

**VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

**TUESDAY JUNE 22, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Chairman Boucher, Members Allen, DeAngelis, Hafenecker, Karlich, Kelly, and Parise; Attorney Cassidy, Engineer O'Rourke, Planner Fink, Building Inspector Cocks.

Chairman Boucher opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. Chairman Boucher stated that this meeting is being held via Zoom in conformance with Executive Order 202.10 from the Governor Cuomo.

Regular Meeting

1. **The Q – Site Plan – (222-1-13, 14, & 15)**

Present: Steve Esposito, PE; John Till, Architect; Aaron Goldklang, Owner;

Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments to the board. Engineer Esposito's office is working on the SWPPP and site plan comments that were issued by the L&T office during May 2021. A site walk was conducted by the planning board on June 11, 2021. From the site walk it was decided that additional landscaping would be added to the border of the golf course and along some of the existing residences. The planning board reviewed the location of the sewer lines, where the main road was coming from. The applicant planned to redesign the sewer to avoid the relocation. The general layout will remain the same. The L&T office has no objection to holding a public hearing for this application so the neighbors can become involved and voice their concerns. Engineer Esposito stated that the applicant received two memos, one memo dated May 5, 2021 on the site plan and the other memo dated May 10, 2021 on the SWPPP. The applicant addressed most of the concerns on the May 5, 2021 Site Plan memo and is working to address the technical comments on the May 10, 2021 SWPPP memo. The applicant aims for a resubmission in July 2021. The applicant would like to schedule a public hearing for the regular July 2021 meeting. The applicant submitted revised elevations for the outside of the buildings which took into account the planning board's comments on color and architectural detailing. A floor plan was submitted to the planning board as well. The outside of the building grew from the inside of the building. The goal of the project is to have the project be different and stand alone. The applicant is not inclined to go down the colonial sort of look. The applicant wants this project to stand out and be recognizable as the goal is to serve a sophisticated end user. Architect Till presented floor plan page A2 to the board. This is an overall floor plan which depicts one half of the building. The other floor plans are the other half. The units are approximately 11,000-12,000 sq. ft. The units are two-bedroom and each unit has its own individual entrance. Architect Till displayed the upper-left corner of floor plan page A2 to the board. The elevations do not show a great picture of the building that is being proposed, as the outside is not just a straight façade there is a lot of dimension. The outside

dimension is featured all around the building. There is a large style of living room. Inside each unit is also a dining room, kitchen, two bed rooms and two bathrooms. There is a primary bathroom and a family style bathroom. There are different units around the building. There is an end unit type, a center unit type, and there are two storage units in the center of the building. One half of the building is the same as the other half. The upper level units also have a private entrance with a staircase leading up to the second floor. The floor plan ties into the building's elevations, which ties into the look, scale, and shape of the building. The building elevations have been thought through in terms of the shape and scale of the windows, location of the windows, and location of the doors. There are different rooms behind each of the windows, an example being the small horizontal windows on the bathrooms with allow for more privacy. The vertical windows are more for light and ventilation. Chairman Boucher stated that the board is still concerned about the design of the building. The project site will not be as hidden as was previously thought. On the project site the trees are cleared and Stephen Lane will be widened. Even with a berm of eight ft. trees the 30 ft. high buildings will be visible from the road and golf course. The planning board requested that the marketing surveys used be provided. Real Estate Broker Coladonato had told the planning board that several designs were sent out for people chose from and the planning wished to see those designs. The planning board has not yet received these designs. Architect Till stated that he would have to defer to Real Estate Broker Coladonato for those marking materials. Architect Till stated that from the beginning the project was envisioned to have a more contemporary feel, and the marketing teams advised the applicant that this type of design is the direction to go to attract the demographic of younger professionals. Chairman Boucher stated that the planning board appreciates the effort put into the marketing but the board is concerned with having the building matching the surrounding landscape and area. The design doesn't match the surrounding houses. Architect Till stated that effort was made to bring in more earth tones to the design. The siding choices and roof shingles are similar to residential buildings in the area. The colors and design choices cause the buildings to blend in more, but the goal of the project was to have the building stand out. The form, size, scale, and proportions of the buildings are also similar to residential houses in the area. Chairman Boucher doesn't believe that many people will agree that the designs proposed for this application are similar to other residential houses in the area. Currently the board is split on agreement with the design. Chairman Boucher appreciates the revised colors and the removal of the stucco. The goal of the revised elevations was to see if the revisions would change the board's opinion, but Chairman Boucher doesn't believe that the board's opinions on the design have changed much. The board would like to see the design versions sent out with the marketing survey. Chairman Boucher stated that the planning board also serves as the Architectural Review Board. Chairman Boucher read the following portion of Village Code from § 200-73 D (2) which reads "Excessive dissimilarity or inappropriateness in relation to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application, facing upon the same street and within 300 feet of the proposed site, in respect to one or more of the following features: (a) Cubical contents. (b) Gross floor area. (c) Height of building or height of roof. (d) Other significant design features, such as material or quality of architectural design, provided that a finding of excessive dissimilarity or inappropriateness shall state not only that such excessive dissimilarity or inappropriateness exists but further that it is of such a nature as to be expected to provoke beyond reasonable doubt one or more of the harmful effects set forth in § 200-73A hereof and that the finding is not based on personal preference as to taste or choice or architectural style." Chairman Boucher stated that he doesn't dislike the current building design proposed by the applicant but is concerned that the design does not fit in with the surrounding area. Chairman Boucher's goal is to protect what the Village is, how the area is designed and laid out. Member Allen provided his comments. The houses in the area of the project site are older and outdated. A

