right. That's the rust color one, sorry.

Mr. Olson: So, this is, and I was just going to kind of go into that, to say, so clearly here's the lattice tower. Yes, you can see it, but when you compare it to this, fire tower, clearly the fire tower is going to be wider and have more visibility. My opinion is that this sticks out a lot more. Obviously, it's something the Board has to consider. The next one is also a fire tower, but I believe this is more of a galvanized if I remember correctly.

Chairman Dupree: Yes, not painted rust.

Mr. Olson: So it blends a little more, but it's still going to be wider. So, anyway, that's just what I wanted to point out. So, unless anybody has any questions about, you know, this, we can certainly move on to any of the other issues.

Mr. Johnson: Scott, Bill Johnson here. I just wanted to ask a quick question. Is this simulated, since we can't really tell, is this simulated with all the collocators on board or is it just with your antenna arrays at the top?

Mr. Olson: I think it's...Steve can correct me; I think it's just with our antennas.

Mr. Johnson: And the reason I'm asking that question is I, you know, I then tend to agree with Liz. The boom that's at the top of the tower that supports your antennas is in the neighborhood of about 10 to 12 feet in diameter on each of the faces. It just seems like there should be something at the top of the tower that would be visible. If the tower itself is five feet wide, we're looking at something that's twice or two and a half times as wide on the booms at the top.

So I just wanted to throw that in. Let's just verify that actually what was simulated is actually indeed what was intended.

Mr. Olson: Yes. I, I agree. We need to do that. Thank you.

Ms. Axelson: And then the only other thing before we leave this, because I think the Board would probably like to hear more from Mr. Johnson, is just I did send some sample images out so the Board would have a sense of what types of towers we're talking about. Were those clear?

Chairman Dupree: Yes.

Ms. Axelson: Okay.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Mr. Olson, you can continue.

Mr. Olson: Okay. So there are other documents we can go through, but I don't know if it's necessary unless the Board wants to. We have the revised site plans, but most of the revisions that we did were just changing tables, adding things that Liz asked us to add. I'm not trying to downplay that at all. We just didn't change anything major on the site plans in terms of location or anything like that. But the one issue I think that I know the Board wants to talk about is Melanie Way and grading plan and Steve's on the line obviously, but I'll just summarize. Right now, Melanie Way is a very well, say, built road. It doesn't need any improvements for our use. It can handle construction vehicles fine, so we're not going to make any improvement to it. We will add utilities alongside of it through trenching. So I know Steve wrote a letter and I think I provided that to the Board that we were not proposing to do any detailed grading plan because frankly there's not going to be any grading. But I think that's something the Board wants to talk about and we're happy to talk about it.

Chairman Dupree: Let me then go over first to Liz and I'll ask Tad to weigh in. Mr. Pickett you actually walked the road with, Liz, I believe.

Mr. Pickett: Yes.

Chairman Dupree: Do you think that that road, as it is now, or path, is actually satisfactory in case Tad needed to go up there to do inspections. Would a Town vehicle be able to make it up that road as it is?

Mr. Pickett: Yes, I'm good whether you could make it up that road. And I think if you were to try and improve it or pave it or anything that you'd actually be destroying the ambience of the area.

Chairman Dupree: No, I don't think we want to see it paved. I just want to make sure that it's safe for vehicle access.

Mr. Pickett: Yes.

Chairman Dupree: So Liz, comments?

Ms. Axelson: So my main issue with the way the road is, what I've observed, it seems to be kind of, what's the word I want... Low in the middle and high on the edges. I observed rockiness or maybe shallow depth bedrock there. And it had occurred to me that in order to use it for construction and access, that the applicant might want to just simply lay down gravel. But then, I looked at the specifications for the utility trench that's going to be running up, I believe the South side of Melanie Way and I know it would be on the side, but my understanding is that that's a two foot wide trench that's approximately, almost four feet deep. And the bottom half of it or the bottom, approximately two feet, it isn't backfill, it's some kind of cement and *[Inaudible]*. And, so naturally on the side, there has to be excavation to be able to put that trench in and half of it would be backfill and half of it is going to be something else. According, if you just read the code and look up excavate or fill, et cetera, you're going to have to dig to put that trench in as far as I can tell, unless the trench was going to be on the side and you were going to build up the rest of the road so that that depth would occur, but that's unlikely that you're going to bring in that much fill. So that's why I believe that it looks like you would have to excavate for that trench and fill and possibly do a little grading on that side. And so the question kind of remains in the air. I'm going to go back out to the site and take a look at it, but according to the code, that's filling. I'm aware that even if you were to grade just that trench on the side, that you would probably be below an acre of disturbance based on just desktop calculations. I can understand how you might be worried about having to do a SWPPP in this particular case. And based on speaking with Pete Setaro, I don't believe a SWPPP would be needed. But that's my take on that and I guess you have to look at the code and maybe if you're not going to provide grading, give us some explanation of how the trench would be installed in that particular situation. That would be, I mean, we need something because otherwise when you're standing there, it's kind of hard to figure out how you would do it without digging and filling.

Chairman Dupree: Tad, do you want to weigh in on top of that first before I let Scott answer?

Ms. Moss: Well at least we're going to need an erosion sediment control permit. These slopes are quite steep. I'm not sure exactly how the staging of material is going to work. I believe you indicated that there weren't any trees or weren't many trees that were going to have to be removed, but it looked to me like there was going to be removal and clearing and leveling. And the steep slope off the side of the access, down into the gully, I guess is really steep and you may have difficulty holding it and revegetating it. And I, I just want to

caution about that. And Pete and I will be looking at that again and if Liz goes to the site, Liz, let me know, I'd like to go with you.

Ms. Axelson: Right. And here's a suggestion. I don't know if this works for the applicant's folks, for Steve or whoever; is it possible to stake out the center line approximately of where that utility trench would be. That might help us understand better what you have in mind and why you believe grading isn't necessary. And then once that's staked, we can take a look at it.

Chairman Dupree: Scott or Steve, would you like to reply?

Mr. Matthews: I can reply. The trenches, so if you have your 12 foot wide travel path, it will be literally right off the edge of that. I mean, I could stake it, but if you know where the road is, you know, where the trenches going. It's going off the edge. And we have never tried to say that we wouldn't be digging for this. We've had that detail in the plans since day one. We have designed for a four foot deep, two foot wide trench. The spoils from that, that won't go back into the trench will be used for fill at the tower compound, so all the material will stay on site. It won't be trucked outside. But for actual grade, the existing grade, will remain, so the finished grade, when the trench is complete, will be the same as the existing grade.

