

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2014**

Members Present: Stephanie DeVito, Deborah Calarco, Scott Kilmer, Ed Darrow

Absent: Mario Campanello, Susan Marteney, Matthew Quill

Staff Present: Andy Fusco, Corporation Counsel; Brian Hicks, Code Enforcement

APPLICATIONS APPROVED: 159 Franklin St., 203 Genesee St., 83 Wall St., 72 Owasco St.

APPLICATIONS TABLED: None

APPLICATIONS DENIED: None

Ed Darrow: Good evening. Welcome to the Auburn Zoning Board of Appeals. I'm board chairman Edward Darrow. Tonight we will be hearing 159 Franklin St., 203 Genesee St., 83 Wall St., 72 Owasco St.

First order of business, has everyone received the minutes from the November session and had a chance to review them? Any additions, corrections or deletions? If none, they stand approved.

159 Franklin St. R1 zoning district. Area variance for fence/garden screen exceeding allowed maximum height. Applicants: Kyle and Tami Laukaitis.

Ed Darrow: 159 Franklin St., if you could please approach. Give your name, address and tell us what you'd like to do for the record.

Kyle Laukaitis, 159 Franklin St.: We would like to put a screen behind our garden.

Ed Darrow: Could you go into a little more depth and explain what you're referring to?

Kyle Laukaitis: Yes. On the side of our property about 60 feet back from the road our neighbors had a bunch of trees that they cleared out so now we're looking right into their house. We'd like to put a trellis, a screen, a lattice work screen that's 8' x 16', they come in the panels from Lowe's, and put those up to block to view into their room.

Ed Darrow: Now when you say screen are you referring to a living screen in the summer that will have green on it, if you will?

Kyle Laukaitis: Possibly. We don't really have plans for that now, I'm just looking to put up the lattice so I'm not looking at a white wall outside.

Ed Darrow: Okay, so just lattice.

Kyle Laukaitis: Yes.

Ed Darrow: So basically a barrier.

Kyle Laukaitis: Yes, a visual barrier.

Ed Darrow: Questions?

Scott Kilmer: Kyle, when I drove by your property you have a split rail fence to the right of your driveway and a little lattice situation just beyond that, is that where the new will go?

Kyle Laukaitis: That is the lattice. I didn't realize what the definition for a fence was.

Scott Kilmer: So it's up already.

Kyle Laukaitis: Yes. I'll take it down if not approved but I thought a fence was an enclosure.

Scott Kilmer: My question was going to be if the new lattice was going where the old lattice is and I guess the answer is yes.

Ed Darrow: Any other questions from board members? No other questions? Sir, you may be seated but we reserve the right to recall you.

Is there anyone present wishing to speak for or against 159 Franklin St.? Seeing none, hearing none I shall close the public portion so we may discuss it amongst ourselves.

Thoughts?

Scott Kilmer: It looks nice. It's there now. I was kind of wondering why they wanted to replace it. I guess he answered my question.

Stephanie DeVito: Yes, I agree.

Ed Darrow: I understand the concern for privacy there.

The chair will entertain a motion.

Scott Kilmer: I make a motion to grant Kyle and Tami Laukaitis of 159 Franklin St. an area variance of two feet in height in order to erect an eight foot planting screen/lattice/trellis based on the following reasons:

- The area variance will not produce an undesirable change or detriment to the character of the neighborhood or the properties in the neighborhood;
- The benefit sought cannot be attained by a method other than an area variance;
- The area variance is not substantial;
- The area variance will not produce an adverse impact on the environment nor the physical conditions of the neighborhood;
- The applicant's difficulty was not self-created.

Andy Fusco: Well, regarding five even though it is self-created in this situation that is not a bar to relief. So are you willing to amend your motion accordingly?

Scott Kilmer: Yes, basically we can remove number five.

Ed Darrow: We have a motion, do we have a second?

Stephanie DeVito: Second.

Ed Darrow: We have a second, roll call please.

All members vote approval. Motion carried.

Ed Darrow: Sir, your variance is approved, please see Code Enforcement for any necessary permits before you go any further with any work.

**203 Genesee St. R2 zoning district. Area variance for sign on Theatre Mack building.
Applicant: Cayuga Museum of History and Art.**

Ed Darrow: 203 Genesee St., please approach, give your name and address and tell us what you'd like to do.

