

TOWN OF VICTOR ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS, July 19, 2021

A regular meeting of the Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals was held on July 19, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Michael Reinhardt, Chairman; Mathew Nearpass, Vice-Chairman; Fred Salsburg; Sarah Mitchell, Donna Morley

OTHERS: Scott Harter (for 7117 Dryer); Ed Kahovec, Town Board liaison; Al Benedict, Town of Victor code enforcement; Suzy Mandrino, Town of Victor; Kim Reese, ZBA secretary

Chairman Reinhardt called the July 19, 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PAST MINUTES:

On motion of Fred Salsburg, seconded by Donna Morley:

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the meeting held on July 6, 2021 BE APPROVED.

Adopted: Ayes 5, Nays 0

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Reinhardt – First is the carry over for Rotach. I don't see him or any representative.

Mr. Nearpass – Is he online by any chance? Are we on YouTube?

Ms. Mandrino – No. Just you guys are.

Chairman Reinhardt – If the board's comfortable with that, we will just hold on to Mr. Rotach and we will jump to the Logan application. And here for the Logan application is Mr. Harter, how are you?

Mr. Harter – Good, how are you? Hello everyone. I'm here representing Joe as I mentioned, I was lucky enough bump into Kim at the supermarket who told me that I was on the meeting minutes here as Joe's representative tonight and I wasn't aware of it. I read through the meeting minutes from the last meeting and it seems like the issue of importance was the proximity of the horse barn to the property line was less than 100 feet. I see that there are some additional comments generated by Al since then. I was thinking that we were probably close to a resolution from the meeting minutes, but I see some new items have appeared here and I'm a little uncomfortable trying to negotiate those out with you if Joe's not here, quite honestly because he's the one whose ultimately going to be affected by the result and not me.

Mr. Nearpass – What are the new items?

Mr. Harter – One of the items is the possible relocation of the property line so a 15 foot setback would be satisfied. The other one is a pool, I believe. A pool that appears on the aerial images that's item number 7.

Chairman Reinhardt – Do you know if that pool is still in place? I think what Al has indicated on his memo is that from the aerial pictures the pool is present.

Mr. Harter – Is that a pretty recent photograph, Al?

Mr. Benedict – The photograph is end of March, beginning of April of this year.

Chairman Reinhardt – Scott, you don't know one way or the other if that pool is there today?

Mr. Harter – I don't know. We didn't survey it. We didn't locate it because we didn't think it was in the area of interest.

Mr. Nearpass – Is the pool a different topic in that code enforcement would have to do their thing, send them a letter, they have to come in front of us under a different public hearing or is this the time and place to?

Chairman Reinhardt – There needs to be notice given for a variance.

Mr. Salsburg – What's the problem with the pool?

Mr. Nearpass – If it exists it's forward of the main house here in the back.

Chairman Reinhardt – That's what I understand.

Mr. Benedict – That's correct.

Mr. Nearpass – It also looks like from the satellite photo that if it is a pool the liner is ripped out. You can see the dirt in it, it if still even exists. It doesn't look like there's a liner in it, so I'm just looking at it as this is probably where code enforcement practices their trade and we send them the letter if we have to bring them in here because the pool's there it's really a separate matter and it's a variance that would have to go through the public hearing process.

Mr. Salsburg – It's in an awful odd position.

Mr. Benedict – The pool was existing with a permit, legally. It's because of changing the lot lines now it's on a different property, so to speak. So it would be forward of their front line of the house.

Mr. Harter – Al has also item 4 on his list, the horse barn would be considered forward of the front lot line of the primary structure and an area variance is required along the same line of thinking, right?

Mr. Benedict – Correct.

Mr. Nearpass – When we had everyone on the call with us the last time, my recollection is that everything seemed preexisting, non-conforming, that the applicant was okay limiting the number of horses to two in the future as a condition. I personally don't remember having any other issue with the site so I know Al's got the list here.

Mr. Harter – That's what I read in your minutes as well and I kind of thought that that was the last part of the things, but there are a couple of new items that emerged here and I'm not really quite sure how Joe would like to handle it.

Chairman Reinhardt – Let's do this, let's proceed and pin down as much as we can. If it turns out that there's some issue that needs to be, Scott as you used the word negotiated, if you don't feel comfortable then we'll have to hold it over. Do you know what his time frame is for the project itself?

