

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
AUGUST 21, 2018**

**PRESENT:** Kathy Kiernan, Chairperson  
Karl Wick  
Vic Barranca  
Joseph Guido  
James Banks  
Frank Skerritt

**EXCUSED:** Glen Kubista

**ALSO PRESENT:** Kyle W. Barnett, Esq.

Chairperson Kiernan called the meeting of the Town of Esopus Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:00 p.m. beginning with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Chairperson Kiernan asked the Board if everyone read the minutes of the June 19, 2018 meeting and if there were any changes.

**VIC MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 19, 2018 MEETING MINUTES SECONDED BY FRANK. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-1. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:**

Karl .....Abstained (not at meeting)  
Vic .....yes  
Kathy .....yes  
Joe.....yes  
James.....yes  
Frank.....yes

**VIC MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 17, 2018 MINUTES AS AMENDED, SECONDED BY KARL. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.**

**VOUCHERS:**

April Oneto (secretarial services)..... 10 hours

**JOE MADE A MOTION TO PAY THE VOUCHER AS SUBMITTED, SECONDED BY JAMES. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR.**

Chairperson Kiernan explained that there are three parts to this process. First part is the Informational Meeting, second part is the Public Hearing and the third part is the Decisional

Meeting. Kathy explained that the decision could be as early as two months but it could take longer than three months.

### **INFORMATIONAL**

**08-21-18-01 Troy & Nicole Temple  
1496 State Route 213  
SBL: 63.10-1-25  
Area Variance**

Applicant showed site plan to build a three car garage in the front yard. They need an area variance from Section 123-21 C(5) of the Town Code.

Kathy asked if the house could be seen from the road. Troy stated that there is a line of cedar trees so that house can barely be seen from the road. The house is about 300 feet back from the road. The reason for the variance is because the house was built on a rock face and they cannot get a garage behind it. The garage would be detached from the house. Karl asked the height at the peak. Troy stated that it is 19 feet. Karl asked to see the actual garage with the dimensions. He stated that the average height has to be under a certain number. Joe asked the overall size of the garage. Troy stated that it is 26 feet deep, 44 feet wide. Joe asked why so big. Troy stated that it is a three car garage. He stated that they have four cars and store two for the winter. They are planning on finishing it in a similar style to the house as far as the siding and the roof. Joe asked if they had their own septic and well. Troy stated that he does and he will present a site plan next month showing this. Kathy asked for the dimensions of the house. Troy stated that he believes it is 40 feet wide by 30 feet deep.

Joe stated that some members would probably come over and look at the site. This would be okay with the applicants. They can call ahead if they would like. Frank asked if they have a structure along the driveway. Troy said that they have a tent there which would come down. Kathy asked applicant to bring photos the next time and the dimensions of the house.

Applicant stated that if they were given permission to build this they would like to start in the Fall and it is a three month process. Kathy explained that it is a three part process not necessarily three months. It can be two months or it could take longer depending on the Public Hearing. Sometimes the Board votes on applications after the Public Hearing if there are no issues but she cannot guarantee this. Karl asked if the house is a two-story house. Troy stated that it is a two-story house with an attic.

Chairperson Kiernan told him that the Public Hearing for this application will be at the next meeting which will take place on Tuesday, September 18, 2018 at 7:00 p.m.

**KARL MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARINGS, SECONDED BY FRANK. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.**

Chairperson Kiernan asked applicant Jess Hicks if he would mind if the Board did the Public Hearing for Pangea East first and then came back to his hearing. Jess stated that he had no problem with this.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

**07-17-18-01 Pangea East  
1170 Route 213  
St. Remy, NY  
SBL: 56.018-2-25  
Area Variance**

Scott Dutton stated that he is a resident of the City of Kingston, a licensed architect and he is here representing Pangea East who purchased this property at 1170 Route 213 in 2010 and has been before the Planning Board for the last couple of years and they are slowly working their way through the process trying to address some issues that need to be corrected.

