

DRAFT
YATES COUNTY PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
FOR
DECEMBER 10, 2009

PRESENT: Jim Ritter, Kevin North, Jerry Stape, Judy Wiltberger, Dave Christiansen; Lane Clute; Ron Rubin; Alan Snyder; Sandra King; Charles Mitchell; and John Sawers.

Others present: Andy Kaarsgard; Matt and Sandy Downey; Fran Dumas; Joe Gibson; LouJane Johns; Amanda Folts; Mark Morris; John Griffin, Sarah Purdy, County Administrator, and Shawna Bonshak, County Planner.

The meeting began at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Christiansen noted that there were two corrections made at the last meeting, one in which he was credited wrongly for going to Bath which was corrected, but the other correction was that Mr. Clute shouldn't have been credited for the other correction. Shawna noted that Mr. Skeet was listed as having spoken, but was not present. It should simply just state that Mr. Skeet was present at the meeting.

Ron Rubin made the motion to approve the minutes with the corrections. Lane Clute seconded the motion. All in favor.

GML 239 REFERRALS:

2009-64- Erick Falck, Route 14 & Upton Point Road, Town of Starkey. Special Use Permit/Site Plan approval to construct a winery with a retail store, production room, kitchen and eating area.

Shawna reported that this referral will be coming back for the site plan, because it went through Soil and Water, but there are really no plans on this yet. We can look at it as a special use permit, but not as a site plan. The motion should say that it should come back.

Mr. Ritter stated that this is zoned resort/residential but that is only because there's a few areas that used to be farmland and they used Route 14 to divide resort/residential from the agricultural. It is still a long way from the lake.

Sandra King made a motion to approve the application for a special use permit for Erick Falck for a winery contingent upon the Town granting the special use that he forwards us with the complete packet, such as the site plan. Alan Snyder seconded the motion. All in favor.

2009-65 – Cardinal Disposal, 635 Shannon Corners Road, Town of Starkey. Modification of existing Special Use Permit to add a climate-controlled storage building at 36' X 80'.

The applicants stated that they currently have a shop where they do climate control storage in the winter for Dundee Foods; this could be dependent upon what they do with some of their other options. They basically need a spot to warm up the product to about 90 degrees for a few days in order to liquefy it because when it comes across on the ship it is in a buttery state or semi-solid. It thickens right up, so they need a place for about 3 months to be able to warm it up and then pump into their tanks so they can bottle it and send to a bulk station. This would allow them to obtain current operations in order to do maintenance on trucks, etc. This would be a 36 X 80 addition that would look just like the original truss design. At the south end, there would be garage doors with power openers. If it doesn't end up being used for heating, they can still use it for fixing their equipment. It has a 4-12 pitch, which would match. The entire barn would be recoated with a new tin roof and all.

Sandra King made a motion that the Yates County Planning Board has determined that this proposed action only has considerations which are of significance to the Town of Starkey. This action appears to have no significant countywide or inter-community impact. This falls back on the Town of Starkey and the Code Enforcement ensures everything is at state specifications. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion. All in favor.

2009-66 – Matt and Sandy Downey, Old Lake Road, Town of Starkey; Special Use Permit/Site Plan approval to construct Magnus Winery (Winery/Tasting Room).

Shawna distributed a memo relating to this referral from the Office of Soil and Water.

The architect, Andy Kaarsgard and their engineer stated that they have been growing grapes (57 acres down the road on the right hand side by the bridges) , and they recently purchased 16 acres just south of Rock Stream Road. They started clearing that for grape vines for next year. The 16 acre parcel plan in front of everyone represents the master plan for the overall site which is a wine tasting building of approx. 6000 sq. ft. Directly to the north of that is the winery building and behind that the refreshment area. The site currently exists with two ponds and they are proposing a new series of three ponds as part of the overall site. There are two ponds down near Route 14 which is part of the storm water management plan and the overall swift and if there are questions specific to those items, Rudy would handle those questions. In the future, with their four year plan, they would be staking off future uses such as cottages and overnight stays as part of the project. They are now focusing on the portion of the property and in the center is the phasing plan deeper in the package which is basically proposing the wine tasting building and the ponds as well as storm water management as well as septic for 2010. In 2011, the plan is to add more agricultural areas to the west of the first phase of the project and in 2012 plans are to put in a winery building and then if everything goes right, in 2014 they will be back to talk about some cottages.

