

Town of Hamburg
Planning Board Meeting
May 6, 2026, Minutes

The Town of Hamburg Planning Board met for a Work Session at 6:30 PM, followed by a Regular Meeting at 7:00 PM, on Wednesday, May 6, 2026, in Room 7A/7B of Hamburg Town Hall.

WORK SESSION

Planning Board discussed various zoning code amendments as presented by the Planning Department

The Planning Department continued to review subsections of Chapter 230 Subdivision of Land Code with the Planning Board. Mr. Rogers explained that he will continue to use work session time to review sections at a time, instead of one comprehensive review.

REGULAR MEETING

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Cynthia Gronachan led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Gronachan, Member Clark, Member Geraci, Member Ryan
Member Stewart, Member Chmura, Member Zajac, Member
Quandt (alternate)

Absent:

Staff: Josh Rogers, Planning Department; Joseph Gogan, Planning
Board Attorney; Camie Jarrell, Engineering Department

Public Hearing- 7:00 P.M., Carl DiNezza- Requesting Preliminary Plat Approval on a proposal for a 2-lot subdivision at 58 North Shore Drive

Mr. Carl DiNezza appeared on behalf of the project and gave a history of the project.

Member Geraci read the following Public Hearing Notice:

“Notice is hereby given that the Town of Hamburg Planning Board will conduct a public hearing on a proposal for a two-lot subdivision to be located at 58 North Shore Drive. The Public Hearing will be held on May 6, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in Room 7A/7B of Hamburg Town Hall.”

Chair Gronachan made the following statement:

“In order to hear from all residents at a reasonable hour, a three-minute rule will apply for each person who speaks. A public hearing is an opportunity for the community to share information on how they are impacted by the project. It is not a question-and-answer period. Those who ask questions will receive answers by the Board and the applicant at a later date. All statements made during the hearing, as well as written correspondence, will be sent to the Planning Board, as well as the applicant for response.”

Chair Gronachan declared the public hearing open.

1. Scott Philips of Nelson Avenue spoke in support of the project.

Chair Gronachan declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Rogers explained to the Board that Mr. DiNezza did go to the Town of Hamburg’s LWRP Committee and did receive a favorable recommendation stating that the project is consistent with the LWRP.

Town Engineer Camie Jarrell had nothing to add at this point.

Member Chmura made a motion to approve the following resolution:

Carl DiNezza- 58 North Shore Drive SEQR

Whereas, the Town of Hamburg Planning Department received a minor subdivision application from Carl DiNezza for the approval of a two-lot subdivision to be located at 58 North Shore Drive, and

Whereas, the Town of Hamburg Planning Board held the required public hearing on May 6, 2026, and

Whereas, the Town’s LWRP Committee has reviewed the waterfront consistency form WAF and recommended to the Planning Board that the project is consistent with the Town’s LWRP and the Planning Board has reviewed this information and has determined that the project is consistent with the Town’s LWRP coastal consistency determination, and

Whereas, in accordance with part 617 of the implementing regulations pertaining to Article Eight, State Environmental Quality Review Act also known as a SEQRA of the Environmental Conservation Law, the Town of Hamburg Planning Board has reviewed part one of the SEAF and completed parts two and three of the SEAF and reviewed the criteria for determining significance in accordance with section 617.7 of SEQR.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that The Town of Hamburg Planning Board has determined that this proposed smaller project will also not significantly adversely affect the natural resources of the state and/or the health, safety and welfare of the public and is consistent with social and economic considerations and therefore issues a negative declaration in accordance with section 617.7 of SEQR, and

Be It Further Resolved, that the Town of Hamburg Planning Board Chair is authorized to sign the short Environmental Assessment Form, which will act as the SEQR negative declaration.

There was a motion to approve by Member Chmura, that was seconded by Member Stewart. Resolution passes with no opposition.

Minor Subdivision Approval Resolution

The Hamburg Planning Board, after reviewing this project against the requirements of the Town of Hamburg Subdivision Law and granting a SEQR negative declaration hereby grants minor subdivision approval for Carl DiNezza, a two-lot subdivision with the following conditions:

1. The instillation of sidewalks is not warranted.
2. The Hoover Beach Community Association will be responsible for appropriate filing requirements and keep track of the subdivision.

