

The Regular Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Goshen was held on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. in the Town Hall located at 41 Webster Avenue, Village of Goshen, County of Orange, State of New York.

Present: Douglas Bloomfield      Supervisor                      Kenneth Newbold      Councilman  
                 Philip Canterino              Councilman                      Louis Cappella        Councilman

Absent: George Lyons, Councilman

Also Present: Dennis Caplicki, Town Attorney; Edwin Garling, Town Planner

**A. CALL TO ORDER:** Supervisor Bloomfield opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. and asked Attorney Allen Lipman to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. AMENDMENT TO THE AGENDA:** None

**C. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR (agenda items only)** No response

**D. PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Continuation of Public Hearing for Proposed Local Law #2 of 2007:  
“AMENDMENT TO THE CODE OF THE TOWN OF GOSHEN, TOWN OF  
GOSHEN ZONING MAP OF LAND USE DISTRICTS” AND;**

**Proposed Local Law #3 of 2007 entitled “AMENDMENT TO THE CODE OF  
THE TOWN OF GOSHEN, CHAPTER 97 ENTITLED ZONING”**

Councilman Cappella made a Motion to open the Public Hearing at 7:35p.m. and the Motion was seconded by Councilman Newbold. Motion carried 4 to 0.

Alan Lipman, attorney, addressed the Board, representing Orleans Homebuilders, Inc. and the Makuen family, who are before the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen for a Special Permit for a Planned Adult Community. They are asking for subdivision approval for 185 single-family detached dwellings on approximately 87 acres. Attorney Lipman said he wanted to speak to the Board to explain the impact of Local Law #3 on the Makuen family. The lands which are the subject of that application are currently zoned CO in which the PAC use is specially permitted. Pursuant to Section 3.2 of proposed Local Law No. 3, the permitted uses of the current zone will be modified over the bulk of the Makuen Farm and the PAC use will not be authorized at all in the CO Zone. He said the zoning of the Makuen Farm will not be changed, but the PAC use will no longer be authorized at all in the CO zone.

Attorney Lipman called the Board’s attention to the map included in his presentation. He pointed out where Route 17A is located on the map and pointed out that in order to get to the

CO property, in the rear of the property, traffic must flow through RU Residential district. Also in order to get to the RU lands at the back of the property, you have drive through the Commercial. He said "In my view it is an absolutely untenable circumstance." He said to consider the topography of the property which rises from Route 17A all the way to the top and then plateaus and goes down into a hollow, which is relatively flat. "Anything developed commercially, on the commercially zoned property, will have no view, I am putting it backwards, you won't be able to see it from Route 17A, it will be behind and below the peak." "Would any of you invest in Commercial property that couldn't even be seen from the highway?"

He said I believe a lot of the Board's concerns relating to PACs, is related to increased traffic along that corridor. Attorney Lipman said the lands zoned CO are not only unfeasible for commercial, but they would generate probably four times the traffic that exists now. He said in his view, to place this parcel in the position that it will be in if the text changes, would constitute a regulatory taking of this property, because there is no feasible need to do this. He asked "what is wrong with a PAC on the Makuen property?" He said there is and will be a need for PACs to accommodate the seniors in years to come. Looking at your ordinance, I can find no statement of why that change or any other change is needed.

Referring to the EAF, Attorney Lipman stated "you say, however, while most of the provisions of the regulations are laudable and are fully intended to be retained for the benefit of the Town, many sections of the regulations contain provisions, the consequences of which were not well thought out or resulted in development proposals not fully understood or perceived by the Town Board and the Planning Board." "Can anyone tell me what that means, I don't know what it means and I have been practicing law for forty eight years." He said "no one identifies a single reason for the change."

Attorney Lipman said, you say the changes were made after an evaluation of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan which was three years in the making, and cost approximately more than three hundred thousand dollars. "The 2004 plan was comprehensive and innovative and the Town Board is now considering if any changes are needed." He said "to say the changes proposed do not impact the basic concepts of the zoning laws that were based on the 2004 Comprehensive Plan is erroneous." Attorney Lipman said "not only do you not identify the changes, but one of the precepts of the Comprehensive Plan was high density, residential use along the 17A corridor, close to an interchange with the quickway." "There is no property closer on Route 17A, near the interchange, than the Makuen property." "So what is so important about the need to change, that which is going to turn the lives of that family upside down." "What is it that is wrong with the PAC generally and what is it wrong with the site?" Attorney Lipman said after all your ordinance allowed the PAC in the CO zone, and the Makuens followed your lead in the zoning office, a buyer was found that wanted to develop a PAC, the only residential use allowed in the CO zone. "A lot of money was spent and suddenly it is no good."