Mr. Harter – Well I think that he expected to have this wrapped up by the end of the month. That's what I know.

Chairman Reinhardt – The next meeting is August 2. I understand, if you don't have authority to negotiate then.

Mr. Harter – Well I suppose that I could negotiate, but if you've listened to Joe speak about his property he's very exact about what he wants to do with it. I think that he would have definite responses to some of these items that have emerged that are better answers for you than I have.

Chairman Reinhardt – What we do know is the county planning board came back. It's a class 1 but there was no quorum, so no vote was taken. So as far as referral from the county I don't think we as this board, have a lot to worry about that piece. Donna, do you have any questions?

Ms. Morley – I do. Where the old line is, is where it said existing property and now they've taken this back slice out, Scott? And they are making that go to this part, now?

Mr. Harter – Right, they are taking the portion of the parcel to the east and they are removing that property line and they are merging it in with their westerly parcel creating then the way I understand it about,

Ms. Morley – Okay, so they have more property on that main, okay.

Mr. Harter – And, I believe they tend to sell off the other parcel and the desired acreage for that was about one acre, if I remember right.

Ms. Morley – No, I have no other questions.

Chairman Reinhardt – Sarah, do you have any questions?

Ms. Mitchell – No, I don't.

Chairman Reinhardt – Fred?

Mr. Salsburg – I have question for Al. In your comments, you suggested changing the lot line behind the existing shed from 14.3 feet to 15, which brought that into compliance. I don't have it in front of me, but one sentence said continuing on to the point of origin. Can you explain what you meant by the point of origin?

Mr. Benedict – I guess what I meant by that is the blue line that goes from the west property line of 7081 and then finishes at the east property line of 7081 my thought would be if you turn that line just a little bit so it goes behind that shed at 15 feet instead of 14.3 and then goes to that east point.

Mr. Salsburg – And, that takes it off one aspect of a variance.

Mr. Benedict – That's just my suggestion. It's up to you guys to whether you want to go that route.

Mr. Salsburg – I don't quite understand what you want to do.

Chairman Reinhardt – This line here, that existing shed on 7018 is an issue, so if that lot line is moved encroaching it further south that variance wouldn't be needed.

Mr. Salsburg – Right. It's easier to see on here, but where does it go?

Mr. Nearpass – It goes all the way to the east property line.

Mr. Salsburg – In a straight line?

Mr. Nearpass – Yes.

Mr. Salsburg – Take that bend out of that back line?

Chairman Reinhardt – Adjust it.

Mr. Nearpass – Adjusting that angle will give you more than 15 feet.

Mr. Salsburg – So the western point of that line stays where it is and it swings down until it makes 15 feet

Mr. Harter – We can rotate that line to get 15 feet.

Mr. Nearpass – It's basically eliminating the two points in between the east and the west one.

Mr. Salsburg – It expands all three of those lots a little bit.

Chairman Reinhardt – If that's what can be done to eliminate the need for the variance, however that line is drawn whether it goes.

Mr. Nearpass – You're only looking for about 8 inches here.

Mr. Harter – And, the reason we left it the way that it is because I believe originally we thought the setback was 40 feet. I didn't see in the code the 15 foot for accessory structure so we went with 40 feet. But if it's 15 feet, you're right it's not much of a difference and I think you could rotate that property line from the southeast corner of the new lot just a hair and by the time it reaches that shed it will pick up that 8 inches.

Chairman Reinhardt – The flip side though is if you pull that line further south, it gets closer to the existing horse barn which then means it might be a few feet.

Mr. Salsburg – No it's in inches. To the horse barn.

Chairman Reinhardt – I'm trying to think of where that line goes. The southern line.

Mr. Harter – Are you referring to the 36 ½ foot dimension?

Mr. Salsburg – To make 15 inches at the shed it's going to take away about a quarter of that to the horse barn 39.5 feet.

Chairman Reinhardt – That horse barn is supposed to be pursuant to code a hundred feet.

Mr. Salsburg – Can't make that anyway so it doesn't make much difference.

Mr. Nearpass – So either way we're not talking about actually moving a building so the distances are.

Chairman Reinhardt – If you can eliminate one variance then I think that's as far as efficiency goes.

Mr. Nearpass – I agree.

Mr. Harter – Mike I think that 36 ½ would then be probably closer to 36 if I pivot it on that southeast corner.