Eileen McHugh, Brister Ave: I am the executive director of the Cayuga Museum at 203 Genesee St. The building that I'm talking about is at the rear of our property on Orchard Ave. It's the former carriage house of the Willard Case Estate that we have turned over several years into a community theatre venue called Theatre Mack. I am requesting a variance for sign on the outside of the building. You have a photo, a drawing of the proposed design.

Andy Fusco: Ms. McHugh, just for the benefit of the record, apparently in counting the square footage of the sign, you included not only the lettering but that splash of paint.

Eileen McHugh: Yes, Codes told me that it had to be the splash effect to.

Andy Fusco: I don't disagree with Codes on that. Just for my edification, the words 'Theatre Mack' approximately how many square feet would that be? Just an estimate.

Eileen McHugh: Maybe 10' x 4', 40 square feet.

Andy Fusco: And the only reason I bring that to the board's attention is on the issue of substantiality.

Eileen McHugh: You may see that because we have covenants, because we've accepted funding from the State Historic Preservation Office, anything done to the building has to be approved by them and we did already get their approval for this sign. Because it is, in their view, temporary and reversible.

Ed Darrow: Questions? Council asked my only one.

Andy Fusco: That's because you complemented me in the minutes last month of what a good attorney I was.

Eileen McHugh: The sign itself is not lit. There is a light that's already in the space where the sign will go but the light will be sticking out of the sign but the light is there already.

Ed Darrow: You may sit down, ma'am, but we reserve the right to recall you.

Is there anyone present wishing to speak for or against 203 Genesee St.? Seeing none and hearing none I shall close the public portion so we may discuss it amongst ourselves.

Thoughts? Concerns?

Scott Kilmer: I think it's a nice looking sign.

Ed Darrow: I think it's very nice.

Stephanie DeVito: Agreed.

Scott Kilmer: Eileen, did you put together this package? The letter of explanation helped a lot on the necessity of the sign, referring to the fact that it's a side street and there's Orchard St. and Orchard Ave, it's nice. I think this sign will definitely help to clear that confusion up. It is kind of an out of the way building on the back side there.

Eileen McHugh: If you don't know the area you don't know it's there.

Ed Darrow: Right. And the fact that it's already been pre-approved, I think that speaks volumes as well.

Chair will entertain a motion.

Scott Kilmer: Do you want these broken down into two?

Ed Darrow: I don't think there's a need.

Scott Kilmer: I'd like to make a motion to approve an area variance for the Cayuga Museum of History and Art in care of Eileen McHugh at 203 Genesee St. to allow the sign to be painted directly on the wall and an area variance 440 square feet of the allowed ten square feet based on the following reasons:

- The area variance will not produce an undesirable change or detriment to the character of the neighborhood or the properties in the neighborhood;
- The benefit sought cannot be attained by a method other than an area variance;
- The area variance is not substantial;
- The area variance will not produce an adverse impact on the environment nor the physical conditions of the neighborhood;
- The applicant's difficulty was not self-created.

Ed Darrow: We have a motion, is there a second?

Deborah Calarco: Second.

Ed Darrow: We have a second, roll call please.

All members vote approval. Motion carried.

Ed Darrow: Congratulations, your variances are approved. Please see Code Enforcement for proper permits before proceeding with any work.

83 Wall St. R2 zoning district. Use variance for social club. Applicant: Bowtak, Inc.

Ed Darrow: 83 Wall St. if you could please approach. Give your name and address and tell us what you'd like to do.

Dan Bouley, N. Hunter Ave: I am president of Bowtak, Inc. whose offices are at 265 Genesee St. Our property located at 83 Wall St. currently operates as a restaurant. It is under a use variance for that, commercial use in a residential area. It is located next to the Neighborhood House. We are seeking a use variance from a restaurant to a social club classification. We had a tenant in there using it as a restaurant for the previous two years. She vacated in May and since May we have tried to lease and sell the property as a restaurant but it's been unsuccessful. We were approached by the Moose Lodge back in October as a potential tenant. In order to get them as a tenant we need to have a use variance for a social club because that's what their classification is. I spoke with Brian in Codes and he led us in that direction. As a result we would be taking less of a rent from them but it would be enough to cover our caring costs for that property.

Ed Darrow: Mr. Hicks, what, I'm not understating the difference between a restaurant and a social club. It seems like the same activities go on in both yet one is a private membership and one is public.