There was a motion to approve by Member Chmura, that was seconded by Member Ryan. Resolution passes with no opposition.

Public Hearing- 7:00 P.M., Erie County Agricultural Society- Requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposal to demolish three (3) structures and construct a 32,850+/- sq-ft one-story building within the existing Slade Park between the existing Fireman's Building and Grange Building, to be located at 5600 McKinley Parkway

Doug Hutter of Zaxis Architectural appeared on behalf of the project and gave a history of the project.

Since the original presentation, the applicant submitted a landscape plan.

1. There will be 28 total trees removed, with 37 existing trees remaining.

2. 31 new trees are going to be planted so there will be three more trees than there are currently.

Member Geraci read the following Public Hearing Notice:

“Notice is hereby given that the Town of Hamburg Planning Board will conduct a public hearing on a proposal to demolish three structures and construct a 32,850 square foot + one story building within the existing Slade park between the existing fireman’s building and the grange building, to be located at 5600 McKinley Parkway. The Public Hearing will be held on May 6, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in Room 7A/7B of Hamburg Town Hall.”

Chair Gronachan made the following statement:

“In order to hear from all residents at a reasonable hour, a three-minute rule will apply for each person who speaks. A public hearing is an opportunity for the community to share information on how they are impacted by the project. It is not a question-and-answer period. Those who ask questions will receive answers by the Board and the applicant at a later date. All statements made during the hearing, as well as written correspondence, will be sent to the Planning Board, as well as the applicant for response.”

Chair Gronachan declared the public hearing open.

1. Ted Gura of 4276 Cherry Place asked that construction debris not be dumped in the grass parking lot within their site distance and that heavy equipment not be parked near the property line.

Chair Gronachan declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Rogers asked Mr. Hutter to explain the project a little to sort of answer Mr. Gura’s concern.

Mr. Hutter explained that the construction site will be fully enclosed with fencing with all staging storage materials inside the fenced area. Since it is a one-story building, they are not anticipating tall cranes.

Mr. Hutter stated that the entrance for construction is off of South Park so the residents on Cherry Place will not be affected by the activity. The construction will start with the New York State Building after the Fair in 2026 with utilities being installed during the fall. Construction of the building will start in the spring of 2027 pausing for the Fair of 2027. The construction will be completed and open for the Fair of 2028.

Mr. Rogers explained that the next step would be to table the project until May 20, 2026, and authorize the Planning Department to produce SEQR and draft Site Plan Approval Resolutions.

Member Chmura agreed to have Mr. Rogers draft the approval resolution and SEQR resolution for May.

Attorney Gogan brought up that there is a requirement in the Town of Hamburg Code, even when part of a site plan, to have a permit application that gets reviewed by the Conservation Advisory Board (CAB).

The project was tabled to the May 20, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

Brandon Santa- Requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposal to construct six (6) shop warehouse buildings along with other associated site improvements to be located on a 7.46-acre parcel at 0 Lakeshore Road (SBL #: 150.00-1-6.2)

Brandon and Brittany Santa appeared on behalf of the project.

Mr. Rogers explained that before the Planning Board tonight for their consideration is a SEQR resolution that has been crafted as a negative declaration.

Mr. Rogers gave an overview of the SEQR process.

Mr. Rogers explained that the SEQR resolution before the Planning Board is not a resolution for final approval of the project, approval of the site plan, or the construction of the buildings. He stated that what is before the Board is the Part 3 Analysis, that looks at all the impacts based off of the SEQR FEAF Part 1 and Part 2.

Member Geraci had no further comment as what he has read seems to be thorough.

Member Ryan agreed with what she has read, which is very detailed. She stated it follows through with everything that has been discussed from the beginning to date.

Member Stewart concurred with Member Ryan.

Member Chmura stated that in looking at the Part 2 of the FEAF, Impact #5, the impact on flooding, said “the proposed action may result in development on land subject to flooding” which was checked no. She asked if the Board ended up indicating that this action is in a 100-year floodplain.

Mr. Rogers explained that the part of the property that is within what is considered the 100-year floodplain is the extent of Rush Creek, which is on the southern border of the parcel.