Chairman Reinhardt – On that note, do you have authority to negotiate?

Mr. Harter – I think on that issue, yes, I think that Joe would be okay with that. As far as his pool goes and the

Chairman Reinhardt – I think the pool is going to be that's a separate variance. It's out there. I don't think that pool is necessarily going to be contingent upon granting or denying any of his requested variances.

Mr. Harter – I feel comfortable having done the map, knowing that we can rotate it and achieve that number.

Mr. Salsburg – It looks like a watering trough for his big pet, rather than a swimming pool.

Mr. Harter – I think it would shave that number if that's 36 ½ I think it might shave it down to about 36.

Mr. Salsburg – 39

Mr. Harter – Is it 39 ½?

Mr. Salsburg – Probably go to 39.3 or something.

Mr. Harter – On your item number 5 here the horse barn is indicated to be 36.5 feet south, so that should be 39, is that right?

Mr. Salsburg – That's what the map says.

Mr. Harter – The map's right. So item 5 should be 39 ½ feet then?

Mr. Salsburg – Yes.

Chairman Reinhardt – It already is 39 ½ feet.

Mr. Harter – Not on item 5.

Mr. Salsburg – No not on the paper. The maps right and the letter's wrong.

Mr. Harter – Right.

Chairman Reinhardt – If we're looking at the drawing then the distance from the new proposed property line is going to be 39 feet?

Mr. Harter – I would say approximately. It's going to be approximately the same amount that we take off on the, it's going to be almost exactly the same amount.

Mr. Nearpass – You're going to take 8 inches off one and give it to the other.

Mr. Harter – Right, so 7/10th of a foot, approximately.

Ms. Mitchell – I know I'm only one vote but I think that we're asking for inches here and inches is literally the least amount we can grant, so I think we're sending him back to the drawing board just for a few inches.

Chairman Reinhardt – We're just trying to. . .

Ms. Mitchell – I'm just saying that he's required 15 feet, it's 14.3, we're talking 9 inches. So I think it's an awful lot to send back to adjust a lot line by that little bit, when 9 inches is only 9 inches.

Chairman Reinhardt – If the applicant willing to, let me ask you how hard is it to adjust that?

Mr. Harter – It won't be that difficult for us and I think that that's a good comment and having been on this board for a while I think one of the things that got hammered into my head over the years is if you can eliminate a variance it's a good thing.

Mr. Nearpass – Is this going to cause the applicant to have to redo drawings and is it a costly activity?

Mr. Harter – No, this is kind of one of the first steps on our way to subdivision so we're going to have to regenerate the map for subdivision anyway and run that through the town so, but I appreciate what you're saying. And, I get your point. I think for a few inches we can change it and eliminate that variance.

Ms. Mitchell – By eliminating that one you're also creating a bigger one.

Mr. Harter – Slightly, yes.

Ms. Mitchell – Right, so.

Mr. Harter – It's a Peter and Paul type of thing.

Ms. Mitchell – We're eliminating one to make one bigger, so it's just my thoughts.

Chairman Reinhardt – So then the other piece with the horse barn is forward of the existing structure, but the manure pile and the location of it. So the applicant, Mr. Logan had indicated that it was going to be in the southern portion of his property, but still within 100 feet of the rear property line. Your understanding that's the only place it can go as far as it to be compliant with the code?

Mr. Harter – As far as I know, yes.

Mr. Nearpass – I thought the applicant did a good job last time explaining that to us. You've got to put it where, logistically it's feasible and convenient.

Chairman Reinhardt – I think limiting it to two horses I think it will be a modest pile.

Mr. Salsburg – A two horse pile. (Laughter)

Chairman Reinhardt – Fred, do you have any questions on any of the variances that are being proposed. There's three of them here and we're going to try and eliminate one of them. Right now we're looking at the horse barn being forward of the primary structure and the horse barn and the manure pile being less than 100 feet of the property line.

Mr. Salsburg – I don't have any more questions.

Chairman Reinhardt – Matt?

Mr. Nearpass – I'm okay with it. One thing maybe on similar lines to what Sarah said, we've got the three variance requests so we don't have to split hairs on what the value is for the existing barn. I'm okay with approving for example approving the barn and approving the two horse pile and put the other one on hold. If the applicant wants to move the lot line they don't have to come in front of us, they can withdraw that variance request or if he doesn't want to move the lot line he can come back in front of us on August 2 and explain why he needs those eight inches. That way we don't have to start making up numbers here.