The applicant is seeking a change of use from a single family residence to an educational use. This change of use triggers issues with the zoning ordinance. They are here tonight to request an area variance. The existing structure was built sometime in the 1970s early 1980s and is less than 100 feet from the property line. It is not visible from the road. Mr. Wick has been there as a volunteer firefighter and suggested that I bring an aerial view for clarification to show exactly where the property is. Scott stated that a couple of questions asked by Mr. Wick regarding the short form EAF he brought a copy of what you receive when you use the DEC Mapper Program to complete the EAF. The answers to questions #12 and #15 are filled in automatically by the DEC. Scott stated that there was a question about turnaround and he clarified with the official maps submitted to the Planning Board and they do have adequate space for turnaround for a pumper truck. There was a general question about Mark Day, Structural Engineer having visited the site and analyzed the bridge to the property and he determined that it was adequate for the fire truck.

Joe stated that they are not building anything or doing anything this variance is required because of the change of use. Scott stated that as far as the ZBA is concerned that is correct. He stated that there is an application before the Planning Board to erect a different structure but that would meet all of the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Kathy asked if there was anyone from the public who wishes to speak regarding this application. There was no one present.

Karl stated that the question was not whether they could turnaround the pumper truck but whether there was adequate parking in all weather for up to four (4) emergency vehicles. This was his concern. Scott stated that given that they are in the middle of their planning process he would be happy to attest to and make a part of the record that the site plan would accommodate his concerns and that there would be a final review by the fire department as a condition of approval.

Frank looked at the property this afternoon and noticed that there appeared to be another structure on the property close to the property line. Scott stated that it is a shed that will be removed. It is part of the site plan and the Ulster County Health Departments approval to implement a septic system that will meet the needs of the proposed use.

Kyle Barnett asked where this applications stands with the site plan process before the Planning Board. Scot stated that he has been to a couple of meetings and believes that they have addressed the majority of the comments and concerns. Roxanne recommended that the applicant run the variance review process in parallel and we asked that it be tabled. We are probably one meeting away. Kyle asked if SEQR has been completed yet and Scott stated that it has not.

Joe asked what was in the back of his property. Scott stated that it is a very large property but he does not know. Karl stated that it is a wood lot and there are no buildings. Scott stated that the adjacent parcels are quite large.

Kathy polled the Board about whether they felt comfortable voting on this application tonight and it appears that the Board is ready to vote. She explained that we will close his part of the public hearing but we cannot vote until after we complete the next public hearing.

**VIC MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR PANGEA EAST, SECONDED BY JOE. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR.**

Karl pointed out that the Ulster County Planning Board listed the property as being in Rifton as did the Esopus Planning Board. It should be St. Remy.

Kathy stated that all of the actions before the Zoning Board tonight are classified as Type II Actions pursuant to SEQR.

**VIC MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR JESS HICKS (PORT EWEN CORP), SECONDED BY FRANK.**

**05-15-18-01 Jess Hicks  
15 Broadway, Port Ewen  
SBL: 56.044-1-1.1  
Change in Non-Conforming Use (Section 123-30B(3))**

Kathy stated that the Board was presented with additional information today and wants to make sure that everyone has had a chance to look at the material. Everyone acknowledged receiving the material.

Joe asked Jess to state for the record what they are planning on doing on the site.

Jess stated that the intention is to occupy the garage and the office buildings on this site. He stated that they are a construction/service company as well as an environmental clean-up company. They will be using the warehouse for dry goods and he has a couple small machines

there. He has some smaller one ton vehicles. Most of the employees are dispatched from home. He stated that he goes up and down the road and that is about the extent of the traffic to the site.

Joe stated that basically you are using the buildings that are there. Jess stated that he is not going to construct anything new. Joe stated that there are several restrictions in the deed. Jess stated that there are restrictions for 30 years in the deed. A copy of the deed is on the file. Karl stated that some restrictions are in perpetuity that there are no basements no excavations which really limits what you can do. Joe asked if the property has been surveyed. Jess stated that there is a survey map that was submitted. Copy of survey map dated 2015 is in the file.