Ms. Axelson: Well, I'm wondering then if it would be helpful if, I don't know if you can give something kind of like notation that's construction sequence that describes what your process would be. And then if we could just take a look at that, maybe we'd have a better understanding.

Mr. Matthews: It's just standard construction practices for a utility trench. It might already be covered in the drawings, I'm not sure, but there'll be a mini excavator, they'll carve the two foot wide trench down the side of the road. They'll lay the conduits with the sand bedding and they'll put the backfill on top of it and compact it. And it's done. That's fairly simple.

Chairman Dupree: And if you encounter any bedrock?

Mr. Matthews: We don't anticipate any bedrock. I haven't witnessed any bedrock. There is loose rock there that we feel was from a stone wall that was made when they built the road. So it was rock moved out of the way to construct the road and I did not see any evidence of that rock.

Ms. Axelson: Well, I'll go back through and read all the texts and see if there's something resembling construction description that could be added to the plan as plan notes. I guess maybe Tad you could take a look too and find out what's satisfactory and what do we need after that? Do some offline consultation.

Chairman Dupree: Yeah, go ahead.

Ms. Polidoro: I was just going to bring up while we're talking about Melanie Way. I did request a copy of the easement or legal mechanism that you're using to access Melanie Way. And I don't think I received it in the last package, so if you sent it, I'm sorry, I didn't see it in your plan set, but if you could get it to me, I would like to review it.

Chairman Dupree: And we will have the same issue here. The town will need access over Melanie Way to get to the site for inspections, et cetera.

Mr. Olson: Sure. I will send that because there were some title issues involving Melanie Way that we resolved prior to making an application. We have, there is an easement, it'll be in two parts. We have an easement through our lease and there's an easement agreement with the owners of Melanie Way and the owners of the property that we're going to be located on. So I'll send both of those to you so you can review.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Olson: Sure.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. And part of the issue, again, we're not trying to throw roadblocks. I'll be honest, I believe, if I haven't stated this before, the Board... I think I can speak for the Board on this. We were all fairly surprised that for 179 foot - with the lightning rod - tower, that it was not as visible as we expected it to be. It also helped that there is another lattice tower that's located in Pleasant Valley that Mr. Setaro sent us to. And we took pictures of that too, all of us and observed. It was quite interesting to see that what we expected to be this huge monolithic thing kind of disappeared more than what we expected. But in terms of grading, those of us who live here know that Hyde Park is basically rock and swamp - what's left that's not developed. Everything that was developed easily, was developed a long time ago. So we're used to having contractors, et cetera, encounter veins of bedrock here and there before - they've caused problems afterwards. So if you don't believe that it's there, then maybe you're lucky, but I know there is a big rock out there because I walked the site as well. So, any other comments on...Yes, Liz? No, no, go ahead.

Ms. Axelson: I guess, you know, I I'd like us to have some kind of text or dialogue. Let's talk about it offline because you know, the Board has encountered a number of projects where there was minor excavation and filling, but they still were provided with a grading plan. But if there's some way we can figure out plan notation. I'm going to do a search and see what I can find for the language, Steve and, you know, maybe you could point me in that direction after this.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Ms. Axelson, any other comments that you'd like to address besides what's in your most recent Memo or including what's in your most recent Memo?

Ms. Axelson: Unless the Board or the applicant's representatives have questions.

Chairman Dupree: I'll note that this was issued yesterday, June 2nd, as well as the Memo on Anderson Center prior, which is why, when you said you only had them a few days, you've only had them less than 24 hours, Scott. So we don't expect a response immediately, even though I think you did do a great job of responding to Liz's initial Memo with the changes that were made. Ms. Moss, anything else to add?

Ms. Moss: No.

Chairman Dupree: Ms. Polidoro, anything else to add? Okay, let me start from my virtual right then. Mr. Oliver comments.

Mr. Oliver: I have no additional comments at this time.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Vice-chair Dexter?

Vice Chair Dexter: So when I was driving around and then I read your report about where it was visible from...I know it can't be included because I didn't have a camera, but between #79-#91 Windmill Road, that is just south of the automobile reclamation place, it was quite visible along that stretch of Honeywell or Windmill. Let me check,Honeywell Lane, yep. And I just wanted to note that - because it's not on any of the documents and I did not take a picture of it - but it was, to me, it was the most visible place because it's very close. But there are very few residences there and there is an auto salvage yard right across the street. So, you know, the impacts are probably minimal, but it was actually very visible. So I did just want to get that on the record that I did see that, but I don't own any fancy cameras or anything.

Mr. Matthews: Could you repeat that address, please, if you don't mind.

Ms. Axelson: It's a, go ahead. If you want Anne.

Chairman Dupree: Repeat the address.

Vice-Chair Dexter: It was between 79 and 91 Honeywell Lane.

Mr. Olson: I think Liz, that was when we first left the site and we were driving past the salvage yard. It was kind of, well as the name suggests, windy road and we both stopped and said, Oh, there's the tower. I think that was, so I

agree with you, I think the tower, the balloons were visible there. I agree. I may even Steve, have some photos of that. I'm not sure.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Okay.

Ms. Axelson: Yeah. And I, I did tell Michael before this, when I've done photos, sometimes you get sent out, as the developer's representative, with a list of photos, but when you go out in the field, sometimes you notice something that maybe a local Planning Board didn't put on their list. So if there's a way to do a simulation from that. It would be helpful for the Board's record.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Other than that, I don't have any other comments.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Mr. Pickett?

Mr. Pickett: Yes, Liz and I spent a fair amount of time up in the subdivision above Greenfield Park and particularly on Coll Hollow, Russet, Windmill, those streets up there. It was, I think the closest subdivision and even with it being leaf off, we could only in one particular spot, could we find it? And that was almost with a telephoto lens through the trees, so with leaf on you'd never ever see it. And even during that day, I think Liz will agree. We had a hard time. You had to be just in the right spot in order to see it. That's the closest subdivision. Oh, what's the diameter of that red balloon?

Ms. Weiser: 4 feet, I think it was.

Mr. Pickett: Okay. So if you're looking at a red balloon that's four feet in diameter versus a tower or whatever, that's five. You're not going to see it from where we were at.

Chairman Dupree: Any other comments Brent?

Mr. Pickett: No comments, no additional comments.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Ms. Wasser?