Member Chmura stated that Impact #5 should be marked as yes, and although it is not a moderate to large impact, it should be recognized that part of the parcel is within the 100-year floodplain. She also stated that in the Part 3 analysis, we want to indicate and recognize that it is in the 100-year floodplain.

Mr. Rogers stated that they can amend the FEAF Part 2 to include impact on flooding and there is a write-up on the FEMA map within the Part 3 analysis.

Member Chmura further stated that there has been a lot of discussion with respect to a significant increase in traffic. She feels that it needs to be noted in the Part 3 analysis that within the IT Trip generation manual, the proposed development based upon all the data, can be expect about 36 trips during peak hours, which falls well below the DOT threshold of 100 trips which would have triggered the traffic impact study.

Member Chmura pointed out in the Part 3 analysis document that the narrative on Impact #15 states that there shall be no building mounted fixtures on the north or east buildings. She feels it should also be noted that any building faces that are abutting any residential properties shall not have any building mounted fixtures. She understands that it is already stated but she wants it to be explicitly clear.

Chair Gronachan agreed with this clarification and asked the Planning Department to add that as part of the site plan approval conditions.

Member Zajac stated that when it comes to the impact on community character, there has been discussion regarding the ten-foot fence and the landscaping along the fence. He asked if that is on a separate parcel.

The consensus answer to Member Zajac's question was yes, the fence is on a separate parcel from the project parcel. The landscaping is no longer along the fence, but up against the buildings.

Mr. Rogers stated that he will be remove from the description from the Part 3 analysis on Impact #18 - Community Character, where it talks about the fence, and it will now reflect the fact that the landscaping is along the existing buildings.

Member Clark added that Part 2 of the FEAF, subsection 13 (E) and (F), there are moderate to large impacts on traffic. Given that the entrance to the project is so close to the pedestrian walkway, he feels that Part 3 should talk about the impact of pedestrians coming off of the sidewalk.

Member Clark further stated that on Impact #18 - Community Character, the general zoning code states there should be a 75 ft setback from an industrial to residential property, but because there is the 10 ft. piece of property in between, he believes there is a loophole for not having the full setback. Member Clark stated he does not believe that has been addressed at all in regard to Impact on Community Character. He explained that due to the fact that the buildings are a shorter distance to the residential properties, the Planning Board encouraged the Applicant to add more screening, which they did, but it is not spelled out in the Part 3 analysis.

Attorney Gogan stated that as long as the reasoning is stated on the record what the concern was, he feels that it is a reasonable request to include that to show the concern was resolved with mitigation and addressed.

Member Chmura asked what the current proposed distance of the industrial buildings to the residential property line is, which the answer was explained to be 58 ft.

Chair Gronachan stated that the ordinance says that it's abutting to the property line which is the reason why this 10 ft. keeps getting brought up.

Mr. Rogers stated he would like to address the Part 3 analysis and make sure that it accurately incorporates the board's feelings.

He asked would Member Chmura feel comfortable having the document reference what is written in subsection three talking about the FEMA flood map, or would she want a copy and paste to Impact #5 (Impact on Flooding).

Member Chmura told Mr. Rogers that he can reference the flood map from the previous section, noting the 100-year floodplain as it pertains to Rush Creek.

It will read: "see reference to the Flood map and narrative and subsection 3 related to the 100-year floodplain and Rush Creek".

As to the impact on transportation, Mr. Rogers asked if there was any specific way that Member Clark would like it worded or incorporated into the document.

Mr. Rogers stated that the Part 3 analysis already states: To address volume and traffic access concerns, the applicant is proposing that all heavy construction vehicles shall be required to continue southbound and utilize the Woodlawn exit off of Route 5 to circle around and come back up Route 5, going northbound to make a right into the project site. This has been discussed to be a required condition of site plan approval for the project. The applicant will direct his drivers and, to the maximum extent practicable his tenants, to not use the State right of way off of Hawley Road. Hawley Road, which is a Town Road, already has signage prohibiting trucks over 5 tons from entering the road.

Member Clark explained that he does not have anything that would fix it.