Kathy asked Sal (Building Inspector) if he wrote on the Notice of Disapproval Referral Form that this action is a use variance? Sal stated that it is his signature but he did not hand write use variance on the form. Kathy stated that for the record this is not a use variance even though it is written on the form. Kyle questioned if the confusion may have started when Jess did his application and the box was checked that this was a variance and it should have been checked as other. Jess stated that he did not fill out this section of the application. Joe stated that this is a “continuation of a non-conforming use” that is before this Board. Joe further stated that some of the information submitted to the Ulster County Planning Board led them to interpret this is a variance which is totally different from what Jess is seeking. Sal will provide the ZBA with a good, clean copy of the referral form. ZBA clerk will check with Ulster County Planning Board to decide if this needs to be re-referred to them.

Karl stated that it is his opinion that the prior use was a permitted use as it was not a non-confirming use. He thinks this is an error simply because 123-6(J) permits uses dependent on transportation of goods by water. Karl stated that to his mind that permits uses things like oil on barges that was a use at least at some point a use dependent upon water. He thinks KOSCO’s use was permitted not non-conforming. Kathy asked when KOSCO’s opened. Karl stated that it was well prior to 1971 when the code went into effect. Karl stated that it is also his opinion that the use did not end until clean-up was completed in the summer of 2015 which is less than five (5) years ago. Kathy stated that this is what the Board needs to determine.

Kathy opened the meeting up to comments from the public.

***Gloria VanVliet, 217 Doris St., Port Ewen*** – She does not understand that if this use has not been permitted why are they in operation and using the site? Kyle asked if she meant they being KOSCO or they being the applicant. Gloria clarified that she is speaking about the applicant that is before the Board tonight.

Joe asked Jess if he was using the site. He stated that he is and he did not know that he couldn’t. He stated that he is down there cleaning it up. He did not think that this was going to come to where we are today. Jess stated that he is not using the site. Karl wanted to clarify what he meant by using the site. Jess stated that he is down their cleaning up the site and he has some material stored in the one building. Jess stated that there is no office that is open or being used.

Kyle asked what is being stored on site. Jess stated that he has two trailers, a small dump truck, empty new drums inside, absorbent material and some electronic parts. Kathy asked how long it

has been stored there. Jess stated since they have been doing some work down there. Joe asked how long they have owned the property. Jess said that the owners have owned the property since 2015-2016

**Jay VanVliet – 108 Everson Street** – He is right down by the property. He worked for KOSCO in the 60's. He said that half the time he does not know they are down there. They have been quite and sometimes too quite. His only complaint is that he is supposed to have a water view property and he cannot see the water because of the overgrowth.

Joe asked Mr. VanVliet if he has heard what Jess' plans are for the property and does he feel that it is less intrusive. Jay stated that Jess told him some of it and they will be doing a lot less down there than what KOSCO did.

**Carol Carson Tomasetti, 169 Parsell St., Sleightsburgh** – Carol stated that one of the key value propositions for the Town is the waterfront properties on the Hudson and Rondout. She stated that there is not a lot of waterfront property and not a lot that offers access to the Rondout. We have pretty limited resources that we are dealing with. She said she takes exception to approving a request which would allow this strategic waterfront property to be utilized for industrial non water dependent use for the long haul. She stated that she thinks what Jess is trying to do from a short term perspective; his intentions are good and he is trying to do the right thing. He may not be there forever so the decisions that we make for long term use will affect what happens to that property for a long time. She knows that there is this issue with conforming use and non-conforming use. She stated that as a resident there and based on what KOSCO said she believes that they ceased operations. In her mind they ceased in 2010. From that perspective from a non-conforming use which is a pretty permanent item that gets granted to a property, she does not support this approval. At the very least, if something is to be granted a very short term restricted temporary special use permit should be evaluated until some of the use restrictions can properly be evaluated to determine how the property might be used in a way that is supportive of a waterfront revitalization strategy consistent with our comprehensive plan. Additionally, she said she would like to see some research work done to identify why the previous owner modified the deed in 2016 to place so many restrictions on future use and to determine if these restrictions can be removed to make the property usable as a waterfront asset. Additionally, she would like to know how they are allowed to take a piece of property that is a viable waterfront piece of property that could have other use and deed that in. If it is because it is contaminated, then maybe they should have been made to clean it up. She stated that she thinks what Jess is trying to do is on the straight and narrow but he may not be in the picture forever and granting something that is very permanent like that and the Town does not have any control. This is not a resource that you are going to manufacture any more of.