Ms. Wasser: I don't have additional comments, but I did have a general question for the benefit of anyone who's maybe watching live, what is the radio range for cell use off of this tower? I wanted you to have something to do during your session.

Mr. Crosby: I appreciate that. I would have to look to give you the exact, because I know that at the ZBA meeting, I disappointed the gentleman that lived across the street when I undersized the diameter of the footprint. But I

can...real quick here, I've actually got Google earth up on my screen, I'll just give you a quick...this is just a rough estimate, but it's at least a two-mile diameter or excuse me, radius. So you'd be looking at about a four-mile diameter and it varies. It depends on which direction and what obstructions are out there to block the RF. So this is designed to be a site that goes a long way to try to help fill in Hyde Park. I know it's been a long time since everybody had three white bars on phones that worked in all the nooks and crannies around town, you know. The network has advanced, the phones have advanced, but this area has lacked in densification and that's what we're trying to do is to fill in this gap area. So this is going to provide a lot of improvement for anybody that may be watching that lives generally in this area. This is definitely going to help out. And we know we've heard from many of the customers in this area. We know that people are looking for improved services, we can see it on our network. You can see the level of performance that the phones are operating at. We see the failures. We see the increase of traffic on the network over time. And so this site is really, I think it's long overdue and I hope that it's well received because we're trying to do the right things for the right reason and improve this area of the network. So thank you for your help in that regard.

Ms. Wasser: And I certainly appreciate that. I don't have further comments at this time.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Stephanie. Ann?

Ms. Weiser: Nope, no comments. I just wanted to thank you for clarifying that what we're looking at on S20, S21 and S22 were indeed lattice towers rather than monopoles.

Chairman Dupree: So I saved Mr. Johnson for last, because normally I would put him in with the consultants, but I had some questions for him too, before we go on. But first Mr. Johnson, would you like to present? I made it through all 26 pages of your report and I will say that I would concur with Mr. Olson's sort of idea of your summary, but I noticed that, kind of back in the more technical areas, there were some interesting things I want to bring up after you speak. So let me turn it over to you.

Mr. Johnson: All right. Well, thank you. I apologize for the 26 pages; I'll use smaller type font next time.

Chairman Dupree: These old eyes need, need a big font. Don't worry.

Mr. Johnson: I fully understand that problem. I live there. So this site is pretty much easy to understand once you've gone through the fairly detailed information. I guess Mike Crosby, I'll commend you. You put a lot of information into the technical presentation and actually that made it a little

harder to get through, but at the end of the day, I had a whole lot less questions for you. So the site as proposed, 175 feet to the top of the tower, that's a 171 ft antenna center line, which is what's used to do the simulations, is just about where it needs to be. Going lower ... Mike included a propagation plot for 30 feet lower and demonstrated where the dropout starts to occur and it happens right at a fairly, relatively densely populated area for Hyde Park anyway. And they lose a lot of coverage in that particular area going to that 30 ft reduction. So I'm fairly convinced looking at the propagation plots that 175 feet is about where it needs to be. Now, having said that if you consider that to be sort of a universal height, no matter what the ground elevation is, it's going to have to be approximately at that location above mean sea level. Going to other locations which have lower ground elevation could very well push it up above 200 feet. And in my report, I did highlight the fact that a Federal Aviation Administration requirement is it doesn't really matter what's near the tower, if you cross 200 feet, there's going to be a blinker strobe at the top, and it's going to have to be orange-and-white-band striped. So it's a non-visible right now, as much as it could be if it had gone above 200 feet. So I think the applicants are to be commended for having found a location that is so aesthetically workable without getting up to that type of height, to provide the coverage that they need. The Board may very well be familiar with this. And again, I thank you for bringing me in on this. This is the first time that I'm working with this Board on these types of sites. Up to this point, you have probably seen what are called RF coverage sites, and this is where there was no coverage and an applicant is trying to provide radio-frequency coverage. There is some coverage in Hyde Park but really one of the major problems of the applicant at this point in time is if you made it through the plots that are in the RF analysis in exhibit five, you see that there's a number of sites, which are the neighbor sites, the sectors are saturated or exhausted. Most terms are used, too many users are trying to use those sites and by putting this site at the location it is, it's first of all going to provide stronger coverage for the more central part of Hyde Park. But it's also going to draw traffic from those sites that are currently saturated or exhausted and allow more users to share between the two different sites or the multiple sites I should say and get a better throughput and better performance. So you're going to see more of these in the future as more and more people come online with wireless equipment. Mike, thanks for putting in the summary also in exhibit five, which lists some of the applications for 5G. We all heard about it, we don't really know what it is except a number and a letter. There's going to be applications being developed that are going to demand that the cell sites be very, very close to where the end user is located. When you're driving an autonomous vehicle or when you're letting an autonomous vehicle drive itself, I should say, and you're in it, you want to be sure that that vehicle is going to be getting the information very, very quickly. About one millisecond, one 1000th of a second, return time to be able to get the navigation information to know that there's another vehicle approaching on the side street that is going to intercept you and those two vehicles now need to communicate in order to avoid a collision. We're not quite there yet, but that's,

that's coming. And you're going to be seeing in Hyde Park and anywhere else that you want to name, more and more small cell type sites, not just to do things like the autonomous vehicles but also to provide offloading services to commercial office parks and where there's high density of users. So, with that information, I did indicate that there's going to probably be other sites in Hyde Park. None of those are enunciated right at the moment and I know Mike, you probably don't have a crystal ball. Mine broke a number of years ago to try to predict where those sites are exactly going to be. But as the sites go in, the traffic will be measured by Verizon and where there are dropouts and where there's blocked calls and the problems, there are probably going to be other tower sites put in or small cell sites. My last comment is that a 5G site, you probably have seen some pictures of them. And if you haven't, it's worth taking a look at because these are going to be on light stanchions, telephone poles and perhaps the sides of buildings. They are fairly substantial if you happen to be the house that has the telephone pole outside your window. So it's certainly something to keep an eye on and my encouragement to the Town of Hyde Park is to be looking down the road and keep your eyes on this one, because there are time limitations for approving small cells and the type of cells that I'm talking about for 5G. So bottom line is this site looks to be justified based on both the coverage and the capacity requirement. The height is just about where it needs to be. It won't be over 200 feet at this point. The question though would be a future co-location as shown below 175 feet. I always just want to caution my clients to realize that if the applicant needs 175 feet, the physics doesn't change if you go to AT&T or to other service providers. They are probably all located on the neighbor's sites, just like Verizon is, which means their coverage pattern is probably going to be pretty similar to what Verizon has in each of the bands in which they're operating. It may be advisable to think about the possibility of designing the tower to extend it another 20 feet. Now that doesn't put it over the top of 200 feet, so there wouldn't be an FAA lighting requirement or marking requirement, but if you can't extend the tower and another applicant needs the type of coverage, that means you're either going to have to approve another tower somewhere else or do something special to this tower. Oftentimes what's done is to design the foundation for the tower and the lower superstructure so that it could be extended. And that would be another service provider coming to you, demonstrating that they actually need that height. And if you then approve that additional, incremental height, the foundation and the superstructure of the tower would be able to support that extra requirement. So those are pretty much the quick summary of the 26 pages, the Reader's Digest version. Michael, congratulations for making it through it. I admire you completely for being able to do that.