Attorney Lipman said what he is hearing, these last few months, is that this Board does not want PACs. He said “ and now we will be in another horse race, litigating the whole issue.” “The Town will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to establish a pattern of development that no one on your side of the table has explained to anyone.” “No one on your side of the table has exhibited a reason, much less a rational reason, for these changes. Attorney Lipman suggested the Town Board form a committee, as was done in 2002, using a cross section of this community, including the developers and residents of Goshen.

Kevin Makuen approached the Board stating he is a life long resident of Goshen. He gave the history of his family dating back to the 1800s, at that time owners of a general store. Later, he said the family became involved in the dairy industry, buying various tracks of land and renting several others. As years went by the farming industry was not very lucrative and began to take a toll on his grandfather’s health. Kevin said at that time the size of the farm was unable to support three growing families and his father began his career in construction. His uncle soon realized he could not go on running the farm by himself, so he went into the government buy out program. This meant the property could not be used as a dairy farm for ten years. Kevin said since the mid 1980s the property has been sitting idle and we decided to look into developing it, looking at several possibilities, always keeping what was best for the Town in mind. He said the family felt an adult community would be a great idea, for a number of reasons. First it would put no additional pressure on our schools. It could also produce several million dollars in taxes for the Town, with a possible 1.2 going just to the schools. “The Town could really use this money after some recent reassessments and tax reductions.” He said the property layout would lend itself to be handicapped accessible without an extreme amount of excavation. He said there would be walking accessibility to the Village and would not impact traffic with it’s proximity to 17 and 17A. “Most of the seniors limit themselves to one vehicle, with the high cost of fuel.” “Many seniors would be seasonal, and would seek warmer climates during the harsh winters.” Kevin said in closing, I would like to ask the Board and the residents of the Town of Goshen to support our project by not removing our PAC and besides, with all these fabulous benefits, how could you deny such a great project?

Marsha Rubin Goldstein approached the Board saying she was with the firm of Zarin & Steinmetz, Attorneys at Law. She stated she was here this evening representing Centex Homes, the contract vendee of approximately 271.6 acres of land in the Town of Goshen owned by Dr.Olivia Serdarevic and Bosiljka Serdarevic. She said the Serdarevic property will be severely impacted by the proposed zoning. She stated the property is known as Section 11, Block 1, Lot 46 and Section 15, Block 1, Lot 59 on the tax map of the Town of Goshen. She explained that under the existing zoning Law adopted, June 10, 2004, Lot 46, an approximately 104.6 acre parcel, is zoned Hamlet Mixed-Use (“HM”). Lot 59, an approximately 167 acre parcel, is zoned Rural (“RU”).

Ms. Goldstein referred to a letter stating their opposition to the new proposed zoning that was submitted to the Town before the last Public Hearing. (on file in the Town Clerk’s Office) She said that letter stated clearly their opposition to the proposed zoning and it’s

effect on Hamlet zoning in the Town, particularly on lot 46. Centex is opposed to that portion of the Proposed Map Amendment that would rezone approximately 56 acres of Lot 46 to Commercial Office (“CO”) and approximately 48 acres to RU. She said sound zoning and planning dictate that Lot 46 should remain zoned HM. It is Centex’s position that the proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and will have a negative impact upon opportunities for affordable housing, while increasing traffic impact, particularly in the area zoned commercial. Ms. Goldstein said the zoning of Lot 46 is the ideal setting for a Hamlet, Traditional, Neighborhood Development. She said after they made their last submission, Orange County Planning submitted various reports which agree with Centex in various ways. “The proposed zoning amendment which reduce the potential for Hamlet Residential and Hamlet Mixed Use development in Goshen will likely increase peoples’ dependency on their automobile for mobility and so on, in other words, increase traffic.