Member Chmura asked to address the pedestrian comment and asked if there can be something to the extent to say that it is noted that there are no improvements planned for any pedestrian access.

Chair Gronachan stated that she does not support that due to the fact that everything that is included is there due to mitigation or explanations.

Member Zajac explained that he does not feel that the fencing on the other property should be mentioned as part of the mitigation in the Part 3 analysis document.

Chair Gronachan stated that the Planning Board and the Planning Department looked at the ordinance, and it did not use that ordinance to have a loophole. It is the way that the ordinance is written.

Member Chmura stated she is in support of removing the reference to the 10 ft. fence so that there is no confusion about any connection with what is considered a separate project that is outside the definition of this project. In addition to the landscaping that is being planned, she believes that it should be noted that additional landscaping in order to support the berm and bank would have a significant increase in the Community Character.

In regard to the points Member Zajac brought up, Mr. Rogers removed the part that talks about landscaping against the fence and had it state that there will be landscaping around the buildings to provide a buffer.

Chair Gronachan added that she feels that Community Character is not specifically defined by the State due to the fact that each case is judged on its own merits. In this case, there is a combined use throughout the neighborhood of both residential and industrial. She feels that the applicant has made a sincere effort to buffer not only along the Creek, but the property line that is going to be next to the neighbors. She feels that with what the applicant has done when requested such as buffering on the back of the buildings, it adds to the Community Character.

Chair Gronachan wanted it duly documented that the applicant has made every effort to follow this project up to and including adding onto the lease that the tenants cannot make a turn from anywhere but Route 5.

Mr. Rogers asked if the Planning Board was comfortable with how the Part 3 analysis is written with the amendments, as noted by all board members, and is written to be entered into the record along with the potential negative declaration.

A majority of the Board responded yes.

Mr. Rogers explained that there is a Negative Declaration resolution for consideration, and the Planning Board does not add conditions to a SEQR resolution. He explained that this is just for approving SEQR and then should the Board vote to give the project a Negative Declaration, they can then discuss proposed site plan conditions that have been mentioned throughout the project.

Member Stewart made a motion:

Brandon Santa 0 Lakeshore Road Industrial Shops Project- SEQR

WHEREAS, the Town of Hamburg Planning Board received a site plan application from Brandon Santa for the construction of six (6) single-story contractor shop/warehouse buildings, totaling 75,220 sq-ft on a vacant lot along with associated parking, on-site utility improvements, stormwater management, site lighting, and landscaping at 0 Lake Shore Road located behind 3401 Lake Shore Road (SBL #: 150.00-1-6.2); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Part 617 of the implementing regulations pertaining to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act - SEQR) of the Environmental Conservation Law, the Hamburg Planning Board has established itself as SEQR Lead Agency and conducted a coordinated environmental (SEQR) review for this Unlisted action; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed Part 1 of the FEAf, has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the FEAf and reviewed the criteria for determining significance in accordance with Section 617.7 of SEQR, and documented their analysis in an expanded Part 3 analysis document; and

WHEREAS, the findings of this review indicate that the proposed project will not adversely affect the natural resources of the State and/or the health, safety and welfare of the public; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Hamburg Planning Board held the required public hearing on March 4th, 2026.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Hamburg Planning Board, as SEQR Lead Agency for this action, has determined that the construction of six (6) single-story contractor shop/warehouse buildings, totaling 75,220 sq-ft on a vacant lot along with associated parking, on-site utility improvements, stormwater management, site lighting, and landscaping at 0 Lake Shore Road located behind 3401 Lake Shore Road will not result in any significant adverse impacts on the environment, and a Negative Declaration is hereby issued, based on the reasons as set forth in the full Environmental Assessment Form and Part 3 analysis attachment; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, the Town of Hamburg Planning Board authorizes the Planning Board Chair to sign the Environmental Assessment Form, which will act as the SEQR Negative Declaration, and authorizes that the appropriate notices and filings be made.

Chair Gronachan asked for a roll call of votes.

Roll call of votes:

Member Geraci: Yes

Member Ryan: Yes
Member Stewart: Yes
Member Chmura: Yes
Member Zajac: Yes
Member Clark: No
Member Gronachan: Yes

The resolution passed six (6) ayes to one (1) nay.