Chairman Dupree: You're Planning Board Chair is a very active and committed Planning Board Chair, I can assure you. Your humble servant for Hyde Park. You actually caught to what I...It was more or less, not buried, but it was toward the end when you were talking about, well, at least toward the latter middle, but we were talking about collocation and it struck me because

the one thing that I need to make sure that the applicants here recognize, the Town of Hyde Park is happy to see improved cellular service for the residents of Greentree and people in Greenfields and emails going around there. What we do not want to see is a plethora of similarly sized towers sprouting up like mushrooms in this area. Am I making myself clear? So I should have also added is that when we went to see the tower, the lattice tower that's in Pleasant Valley, guess what's right next to it? Another lattice tower. So I beg you gentlemen and ladies to make certain that we understand that this is going to be tall enough, so that if someone comes up to you and says, I'd like to collocate, either what Mr. Johnson just suggested, so that the base and the superstructure are already developed soundly enough, that you can do an addition, or you consider making it higher. Because the last thing we want is a bunch of towers here. And this is what happened with Anderson Center as well. I'll point out there, once again, that the cell tower or pole, I really should call it, wooden pole, that's there for AT&T, was not reviewed by the Planning Board prior to its erection. It was put up without our knowledge. When someone wanted to collocate on it, that's when we were told that it existed. Therefore, there's another tower going in now. Those are low and I agree with you, Scott, it's very unobtrusive. It's not visible from the river. You pretty much can see it on certain sites from the Anderson Center, that's it. And that's the primary user or the recipient of the benefit. But in this case, this will be seen at certain locations. We didn't mention it, but I believe it was Anne Dexter, our Vice-Chair, who pointed out that the lattice tower in Pleasant Valley, that I'd never noticed is extremely visible from a very prominent location in terms of what the County Planning Board has, I'm on that too, has identified as a scenic view shed, also by that town. I never noticed it because it's where I take a right to come down into Hyde Park. It's the intersection of Salt Point Turnpike and what I believe would be Netherwood Road there.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Yeah, I believe so.

Chairman Dupree: At any rate, once I saw it, and you can see about half of it up there. And then the other one now sticks out like a sore thumb to me. So I just want to make sure again, for the purpose of the people that may be watching this and the residents there, I've learned a lot by going through this process and by other visual assessments. Your eye doesn't necessarily look at something unless you're looking for it. And by that, I mean, when you drive someplace regularly, you become routinized to things and don't really notice it. So in our case, when we were driving around looking for the balloon, we were looking for it very specifically. In most instances, it would blend right in with the trees, because the tree area around it is so high, but trees can be removed. And again, if that's what we're relying on to help camouflage, I want to make sure that we don't have 14 towers and one area that 14 different... I guess there's less service providers now with the merger, but at any rate three or four different towers of the same height in the area. So you don't have to answer me now, but please consider making this decision because I can say we don't want

it to go above 200 feet because part of the camouflaging is the fact that it's not lit. That's one of my favorite things about this, and then it's not going to be painted any kind of garish colors, and it will kind of blend in, but we need to make sure there's a way to collocate. I don't know if Verizon likes to have other people collocated or not. That might be an issue, but our code does require that that be explored first.

Mr. Olson: If I may, Mr. Chairman. Verizon Wireless...collocation is, and has been something that is accepted within the industry for a long time. I mean, you know, maybe 20 years ago when I started doing this, you know, there were companies, and I'm not saying it was Verizon Wireless, but other companies that would try to exclude the other companies from coming in and do these exclusivity agreements. That has been long gone. We anticipate that there will be other collocators on this tower. We don't know which ones, when or where...well where we know. In terms of height, that's an issue, that's a good question, a good issue raised by Mr. Johnson. We've battled with it over the years. Sometimes we've come in and said, Hey, your code requires us to build this for collocation, so we're going to propose a tower that's actually a little higher than we need it. We've come back to... my view is don't do that. Propose what you need. If there's a lawsuit you're in trouble, if you're proposing more than you need. That said, as Mr. Johnson said, there are things you can do to build the foundation, to be able to handle and accommodate a future extension, as well as the base part. We have done that in the past with other municipalities when they've made it a condition or asked for that to be done, we've done it because we understand you don't want to see another tower right next to this. It just, it doesn't make any sense. So we hear you and I think that's something that, Steve, we have to just make sure we consider. Assuming we move on to the next phase at some point to building permit. So we, we hear you.

Chairman Dupree: I'll also repeat what I've said before. The Board understands and recognizes the importance of this particular utility. People rely on not just their cell phones for communication, but really for all communication. Not just for speaking by phone, but also for all the data. In addition, Mr. Johnson made the excellent comment that when and if we have, I suppose when we have driverless vehicles, they'll be relying on signals, supplied by towers like this. So again, we're a forward-thinking town. We want to make sure that we provide individuals with what they need for life. And as I've said before, I myself am a Verizon Wireless customer. And I know when I travel on Quaker Lane, I get no service the entire time out there, or rather it's very patchy, but I get no service, for blocks at about a mile and a quarter at a time. And then it's dropped when I have it for a second. So I know that people in the neighborhood, as I said before, that's an older neighborhood, but it's also been changing, homes have been being sold to younger people. A lot of younger people don't even bother with landlines. They rely on their cell phones. We want to make sure that our residents can utilize things like that. So the

objection is not to the height, that's what's demanded and that's what's required. I saw that it will help your capacity. I didn't see what I should say as Mr. Johnson writes very eloquently, particularly for someone who's a layman, Mike, no offense, but I kind of went through yours and thought, okay, this is saying that this is why they have to have it, but I can't follow any of it. That was why we have to have Mr. Johnson. But Bill really did lay it out in ways that even I could understand. So I get that this actually solves not just the immediate problem there, but between the bouncing of the other service areas, we'll call it, you're going to be able to provide better service there and more capacity. So I think that...Yes?