Chairman Reinhardt – I agree. I hear you Sarah on that but in addition to trying to eliminate the need for a variance is because eventually when this goes through, not if, when it goes through for the division of the property lines 7081 won't need a variance. So right now there's one parcel and it's going to be carved into two. So by taking one away no at least that property the 7081 won't have to deal with the variance.

Mr. Harter – That's one way of looking at it, sure.

Chairman Reinhardt – Alright, anyone else have any other comments, questions, concerns?

Mr. Salsburg – Well this property is so unique. To me it's a pretty good project to approve.

Chairman Reinhardt – Okay. So Scott let me ask you this then on the 15 feet for the proposed change in lot line, leave it up to you. Are you comfortable with changing the lot line or do you want to hold that piece of it over to the next meeting and we'll deal with the other two today.

Mr. Nearpass – (inaudible)

Mr. Harter – I don't think Joe would have a problem with that additional 7/10th of a foot.

Chairman Reinhardt – If he wants to hold all three of them over, we can certainly do that. We can address two, if you are in agreement to change that lot line then the need for that first variance for the setback for the shed is no longer needed.

Mr. Harter – I think that's okay.

Mr. Salsburg – It would be a condition. A condition that that's changed.

Mr. Nearpass – I don't think it would be a condition. I think that we would just reduce the variance of the barn to the new property line, because it's going to be less, right?

Chairman Reinhardt – But, if he fails to do it and Scott, I know you're going to do it, but as far as the record goes, if you fail to change that lot line, the applicant's still going to need a variance for the shed being closer than 15 feet.

Mr. Harter – Right.

Chairman Reinhardt – I think that’s the way to go.

Mr. Nearpass – Right. I’m just saying we just have to come up with a new number for the (inaudible) for the barn. It might be 39 feet, it might be 38 feet, 10 inches, but if he does move it then that barn gets closer to the lot line. If we approve what’s written on paper right now and he moves the line to eliminate the variance we now just made the barn in non-compliance because it’s now 6” closer to the

Chairman Reinhardt – Is 38 feet going to get you enough room?

Mr. Harter – That’s more than enough.

Chairman Reinhardt – So, if we grant the variance for 38 feet to the lot line to the proposed lot line to the north. You’re not moving the barn. In our criteria we’re going to put in there that the applicant is going to move the proposed property line so that the existing shed at 7081 will be in compliance with the code and wherever that new proposed property line is that the existing barn to the south will be. . .

Mr. Nearpass – I don’t think we even need to do that. If doesn’t move the property line he has to come back in front of us for a variance on it, right?

Chairman Reinhardt – I think as far as the minutes go I think it’s the justification on why it’s changed from 39 ½ to 38 feet.

Mr. Nearpass – For the minutes, but you wouldn’t put it as a condition on the, you’re not talking about a condition. For the minutes, I think that makes perfect sense. I wouldn’t put it as a condition on the variance, right?

Chairman Reinhardt – No, no, not a condition, but at far as in the criteria it needs to be in there someplace. On whether or not it’s significant. Sound like a plan? Okay.

Mr. Salsburg – He referred to those as very large pets. Joe did. It’s not a barn it’s a large pet house.

Chairman Reinhardt – For the formality, anybody want to speak for or against this application for variances? You don’t see anyone on line?

Okay, let’s run through the criteria.

Let me ask the board this, we can either bundle both of them, since they are really dealing with the horse barn being forward of the primary structure and manure pile being less than 100 feet to a property line. Together, separate, Sarah?

Ms. Mitchell – I’m fine with it together.

Mr. Nearpass – Isn’t the third one the existing barn being less than 100 feet as well? Aren’t there three on this one?

Chairman Reinhardt – The barn and the manure pile are less than 100 feet. It’s really the barn

Mr. Nearpass – The barn and the manure pile less than 100 plus the barn forward.

Chairman Reinhardt – The manure pile is going to be in a separate location. I'm thinking whether or not we can do this together or separate because it's really the manure pile is going to be in a different location than the horse barn.

Mr. Nearpass – Wouldn't it just be three variances? So on the main property here, you've got one for the pile and you've got two for the barn, one because the barn is forward of primary structure and another one for the same barn because it's closer than 100 feet to the lot line.