Kevin North said it sounds like they have a pretty good idea of the various stages they would be going through. Rudy, their engineer, stated that the two ponds along the road are part of the storm water management plan. There will be permanent pools of water that meet the DEC requirements and as the bigger storms hit the place it will rise up and you may see water in between the two, so it becomes one big pond instead of two small ones and it flows out through the outlet control structure. The outlet

control structure is just a concrete structure with a hole in it that will control the storm events before they get to the State DOT right-of-way. The State DOT Right-of-way has a pipe that goes down the center of Route 14 and they use that as their control. There are three watersheds; the two ponds at the top set a barrier for everything that comes across Old Lake Road. There is a lot of water that comes from across Old Lake Road and there's a high point that sheds water and makes it go down the edge of the property. What they are building is in the watershed. It is conservatively designed and meets the state's standards. They tried to limit it to one place. They would have loved to use them as storm water ponds, but didn't quite take into account the whole watershed. He noted he talked to Soil and Water Conservation and they are happy with their submission. There were a few issues with line types, etc. Mr. Christiansen asked if the ponds next to the building were there now. The answer was no. He then asked what would feed the pond – the springs? Rudy said there is a slight depression that runs into the culvert that takes up some water. Sandra King asked how they fill the ponds with water; are there springs there to maintain them or how will they get the water into those ponds when they do not exist there now. They said their initial thoughts were to tap off the other ponds and fill the others. The two are continuously fed and when it overflows there is a spillway that overflows to the other spot. They have proposed dry hydrants there for fire protection.

It was then asked if the grapes that are being grown now are for sale right now or did they just start out as a hobby. It was noted that they have a small farm winery license and existing property $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile up the road. They are just getting started there. They planted the grapes in 2005 and then in 2008-09 they started coming in. It was then asked if they have a unique type of grape or a different type of wine being produced. It was stated that they would like to add a type of grape that is not grafted so they don't have to hill up to create any extra erosion. They are sensitive about that.

Mr. Rubin stated that there are a lot of wineries that currently exist and they are obviously putting a lot of thought into this. They are trying to create some type of a wine destination. This looks a bit different than the other wineries. They will have a lot of picnic areas, where a lot of wineries have stone drives and you go into a metal building and taste the wine and then walk out. Andy has designed something fairly unique for their area – there's a path growing through the vineyards so you can see the different types of grapes and they will have a room to eventually put a theatre in to have an educational aspect of the process of growing and making wines and they will be able to tour through the different buildings. There will also eventually be a café. They are trying to create more of an experience than just a place to go and taste wine. They want their customers to come and stay for awhile and really experience the grape country. Overall, this is sized up for approximately 20,000 gallons of wine per year. It would not be a large winery, but they aren't exactly spring chickens either. They started in 2002 one step at a time, such as clearing the land, putting the grapes in and processing them and this is the next evolution in their process. That is why they are phasing it in, to be able to grow into it and see how it goes.

Sandra King said her interpretation is that they are trying to make this more of a family experience where people would come and spend more than a time to just taste wine and jumping into a limo and going to another. They are trying to promote a whole different way of looking at these wineries. She then asked if there will eventually be a game plan to rent out cottages. The Downey's stated that they

would like to get people to stay and learn some of processes of pruning grapes, etc. They have the parking areas designed so that people can pull directly into the vineyards and look directly at the vines.

Mr. Christiansen said one issue that Soil and Water had questioned was with the silt fencing and they also recommend additional intermediate fencing. It was noted that this has been addressed; there is silt fencing. They have a set of silt fence along the edge and one along the DOT's right-of-way and they will add one by the ponds. It was then asked if there would be more than one acre disturbed during the phase. The answer was yes, but not more than five. They won't need the five acre permit, just the one.

Mr. Stape asked how much room is between the driveway and the retention ponds. It was noted that there is probably about 32 ft., and then it widens out. The direction of rows will be the other way, but today the grapes are all picked by hand and they will probably continue to do that versus by machine.

Sandra King asked how many people would be employed. Initially, they are targeting 4-6 employees to handle that, but during busy times they would probably have to increase to about 12.

Dave Christiansen made a motion to approve this referral. Sandra King seconded the motion. All in favor.

Sandra King stated she would like to commend the Downey's, in that they are doing a tremendous amount of good for the Town and they have done a very professional job on their presentation and wished them luck.