Ms. Goldstein also quoted the Orange County Planning Department saying “Lastly, this office reminds the Town that the proposed zoning will decrease the number of affordable housing units available.” She quoted from an earlier County submission “It is our opinion that the sizable area, referring to lot 46, may prove to be the best place for the HM Zone.” She said at the very least, as they discussed in the letter, this re-zoning should not take place without a full environmental study and analysis. Centex is ready and willing to assist the Board however possible.

She said with regard to the other parcel, lot 59, Centex is happy that the Board has recognized the advisability of allowing PACs in Zoning districts including RU. They have been eagerly wanting to develop lot 59 in this matter for some time. However, Centex believes it would be much better planning to allow neighboring development of the Mixed Use Hamlet on lot 46.

Michael Zarren spoke on behalf of GDC, Ginsburg Development Companies. He stated he did not plan on speaking this evening, however, he understood that maybe the Board was considering a Positive Declaration on this proposed action. “I just wanted to say, if that is the determination of this Board, I obviously think you made the right decision.” He said the SEQRA process will afford the Board the opportunity to take a hard look at the text of this proposed action. He said many times the SEQRA process is just a perfunctory review and the EIS process becomes nothing more than a de facto road stamping of an already made determination. He said I am hoping and trusting that this is not the case here, and upon reflection, you have determined to do it differently. He said “what does result however, if that is the path, the direction, you consciously or unconsciously take, what often happens is the thing digresses into a nonproductive gorilla warfare.” “Each of us, or many of the lawyers and many of the other people you have hurt, spend more time making a record, posturing, throwing every obstacle we can, you know, in your path.” He said it always leads to litigation.

He said I hope this is not the case with this Board, and that the Board take this opportunity to do a meaningful, good faith review of the proposed action, and what could be a very open minded process.

Steve Esposito approached the Board saying he would like to echo what Mr. Zarin just said. He said he was involved in the initial process of the 2004 Zoning Code, as well as some of the current Board members. He said the 2004 Zoning Code was not the product of one consultant, but many; there were numerous meetings, committees, input from realtors, developers, land owners, farmers, etc. He said the process was a comprehensive process and the 2004 Zoning Code evolved. "An award winning code." "I just hope that as Mr. Zarin said, there are two ways to approach the SEQRA process, I truly hope that in respect for all the work, all the money that went into this code, that you take a comprehensive approach, with your eyes open." "Don't just write the book on the last chapter, lets let it evolve." "You have an opportunity to make some decisions, that truly should be a product of our community, not a product of unsubstantiated concerns." "As a resident I do hope you open it up to the community, continue this dialogue and look for input from all the statements."

With no further response from the public, Councilman Cappella made a Motion to continue this Public Hearing until October 25, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. in which time the Board will continue to accept input and suggestions from the public. The Motion was seconded by Councilman Canterino. Motion carried 4 to 0.

Supervisor Bloomfield said we take this very seriously, and we will be putting our shoulder to the wheel and we are looking for quality input, we want to do a good job.

#### **E. REPORTS:**

Supervisor Bloomfield said Councilman Lyons is not present due to a back injury and he called upon Councilman Canterino.

Councilman Canterino stated he gave most of his report on Recreation at the last meeting. He said however, the opening of the Salesian Park may be delayed, past the October date hoped for, because there seems to be a problem with the finials that were purchased to cover the points on the fence.

Councilman Cappella reported Highway was going to begin to pave Storm, August and Strack Roads, but it is completed already.

Councilman Newbold reported he attended a beautiful ceremony at Orange County Park in memory of those lost in 9/11 and the unveiling of another monument and he would encourage anyone who can to go see it. This monument is dedicated to all war veterans

of Orange County past and present. He said he then attended the rededication of the Orange Blossom monument on Main Street, again compliments of Orange County.

He said the Humane Society had a very successful fund raiser in the church park and the Goshen Library had a marvelous jazz festival.

Councilman Newbold also reported the filters and other steps taken at the Humane Society and the Police Department, to correct the MTBE problem, are working properly and were just recently inspected by a member of the Environmental Services and no problems were found.