big influx of people moving up to this area are millennials from the city. They have a lot of money, and will redo the entire house putting another \$100,000 - \$200,000 into the house. If these people moving up see the elevations, such as the ones the applicant has, those people might be inspired to design their homes with a similar modern look. In Newburgh, on Broadway and Robinson Avenue, there is newer construction that looks out of place because it is more modern than the surrounding area. This is because Newburgh is trying to modernize the designs in the area. The building designs proposed by the applicant are a step forwards for the Village of Monroe to look more modern like the rest of the country. Member Parise mentioned that in the previous year there was a fire on Lakes Road where a house was burnt down. The house that was built in its place is modern with earth tone colors. On Still Road there is a house right across the street from the Sacred Heart Church, near the right of way and between the golf course. That house was redone a few years ago and looks more modernized. When people remodel their homes they will opt for a modern style, not an old fashioned style. Architect Till stated that this application has a certain feel and style that works for the site. The applicant went through and made revisions for the building colors to blend with the surrounding area. The buildings have sloped roofs, wood roofing shingles, porches, and windows. Member Parise stated the public should be given a chance to see The Q's proposed designs during a public hearing. Spring Hill Apartments went through design changes which were in part because the public saw the second proposed design and were not happy, and so the third design was a compromise. Member DeAngelis stated that The Q's design is too far out for the neighborhood; the buildings look like a hotel and the colors are too dark. Member Hafenecker asked if there were porches proposed on the buildings. Architect Till stated that there is a covered porch over the two doors on the elevation. It's an entry point, not large and just enough to keep snow and debris off. Member DeAngelis stated that balconies could be added so that residents could enjoy the view over the golf course. Architect Till stated that balconies become problems. The proposed design includes long windows for the living rooms so that residents can appreciate the view from there. Member Karlich agrees with Chairman Boucher. The board requested to see the marking information with the different designs sent out, but those materials were not provided by the applicant. The revised colors are a nice change, but the design does not fit in the area. No houses in that area were changed, only the outside was redone with new siding, but the design is still the same. The design of The Q does not fit with the area, and the project is comprised of 72 units contained in four very big buildings. This project will be visible from everywhere. The buildings that are similar to this project are the commercial buildings found in the area, not the residential ones. Member Kelly agrees that although the revised colors are better there is still significant architectural contrast with the neighborhood. Member Hafenecker asked the board if maybe changing the vertical board to horizontal board would improve the design for the board. Chairman Boucher stated that the design is very different than a residential design. The modern, commercial buildings, such as the nearby McDonald's, are in the middle of a shopping center. The project site for this application is in the middle of a residential area next to a golf course. Planner Fink provided his comments. Many of the communities he works with that have ARB's or architectural standards are farther ahead than Monroe. The section of code designating the planning board as ARB is from 2017, which is fairly new. In Village Code § 200-73 the standards have a lot of emphases on avoiding excessive similarity. § 200-73 also discusses respecting the architecture of buildings within 300 ft of the site. In the case of this application any of the residential uses within 300 ft. of the site are going to be single family. Planner Fink does not believe there are any multifamily within that distance. In this case it would be beneficial to review what other multifamily developments are in the Village. What are some other characteristics that the planning board could examine in relation to the proposed building here, such as the window patterns. Are the patterns featured in this application typical of the Village of Monroe, or is the design proposed with this project