Chairman Reinhardt – The horse barn being forward is one. Oh, I see the barn, got it. So, let's do the horse barn. There's actually four variances and we're eliminating one. So we have three to do. Alright, we're going to do the horse barn and manure pile less than 100 feet to the property line. Criteria being an undesirable change would not be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties created by the granting of the area variance. The minutes should reflect on both meetings that the applicant is dividing the property, one is 7117 and the other is 7081 and the property line that's to the south of 7081, the existing barn, it's a horse barn. The applicant has indicated that the maximum number of horses will be two. They've had and used that as a horse barn. Applicant is willing to put a condition on that that there will be no more than two horses there. Does anyone want to add anything else to the first criteria?

Second, the benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance. Dividing the property as proposed there isn't any other way to divide that property for 7081 and 7117 so a variance is required. Does anyone want to add anything to the second criteria?

Third the requested area variance is substantial, however that is an existing barn and I think with the proposed condition I think it minimizes the issue of it being substantial. Does anyone want to add anything to the third criteria?

Fourth, the proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. I haven't heard anything that would give this board any reason to believe that there would be any environmental conditions with the proposed variance.

Fifth, the alleged difficulty is self-created. The consideration is relevant to the decision of the board, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance. The condition that there will be a maximum of two horses in the existing barn. Does anyone want to add anything to the criteria or to the conditions? Great.

If I could entertain a motion for approval.

Mr. Nearpass – I'll motion for the approval.

Mr. Salsburg – Second.

Chairman Reinhardt – Thank you. Thank you. All in favor?

(Aye) Any opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Mr. Nearpass – I do have one comment. The more I look at this, I don't think we're looking at a pool. It's in the middle of where the horses run around. Isn't it one of those pens that they either feed them from or you put the food in or they go in and run around? It just seems like in the middle of a horse pasture there's a pool. I'm not sure it's a pool. That's all.

Chairman Reinhardt – Well it's noteworthy, and I think it's

Mr. Nearpass – Al?

Mr. Benedict – As far as I can tell from aerials and the previous permit, it is a pool. I had the same questions as you did. I zoomed in as far as the best, you could see the framework for a pool.

Chairman Reinhardt – We will do the third variance, the barn is forward of the front line of the primary structure. All the criteria that we've used before unless you want me to repeat them? I think it's pretty much the same.

Would anyone like to add anything else to the criteria as we've laid it out for the prior variance? Same conditions everyone in agreement with that? Motion for approval?

Mr. Salsburg – I move.

Chairman Reinhardt – Okay Fred. A second?

Ms. Morley – I'll second it.

Chairman Reinhardt – Thank you, Donna. All in favor? (Aye) Opposed? Motion carried.

Thanks so much. And, far as the third goes, just reflected in the minutes that the one variance for the 15 feet required for the shed that's on 7081, you have any guesstimate on when you expect to resubmit the drawings with the new property line?

Mr. Harter – Whenever you'd like.

Chairman Reinhardt – Think it can be done within 30 days?

Mr. Harter – Yes, absolutely. We'll be submitting for subdivision.

Chairman Reinhardt – So, it's clear for you and the applicant if that property line is not adjusted so that the existing shed. We've got to back up then. We didn't put any distance for the existing barn on 7117.

Mr. Nearpass – That would be 38.

Mr. Harter – It would be no less than 38.

Chairman Reinhardt – No less than 38 feet. So then on the existing shed that's at 7081, the representative of the applicant has indicated that the property line is going to be adjusted within 30 days. If it's not done the variance is still going to be required for the existing shed at 7081. Is that alright for everyone? Thanks so much.

Mr. Harter – Thanks a lot.

Mr. Salsburg – He sure is a tough negotiator isn't he?

Mr. Harter – What should I tell Joe about the pool? That's a separate issue?

Mr. Benedict – It still needs a variance. He needs to reapply or make it clear he's removing it or whatever he's doing with it.

Mr. Nearpass – Is the process that he's going to get a letter from you saying he either needs to correct it or get a variance?

Mr. Benedict – He can't approve the subdivision until you have all the variances in place.

Mr. Nearpass – But, to his point is code enforcement going to send him a letter or is us just telling Scott to tell him?