Ms. Polidoro: May I ask a question?

Chairman Dupree: Yes.

Ms. Polidoro: Victoria speaking. Our Code does require collocation. And so looking to the future, one of the mitigation techniques, I guess, that the Board has been looking at is disguising the tower either with lattice or as a ranger tower and I'm just curious, I don't know if it's Mr. Johnson or Mr. Olson who can answer this, but if we do something like a ranger tower, is that capable of being added onto in the future or does it make sense to just design a taller ranger tower at the outset?

Chairman Dupree: Good question.

Mr. Matthews: I can answer that. It is possible to extend a ranger tower. So if it's built at 175 with a roof on it, you can extend it. It's obviously much more intensive in the construction process, versus a self-support tower. So if you build a self-support tower to 175 and you extend it to 195, you would most likely just put another 20-foot section on top bolted into the three legs and that's pretty much it. For a ranger tower, it's a more challenging, you'd have to take the roof off, somehow splice into the four legged structure and the actual section there is obviously more beefy because it's probably going to be on the order of 12 to 14 feet square, because it has to enclose the antennas around the outside. So there's more structure, harder to attach. So yes, it is possible, but more challenging.

Mr. Johnson: I think you're right. I think things like ranger towers and with other type of self-structures, those only work when people are going to look at them and expect to see them there. But these days, forest fires and views from a ranger towers and things are really a thing of the past because of the type of imaging that's being done from satellites. One of my clients wanted to do an artificial tree that was going to be up in the 150 ft range. That's nearly 60 feet above the top of the canopy. And my comment to them was you could do that, but everybody driving past the site is going to say, wow, look at that cell tower. Do they really think we're stupid? And so when you get to these kinds of

heights, just for structural purposes, nobody's really being fooled that it's not some sort of a communication tower. If you think a ranger tower is going to actually make it more aesthetically pleasing,, you know, you're the folks that have to look at it and you'll be in the area there, but I think most people expect to see, or when they see an odd looking structure, they do piece it together. That probably was an attempt to try to fool them. And it really is a cell tower, in fact. I'll just throw that in as my 2 cents on that one.

Chairman Dupree: No, actually, Bill, our Code requires it be camouflaged, whatever that means precisely. And we are in an historic area here. We actually have lots of ranger towers, believe it or not, out and about. There is one on the top of Mount Stissing. They are old. I'm scared to death to go all the way to the top because it's too rickety, but we do have them in several areas, including Rhinebeck in Ferncliff Forest. So they're not too obtrusive here, but I can say straight out that the one that's on top of Mount Stissing is only probably 50 feet tall. You got Mount Stissing, you can see it because it's actually a tall mountain. Well, what passes for a mountain in Dutchess County; let me rephrase that, nothing like what you'd have up North. I didn't ask the Board to weigh in on the aesthetic question yet of lattice versus ranger tower versus anything else, monopole. Mainly because we didn't have a copy of what the image was that was used for the simulation. We have in the plan submitted, what the outline of the monopole looks like, but I wanted to see what it actually was and Liz has provided some ranger tower, cell phone towers, as well as examples. They look pretty massive, to be honest with you. I myself liked the idea at first of the ranger tower, but then when I saw the sort of mass of it, because to make it look like a ranger tower, it's got to have steps that go up and make it look like somebody wants to go up. That made me maybe change my mind. I'm not certain yet. Also I know that in this area, we don't want to encourage people thinking, Hey, there's a tower and I can climb up and have good views. This is on private property and we don't want people going over there unless they're authorized to. So this is something, that's just my opinion, that's something for the Board to consider. One big question I have is how would we know, in terms of inspection, whether or not you've actually given it, the kind of structural support it would need to do the extension for lattice or whatever.

Ms. Moss: It would be in the building permit. It'll show up there,

Chairman Dupree: Okay, but how would you know that that building permit versus a building permit that doesn't have the structural addition?

Ms. Moss: Because they would note on the building plans.

Chairman Dupree: Aha. Okay. Thank you. I'm just wanting to make sure that we didn't have to hire Mr. Johnson to come back in and actually do a physical inspection of the plans or something. So that's all.

Ms. Axelson: I want to just follow up on Victoria's point, you know, in terms of looking ahead and planning ahead and Mr. Johnson's comments. I don't know if at midway point in the project, you know, this application is for tower of a certain height. We've had the simulations. To simulate a higher tower just for long-term planning consideration, I don't believe would be that difficult to do. And so my question is, is there a way to sort of amend this review process to consider that now? If it's something that the board is thinking of in terms of long-term planning, instead of having another site or another tower on the other part of this property of having this be taller to be a more realistic provider for future collocators. So kind of a question for Victoria actually.

Ms. Polidoro: Yes. I think the Board could ask the applicant to make that change if we consider it mitigation, under SEQR, for lessening community impact of having another tower located right next door. I mean, I think based on the visuals received, I'm not sure 20 additional feet is going to make any discernible difference, but I'll leave that to the experts.

Chairman Dupree: I tend to agree if it's only five feet tall. If you're talking about extending 25 feet, more than 20 feet, the maximum visibility, the most visibility for most of the receptor sites were actually miles away. That's why it looks so small and as Anne noted and Scott and Liz, sort of chimed in on too, you will see it in some areas on Honeywell Lane, particularly being visible, but you're seeing enough of it that a 20-foot addition may not be much there. And I understand Scott you're worried about potential lawsuits. I don't ever like lawsuits either because the Town has to spend money to defend its decisions. I know how much an article 78 costs in defense as well, because as I said, we've been through two of them before. I certainly would be willing to stand by our record that if we're doing this, so as to avoid further larger towers, I think that it could be justified quite easily as mitigation to community impacts as Victoria outlined. I will let your team discuss that amongst yourselves to what maybe revisions you'd like to make, either it's for the structural base or to build it taller now, in the sort of, if we build it, they will come, hoping more collocators will come. In addition, I wanted to conclude just because Mr. Johnson put it in his report, but again, toward the end, this is a very evolving field. You know, the original towers that you see are already, they're not useless, but they're not as effective as they were before. He noted that in some cases we may be changing to different methods of providing cell phone coverage, including satellites. I have dear friends who own something called, Dial-tone Services. It provides satellite cell phone to rural areas in Texas and New Mexico. This is actually always paid for by the FCC through a little thing you see called line charge in every one of your telephone bills, it's like a \$1.22 on mine. This goes to help companies provide a kind of cell service. So the reason why I'm saying this is even though we keep talking about the easements for the Town to decommission or remove if necessary, that doesn't seem logical because Verizon's a huge, wealthy corporation and we assume that if it's no longer useful, they'll come in and take it down. But you never know and in the future

as technologies change, it may be that these are no longer what are used to provide this kind of service. So that's why it's important to make sure that the Town has the easement both for inspection for Tad before the CO, as well as for the future, possibly decommissioning. This noted, I think we have a little bit of clean-up to do on the visual analysis. It doesn't sound like too much. You'll need to also provide, it sounds like a little bit more language regarding how the trench is dug, et cetera. And we should be seeing, again I think Bill brought up the point that the boom for the antenna is actually 10 to 15 feet. Which is wider than the 5 ft area we're seeing is, so that probably should be added in if it's possible.