Supervisor Bloomfield said he also gave his report at the last meeting, however he had a humane interest story he wanted to share. He said there has been a lot of discussion about the fence at Salesian. However, about a week ago, in a Pennsylvania newspaper, there was a picture of a 21 year old impaled on a fence. He said he had a call from that newspaper asking what we were doing with the finials and our fence and was our fence similar to theirs. Supervisor Bloomfield said looking at the picture in the Times Herald Record, the fence looks exactly like ours. When he asked the newsman what happened he was told the young man had a ticket to the concert, but there was a long line and he thought he would just jump over the fence. While attempting the jump his right thigh became impaled on the fence, going all the way through his leg. The rescuers had to cut out a four foot section of fence to take with him to the hospital as there is a main artery in the thigh that if punctured, could cause a person to bleed to death in one minute. Supervisor Bloomfield said he is telling this as a lot of people thought we were being paranoid on this Board with our concern for the points on the fence. He said I am very proud of the people who worked on finding a solution to this problem.

**F. OLD BUSINESS: CONSIDERATION OF POSITIVE DECLARATION MOTION – LOCAL LAW 2 AND 3:**

Attorney Caplicki called the Board's attention to the Draft of the NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE AND SCOPING (Positive Declaration). Mr. Garling explained it was a standard document basically saying that you have prepared a zoning change you believe an EIS is necessary and there will be a scoping of that. A draft scope will be prepared within the next few days, the Board will review it and it will be available to the public for comments. A final scoping document will be prepared which will be the table of contents of the EIS.

Supervisor Bloomfield made a Motion to set a Public Hearing scoping session for Thursday, October 11, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. The Motion was seconded by Councilman Canterino. Motion carried 4 to 0.

Councilman Newbold made a Motion to accept the issuance of this Positive Declaration on Local Law #2 and Local Law #3 as drafted, the Motion was seconded by Councilman Canterino. Motion carried 4 to 0.

**TOWN OF GOSHEN TOWN BOARD**

**INTRODUCTORY LOCAL LAW NO. 2 OF 2007**

**DRAFT**

**NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE AND SCOPING  
(Positive Declaration)**

**Action:** Issuance of a Positive Declaration

Significant Environmental Effects have been identified and the Town of Goshen Town Board, in accordance with 6NYCRR Part 617.7 and following review of proposed zone map changes and a Full EAF has determined that a Positive Declaration of Environmental Impact shall be issued and an Environmental Impact Statement shall be prepared. The significant environmental effects identified are:

Changes to the code may have traffic impacts that must be analyzed.

Changes to the code may have impacts on diversity of housing, PAC's and affordable housing that must be evaluated.

Impacts on various zoning districts based on restrictions of open space and changes in density must be evaluated.

**Lead Agency:** Town of Goshen Town Board

**Contact Person:** Honorable Douglas Bloomfield, Supervisor  
Town of Goshen  
41 Webster Avenue  
Goshen, New York 10924  
(845) 294-6996

**SEQRA Status:** Type 1

**Scoping:** A Public Hearing scoping session will be held on Thursday, October 11, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be discussed at the Town Hall Meeting Room at the Goshen Town Hall at 41 Webster Avenue, Goshen, New York.

**Location:** Townwide

**Project Description:** Eight specific Zoning Map amendments or changes have been proposed as described in items 3.1 through 3.8.

**Amendment to Hambletonian Park Hamlet Residential HR District**

Eliminate the HR District from all portions of tax parcels identified as Section 8, Block 1, Lots 1.1 and 48 and rezone these lots RU. These parcels contain approximately 69 acres located northeast of Hambletonian Park between Craigville Road (CR66) and Coleman Road. This area consists of lot 1.1 and approximately half of lot 48 and is bounded by Craigville Road (CR66) to the southwest, the Village of Goshen to the Northwest, Coleman Road to the northeast and an unnamed stream flowing northeast from Hambletonian Park.

Eliminate the HR District from all portions of tax parcels identified as Section 8, Block 1, Lots 9.22, 13 and 14 and rezone these lots RU. These parcels contain approximately 27 acres located southwest of Hambletonian Park between Hambletonian Park and Old Chester Road. These lots are bounded by Old Chester Road to the southwest, the Village of Goshen to the northwest, lots 15, 12.221 and 12.1 to the northeast and the RU District portion of lot 9.22 to the southeast. This land shall be zoned RU.