Mr. Harter – I'll tell him exactly that. I'll say we can't go forward with the subdivision map until we get it reconciled.

Ms. Morley – Well he can get Al's comments any way.

Mr. Benedict – I'm thinking he already has those.

Mr. Harter – Well he's incognito in Alaska, so. As soon as he gets back in the area, I will review this with him. And, thanks a lot for your time and have a good night. Nice to see everybody again.

Chairman Reinhardt – Back to Mr. Rotach. We have some choices. We either can discuss this. Make a decision on the variance. We can hold it over because he's not here. Fred, what do you think?

Mr. Salsburg – I think that even though this rather large garage is way in front of the house, it's still 200 feet back off the road in the woods with no close adjacent neighbors. And, the neighbor backed off.

Chairman Reinhardt – Well let me be more specific. Are you prepared to address this tonight or would you like to hold it over and have Mr. Rotach here to answer any other questions that you may have?

Mr. Salsburg – I'd like to do it tonight.

Chairman Reinhardt – Sarah?

Ms. Mitchell – I think we asked him to provide information to us as far as a hardship as to why it would be too costly for him to put it in a different location. So I don't know if we should, we did make it clear that it was an in person meeting and I'm sure Kim has made sure that he's aware that the meeting was tonight, so I guess I could go either way on it. I'd like to give him an opportunity but I understand that it is also his responsibility as the applicant to be here to represent his project.

Chairman Reinhardt – Okay, thank you. Donna?

Ms. Morley – I also would like him here because as it's saying he needs three feet of fill and other comment is what is the volume that he is going to use. And, I also when I went by the other day, it was very, very flooded, so I have some concerns about that area myself.

Mr. Nearpass – Do we know if he's been in front of the planning board yet? He has not? Okay. I agree with what the ladies said. In general I'm okay with the project. He was going to put the downward facing lights that the neighbor wanted. He did say that he was going to go off and provide some estimates after we pushed him a little bit on that or give us some justification. I think he at least owes that to us. I'm not against this, but the applicant does owe us some more data.

Mr. Salsburg – And, the neighbor kind of cooled off during the meeting. He sent in a couple things that sounded alright.

Mr. Nearpass – Yeah, yeah.

Chairman Reinhardt – I agree. He used the words a couple of times *cost a fortune* and when we pressed him a bit, it was very general, well it's obvious. It's not obvious. I think if you're going to present a proposal like you should be able to provide us some data on why it's going to cost a fortune and/or why that's really the only place it can go. The other point that I raised last time and I'll raise it again is that the proposed barn is 40 x 40 and then on the drawing it's 40 x 50 and he's talking about an overhang and I'm not quite sure he knows what he wants.

Mr. Nearpass – I also don't think he provided an engineering drawing everything was hand drawn, wasn't it?

Chairman Reinhardt – Yes, I think that's accurate.

Mr. Salsburg – What was that that Matt said?

Mr. Nearpass – Everything he provided it was hand drawn.

Ms. Morley – And, I could see what the neighbor was concerned that maybe it was going to be an auto repair shop because when you pull in there there was all kinds of lifts and stuff for motors and stuff on the property sitting there, so I can see his concern. And, the way the water was flowing the other day, putting that building there I'm not guaranteeing we're not going to make the next guy have a serious problem.

Chairman Reinhardt – I think this board has done a great job that when variances are granted or for that matter when they are denied, the minutes as well as the facts that we have found are sufficient enough to either grant or deny the variance. And, in this case I think we're still missing some important pieces, important facts. I appreciate it everyone on this board takes this very seriously and we should treat this one no differently. So, I'm alright. If everyone is good with holding this over for the next meeting for August 2nd and if you would let Mr. Rotach know that we would greatly appreciate his appearance at the next meeting.

Does anyone have anything else? Al, anything for us?

Mr. Benedict – I don't believe so.

Chairman Reinhardt – Alright, Ed, you're good? Thanks so much for everyone showing. It's a pleasure to see everyone's smiling faces again.

Mr. Salsburg – How did we make out with the mandatory training business?

Ms. Reese – Tina said at the end of the month she'll send the link and you can do it at your convenience and the other one is tomorrow. It's a different one.

Chairman Reinhardt – Motion to adjourn?

Ms. Morley – I'll make that motion to adjourn. All in favor. (Aye) Have a great evening. Thank so much everyone.