Ms. Axelson: It actually scales at 16 feet, but I don't know if that's the plan, if there's a discrepancy, sorry.

Chairman Dupree: Then, also we need to address, as I said, if there's removal of trees, et cetera. It sounds like there will be an erosion and sediment control permit required, but I think we've known that all along. So because some of the slopes are so steep. The question is, is when do we think we're ready to have this ready for circulation? Liz comments on circulating?

Ms. Axelson: I mean, you know, we have a fair bit of detail. I think it would be helpful if it's possible to brush up some of the VRE a little bit. At least so the public can understand how it's presented.

Chairman Dupree: I believe this will be circulated to Dutchess County Planning, wait, this is technically a private road but it abuts... help me with this Victoria, Quaker is a County road.

Ms. Axelson: It is the address of the parcel, is it landlocked? We'll have to figure out whether it needs 239m. I'll have to pull the mapper, sorry.

Ms. Witman: The address is on South Quaker.

Ms. Polidoro: The address is on South Quaker, but is it within 500 feet of South Quaker? I think it would be prudent to refer it either way, but we'll do the measurements.

Chairman Dupree: Heather will be most interested in the visual analysis as well.

Ms. Polidoro: We had discussed holding off on circulation until we received the revised visuals.

Ms. Axelson: Honestly, it looks like it's way back farther than 500 feet, the actual improvements.

Ms. Polidoro: It's the property line.

Ms. Axelson: Oh, so the property line is right on South Quaker, within 500 feet.

Mr. Olson: Yeah, the property butts up against South Quaker. So since that's a County Road, I think you have to refer it. If you don't mind me chiming in.

Chairman Dupree: No, we're happy to have you chime in.

Ms. Polidoro: I don't have a hard copy in front of me. It gets difficult.

Mr. Olson: I understand.

Chairman Dupree: I'm happy to have you chime in Scott because that's also, I don't want to have a procedural defect, which failing to go to County Planning would be considered that and we'd lose immediately. Not necessarily immediately, but it sounds like it would be. Are there any other agencies we'd be referring this to, I'm trying to think right now?

Ms. Witman: Courtesy to Pleasant Valley.

Chairman Dupree: I think that'd be about it.

Ms. Axelson: We've suggested that the fire department look at the access.

Chairman Dupree: Of course.

Mr. Olson: Concerning that. I'm sorry. I saw that in your memo, Liz, would you like us to refer it or would the Town refer it? Just let us know.

Chairman Dupree: The Town refers it that way we know what the communication is between the two of you. I strongly urge you once you give us copies and we circulate to contact the fire department.

Mr. Olson: Okay.

Chairman Dupree: This is also, I'm going to be honest here now and say this. That's why I was also mentioning grading. The fire department may have issues with the condition of Melanie Way. I don't know. I can't predict the fire department. I'll be honest with you. I get along with all of them. They're really nice guys. And the people they have commenting for applications change periodically. So it's changed often enough lately that I can no longer tell, but they will want to weigh in on this as well. This is Roosevelt Fire District and they're very approachable and the people who respond know what they're talking about. One of the individuals who used to be the chief actually writes

the State Fire Code, so it's a tightly run organization, I guess is the best way to say it. And it covers most of Hyde park including this area.

Ms. Axelson: And then Dutchess County DPW, we could circulate to them, but it might be a good idea to start speaking with them. And that's one of our comments is to confer with them about whether any permitting is needed for either construction or access.

Mr. Olson: Yeah. I don't believe anything is required because we're not going to be doing any improvements to the County right of way. I think Steve is nodding his head, so I guess that was the right answer.

Ms. Axelson: Just the suggestion is to reach out to them and get an answer.

Chairman Dupree: So what I think we'll do is once you can address the issues you heard tonight and get something back to us, then we can go ahead and get you on an agenda quickly, because you're already in the pipeline, so to speak. Um, and then we can consider doing a circulation and maybe actually setting a date for a public hearing. Because I think, again, I don't know that the public will come out and speak, or not. I'm sorry, we'll also refer this to the CAC, obviously. I'm always thinking about agencies with permitting authority rather than interested. But I think that it will be instructive to hear this. If people in the most immediately impacted neighborhood are going, gee, I can't wait to give up my landline and have a cell phone, I'm just happy about this - that'll tell us something. And it's also be an opportunity for people to discuss potential visual impacts on the neighbors or on the far away neighbors that are impacted. I'm not sure if anybody who lives on Kristi Lane is actually watching these and paying attention to say, Hey, I want to come and talk, but they can. I want to underscore something that for anybody who might be watching - visual impacts are going to happen with cell phone towers of this height. You're going to see it from some locations. The job of the Planning Board is to weigh all the factors of what's good about it, what's bad about it and then to mitigate to the maximum extent possible and practical. And that's what we're trying to do by doing this in the first place. So anything else from your team tonight, Scott?

Mr. Olson: No, I think we're all set. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: And you do have my permission if that's needed for you and Liz to discuss, if there's more questions you have of her, whether that's Steven, Mike as well. For what we are looking for the VRE, the increase. And I want to thank all of you for appearing tonight. Andrea, thank you for coming. I'm sorry you didn't get to speak, but you got Mr. Johnson to say you did a heck of a job on finding that spot.

Ms. Armstrong: Yeah. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: And also Mr. Johnson, thank you for weighing in too. And thank you for getting the report out as quickly as you did. It was quite comprehensive and you don't know this, but I'm a former magazine editor and I meant it when I said I caught some typos, no offense, that's the old editor in me, but no, they were just like an 'S' where it should have been a singular verb rather than a plural. But you did an excellent job. As I said, it was lucid. Maybe even penetrating for someone who's a novice to read all of the data that was in there. I liked your term, um, vertical discontinuity, et cetera, for assessing what people think about. Because I would never have used that terminology myself.