2009-67 – Chris Iverson w/ Chrisantha Inc., 120/130 Water Street (Birkett Mills), Village of Penn Yan. Site Plan approval to renovate existing site to include interior and exterior rehabilitation of buildings, addition of boardwalk/docks, landscaping, lighting and parking upgrades.

Shawna reported that we have received a memo from the Office of Soil and Water on this.

Fran Dumas asked if the SEQR that is included as a short form is the only SEQR they are going to have to do. Both of these buildings are on the National Register and they are accepting the tax credit, so even if they weren't on the national register they would still have to do a Type 1 form. It was noted that they are proposing a substantial change. If they are accepting public money that goes with inside and outside interior and exterior, a short form should not be used. Jim Ritter said he thought the SEQR was basically for new construction on the ground and this is all there. Fran said these are substantial historic structures and both of them are on the national register; one of them (at 130 Water Street) is the only remaining Crooked Lake Analogy structure. She noted that in the back of the building there is a trap door. The canal used to run underneath the building and the trap door was opened up and used for loading boats. They are proposing a big change to that very historically significant area. She said they are going to have to do a long SEQR. Mr. Christiansen said he didn't see anything of this nature mentioned when they came to discuss the funding that is coming into the county for these buildings. The floors are 7 ft. and he believes they are required to be 8 ft. if they are going to turn them into apartments. He noted he didn't see anything referring to that in this plan. Mr. Stape said he believes it's just under 8 ft. Shawna said right now the focus for this application is on the site as they

reconfigure; it is really just for the parking area, the retaining wall, the board walk and the facade changes, but not the interior. Mr. Christiansen said maybe we aren't addressing that, but that could make a big impact on the outside. It is pretty hard to change the interior when you're not changing the exterior. He then said he believes at the time they said the floors were 7 ft. Mr. Ritter said that on the one building they were going to turn 8 floors into 7.

Shawna noted that this will be through public funding. She then stated that in reference to the SEQR, the Restore New York application requires that they address that. What we are looking at now is the short form, which is applicable to the actual parking and the site modifications here. Fran Dumas then said that if the retaining wall is part of the site plan, then that is pretty significant. She said that according to the plan, they are basically blacking out the facade according to his plan and to do that, he has laid out the stone retaining walls back there and the building is kind of built into the bay. Jerry Stape asked Fran if she knows where the old stone retaining wall is that they are going to remove. Shawna stated she was out there this week. Fran said that they are removing the railroad track. They are proposing to sort of smooth out the back of the building in a kind of a curve and right now there are retaining walls into the bank. Jim said that the one he is looking at is between the buildings where they are talking about removing the existing building and retaining wall. Shawna said that is from the newer warehouse where they are taking off the little jut. They are proposing to take that off. Right now you can drive in and go down a little bank. If you drive in where it says proposed van access you can drive in. They are going to berm it up and put in a retaining wall and block the access and make a parking lot. Ron Rubin asked if they also included another project – can this one go ahead on its own without the one at the end of Water Street right on Liberty. Jim said they were all separate. Ron asked if the total money is inclusive of the other. Jim said they can divide the money up the way they want to. This can go ahead regardless that nothing else happens.

Fran asked why this is a complete application without a SEQR. Shawna said there is a SEQR. It is a short form SEQR. SHPO is part of the Restore New York. They obviously have to work with SHPO. Fran said she understands this and realizes the Board is only considering the site plan, but she doesn't see how we can talk about the site plan without taking the SEQR into consideration. Fran said she realizes this has to go through every board the Village has and it hasn't yet. The planning board cancelled their meeting this week to wait for the County Board's opinion.

Sandra asked if there was a full-blown SEQR done for this project originally or is the short form SEQR the only one done for this project. Shawna said they had to go through this process with the storm water application, so they fulfilled everything they needed to do. It wasn't a full blown SEQR but he had to identify the SEQR with the application and now this is a separate application. This has nothing to do with his Restore New York funding. The Village decided that they would do a short form and that was their Board's decision. They came to the conclusion that it had no further impacts, so it would be up to this Board. The lead agency will go through and determine whether it needs to go on. Fran said this is the first time it has been submitted. If the lead agency doesn't approve it, then they will have to do a different SEQR.