Joe wanted it noted on the record that the ZBA received a recommendation from the Waterfront Advisory Board dated 7/18/18 and a copy is in the file.

Jess stated that for the record Getty was the owner not KOSCO and he believed they are the ones that changed the deed. The property is now owned by Port Ewen Corp. (Frank DiAndrea).

**Steve Lewis – 153 Parsell St., Sleightsburgh** – Steve said that for himself and his family they strongly believe that granting non-maritime use of this property is forward thinking for the future of Sleightsburg, Town of Port Ewen and the Esopus community nor is it in keeping with the Master Plan in which participants asked for greater waterfront maritime recreations. At the very least, he asks that the Town of Esopus not encourage non-conforming usage of such a potentially economical pivotal piece of property. We also ask that because this is an issue that falls firmly within the plans for the Town’s future, it should therefore be reviewed by the Town’s Planning Board.

Steve read an email from the Haber Family – 14 Parsell St., Sleightsburgh – The email states that they have resided in the Town of Esopus for 4 years. What drew them to the area was the unique opportunity to be in such close proximity to stunningly beautiful natural scenery and the cultural offerings of nearby Kingston. They are asking that the Board consider better utilizing one of Esopus’s greatest and most limited resources – waterfront access. He would like the Town to consider finding a way to make use of this waterfront parcel for community enjoyment and utility, not automobile storage. (A copy of email placed in file.)

Steve read a letter from Michael Hyman (unknown address) – Mr. Hymann stated that he was disheartened to hear of the planned usage for the current industrial plot. He stated that there has been no formal testing to find out if the site and surrounding area is contaminated. This should be performed prior to considering future usage for the site. He feels that contingent upon findings the land should be slated for park/community usage as outlined in the Town’s Master Plan. Mr. Hymann stated that in the event that the site must be sold commercially to earn tax revenue for the Town, the sale should be public with fair market value and usage considered. The waterfront is the town’s prized possession and it must be used to attract people. (A copy of this letter has been placed in the file.)

**Jay VanVliet – 108 Everson St.** – He stated that the Spit has public access to the waterfront and individuals are down there dealing drugs, smoking pot. He said he sees it and he hears from a lot of the neighbors about it. He hears gunshots coming from there at night and the sign says fishing from dawn to dusk and the park is closed except for fishing. You go down there and nobody is down there fishing but they are doing drugs and drinking. They are throwing beer bottles in his yard and now they want to open it up so more people can go down there. He stated that his wife has been almost run over about five times getting out of her car to open up the gate to their property.

**Carol Carson Tomasetti** – She stated that it is really more of the concept of water dependent use that we are trying to drive at.

No further comments from the public.

Joe stated that a lot of this Board’s decision is going to be based on the five (5) year period. He asked Jess if there is anything that he can present as to why you feel that you are within the five years. Jess stated that he submitted NYSDEC Spill Report Forms dating back to 1/26/16 which is the Close Date documented by NYSDEC.

Jess stated that he submitted an MSOF which is basically a registration from the State that all bulk petroleum facilities have to carry with them. He stated that he knows this because this is his business that if you discontinue use of a bulk petroleum facility the facility is still considered active until the tanks are removed and closed. You can't just pull the plug and say see you later. He submitted a picture of a tank from 2010 that was rusted. As part of them keeping compliant, that tank needed to be painted. In 2013, you see the painted version of that tank. They did not take down and amend their registration until 2015. Up until that point that facility was still capable of accepting fuel, pumping fuel and operating. Between that information and a water bill from 2014 the State document says that the facility was open until that time. Joe asked how they were taxed on that property. Jess stated that he honestly does not know. He does not own it he is representing the owner. Jess stated that the reason that the owner is doing this is because Jess owns two houses in Esopus and it is his branch that the owner purchased 4-5 years ago. He is doing Jess a favor and himself at the same time. Jess stated that it needs to be cleaned up still.