Brian Hicks: That's the biggest item right there. One is a private membership but the other one is open to the public. With that the change in the traffic in the area would be consistent with a social club to stay steady. With the restaurant you have highs and lows. This is a residential neighborhood we have to be concerned with.

Ed Darrow: So wouldn't you think traffic would be less as a social club?

Andy Fusco: Let me interrupt, because he's not the legislative member that passed this law distinguishing these two uses. However in my experience for whatever reason, and I don't disagree with you that it really doesn't seem to make a lot of sense, this is a fairly common provision in zoning ordinances, at least in Cayuga County, that private membership clubs and restaurants aren't allowed in some of the same zones that public clubs and membership organization are allowed in. exactly why that is, I don't necessarily know. I once had a case in the town of Sennett where a private gun club would be a non-permitted use but a public gun club would be a permitted use on the same property. For whatever reason this is a fairly common distinction in the law.

Ed Darrow: So it is black and white, not a lot open for interpretation.

Andy Fusco: Correct. Private and public clubs there is often a distinction in the zoning ordinance. Not only in the City of Auburn but in many places in Cayuga County hence the need for the use variance.

Ed Darrow: Thank you. Never stop learning.

Deborah Calarco: Once this is allowed can it go to another private club? If this private club goes in then the next private club can go in?

Ed Darrow: Once it's this it can't go back to a restaurant.

Andy Fusco: Not necessarily so.

Ed Darrow: They'd have to get a use variance to go back to a restaurant.

Deborah Calarco: Are we falling back into the same question as we had on South St. with the Case Mansion. If one club goes out can any club come back in?

Andy Fusco: I think that the proper way to handle that would be for you to condition your approval tonight, is you're so willing to approve, to condition it upon the Moose and the Moose only. Obviously there are certain private clubs that don't do the kinds of things the Fraternal Order of the Moose do and I can certainly commend your observation in that regard. I did call the Prelate of the local Moose chapter, Don Ryan, he is supportive of this application and so that I think the way to avoid some type of private club that might not fit into that neighborhood is to restrict the relief tonight to the Moose and the Moose only.

Also, before we do that we will have to address SEQR. You have part one filled out before you. Regarding part two it's my recommendation that you answer question one 'no'. Even though there is the conflict with the zoning law that our chairman points out I don't think it's a material conflict so I would answer that no. Regarding question two, arguably the intensity of a private club is less than a restaurant so I would answer that 'no'. Number three, I don't think, in my opinion and I would recommend that you find accordingly, that the proposed use is inconsistent with the quality of that particular neighborhood. I think the applicant indicates the Neighborhood House is just next door and this is a long standing restaurant type use so it's pretty consistent. Number five, I don't think this has any effect on mass traffic or biking or walking so I would recommend you answer that 'no'. Number six, I don't see where this would have any impact on energy so I would recommend that you have an answer of 'no' to that question. Regarding number seven, I would also recommend both A & B be answered no. I don't see where the water or sewer would be any more impacted by this use than the Wall St. tavern or any other use previously there. Number eight, I would also recommend you answer 'no' because according to the circles and squares map of the State of New York there are no aesthetic archeological or architectural resources in need of protection. And regarding number nine, this is not a wetland area so I recommend answering that question 'no'. Number ten, this is not a flood plain area, I recommend answering that question 'no'. Number eleven, I don't see any hazard to environmental resources or human health occasioned by Mr. Bouley's application tonight and I would recommend you answer that 'no' as well. Therefore staff would recommend to the board that you make a determination of a negative declaration, that being no significant findings to the environment.

Ed Darrow: At this time, after reviewing short form SEQR, I would like to put forth a motion of a negative declaration for 83 Wall St. All in favor?

All members vote approval.

Ed Darrow: May the minutes show approved.

We can move forward with any more questions for Mr. Bouley.

Scott Kilmer: This will have a kitchen in it, right?

Dan Bouley: Correct. It currently has a kitchen in it.

Scott Kilmer: Do you know how much the Moose Club would use the kitchen as opposed to a restaurant? Do they use it just for their own? Do they have fund raisers where they would use the kitchen facilities?

Dan Bouley: My understanding is that it's a member and guest only club. They do have two, what they consider public or family, functions throughout the year. Other than that it would just be their own private and internal use. So I think the use of the kitchen would be significantly less than a restaurant.