Ron asked if we are responsible for determining whether there is sufficient parking for the number of apartments that are being put in. Shawna said they do meet the required parking. The village would have final control of the parking. At the top of the site plan are their requirements. There are 26 spaces for the office and they need 38 spaces altogether. Jim said that must meet the code that they have in the Village. A lot of people in a building like that won't have a car, which is an advantage of living downtown.

Sandra King asked who would be the lead agency on this. Shawna said it could be the Village Board or the Planning Board. Sandra said this all falls on the Village of Penn Yan to regulate their officers. Jim said that when you put the historic part in, we don't know anything about the historic part of the village. Sandra said the building is sitting there empty rotting away and falling down and at least this is an attempt to do something regardless of opinions of where the funding comes for it. Jim said he's just happy to see something happening this quickly. They haven't wasted any time doing this.

Kevin made a motion to approve what was submitted to us. Sandra King seconded the motion. All in favor.

2009-68 – E. B. Martin, 2845 State Route 364, Town of Benton. Special Use Permit to construct an 80' x 26' storage building.

John Griffin stated that they would like to start on this building in the spring. Mr. Christiansen asked if there are any problems with this. John said he hasn't done the planning check on this, but he doesn't see any major problems with it.

Sandra King stated that Mr. Martin has a successful business and does a wonderful job at promoting an ongoing business in this tough economy, and made a motion that the Yates County Planning Board has determined that this proposed action only has considerations which are of significance to the Town of Benton. This action appears to have no significant countywide or inter-community impact. She noted that this should be handled by the code enforcement officer to make sure that this is brought up to state speculations. Ron Rubin seconded the motion. 10 members were in favor. Mr. Stape abstained from the deliberation and the vote.

2009-69 – Mark Martin, 1540 Route 14A, Town of Benton. Special Use Permit to operate an excavating business from site to include the storage of equipment and materials.

Mr. Griffin stated that Mr. Martin has been running this business for quite awhile, so he is just bringing him in for a special use permit. He basically just has a dump truck, excavator and a bull dozer, etc. Mr. Rubin asked if this business has been located at a different location other than his home. Mr. Griffin noted that Mr. Martin lives at this location and he is expanding a bit. He had been working for another excavator business, basically bought some equipment and now he has been brought in to get the special use permit to operate out of that location. He is quite a distance off the road. Mr. Stape asked if the property line is located that far away from the road. Mr. Griffin noted that the property line is over beyond 30 behind his existing barns and structures. Mr. Griffin said on 14A it goes in and out because of a gully and a lot of different reasons. Mr. Stape said he thought the property line went to the middle of

the road. John said there's a setback. It is denoting the right-of-way. Mr. Stape said normally you pay taxes to the center of the road. John said all setbacks are from out of the state right-of-way. It varies from place to place. On certain county roads they are consistent, but not on all of the roads.

Mr. Rubin made a motion to approve this referral. Mr. Christiansen seconded the motion. 10 members were in favor. Mr. Stape abstained from the deliberation and the vote.

2009-70 – Town of Middlesex. This application has been withdrawn.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Shawna distributed the new meeting schedule for 2010. This has been sent out to the municipalities. She did put an extra meeting in November because of Christmas in December. Jim said it just makes it hard for people to have a meeting the first of the month. Shawna said that if we want to do the 16th versus the 9th of December we could do that. Everyone agreed to that. That gives the villages until the 7th to get their applications into us.

Doug Skeet stated that he had attended a meeting in Geneva on December 7th. He noted that we have all attended these workshops and wonder why we wasted three hours. This workshop was different. He distributed the agenda from that meeting and noted that these people were extremely knowledgeable and knew how to present to a group. Half of those who attended were farmers and half were appointed people and they had an agenda there that touched something for everyone. He said the meeting was broken into 1/3rds. The first 1/3rd was on legal issues. He said they have an office in Penn Yan and in Rochester. It was in two parts – one was on the importance of setting up farms in terms of limited liability for the family farm. Most farms are partnerships; but they used the example of having a U-pick farm and a tractor runs over a child. There is a lawsuit that goes beyond the liability of your farm. You're putting your land, farm, and house at risk where it is possible to set your farming operation up in terms of a limited liability – a self entity. You limit the assets that are going into that entity and it is the entity that is doing the farming. It is that entity that the lawsuit would go against that protects your house, your land, your farm and equipment. They emphasize these funds for doing that and very few people; are doing that. It protects you as the owner. He noted that the speaker did an excellent job of explaining that. He noted that when Edward was talking about the planning for passing your farm on and for setting up whether it should be a corporation or limited liability – some farms are corporations. There you are getting taxed double because you pay your corporate tax and when you take the income off you have to pay tax on the income to each person. That is a real problem. Doug said wouldn't go into all of the details, but he does have the materials if anyone wants to take them and copy them. Kevin said there was a lot to absorb at this workshop. Doug said the planning and the taxation for the farms was the first 1/3rd. The middle part of the meeting was on putting your land on a land trust and purchasing the development rights – an extremely complicated process, but these farmers spoke and Dale Hullings was the first one in Yates County that has turned his farm and land over. By selling his development rights he saved a lot of money – he is farming and now it's going to be preserved for his children. He is the third generation. Dave Christiansen said eminent domain can take precedence over that. It is green forever with the exception of eminent domain and that is something