Joe asked if Jess had the authority to grant certain restrictions. Jess said that he does but he does not know if he wants that responsibility. Jess stated that if the Board has restrictions he would like to hear them. Joe stated that he does not know yet. Joe asked if he has any other evidence of five (5) years or does he need more time to produce more. Jess stated that the document he submitted is a pretty strong document from New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Karl mentioned a letter received from T-Environmental, Inc. dated 1/15/16 to NYSDEC regarding Soil Excavation Report/Request for Spill Closure. Karl stated that there was some activity until January, 2016. (Copy of letter is in the file.)

Kathy stated that there is a memo dated 8/21/18 from the Zoning Board Attorney, Kyle W. Barnett which gives a little more information when non-conforming use is determined to be abandoned.

Kyle stated that this is really a legal question that needs to be answered and the importance of getting it right is obviously important not only to you but to members of the community because there could be liability issues. Kyle stated that this puts Jess at a little bit of a disadvantage because he is a lay person who is dealing with legal issues. Kyle stated that he does not know if it has ever been explored or it makes sense for him to consult with a lawyer and have that lawyer offer their opinion based upon whatever evidence he may have. Kyle stated that if he was able to do that it would be introduced into the record and be something that the rest of the Board members here would have to consider. Kyle stated that to expect applicant to make a legal argument when the burden of proof is on the applicant to prove the continuation of the non-conforming use within the five (5) year period and the continuation or discontinuance actually has a legal definition to it. Kyle feels that to expect Jess to do that might be a bit overwhelming. Kyle stated that he is giving this information to Jess and he would be happy to recommend to the Board to continue the Public Hearing another 30 days. Jess stated that he would appreciate that. Jess stated that he will seek counsel. Jess asked if he should not be going down to the site.

Kathy explained that Sal's original Notice of Disapproval does not have use variance written on there. Nobody seems to know where that came from. This is not something that you need to

worry about. It says on the first notice that it is a use variance but it is not so you don't have to meet the requirements that you would have to if it was a use variance. Jess is asking if he can clean up the property. Kyle stated that he can clean up but the storage of stuff is technically a violation. Kyle stated that you need to get the approval of the ZBA before you can even continue a prior non-conforming use. Assuming that you have the right to continue a prior non-conforming use the ZBA has to make that determination under the Town Code and then you can go and move forward but you cannot do it before hand. Kyle stated that what the application really is asking for is permission to change a prior non-conforming use. This is really the application and to change a prior non-conforming use, obviously there is certain criteria, but you still need the approval of the ZBA before you can do that and taking action before hand would be considered a violation. Kyle said that he does not think that cleaning up would be a problem but storing equipment or anything else down there probably would be considered a violation. Kyle expressed that applicant should keep in mind that he is not giving him any legal advice he is just advising the Board accordingly. He further stated that applicant may want to discuss this with counsel and Sal (Building Inspector). Joe asked Jess if he just has the equipment parked there. Jess stated that is true until he needs it and then he pulls it out.

Mr. Barnett asked Jess, in preparation of his return, following up on the Spill Reports he would be curious to see if he would be able to find any information as to why things are being reported as recently as 2015 in terms of some sort of contamination that is taking place that resulted in the spill reports unless he knows that now. Jess stated that when the tanks were removed there was a certain level of contamination that the DEC mandated Getty to clean up. They did that and this is why everything was decommissioned. All the pumps, the tanks, loading docks everything was pulled out, excavated and the State gives what is called a no further action letter. They are not saying that it is clean. Mr. Barnett asked if there was any indication from the prior owner, Getty, when they stopped work, the gap from when they stopped utilizing the property on a regular basis and then finally everything was decommissioned, if there is any information on what Getty's plan was when they discontinued the use. Jess stated that this goes back to the bad blood between Getty and Kosco which he does not know enough about. Kyle told him to say no more because it might be relevant. Kyle stated that this might be something that he wants to discuss with his counsel.