Scott Kilmer: I've never been to the Moose Club so is it something they would use every day, cooking burgers or something for members and things like that? Would they have a lunch or dinner when members come in?

Dan Bouley: I think they would offer more like a dinner service. They are not open on Sundays.

Scott Kilmer: So the kitchen would probably be used every day but not nearly to the extent that it would be with a restaurant.

Dan Bouley: Correct. If I may add there's no external modification to the property or the building. Any minimal modification would be to just update the inside of the restaurant to meet their specific needs.

Scott Kilmer: Thank you.

Ed Darrow: Mr. Bouley, I have been remiss with one thing. This is a seven member board. There are only four members present this evening, unfortunately. It will take all four yes votes for this to go forward. I would like to give you the option, if you're so inclined, to table until next month when we would hopefully have a full board or you may proceed forward with the four members present. Whichever decision to pick.

Dan Bouley: I'll proceed with the four members.

Ed Darrow: I just wanted to give you that option so that it is on the record. Please proceed. Any other questions? You may be seated sir but we reserve the right to recall you.

Is there anyone present wishing to speak for or against 83 Wall St.? Seeing none and hearing none I shall close the public portion so we may discuss it amongst ourselves.

I think it's a kind of win-win for the neighborhood. If I were next door I'd want it to go to a private club with less traffic. I understand what you're saying, Debbie, something like the Moose, the Eagles, the Elks, something where you know what it is.

Deborah Calarco: That type of private club, yes.

Ed Darrow: Any other thoughts or concerns? If not the chair will entertain a motion.

Scott Kilmer: I'd like to make a motion to approve for Dan Bouley a use variance at 83 Wall St. for the purpose of a social club specific to the Moose Lodge only based on the following criteria:

- The applicant has shown that he cannot otherwise realize a reasonable return on the property unless the use variance is granted and this has been shown by competent financial evidence.
- The hardship shown by the applicant is unique to the subject premises and not general to the neighborhood.
- The use variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood.
- The applicant's hardship is not self-created.

Ed Darrow: We have a motion, do we have a second.

Stephanie DeVito: Second.

Ed Darrow: We have a second. Roll call please.

All members vote approval.

Ed Darrow: Sir, your use variance has been approved. See Code Enforcement for any permit before work begins.

72 Owasco St. C1 zoning district. Area variance for year yard buffer. Applicant: D & L Truck Stop, Louis Vasile.

Ed Darrow: 72 Owasco St. please approach. Give your name and address for the record.

Lou Vasile, 72 Owasco St.

Ed Darrow: Mr. Vasile, I want to remind you that it's a seven member board and only four of us are present. It would take all four 'yes' votes in order for your variances to go through. Should there be one 'no' vote your variances would be denied and it would take substantial change for you to be able to reapply. Would you still like to go forward and present or would you like to table until January when there's a full board?

Lou Vasile: No, I don't see any reason not to proceed.

Ed Darrow: Okay, thank you. Please go ahead, sir.

Mike Palmieri: I'm the architect for the project. We're looking to add an addition, a storage addition to the existing building on the corner of Bradford and Owasco Streets. The property is D & L Truckstop. We've been to Planning Board and we've come here tonight because we're looking for a variance for the east side buffers. We can't meet the 60 foot set-back requirement for buffer. Also the plantings. In lieu of that we're proposing a six foot high wooden fence. The other issue is the parking. We have two parcels here that are separated right now and we're

showing six spaces and we're looking for a variance for the...we're looking for six spaces versus the eight spaces. The two parcels are both same ownership.

Ed Darrow: Mr. Palmieri, one questions. You cannot accommodate a seventh parking spot next to six?

Mike Palmieri: We can, yes.

Ed Darrow: Because we are required by law to give the least amount of variance necessary.

Mike Palmieri: The drawing, there's a bit of a mix up between myself and Steve Selvek (in Planning) that I got the...I was in the...I thought we have to have six versus the eight that Steve had originally when we were doing some design sketches with the Planning Board so that's where the mistake was made. We have no problem adding spaces.

Andy Fusco: Mr. Chairman, if I could be heard on that issue. As a frequent customer of the store, many of the people who use the car wash will come in the direction the arrows are showing on the plan and then will turn approximately 180 degrees in that turning area without ever having to go into reverse because it's wide enough to do that. Were a seventh or eighth parking spot added to the south side of the sixth that would become probably impossible.