The project was tabled to the May 20, 2026 Planning Board meeting and the Planning Department was authorized to produce a draft site plan approval resolution with conditions.

James Dragonette- Requesting Planning Board Approval of a tree clearing permit to clear cut 0.6 acres of land at 4735 Southwestern Boulevard

Chair Gronachan recused herself from this project as Mr. Dragonette is her personal physician.

Mr. James Dragonette appeared on behalf of the project and gave a history of the project.

Mr. Dragonette explained that his intention is to clean up part of the property behind his building to make it look nicer and increase the value of the property.

Member Chmura asked for clarification regarding if there is any proposed future development in the rear part of the property.

Mr. Dragonette stated that at this point in time, there is no proposed future development. He explained that he is looking to clear about half of the trees that are still standing behind his office. He is looking to clear about 255 feet (the entire width of the property) and he believes that there is still over 300 feet to the back of the property that will remain untouched.

Mr. Rogers explained that this is a unique situation, as the Applicant is asking for a tree clearing permit that is not associated with a site plan or subdivision. Due to the fact that Mr. Dragonette is looking to clean up and clear about 0.6 acres, it does trigger the need to come before the Planning Board for approval. It also requires a recommendation and review from the Conservation Advisory Board (CAB). Mr. Gardy Low did a site visit and provided a memo to the Planning Board.

The CAB Memo was read into the record by Mr. Rogers, and stated the following:

- There are viable maple and black cherry trees on the property.
- There is considerable value in these cut cherry and maple trees as firewood.

- There are some dead ash trees, with most of them have fallen down.
- The lot is less than 200 feet wide, and both neighboring lots are cleared back to where the landowner is proposing to clear to.
- It is proposed that after any clearing, there should be a plan to reestablish some newly planted trees in place of the trees that have been removed.

Town Engineer Camie Jarrell asked Mr. Dragonette if the intent is to cut and remove all trees in that area to the property line on each side and then to the distance in the back.

Mr. Dragonette responded yes.

Ms. Jarell asked if he planned to remove all stumps.

Mr. Dragonette responded yes.

Ms. Jarrell asked if Mr. Dragonette planned on filling in the divots and holes.

Mr. Dragonette responded yes, it is going to be graded smoothly and planted with grass.

Ms. Jarrell requested that since this is over 0.5 acres, there be some basic erosion sediment controls.

Member Chmura asked if the intent of the tree clearing is to clean up the property and it is noted that there are viable live trees, why wouldn't we just be looking at clearing out the dead trees in order to clean up and allow for the existing viable trees to remain versus clear cutting.

Mr. Dragonette reiterated that he is looking to clean up part of the backyard of his office space to make it look nicer. At this point in time there are no plans to develop anything, however, in the future he may want to put a garage on the property.

Member Ryan asked how many alive trees would be cut down.

Mr. Dragonette stated he did a walk through and there was a rough count of about 118 trees standing and that does include some of the dead ash trees. He does not have an actual number of alive trees. If needed, he would say an estimate of 75-80 trees.

Member Clark asked the applicant if he had a chance to review the CAB memo before coming to the meeting.

Mr. Dragonette responded no.

Member Clark stated the Planning Board has a recommendation that after the trees are cleared, the Applicant plant some new trees to replace the live ones that were cut down. Member Clark asked Mr. Dragonette if he had an opinion on that.

Mr. Dragonette disagreed with that opinion. He stated he is asking to cut down trees and does not see the reasoning in cutting them down just to replant.

Member Chmura asked if there are no future plans for development, why is he proposing to clear cut.

Mr. Dragonette feels that he is trying to clean up his property as a lot of garbage collects in that area. He is getting towards the end of his working life and is thinking about when it is time to sell his office, and believes that if part of it is cleared it may make it more valuable and desirable.

Attorney Gogan stated that the reason the Planning Board is asking this question is because of §243-1 of the Town Code, that states purpose and intent. The Town of Hamburg recognizes the value of trees, and their preservation of these resources is necessary to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the town.

Member Clark asked how much the applicant could clear without a permit.