Vic asked Kyle if current owners vacated the property and later on the property went up for tax sale and later it was found that the property was contaminated does that fall on the taxpayers of the Town to clean it up. Kyle stated that falls on DEC and they go after the prior owner.

**VIC MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE PUBIC HEARING UNTIL NEXT MONTH, SECONDED BY FRANK. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.**

Jess asked Kyle if he would be here at the next month meeting when he plans on bringing his counsel. The Chair requested that Kyle be present at the next ZBA Meeting on September 18, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. Kyle asked Jess to see if his counsel could prepare something ahead of the meeting so that everyone can look at whatever is presented.

Karl stated that he did an informal study of the “W District” not to be confused with the Waterfront Recreational District. He found only seven (7) parcels through Sleightsburg and Connelly totaling 16.7 acres. The premise that is in question is approximately 4 acres which is about 25% of the entire district. He thinks this should enter into the decision as well. He stated that there aren’t many “W Districts” and we should think carefully before granting a variance. Kathy stated that we are not granting a variance this is a non-conforming use.

Kyle questioned if what Karl was saying was that it is not a prior non-conforming use? Karl stated that he is saying that the prior use was permitted by right. Kyle stated that the prior use existed prior to 1971 from what he heard. Kyle stated that this was before there was zoning. Karl stated that it was grandfathered in when zoning took effect. Kyle stated this is what makes it a prior non-conforming use. Kyle stated that if the use that was in existence prior to zoning would now be illegal. Karl stated that it is not. Kyle stated that Karl’s argument is that the use that was permitted up until it was discontinued if discontinued at all was a conforming use under the zoning code. Karl stated that he realizes that this complicates the entire matter but this is his opinion. Kyle stated that if the rest of the Board felt the same way then it would change the whole process entirely.

Kyle stated that if Karl’s argument is that the prior use was conforming with zoning and the use this individual is talking about is even less intrusive than the prior use. Then this should conform too. Karl stated that this is a valid argument but the use that is being proposed is not permitted explicitly by zoning so how can something that is not permitted be less intrusive than something that is permitted? Karl stated that this is something that we need to consider very carefully.

Chairperson Kiernan stated that the Public Hearing is adjourned until next month. There is one item of business that we need to discuss and that is the contract for our attorney. Kathy said that anyone can take a look at this and then we need a motion giving her permission to sign the contract.

**VIC MADE A MOTION FOR THE CHAIRPERSON TO SIGN THE CONTRACT FOR THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS ATTORNEY, KYLE W. BARNETT, SECONDED BY FRANK. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.**

### **DECISIONAL**

**07-17-18-01 Pangea East  
1170 Route 213  
St. Remy, NY  
SBL: 56.018-2-25  
Area Variance**

**JAMES MADE A MOTION TO GRANT A 43 FOOT VARIANCE FROM THE EASTERN PROPERTY LINE AND THAT APPLICANT WORK WITH THE PLANNING BOARD REGARDING THE ISSUE OF ADEQUATE PARKING IN ALL**

**KINDS OF WEATHER FOR AT LEAST FOUR (4) EMERGENCY VEHICLES,  
SECONDED BY JOE.**

Karl - Votes in favor. He thinks the existing building is pre-zoning. It is closer to the property line but there is nothing on that side that is going to be encroached upon. He does not think that it changes the character of the neighborhood.

Frank – Votes in favor. You cannot see the building from the road and there are no neighbors in that area to interfere with.

Vic – Votes in favor. Does not jeopardize the character of the neighborhood and it cannot be seen from the road.

James – Votes in favor.

Joe – Votes in favor. It is an existing building and over 4 acres of property and there are no adjoining neighbors.

Kathy – Votes in favor for all of the reasons stated and also because nobody came to object at the Public Hearing.

Kathy asked the Board if anyone would like to volunteer to replace Joe as liaison to the Waterfront Advisory Board. No one appeared to be interested.

**JOE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY VIC. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:25 PM.**

**NEXT MEETING:                    SEPTEMBER 18, 2018**

**DEADLINE DATE:                SEPTEMBER 4, 2018**

Respectfully submitted:

April Oneto, Secretary

Minutes Approved September 18, 2018