something entirely new within the Village. Are the window patterns proposed relate to the surrounding residential buildings or are discordant with the current architecture in the surrounding area. Are the colors typical with the current architecture in the surrounding area. Other municipalities with architectural standards have a set of visual graphic designs that were prepared to guide developers, planning boards, and ARBs, to determine what's appropriate in the community. The Village of Monroe does not have a prepared set of graphics for architectural review. Planner Fink read § 200-72 I. (2)(c) which reads "Such other architectural, landscaping and engineering data as may be required to evaluate the site plan. The applicant shall be responsible for the costs of the same." There was a request from the planning board to receive the marketing survey information to review the materials that were presented to the survey responders. Did the marketing materials distributed by the applicant include an examination of the surrounding architecture within the community from which the proposed design drew elements from. Can the applicant provide these marketing materials to the planning board. The planning board would be able to evaluate from those materials the sufficiency of the proposed architecture as currently there are no illustrative design guidelines or standards in the Village of Monroe. This is a strategy other communities that lacked visual guidelines used. Member Parise stated that the planning board requested a set of architectural standards and guidelines when the planning board became the ARB but never had a set provided. Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. The planning board can open a public hearing to receive input from the community. Architect Till stated that he is willing to provide to the public all the design pieces worked on so far as a presentation. Chairman Boucher stated that before the public hearing the board would like to receive samples from the marketing survey sent out by the applicant. Architect Till defers to the marketing professionals regarding the marketing materials. Chairman Boucher stated that in a previous meeting Real Estate Broker Coladonato described a process where a survey was sent out with selections that recipients chose from. The board is looking to receive those selections. Owner Goldklang provided his comments. There are three different directions this property can go. This is an \$18-\$19 million dollar development, so care has to be taken before elements are changed. If a certain design is used, who will be the clientele. Option one is to use this current design and focus on millennials. Option two is to revert to a traditional, colonial, or any other design, and focus on a Kiryas Joel style community style clientele. Option three is low income housing. The numbers work for all three projections. A single option has to be picked, there can be no mix-matching. Chairman Boucher asked Owner Goldklang what he meant by a Kiryas Joel style community house. Owner Goldklang stated that this style of housing is designed to meet the needs of their community and focuses more on the inner look of the house. The size of the kitchen is important so that residents can have a kosher kitchen. Bedrooms would be larger. The design of the house is different because the demographic has a different lifestyle. Secretary Doherty displayed the approved renderings from the Spring Hills Apartments project. Chairman Boucher stated that the renderings displayed are what the marketing service for that applicant found to be successful for the same millennial demographic as The Q. This is a different design approved by marketing professionals that was approved for a millennial clientele as well. Owner Goldklang stated that these are similar designs to those in Kiryas Joel. If the planning board wishes he can choose a design like this and market it to the Kiryas Joel community. Owner Goldklang stated that he is willing to choose a different design, which will be marketed for a different clientele, if the wboard wishes. Owner Goldklang does not want to spend money for another design and then shift what the end use is going to be. When a design is created thousands of dollars are invested. A different design is not just a different color; it's a different layout and floor plan. The current proposed floorplan would not be viable for the other two options, as each demographic has different needs and requirements. Architect Till compared the Spring Hills Apartments rendering and The Q's designs. Both designs have earth toned colors and similar presentation of the roof lines. The windows and