Mr. Rogers responded that according to Town law, he can clear up to a quarter-acre (0.25) without a permit.

Member Stewart asked if he could cut a quarter-acre now and in two years ask for another quarter.

Mr. Rogers explained that there is nothing in the Town code that prevents that from occurring.

Member Zajac asked Mr. Dragonette if he is going to be putting in a lawn after the clearing is done. He also asked if he would want an open field with ornamental trees.

Mr. Dragonette reiterated the stumps are going to come out, and the land is going to be graded smooth with grass planted. He stated he is looking for an open field. He feels that there is going to be more land with untouched trees on it than what he is cutting down, and he is not cutting all the way to the end of his property.

Member Ryan asked would he be open to leaving a boarder of trees on either side for the neighbors.

Mr. Dragonette answered that one neighbor is the Thruway Department, and they are clear cut all the way back, and the other is Gullo's and Mulligan's and they are clear cut

all the way back as well. The only houses or residences are at the back of the property, well after where he is going to stop clearing.

Member Ryan stated she would like to see a buffer on the Gullo's side.

The Board requested an aerial showing where the applicant wants to clear and existing photos showing the conditions of what the site looks like currently.

Member Chmura stated that she will not support a building permit or a tree clearing permit without any additional trees being planted. It has been noted by CAB and by the applicant that the sole purpose of this is to clean up, not necessarily for future development.

Member Clark asked if the Planning Board can mitigate the adverse impacts of a lawn.

Mr. Rogers stated that the Planning Board has the authority to place conditions on approval for a clear-cutting permit.

The project was tabled to the May 20, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

Ten Lives Club Inc.- Requesting a use variance for the expansion of rescue services to be located at 3747 Lakeshore Road

The attorney for the project did not appear but let Mr. Rogers know that should the project be tabled for a public hearing, she would appear.

Mr. Rogers explained that the applicant did receive approval for a use variance from the Zoning Board during their May 5, 2026, meeting. The property is zoned M-3 and will be staying the same, however, the use variance now allows for the use of a rescue facility to be within the existing building located at 3747 Lakeshore Road.

He further explained that it is before the Planning Board because they are the Board that does a change of use approval and site plan approval. Typically, for the use variance, if there is an existing survey or existing building layout that is what is used. The change of use approval is for it to go from a gentleman's club to a rescue facility.

The Zoning Board did not place any conditions on the use variance that was granted. Because this is site plan approval, the Planning Board does have the ability to place any conditions should they choose.

The Planning Board has already issued a Negative Declaration for SEQR.

Attorney Gogan clarified that there is a site plan application that indicates it is just for an animal rescue. The reason for this clarification is at the ZBA meeting there was discussion from the owner indicating that one of the possible uses would be a cat café.

Mr. Rogers stated that on the use variance application it was stated that it would be a rescue facility and a cat café. The Planning Board has the ability to set site plan conditions that specify that if this should change, they would have to come back to the Planning Board.

The Planning Board requested that the applicant come in person and answer questions regarding the cat café, as when they were before the Board before, there was a lot of uncertainty regarding it.

A public hearing was scheduled for the June 3, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

EDF Power Solutions Inc.- Requesting Site Plan and Special Use Permit Approval of a proposal to construct a 2.5 MW Tier 3 solar project on a 17-acre parcel to be located south of East Pleasant Avenue (SBL #: 182.14-2-4.11)

The project is tabled indefinitely.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Gronachan stated that in regard to when the Planning Board has other committees come and speak, i.e. fire departments, CAB, traffic safety, they present their reports at the same time as the Planning Department and Engineering Department.

Recently, Chair Gronachan was asked about the boards giving their reports during the public hearings and she did not feel that was correct. Her reason for this is because it takes away from the public and the fact that a public hearing is for the public and the board to ask additional questions. She asked if anyone had any thoughts on this.

Member Clark agreed with Chair Gronachan. He stated members of those boards can come to a public hearing and speak as a member of the public, but not necessarily speaking for the board.

Member Chmura agreed that due to the fact that the reports are different in nature from a public comment, they should remain to be presented as they currently are.

Member Chmura made a motion, seconded by Member Ryan, to adjourn the meeting.

Carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
August Geraci, Secretary