Mr. Johnson: I did plagiarize that from someone. So please forgive me. Thank you for comments.

Chairman Dupree: You're giving credit though where credit's due, so at any rate, thank you all. And as soon as you can get us new information and we'll schedule back here. Okay?

Mr. Olson: We will. Thank you everybody.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PLT STORAGE YARD RECONSTRUCTION

Site Plan Amendment & Special Use Permit Approvals (#2019-19)
Location: 501-503 Salt Point Turnpike, Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
Grid#: 6263-03-221319

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Okay. The next item on the agenda is, we inadvertently thought that we had to set a public hearing for July 15th because I thought we canceled the July 1st meeting, but we did not. So may I get a motion to amend the previous public hearing motion to set the public hearing for PLT Yard Storage Reconstruction from July 15 to July 1st from Mr. Oliver.

MOTION: [Mr. Oliver](#)
SECOND: [Ms. Weiser](#)

To amend a previous motion to set the public hearing for PLT from July 15, 2020 to July 1, 2020.

Ms. Witman called the roll.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver

Absent **Ms. DiNapoli**
Aye **Vice-Chair Dexter**
Aye **Chairman Dupree**

ROLL CALL VOTE **6-Aye 1-Absent 0-Nay Motion Carried**

HUTCHINS STAATSBURG STORAGE ADDITIONAL UNITS

Site Plan Amendment and Special Use Permit Approvals (#2019-20)
Location: 4920 Albany Post Road, Staatsburg, NY 12580
Grid#: 6066-02-891661

Chairman Dupree: And we need to set a public hearing for Hutchins Staatsburg Storage. This is as you know, where they're requesting the additional buildings. And by the way, we did receive comments from the CAC, but in this case, Mr. Setaro pretty much answered them because they were sort of... more broadly, they were about the entire stormwater management system and he explained to them that when the use was converted from PDQ Manufacturing to storage, the stormwater system was designed pretty much for the whole site. And because this is mostly bedrock, there's not going to be much increased runoff at all from it. It will go into the existing DEC approved bioretention basin that's there. So may I get a motion to set the public hearing for June 17th from Vice-Chair Dexter?

MOTION: **Vice-chair Dexter**
SECOND: **Ms. Wasser**

To set a Public Hearing for Hutchins Staatsburg Storage for June 17, 2020.

Ms. Witman called the roll.

Aye **Ms. Weiser**
Aye **Ms. Wasser**
Aye **Mr. Pickett**
Aye **Mr. Oliver**
Absent **Ms. DiNapoli**
Aye **Vice-Chair Dexter**
Aye **Chairman Dupree**

ROLL CALL VOTE **6-Aye 1-Absent 0-Nay Motion Carried**

DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TOWN BOARD

Chairman Dupree: Last but not least. And I apologize for doing this today, but I think you heard, or at least I think I told you, the County Executive has proposed... there's been discussion for a while about how to allow restaurants

to serve outdoors. It's twofold, one with the distancing requirements they wouldn't be able to make their sort of business plan because they have to space out the tables so much if it was just indoor dining. In addition, I don't know about the rest of you, but I know that personally speaking, when I go back into a restaurant, which I'm dying to go to, I would probably feel more comfortable dining outside, just saying. So we obviously want to help all our restaurants in town that are going to be reopening as well as potential new ones. I'll get to that, not tonight, but at some point, later on. But the County Executive suggested that he would pass an emergency order that would then basically allow towns to stick in sections of code that would say that anything that would be banning outdoor dining, outdoor service. But our Code doesn't do that. We actually usually consider outdoor dining to be an incidental part of the overall restaurant use, if there is space available. And we specifically, when the crossroads core zoning was written, that specifically encourages it there. And I actually had mentioned that maybe we should be doing that in the Town Core because we did discuss it, without encouraging it. But at any rate, we all know that seeing people dine outside just as part of a regular restaurant use, it gives you more vibrancy to your town. People drive through. They see, you know, it activates the outdoor space to have people utilizing it this way. It's just something we want to encourage, but it also needs to be encouraged safely. So I talked to Victoria, I think maybe a month ago about our town getting out in front of this. But there were other issues to consider, i.e., they're not going to reopen for a while. Well, we are starting the reopening now in phasing. And it looks as though our restaurants, you know, some of them obviously, we'll say Coppola's, Eveready Diner - they have large parking expanses, they own them themselves, so they can actually take advantage of that. There'll be others say, Antonello's where they're going to have to rely on the owner to say, yes, I'll allow this much of my parking area to be used for this.

At any rate Supervisor Rohr, looked to see if there were any other towns that were proactive. The City of Yonkers had created a permit application that they then asked me - and this all just happened yesterday, I want to make sure you understand - if I could update it and try to adapt it to other things... to include other issues that we might see arise. So that's why I did my own first pass. And by the way, that had to be converted from PDF to word and also from picture to Word. Again, Councilman Krupnick, thank you. He's the one that helped convert it for me to get it into Word format, to send to you. Since I sent it to you, I want to thank, Brent, Stephanie, Cynthia, Victoria, all for weighing in quickly with wonderful suggestions. Just as an example, if you had a chance to read it, one of Stephanie's was it says, all dining must end at 11. And she said, do you want dining to end? And people stay outside having cocktails until 12:30, or do you want all activity to end at 11? So I'll be putting that into the comment into what we'll go to the town. In addition, Cynthia, this was just by conversation said, don't you think you want to have outdoor heaters in case this has to go on to fall? And I was like, yes, because that way I was getting the better permit criteria. So I think we've improved it, and like many things, we

were the first community to pass a solar array law and once we saw what other communities did, we saw some improvements and actually asked the Town Board to go back and add the good things that we saw from the other towns.

I think this will be a cascading effect, but the Town would like to adopt this at their Monday night meeting, or however, the process will flow. Victoria also pointed out that there may be, she thinks that if Aileen does this through emergency orders that she can issue, those have to be issued every five days, which seems cumbersome throughout the rest of this process. And I also want to, I'm just really wanting to go back to what the County Executive did. His proposal was that he would do an emergency order of his own, then towns would be able to say, Oh, we're going to insert this section of code that, you know bans it. But because we don't ban it, the section of code that would have to go in would be, they're not required for any site plan. And this provides a way to get a permit that doesn't require us to review it, but it gives you a specific criteria, you know, like drawing a plan, which is like a site plan, so that we can see where things are. And it would also automatically terminate after a year or whenever the Supervisor quit doing the emergency orders.