Ed Darrow: Makes sense.

The other question; 86 plant units of the 90, that seems a bit much of the planting units. You're putting four of them in.

Andy Fusco: I maybe can address that as well, only because I'm familiar with this as it's been before the Planning Board, which I also staff, a couple of times. The plantings would be up alongside of Bradford St. to delineate that new entrance/exit coming directly off Bradford St. and you can see those, Mr. Chairman, on the drawing. Just to give the board some background as to my understanding of the project. Because the addition, which is the building that is cross hatched on the drawing, constitutes more than 25% of the existing square footage per floor space of the existing building, that triggers site plan approval by the Planning Board and also obviates any pre-existing non-conformity that this perhaps had before because that's a lawn area but there were no plantings there either. The thought of the Design Review Committee and the Police Department was to try to get as many parking spots in the back of the building, the east side of the building, as possible in order to alleviate some of the congestion that can occur in the front of the building, specifically right next to the air hose every time you need to put air in your car and to the north side of the building along Bradford St. So the thought of the Planning Board and the Design Review Committee was to get the cars on the back side to alleviate any potential congestion. To do that and to have a buffer would be impossible.

Ed Darrow: So as this site plan been approved by Planning (Board)?

Andy Fusco: No. All that's been done thus far by Planning (Board) is they've taken a preliminary look at a drawing that was like this. There are a couple changes between what they saw and what you're looking at tonight. But those are mostly on the north side, the Bradford side. They have issued a negative declaration. As you'll recall, Mr. Chairman, we deferred to them. So this has not yet been approved. The Planning Board is looking for either our approval or our denial

tonight before they come up with their final addressing of this. But I can say that the...trying to get parking on the east side of the building was the Planning staffs' idea so, as you can readily see from the drawing, it preempts the ability to have a buffer and really plantings for that matter. That kind of explains to everybody why this is before us and the background that I've heard in the couple meetings the Planning Board has had on this.

Mike Palmieri: What we've done with this addition is basically it's a very congested area. Going up to the front, all the deliveries are made through the front door on the Owasco St. side. At times there's deliveries coming in there, there's people getting gas, people coming in for retail items and there's a lot of congestion. With this building, what it does, if you see the traffic pattern that we show on the plan, all the deliveries are going to be made on the back side of the building. So we're taking all the congestion created at some period of time on the front and we're locating it on the back side of the building so we're creating a better situation for the lot. Like the attorney said, over the 25% created a non-conforming thing that we had to meet with Planning and Zoning. With the addition it really creates a better situation for traffic than it is right now. It's a storage building, it's not going to be retail space. The parking is something that helps alleviate maybe employee parking. And the customers that come into the side of the building...

Ed Darrow: For point of reference are the Owasco St. curb cuts on the plot plan, is that where they are now?

Mike Palmieri: Yes, that's correct.

Lou Vasile: Mr. Chairman, if I may could I show the board a picture?

Ed Darrow: Sure.

Lou Vasile: *Shows picture of delivery truck that usually come in and the congestion it causes.*

Ed Darrow: Any questions from other board members?

Deborah Calarco: [inaudible] Questions buffer and fence.

Lou Vasile: There's a driveway and probably about ten feet of lawn that would come to our fence. We actually allow them to put the fence along the back of the car wash and we also gave that landlord permission to take down three trees which would probably in this situation now be a good thing but it's too late.

Ed Darrow: Any other questions? You may be seated Mr. Vasile. Is there anyone present wishing to speak for or against 72 Owasco St. Please approach. Give your name and address for the record.

Tom Fraher, Mottville Rd. Skaneateles: My wife and I own the property right behind Vasiles at 4 Bradford St. Two years ago we put a ton of money into the worst looking house on the street and unfortunately I had to come here tonight to know what was going on. When I just listened to Mr. Vasile talking, I listened to Mike talk, this is the first I know about it. I don't know if I feel that it is doing me an injustice or not. But I'm here to say that if it is I just want what's right. I really am at odds at what is going on, I don't really understand it as we're talking right now. I know if it's right on top of me that it's going to affect the value of the property that I've had for 20 years

and two years ago we made a concerted effort to make it, I feel, one of the best taken care of houses on the street. Now we get a better grade of tenants and no complaints from the neighbors. With that in mind I didn't know I had to have permission if the fence is on Mr. Vasile's land? Whatever's there we'll take it down. That's not a problem. I went to Codes and they told me with the fence I didn't know I had to get permission. I went to Codes to see what to do with the fence. But if there's a problem with my fence...this conversation's taking longer than it'll take to get the fence down.