doors used are different. The Spring Hill Apartments rendering features a tower, which a previous version of The Q's design had but was removed. To move the concept forward a 3D rendering of The Q's design could be done to show the dimension and scale of the building. Architect Till stated that between the two designs there are similarities in scale, material, and texture. Attorney Cassidy suggested that the applicant could provide photos of other buildings with similar design elements to The Q so that the board can have a real world reference. Member Allen agrees that the Spring Hills Apartments rendering's and The Q's designs have similarities. Chairman Boucher stated that if the applicant were to submit the marketing materials and a 3D rendering then that might make the difference. Architect Till urged the board to have the applicant move forward with a rendering. Architect Till is in favor with a public hearing to get input from the surrounding neighbors. Member Allen asked if it would be possible for the planning board to show The Q's elevations along with the Spring Hill Apartments rendering so that the public can see the similarities. Member Hafenecker stated that the two pictures would be difficult to compare as The Q's elevations are 2D and the Spring Hill apartments rendering is 3D. Member Kelly stated that the windows are different, there are balconies. To him these are two completely different buildings. Member Kelly requested that Owner Goldklang provide a picture of a building in Kiryas Joel with the colonial tower element. Owner Goldklang stated that he will provide some pictures. Owner Goldklang stated that in the past he has developed buildings similar in design to the Spring Hill Apartments project. He has used similar grey cultured stone and similar windows. This is typical cultured stone which is seen in 50% of construction today. Chairman Boucher stated that providing a 3D rendering for The Q would be a great step in the right direction. Architect Till stated that he will be able to provide a rendering by the July 27, 2021 public hearing. Member Parise requested that the 3D rendering be available by the July 12th Workshop. The submission date for July is June 28th. Architect Till stated that it would be difficult to have a 3D rendering properly produced. Chairman Boucher stated that the 3D rendering is too important to not do properly, so the public hearing can be set for the regular August 24th meeting. Attorney Cassidy suggested that the applicant hold the public hearing August 24th so that both a 3D rendering can be presented to the public and the applicant can address outstanding comments from Engineer O'Rourke. Attorney Cassidy revised the resolution to correct the "68 two bedroom open market rental apartments" to "72 units two bedroom open market rental apartments" . Member DeAngelis asked if the planning board received comments from involved agencies for this application. Engineer O'Rourke stated that this application was not sent out to any agencies, and this project does not require 239 referral. Lead agency notices were circulated, but no comments were received from any of the involved agencies. The planning board wouldn't submit for Health Department until after the board grants some type of approval. This application will have to go to county sewer. Attorney Cassidy read the resolution into the record.

On a motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously:
Resolved that the resolution set the Public hearing for The Q application be approved.

VILLAGE OF MONROE

PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION TO SET PUBLIC HEARING – THE Q

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is in receipt of an application for site plan approval and special use permit for the construction of 72 two bedroom open market rental apartments, associated site improvements including parking, recreation, utilities, site lighting and landscaping located at Stephen's Lane (41 Still Road) in the Village of Monroe;

WHEREAS, a Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) dated June 19, 2020, last revised March 29, 2021 was submitted for review by the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board declared itself to be lead agency on July 13, 2020 and determined the matter was an unlisted action; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a public hearing shall be held on this application at the Board's Regular Meeting on August 24, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the application may be heard.

Motion by Member Parise, Second by Member Kelly. Dated June 22, 2021

Member Keith Allen	Y
Member Jeff Boucher	Y
Member Geraldine DeAngelis	Y
Member Paul Hafenecker	Y
Member Marilyn Karlich	Y
Member Fred Kelly	Y
Member Gary Parise	Y

2. **548 Rt 17M - 220-4-8**

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering; Rodger Braley, Architect, Rodger W. Braley Architects;

Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. The applicant submitted a site plan which included both parcels. Engineer O'Rourke's office had provided some comments on that submitted site plan. Engineer O'Rourke believes that it is time for a 239 referral and to schedule a public hearing. Attorney Cassidy read the resolution into the record. Member DeAngelis stated that the planning board need a better rendering of the proposed buildings for the public hearing. The scale should be bigger. The drawing on the site plan is very small. Attorney Cassidy stated that the file on the OneDrive titled "A102 – Warehouse" shows a rendering of the proposed buildings. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant submitted a rendering which should the proposed building, garage doors, mezzanine, with the 3D look. Attorney Cassidy displayed the 3D rendering for the board. Member DeAngelis stated that the applicant should provide a rendering that shows the materials and colors used. Engineer Torro stated that he will ask the architect for the materials and color. The proposed building is a commercial building in the back of the property. Chairman Boucher requested that the applicant indicate on the rendering the colors and materials. Member Karlich stated that Building Inspector Cock's 6-14 email memo mentioned a DEC violation. Is that DEC violation still outstanding. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the DEC violation is an active violation, all the applicant has to do is remove the

offending pile. The pile will have to be removed before permits are issued. Chairman Boucher believes that there is a rendering which shows the existing material piles onsite.

On a motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously: **Resolved that the resolution to declare lead agency, set public hearing, and refer pursuant to GML 239 be adopted.**

VILLAGE OF MONROE

PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION TO DECLARE LEAD AGENCY, SET PUBLIC HEARING AND REFER PURSUANT TO GML 239– 548 ROUTE 17M

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is in receipt of an application for site plan approval and special use permit for installation of a 4,666 sf warehouse as well as an open shed in connection with an existing use of a building materials yard;

WHEREAS, a Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) dated April 29, 2021 was submitted; and

WHEREAS, after comparing the thresholds contained in 6 NYCRR 617.4 and 5, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project is an unlisted action and that an uncoordinated review pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR) is warranted;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Village of Monroe Planning Board hereby declares itself to be lead agency for purposes of SEQR review;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a public hearing shall be held on this application at the Board's Regular Meeting on July 27, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the application may be heard.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of the application shall be transmitted to the Orange County Department of Planning and the New York State Department of Transportation pursuant to General Municipal Law § 239 et seq.

Motion by Member Parise, Second by Member Kelly. Dated June 22, 2021

Member Keith Allen	y
Member Jeff Boucher	y
Member Geraldine DeAngelis	y
Member Paul Hafenecker	y
Member Marilyn Karlich	y
Member Fred Kelly	y
Member Gary Parise	y

Other Business

1. Local Law #5

Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. Based on the comments the planning board provided during the June 12th workshop Attorney Cassidy created a draft letter to the Board of Trustees which would outline the planning board's concerns with the proposed Local Law #5. This letter includes concerns that the definition of lot coverage needs to be reviewed and also that the coverage percentages need to be reviewed more comprehensively. The draft letter also includes a request that the Village Board should consult with the Planning Board of projects currently before the planning board and evaluate if each project should be reviewed under the old standard or under the new standards. Should any projects, such as The Q and 208 Business Center, be grandfathered in. The draft letter also states that "The proposed law may result in significant redesigns of some of the projects before the Board". Engineer O'Rourke stated that if the bulk table isn't changed along with the lot coverage definition, commercial development will be shut down. The applicant wouldn't have room to build. Attorney Cassidy added "Were the existing coverage standards to remain, commercial development would become extremely difficult applying the new definition." comment to the draft letter. Building Inspector Cocks agrees with Engineer O'Rourke. Development within the Village would be shut down. Attorney Cassidy added "Planning Board does not recommend adoption of the local law in its current form" to the draft letter.

On a motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member DeAngelis, it was unanimously: **Resolved that the "Local Law #5 2021 – Planning Board Comments" be approved with the "Were the existing coverage standards to remain, commercial development would become extremely difficult applying the new definition." And "Planning Board does not recommend adoption of the local law in its current form" comments be added.**

2. Public Notice Law

Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. The draft copy of a local law to amend the zoning code of the Village of Monroe code to provide additional public notice for planning and zoning applications was circulated to the ZBA for their comment. Chairman Baum indicated that the ZBA would review the draft copy during their July 13th meeting and provide their comments.