we have to watch in this state. Eminent domain is not just for public, but private as well. Dave reported that Andy from Finger Lakes Land Trust was a good speaker, and very knowledgeable and helpful. Some of these processes will take four years to go through in terms of the government and in terms of lawyers and working it out with your own family about the land trust. In other cases they talked about the process taking 11 months, so each situation is different. The farmers spoke very supportive of it and it gave them a piece of mind - a peace of mind knowing what was going to happen in the future to their farm and not getting priced out with taxes.

The last 1/3rd of the meeting was of elected town people from Amherst and Livingston County speaking about the rules, the regulations, the zoning and the recommendations of the zoning that are in their particular town and to help this process along. Livingston County has the largest percentage of land in the county protected in NYS and they have been very aggressive about that.

Sandra King asked if they have to get permission from someone to put their land in the Land Trust. Mr. Christiansen said that Peter Landre worked long and hard with Dale Hullings when he set his up. Sandra asked if that would go before this board if someone wanted to do this. It was noted that it actually ends up going through the State. The county does not have too much involvement with the resolution of endorsement from the County Legislature. Shawna said there are two distinctions – The Hallings got to purchase the development rights, so they actually got paid for the development rights versus conservation easement which is almost like a donation. It was noted that Cooperative Extension is working on two other applications.

Mr. Stape asked where this money comes from; it was noted it comes from state taxes. But it's preserving the agricultural land. There are three or four more farms in process in Yates County. Jim said there is a requirement that you are in an area that will either be developed for housing, etc. You have to be someplace where it makes sense to buy the rights. It would be up to the Local Government to determine that. They are protecting the view or the development along 14A where the Village is liable to expand out. Mr. Stape asked if there is a size limit. Shawna said there is probably a minimum, but not a maximum. Shawna said there is a pretty substantial application to fill out and every site is rated and a few are selected and sent to the state and then the state will decide. Not only is it our county that is submitting, it is the whole state. Upstate hasn't really been well represented. The largest piece is along Long Island.

OLD BUSINESS:

None.

MEMBER REPORTS:

Sandra King noted that she had missed the meeting where the Board discussed what was going to be referred to the County Planning Board from the Towns. Shawna stated that she distributed an exemption agreement that we have with the municipalities which was in the packet. There is also a spreadsheet of three different counties. The task was to look through each of the spreadsheets and decide what we would want to include or revamp. Sandra King said one of the questions was – is it a