**Amend the Commercial/Office Mixed Use CO District** north of Route 17 at Exit 122 A and Fletcher Street.

Rezone those parcels now zoned RU as cited as Section 10, Block 1, Lots 35, 36.2, 37 and 45 to CO. These parcels are bounded by Route 17 and Fletcher Street to the southwest, Old Minisink Trail to the southeast and RU land to the northeast and northwest. These parcels contain approximately 51 acres.

**Amend the Hamlet Mixed Use HM District southwest of Route 17** and adjacent to the Village of Goshen.

A. Rezone Section 11 Block 1, Lots 46 and 47 as follows:

Rezone Lot 47 from HM to CO

Rezone Lot 46 from HM to CO for a distance of 1,200 feet from the property line of Route 17's southwest boundary as follows. The area to be zoned CO shall contain that area bordered by Route 17 to the northeast, lot 58 to the southeast, a line parallel to and 1,200 feet distant to the southeast from Route 17 and the Village of Goshen to the northwest. This area is approximately 56 acres.

Rezone the balance of Lot 46 from HM to Ru. This area is approximately 48 acres.

**Amend the Hamlet Residential HR area west of Route 17A** north of the Village of Florida from HR to HC and CO as described below.

A. Rezone Section 18, Block 2, Lots 11, 14, and 15 from HR to highway Commercial HC. These parcels are bounded by Route 17A to the east, Lots 9, 10 and 13 to the north and Section 20, Block 1, Lots 10.21 and 152.2 to the south and west. These lots contain approximately 20 acres.

B. Rezone Section 20, Block 1, Lots 152.2, 57 and 58 that are currently zoned HR to CO. In addition, rezone all lands on lots 152.2 and 58 that are located east of the westerly boundary of an Orange and Rockland Utility right-of-way from RU to CO. These lands contain approximately 70 acres.

**3.5 Amend the Hamlet Residential HR and Hamlet Mixed-Use HM areas east of Route 17A** north of the Village of Florida from HR and HM to RU and CO as described below.

Rezone Section 20, Block 1, Lots 17.1, 17.2 and 18 and a portion of Block 2, Lot 2 located east of Route 17A from HR and HM to RU. These parcels contain approximately 63 acres.

B. Rezone Section 20, Block 1, Lots 34.2, 35, 36, 37, 38.1, 38.2, 38.3, 39, 55.12 and 55.2 from HM and MR to CO. This area contains approximately 37 acres.

Rezone Section 20, Block 1, Lot 40 located west of Route 17A from HM to CO. This parcel contains approximately 1 acre.

**3.6 Amend the RU areas northeast of Route 17M** near Arcadia and Old Chester Roads as described as follows from RU to Highway Commercial (HC). This area contains approximately 90 acres and is described as: Section 11, Block 1, Lots: 34.2, 34.3, 76, 79 northwest of Ward Road, 95, 94, 93, 82, 83, 30.1, 28, 97, and 23. Also included are that portion of Lot 98.6 between Old Chester Road and the Orange County Rail Trail and those portions of Lots 27.2 and 96 which are within 400feet from the centerline of Route 17M from the Northerly side of lot 30.1 to the easterly lot line of lot 97. In addition, rezone from RU to CO Commercial Office Mixed-Use, Section 11, Block 1, Lots 79 south and east of Ward Road, 76, 34.2 and 34.3.

**3.7 Amend the CO district along both sides of Route 17M between the Town of Wawayanda and Maple Avenue/6 ½ Station Road** by rezoning the following parcels and areas HC Highway commercial. Rezone from CO to HC all of lots referenced as Section 12, Block 1, Lots 48.1, 48.2, 48.3, 114, 115, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57.1 and 70.1 in their entirety. This area contains approximately 18 acres. Also rezone from CO to HC all of lots referenced as Section 12, Block 1, Lots 9, 10, 11.2, 12.2, 15.22, 117, 15.23, 16 and 77 in their entirety. This area contains approximately 12 acres. Also, rezone for a distance of 400 feet back from the centerline of Route 17M along a line parallel from said

centerline, Lots 15.1, 56, 57.2 and 70.211 South of Route 17M. This area contains Approximately 17 acres.