3. Draft Fee Schedule

Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. Attorney Cassidy provided a copy of the current Village Fee Schedule and a Draft Fee Schedule with the revised portions highlighted in yellow. Planner Fink provided his comments regarding the fees for the environmental assessment forms. Doubling the Short Form EAF from its current fee of \$375 would be reasonable. Some municipalities go even further with the fees charged for the EAFs. It's rare to get special studies that are submitted along with a short EAF because the action is minor and has few impacts. The

Long EAF is reserved for bigger projects where additional materials such as a traffic study are submitted. Some municipalities charge for those additional studies submitted as additional services, such as a licensed traffic engineer, may be hired by the municipality to review those additional materials. Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. The revised portions of the draft fee schedule are meant to provide the planning board secretary with a formula to calculate the initial deposit. If the projects are longer term and repeatedly come back to the planning board then the fees associated with repeated visits will be captured in the 40% replenishment requirement for the escrow. Attorney Cassidy stated that currently the biggest issue is that fees will be billed to the applicant but the applicant will not pay until the end of the approval process. If there is a project that spans 18 months – two years then a sizable outstanding balance can accumulate. Attorney Cassidy stated that the fee for the Long EAF was changed from \$800 to \$1,200. Attorney Cassidy noted that if the planning board finds that the fee schedule doesn't work the planning board can make recommendations in the future. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will send Chairman Boucher the Draft Fee Schedule along with a letter to the Village Board.

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member DeAngelis, it was unanimously: **Resolved that the planning board Draft Fee Schedule be submitted to the Board of Trustees .**

Approval of Minutes

1. May 25, 2021

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously: **Resolved that the May 25, 2021 meeting minutes be approved with the revision of correcting the title of the May 25, 2021 Minute set from “VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP AGENDA” to “VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD MEETING AGENDA”.**

2. June 14, 2021

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Hafenecker, it was unanimously: **Resolved that the June 14, 2021 meeting minutes be approved.**

Other Business: Village of Monroe COVID Procedures

Chairman Boucher stated that Mayor Dwyer had sent him a document regarding COVID procedures at Village Hall. All restrictions have been lifted as per the Governor. We do ask that anyone from the public entering Village Hall wear a mask. The Village Clerk and Village

Attorney were moved off the **odeus** so that individuals were spread out. There are no COVID occupancy restrictions, so that means up to 40 people are allowed in Village Hall at any one moment. Member Hafenecker asked if there was any inquiry regarding the use of the Town Hall for a planning board meeting space. Chairman Boucher stated that he would reach out to Mayor Dwyer. Chairman Boucher stated that as of now the planning board will be meeting in the Village of Monroe court room. Member DeAngelis stated that Village Hall is small and there are a lot of consultants. Chairman Boucher stated that there is a waiting area in Village Hall for people to wait as well. Attorney Cassidy stated that if the planning board is concerned about space they could stagger their applicants by scheduling their appearances. The first applicant would be scheduled at 7:00pm, the second would be scheduled at 7:15PM. This approach has the potential to backfire as each applicant may not fill the allotted time, so the planning board would have to wait for the next scheduled appearance. Member Parise stated that some municipalities have people wait outside. Member DeAngelis is in favor of using the Town Hall as a planning board meeting space. Chairman Boucher stated that he would reach out regarding the use of the Town Hall as a meeting space for the planning board. Chairman Boucher stated that the July 12th workshop will be held on Zoom* with the goal of having the July 27th regular meeting held in person. Member Allen asked if vaccinated people will be required to wear masks. Chairman Boucher stated that Mayor Dwyer had said that board members can decide if they want to wear masks or not. Chairman Boucher stated that the board will probably be sitting the same distance from other members. Spacing will be much harder if there is a longer agenda.

*NOTE: Since the June 22, 2021 meeting Executive Order 202.1 had expired and all government meetings will be held in person unless otherwise noted.

Adjournment

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously:
Resolved that the June 22, 2021 meeting be Adjourned at 8:49PM.