So in other words, and Victoria also cleverly and as did Cynthia, they both caught that I had failed to include language specifically saying this does not override your Site Plan Approval. This has not meant the site plan wouldn't need to be amended once this ends, you know, things that we want to make sure that we do have some control for the town record purposes if they want to make these things permanent. I don't think many people would want to make permanent eating in the parking lot. I mean, for right now, I'm happy to do it under an umbrella. You never know, but I mean, to be honest, I'd rather be in a patio with some trees and some landscaping around me than in the middle of the hot asphalt. But I too, as everyone knows I like to cook, but even I'm sick of cooking, I've got to admit straight out. I'm not feeling creative anymore. I'm sort of going through my basic repertoire. Everyone is nodding. I would love to go to a restaurant again. I actually did my second takeout for the first time just recently. Yeah, I loved it. I haven't been doing takeout. You know I like to cook, but like I said, it's getting tiring. So I know we all want to help our businesses and our restaurants. So if you have any other comments, Warren, the Town Attorney asked me to send in what I have by tomorrow. I actually don't need to send in a letter recommending the adoption because this would not be a local law or anything to do with zoning. It would just be an emergency order. So what I really just need is if anybody has any more input, bring it on. Brent provided some great details about what should be posted. But I also pointed out that every business that reopens is required to have a COVID-19 plan - that includes the Town Hall. It's a written plan. The written plan does not need to be submitted or reviewed or approved by the Department of Health. But in talking to the Deputy County Executive, Ron Hicks explained to me that there's a rule for say going into a hair salon, there must be plexiglass between each seat or there must be every other seat skipped or something like that. If you go

in and you see that's something that doesn't exist, you can call the Department of Health and complain. If you do, they will then come in, and with an inspector. almost immediately and say, what's your plan. And then look to see if it's implemented. If not, they can shut you down. So that the plan has to include things like washing of hands, how often things are cleaned, just all that kind of stuff. I don't want to say they're going to shut you down. I don't think they would, I think they would work with you. But I do believe that this gives us some measure of faith that people will be operating their business practices as they're supposed to be doing it, because I don't think anybody wants to be shut down or much less have the Department of Health come over and say, Hey, we have problems here. If there's customers inside, that's not going to look good for them. So I'm assuming that all the businesses will be truly trying to abide. I know I was just at Town Hall today and saw there that we have our plexiglass up and Cynthia and I communicated, I signed some site plans and we communicated through the plexiglass. The Town Hall in other words is getting ready for a reopening as well. I haven't seen the full plans that Aileen has put forth, but I know they have.

So let me ask if anybody has questions. I see some chats here. Oh, good point. The permit is going to be free. There'll be no charge for it. This is unusual because Tad is going to have to review these. These will be up to Tad. But there'll be no fee. Aileen - if you remember, our Supervisor is the President of the Mayors and Supervisors Association for Dutchess County, and this was discussed there. And it was pretty much agreed upon that all supervisors and mayors, I should add, we'll be looking not to charge a fee to show some empathy for what everybody's been going through because of Covid-19. So any other questions?

Ms. Polidoro: Oh, if you want to send this as Planning Board comments, they should take a motion and a vote, so that you can send these over as Planning Board comments. Otherwise you're just sending individual comments.

Chairman Dupree: Should I be doing this as a Planning Board Member? I mean, I was asked to do this sort of on my own. No one on the Town Board is working on it yet. So I was going to send it to them. I thought I'd let it be their document just with some Planning Board input. But would you prefer that I did in motion authorizing me to send this as our comments?

Ms. Polidoro: I mean, it's up to the Board, but if the Board wants to make comments and send a, you know, an affirmative response, yes, we want to see you do this, then you should have a motion.

Chairman Dupree: Okay, Ms. Dexter, I think I saw Vice-Chair Dexter nodding about doing a motion.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Yes.

Chairman Dupree: Would you like to put one forth?

Vice-Chair Dexter: Authorize the Chairman to send a comment letter to the Town Board regarding the draft permit application for temporary outdoor dining/sidewalk cafes.

Chairman Dupree: Boy was that good? It's like you had it memorized. That was so smooth. Oh, that's right. Thank you. Thank you, Cynthia, for your flawless agenda. Sorry. I'm not looking at it. I'm looking at the comments I printed out from everybody today. Just so you know, Stephanie, I already incorporated your comments, except I put a question mark for activity. I pose it to Councilman Krupnick. I put in Victoria's comments already and Stephanie I put in your other comment. I also already put in Cynthia's suggestion which was to save time requiring that the applicant already have a letter from the fire department or fire inspector, because we want to make sure that we don't authorize something and the fire department, says we have no access this is going to be unsafe. And again, the Town Board is free to utilize this or not. Yes Tad?

Ms. Moss: And these to be clear, these are only temporary measures. These are not permanent changes to the Site Plan or to the structure.

Chairman Dupree: I promise that Victoria made sure of that in her language and Cynthia caught it too. So, again, we have a motion. Is there a second?

MOTION: Vice-Chair Dexter

SECOND: Ms. Wasser

Authorize the Chairman to send a comment letter to the Town Board regarding the draft permit application for temporary outdoor dining/sidewalk café.

Ms. Witman called the roll.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Absent	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

ROLL CALL VOTE

6-Aye 1-Absent 0-Nay Motion Carried

ADJOURN

Chairman Dupree: Thank you all. As always, a pleasure working with every individual present tonight. And our individuals who are not present tonight, sadly, but who will be back I know shortly. I hope so. I really appreciate the fact that you took the time to answer it. And again, I won't be sending this over to the Town Board tomorrow until around noon or one o'clock. For those of you who didn't comment, if you have any comments, feel free to just to send them on over to me by email. Okay? That noted, I believe that the last item on the agenda is to adjourn. I believe Mr. Pickett is going to make that motion. Thank you. And I think we can do a voice vote. Since we can all see each other. All in favor.

MOTION: Mr. Pickett
SECOND: Ms. Weiser

To adjourn.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Absent	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE 6-Aye 1-Absent 0-Nay Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: It's nice to do that for a change, roll call gets a little old sometimes. So I appreciate this again and thank you, Councilman Neil Krupnick, again for hosting and for moderating, et cetera for the evening. Thank you everybody.