**3.8 Amend the A1 district north of a CO district** fronting on Quaker Creek and north and west of the Village of Florida to CO Commercial Office/Mixed –Use. Rezone the following parcels of land CO, Section 20, Block 1, Lots 48.21, 49.2, 50.1, 51 and 54 containing approximately 42 acres.

**Date of Action:** September 27, 2007

**Date of Mailing:** September 28, 2007

**TOWN OF GOSHEN TOWN BOARD**

**INTRODUCTORY LOCAL LAW NO. 3 OF 2007**

**DRAFT**

**NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE AND SCOPING  
(Positive Declaration)**

**Action:** Issuance of a Positive Declaration

Significant Environmental Effects have been identified and the Town of Goshen Town Board, in accordance with 6NYCRR Part 617.7 and following review of proposed zone text changes and a Full EAF has determined that a Positive Declaration of Environmental impact shall be issued and an Environmental Impact Statement shall be prepared. The significant environmental effects identified are:

Changes to the code may have traffic impacts that must be analyzed.

Changes to the code may have impacts on diversity of housing, PAC's and affordable housing that must be evaluated.

Code changes may have impacts on that open space that must be evaluated.

**Lead Agency:** Town of Goshen Town Board

**Contact Person:** Honorable Douglas Bloomfield, Supervisor  
Town of Goshen Town  
41 Webster Avenue  
Goshen, New York 10924  
(845) 294-6996

**SEQRA Status:** Type 1

**Scoping:** A Public Hearing scoping session will be held on Thursday, October 11, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter May be discussed at the Town Hall Meeting Room at the Goshen Town Hall at 41 Webster Avenue, Goshen, New York.

**Location:** **Townwide**

**Project Description:** Text Amendments to Town of Goshen Zoning Law. The Town Board has reviewed the text of the Zoning Law with its professionals during the course of this past year and has fully evaluated Sections 97-1 to 20. The changes incorporated herein only involve these sections of the Zoning Law. Further changes of other sections are anticipated at this time.

Date of Action: September 27, 2007

Date of Mailing: September 28, 2007

#### **G. NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. 2008 Preliminary Budget:** Supervisor Bloomfield explained the Budget process and informed the public the Preliminary Budget has to be on the Town Clerk's desk no later than the fifth of October. He reported that on October 5<sup>th</sup> the Preliminary Budget will be on the Town Clerk's desk for public input and perusal.

Supervisor Bloomfield said the Board has not looked at sections DA and sections DB, which are smaller sections. He said this Preliminary Budget will be presented to this Town Board and we will add, modify, subtract until the Budget is acceptable to the entire Board. The final budget will not be passed until early November.

**2. Award Bid For Survey of Myruski Conservation Easement:** Supervisor Bloomfield explained the need for a survey of the Myruski property for PDR purposes. He said it was put out to bid and reported to the Board the results. The bids ran from \$7,498.00 to \$23,700.00. Supervisor Bloomfield said he sent the low bid to Stantec Engineering, for their review, and they felt it met the specifications the Board had requested. The lowest bid came from Fusco Engineering and Land Surveying, PC. Supervisor Bloomfield made a Motion to award the bid for the survey of the Myruski Farm to Fusco Engineering and Land Surveying Company at a cost not to exceed \$7,498.00. Councilman Newbold seconded the Motion. Motion carried 4 to 0.

**H. FINANCE:** Councilman Canterino made a Motion to authorize the Supervisor to pay accounts payable dated 9/27/2007 amounting to \$288,666.26. Motion seconded by Councilman Newbold. Motion carried 4 to 0.

**I. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR:**

Doris Bialas said the Supervisor did not say whether there was an increase or decrease in the budget and asked which it would be. Supervisor Bloomfield replied, based on everything the Board has done so far, and after looking really hard at the revenue and expenses, it is coming out a little over 1%. The Supervisor said this is primarily due to cost reductions.

**J. ADJOURNMENT:** Councilman Cappello made a Motion to adjourn the regular business meeting to attend an Attorney/Client meeting with the attorney and the Town Board, with intent not to return. The Motion was seconded by Councilman Canterino. Motion carried 4 to 0.

---

Valma Eisma, Town Clerk