fact that the state law mandates that if a project involves NYS agricultural district that it has to come to the County Planning Board. Shawna said no. That is one of the exemptions. Sandra asked if each Town has to have an agreement with the county planning board as far as what they want and what is to be referred. Shawna said it's not a requirement, but it's something that we have done with each municipality. Sandra said that in the Town of Potter they are very concerned with a lot of the stuff and they are reading the minutes and so much of the stuff coming to us has no countywide impact and its going back to the towns and it's a waste of the time for the people that are here doing it. Wineries are fine – they have a legitimate impact, but the individuals or even like E.B. Martin who is just expanding his business do not have a legitimate impact. The Town of Potter feels it is something that should be handled at the town level and shouldn't have to come here and require that the people wait another 30 days in order to be able to move ahead on the plans and the Town of Potter wants to know what they need to do with the county so they don't have to send all this stuff up here when they should be handling it and it should be just handled by the Town. Shawna said there is an exemption agreement, but there are not a lot of items that can be exempt. There's minor things, side and setback variances, fences, signage, simple family residences, site plans. Sandra asked where it's written down as far as to what is required to come to county. Shawna said it's in the state law and said she could give a copy to her, but she has also provided the towns with it. Sandra said there are a lot of contradictions on what should and shouldn't come to the county planning board. We want to streamline our process in our town and we're going through and revamping our zoning, etc. so that they can streamline the process so we are not holding people up. Sandra then said there's far too much bureaucracy and they want to make these changes, but they don't want to then be inhibited by the county. Shawna said a lot of it is state law and there is no way we can get around it, but we can look at the exemption agreement and see what it says. There's going to be a lot of things that can't be taken off. This exemption agreement is in place with each town. We had a model exemption agreement to go by. They are pretty much all the same that each municipality approved with the Board and then Jim signed it. Sandra asked if they can come up with an agreement that would exempt some of these things from having to come to the County Planning Board. Can a new agreement be done so that so much of this stuff doesn't have to come here? There are so many things that we send back to the town because they have no county impact. She said she understands it's required by state law, but maybe we need to look at how we can change some of that. Kevin said if it's a state law, it's a state law. Sandra said that is what we have state legislators for and who does the Government work for? We don't work for the Government. They work for us. If there's a problem with the laws then we need to reach out to our representatives and express a concern and change it. The NYS ABC law has been drastically changed and re-written because there was a huge problem that almost put businesses out of business and the law was changed and we got our legislators to make the changes. If there are problems with all these things and so much bureaucracy, we should try to streamline this to promote it. We're losing a business here in this village. What are we doing to promote businesses and not inhibit businesses? Government is in the way and that is what the Town of Potter is trying to do – change that and allow people to be able to operate and do businesses and there's so much bureaucratic red tape in the way. She asked how we could go about cutting through some of this red tape. The Town of Potter's planning board wants to do something to change it.

Judy Wiltberger said she could use some clarification on exactly what impacts the county and what doesn't. It seems vague. She said she is not sure where the lines are drawn either and doesn't know if it's written up somewhere. Shawna said she doesn't know if there's clear guidelines and can look into it, but her personal feeling is that maybe there are things that we say don't have a countywide impact, but do. Kevin said that there are so many individuals that make a living by doing this. Dave Christiansen said he believes that we may not be wording our statement right. It may have an impact, but each county has their own guidelines and we are referring back to their guidelines. We should word it that way, rather than saying it does not have a countywide impact. Jerry agreed there is definitely a grey line there. Just like on Rte. 364 there could be an impact because of water drawn off. There are different issues that could make an impact. Sandra said that is what the Towns are supposed to do. We have all these bureaucracies in place to follow up and look into those things. Sandra said again, that is something we may need to reach out and change. If there is, in fact, all these requirements, maybe we need to review those and reach out to Winner or Bacalles. We are not the only county and the only towns that are running into this. Sandra said there are big projects that are coming in that we need to spend time on, and not just small things that the town guidelines and the town can handle the regulations and the things that need to be done. She said the Town of Potter is looking for some guideline because they want to streamline things so it's easier for people to come before them and do things. Fran said that as a county, this board also has to look at the impact it may have on the Towns. Those kinds of inter-municipal things very much fall within this board. You don't necessarily want the Town of Potter doing its thing without reference to the municipalities that surround it and that is one of the real important things that this Board needs to look at. Countywide impact, yes, there is a lot of that and there is also a lot of inter-municipal impact and the same motion covers both those aspects of each allocation. Sandra said the Town Planning Board is not in disagreement at all. They have no problems with referring things that will impact the County, but when they have to refer an addition to a porch because it's on a county high and now you have to hold these people up from granting them their special use permit or granting them their variance because of that when it's something that can be handled completely by the Town and has no impact on any adjacent town or the county. Fran asked if that is one of the things that is exempt. Shawna said it could be if it's a front setback variance. Jim said those are the things we tried to get exempt before. The businesses should still come here. Dave said maybe we should review that so the townships are aware of that. Jim said we run into these things a lot, so we send them back because they need to figure out what they want to do. Doug Skeet said this is a good checkpoint and we've sent a lot of stuff back telling them what has been missed. We have caught a lot of mistakes. Shawna stated that she can redistribute the exemption list so that we can relook it. Jim stated that we didn't exempt everyone the same, they each chose what they wanted exempted.

NEW BUSINESS:

Sarah Purdy introduced Mark Morris who will be sitting on the Legislature starting January 1st. He has taken the time to come and join us this evening.

ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.