Ed Darrow: I'm not sure and I'm not sure if you're sure...

Tom Fraher: I'm concerned...I don't know what's going on?

Ed Darrow: Would you like to see the plans?

Tom Fraher: Yes I would.

Andy Fusco: Do we want to take a five minute recess?

Ed Darrow: Yes, we'll take a five minute recess.

Andy Fusco: So Mr. Palmieri can explain this.

*****Recess*****

Ed Darrow: We're going to reconvene. Does that help you at all, sir?

Tom Fraher: I have no problem with this.

Ed Darrow: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Is there anyone else present wishing to speak for or against 72 Owasco St.? Seeing none and hearing none I shall close the public portion so we may discuss it amongst ourselves.

Thoughts?

Scott Kilmer: Two things. I think it's a good use of the property as right now it's just an empty lot and I think it's going to be good for the business. He's not using it for retail space, it's pretty much for storage. And I'm also glad Mr. Fraher doesn't have an issue with it. It's always nice to consider what the neighbors think as well.

Ed Darrow: The neighbor is important whether he lives there or not. That's very important. And I can firsthand appreciate the parking out back as I myself use this store often. You never know where to park up front, you don't want to interfere with the gas pumps, you don't want to interfere with the propane, you don't want to get in the way. I think it's much needed.

Scott Kilmer: I was just asking Brian about the 86 plan units they want a variance on and it's better to put that fence between the parking spaces and Mr. Fraher's because the plant units won't...the headlights are going to go through if there's night time parking there.

Ed Darrow: I think the fence is better as well.

Scott Kilmer: Considering the way the site plan is developed...

Ed Darrow: That's one thing where I think we fall short. A lot of times, unfortunately, we don't know why and what Planning is thinking on a lot of reasons on why they are doing some of these things. Where Counsel's insight was very helpful in some of these as to why some of these were on there that way which made it a lot more understandable why those specific things were done and were done in that reason.

Scott Kilmer: On paper some of these requirements look great but when you take a specific site they just don't work.

Ed Darrow: Exactly. Everything works and you can see why Mr. Palmieri has everything where it is because it's there for a reason.

Deborah Calarco: It's best for everyone.

Ed Darrow: I agree completely. If there is no more discussion the chair will entertain a motion. I don't think there's a need to separate them.

Scott Kilmer: I'd like to make a motion to grant Mr. Louis Vasile of D & L Truckstop at 72 Owasco St. four area variances:

1. An area variance of 25 feet of the required 60 feet rear buffer;
2. An area variance of nine feet of the required ten feet perimeter strip;
3. An area variance of 86 plant units of the required 90 units for the 51 foot property line;
4. An area variance of two parking spaces of the required eight spaces,

based on the following reasons:

- The area variance will not produce an undesirable change or detriment to the character of the neighborhood or the properties in the neighborhood;
- The benefit sought cannot be attained by a method other than an area variance;
- The area variance is not substantial;
- The area variance will not produce an adverse impact on the environment nor the physical conditions of the neighborhood;
- The applicant's difficulty was not self-created.

Deborah Calarco: Scott, I believe you said 25 but it should be 24.

Scott Kilmer: Number 1? I said 25 feet?

Deborah Calarco: I think so but I just want to make sure.

Scott Kilmer: Okay, an area variance of 24 feet of the required 60 foot rear buffer.

Ed Darrow: We have a motion for four variances, do we have a second?

Deborah Calarco: Second.

Ed Darrow: We have a second. Roll call please.

All members vote approval.

Motion carried.

Ed Darrow: Gentlemen, your variances have been passed. Be sure to see Code Enforcement before beginning any work.

Housekeeping? Do we have anything?

Stephanie DeVito: I'll e-mail you but my address is going to change. It's still in the City but will change after January 1.

Ed Darrow: Okay. And we are off until the 26th of January. See everybody the 26th. Happy Holidays.

Meeting adjourned.

Recorded by Alicia McKeen