

**CITY OF OGDENSBURG  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**APPROVED MINUTES FOR  
JULY 28, 2020**

---

<b>Members Present:</b>	William Flynn (Chairman)*, Patricia Redden Sargent, Malcolm Casselman Chris Lalone, and Alternate Chris Lowery
<b>Members Excused:</b>	Steve Schlieter, excused
<b>Staff Present:</b>	Andrea Smith, Director Planning & Development, Nicole Woods, Code Enforcement Officer

---

ALL RECORDS ARE KEPT ACCORDING TO NYS STATUES BY THE CITY CLERK.

In accordance with Executive Order 202.1 and 202.15 this meeting was held in person at 330 Ford Street and also provided for remote participation using Go To Webinar, Webinar ID 131-232-683. This meeting was recorded and transcripts are available.

\*Mr. William Flynn attended the meeting via webinar as did Ms. Danette Weegar, Justin Weegar and Jodi Regan.

4:31 PM Chairman Flynn called the **Regular Meeting** of the ZBA to order. He noted that this was a meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals and that they would follow an agenda. Chairman Flynn outlined the procedures of the meeting before conducting roll call. He stated that each request would require 3 affirmative votes, a majority of the full 5-member board, for approval.

Ms. Smith conducted rollcall and conducted an audio test for webinar participants.

**1. Approval of previous minutes**

- a. June 23, 2020: Chairman Flynn stated the draft minutes had been submitted and required approval.  
Motion to approve the minutes by Mr. Casselman, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Ms. Redden-Sargent.  
All members voted in support of the motion to approve the minutes as submitted, 5/0.

**2. Correspondence –**

- a. **Ex-Parte Communication** – Mr. Flynn asked the board if there was any ex-parte communication to be disclosed, there was none.
- b. **Written Communication** – Ms. Smith stated that 239-m review was required for 1010 Franklin Street and had been returned for local action with no binding comments (full report attached).

**3. Public Hearing**

- a. Chairman Flynn opened the public hearing on variance request Z-2020-007, 323 Albany Ave 4:34 PM. There were no public comments, the Public Hearing was closed at 4:35 PM.
- b. Chairman Flynn opened the public hearing on variance request Z-2020-008, 1010 Franklin Street 4:35 PM. There were no public comments, the Public Hearing was closed at 4:36 PM.
- c. Chairman Flynn opened the public hearing on variance request Z-2020-009, 201 Paterson Street 4:37 PM. Ms. Jodi Regan stated that she lived adjacent to the property at 201 Paterson Street and had no objection to the proposed variance. There were no additional public comments, the Public Hearing was closed at 4:40 PM.

1  
2 **4. New Business**

3 **a. 323 Albany Ave:** Chairman Flynn asked the Applicant to orally present their request. Ms.  
4 Ladouceur explained that she wanted to enlarge the front porch at the property, extending it across  
5 the front of the house by 9'. She noted that this would provide a 14' setback where 15' is required.  
6 The Chairman inquired if the porch would have a roof, or be covered, the Applicant replied, yes.  
7

8 Mr. Lowery moved to approve the variance as requested relieving the minimum 15' front yard setback in  
9 the City's MDR district, providing for 14' front yard setback to enlarge an existing front porch, second by  
10 Mr. Casselman.

11 No further discussion.

12 Ms. Smith read aloud the resolution as follows:  
13  
14  
15

16 **RESOLUTION**

17  
18 CITY OF OGDENSBURG ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

19  
20 2020-007

21 AREA VARIANCE TMN 59.022-12-29  
22

23 **WHEREAS**, an application has been filed with the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Ogdensburg,  
24 St. Lawrence County, New York ("the Board") seeking a Variance under Table 1 of Chapter 221 entitled  
25 Zoning, where the front yard setback is 15', Applicant requests 14' to enlarge an existing front porch.  
26 Requested by Patricia and Sally Ladouceur, ("Applicant") for 323 Albany Ave., Ogdensburg, New York;  
27 and,  
28

29 **WHEREAS**, the Board, acting on said application, duly advertised in the Watertown Daily Times and sent  
30 written notice to all persons listed in the petition as owning property within 100 feet of the premises in  
31 question and held a virtual public hearing on said application in accordance with COVID-19 Executive  
32 Orders, today, July 28, 2020. All those desired to be heard were heard and their testimony duly recorded  
33 at this hearing; and  
34

35 **WHEREAS**, in accordance with 239-m requirements, the application did not require review by the St.  
36 Lawrence County Planning Offices; and  
37

38 **WHEREAS**, the Ogdensburg Zoning Board Appeals, as Lead Agency conducting SEQR has determined  
39 this a Type II Action under SEQRA pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(17) and is not subject to further  
40 environmental review; and  
41

42 **WHEREAS**, Members of the Board are familiar with TMN 59.022-12-29, and the area in which the  
43 proposed relief of minimum 15' front yard setback is sought; now therefore,  
44

45 **BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Zoning Board of Appeals makes the following Findings of Fact and  
46 Conclusions of Law in this matter:  
47

48 Chairman Flynn asked Ms. Smith to read aloud the findings of fact analysis.  
49

50 Ms. Smith read aloud:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

**FINDINGS OF FACT ANALYSIS**

The standard to be used in the weighing of the benefit to the applicant against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community if the variance is granted. In making its determination, the ZBA must take into account the following factors:

<b>FINDINGS OF FACT ANALYSIS</b>
<p>The standard to be used in the weighing of the <i>benefit to the applicant</i> against the <i>detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community</i> if the variance is granted. In making its determination, the ZBA must take into account the following factors:</p>
<p><b>1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created.</b></p> <p>This test requires the Board to consider such things as the undesirable changes and potential impacts on neighboring property values and character.  <b>Staff Comment:</b> Many of the homes on this block and adjacent blocks have less of a front yard setback than the property/Applicant seeking this variance. The proposed relief is 1’ will not be detrimental to the character of the neighborhood.</p>
<p><b>2. Whether the applicant can achieve his goals via a reasonable alternative which does not involve the necessity of an area variance.</b></p> <p>This test charges the Board to investigate whether there is a reasonable construction or alternative to the proposal the applicant has made. For example, can the structure be placed so the existing zoning regulations would allow such construction without the need for a variance?  <b>Staff Comment:</b> The Applicant has a pre-existing front porch with a 14’ front yard setback. To increase the functionality of the front porch the Applicant is seeking to enlarge the porch, extending it 9’ in a northerly direction parallel with Albany Ave. There are no reasonable alternatives to this request.</p>
<p><b>3. Whether the variance is substantial.</b></p> <p>The third test requires the Board consider how substantial is the variance in physical terms- i.e. to what degree will the regulations be varied.  <b>Staff Comment:</b> The Applicant is seeking 1’ of relief, 14’ where 15’ is required, this is not substantial.</p>
<p><b>4. Whether the variance will have an adverse impact on physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.</b></p> <p>The fourth test requires the Board look closely at the purely physical nature of the proposal. Included here should be questions relating to such elements as drainage, runoff, noise, traffic patterns, access for emergency vehicles, impact on utility services, and effect on any sensitive environmental concerns.  <b>Staff Comment:</b> The proposal to enlarge the existing front porch will not pose any adverse impacts to the neighborhood, or environmental conditions. The porch will increase runoff, but this will be contained within the property boundary and will not impact adjacent properties. There will be no impact on access for emergency vehicles, sightlines for traffic or for ingress and egress from the driveway.</p>
<p><b>5. Whether there has been any self-created difficulty.</b></p> <p>The fifth test requires the Board to assess whether the request for the variance has been triggered by a situation or difficulty which the owner has created himself. If so, the Board must weigh that fact against the owner, but need not (as in the case of the use variance) deny relief altogether.  <b>Staff Comment:</b> The property has been owned by the Applicant since 1974 which predates the City’s present zoning ordinance. However, all current zoning regulations have been in place since 1992, therefore this is a self-created hardship. This alone shall not justify denial.</p>

6

1 Chairman Flynn asked Ms. Smith to read aloud the recommendation from staff.

2  
 3 Ms. Smith read aloud the staff recommendation:  
 4 In balancing the benefit to the Applicant against the detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the  
 5 neighborhood, staff finds that the request will not result in any potentially undesirable impacts, and the  
 6 applicant does not have reasonable alternatives to this request. Therefore, in accordance with NYS  
 7 standards for granting variances staff recommends approval as requested.  
 8

9 No further discussion, Chairman Flynn asked Ms. Smith to call the roll.

Moved:	Lowery				
Second:	Casselman				
<b>VOTE</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Chairman Flynn	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Ms. Redden-Sargent	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Casselman	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Schlieter				X	
Mr. Lalone	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Lowery (alt.)	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.

10  
 11 Based on the above Findings of Fact, and after reviewing the application, sketches and plans at this  
 12 meeting, testimony at the hearings, and other documents submitted by the Applicant, the Board  
 13 determines that the proposed area variance requesting relief of *Table 1 front yard setback* will be  
 14 approved with conditions, 5 y, 0 n, 0 a, 1 ab, the request is approved 5/0.  
 15

16 Ms. Smith explained that the request had been approved providing a 14’ front yard setback. She further  
 17 noted that building permits would be required and could be obtained from the Code Office. She asked if  
 18 the applicant had questions, the Applicant responded no and thanked the board.  
 19

20 **b. 1010 Franklin Street** – Chairman Flynn asked the Applicant to orally present their request. Dr.  
 21 Michele Vondra-Harwood explained that she would like to subdivide her parcel, but cannot  
 22 achieve the required minimum rear yard setback of 20’ in the MDR district. She added that she is  
 23 requesting 10’ where 20’ is required. Ms. Casselman inquired about the structure connecting the  
 24 two buildings and whether or not the Applicant had an issue with demolishing that as part of the  
 25 subdivision. Dr. Harwood explained that the demolition is in motion, but cannot be completed  
 26 until the utility company completes the removal/disconnect of the electric and gas service.  
 27 Otherwise there is no issue, that is part of our plan, she added.

28 Motion by Mr. Casselman to approve the variance with conditions relieving the minimum 20’ rear yard  
 29 setback in the City’s MDR district, providing for 10’ rear yard setback with conditions that the portion of  
 30 the structure connecting the two buildings be demolished as part of the subdivision and variance approval,  
 31 second by Mr. Lowery.

32 Ms. Smith read aloud the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION**

33  
 34

CITY OF OGDENSBURG ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

**2020-008**

AREA VARIANCE TMN 59.023-7-38

**WHEREAS**, an application has been filed with the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Ogdensburg, St. Lawrence County, New York (“the Board”) seeking a Variance under Table 1 of Chapter 221 entitled Zoning, where the rear yard setback is 20’, Applicant requests 10’ to allow for a subdivision. Requested by Michele Vondra-Harwood, (“Applicant”) for 1010 Franklin Street, Ogdensburg, New York; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board, acting on said application, duly advertised in the Watertown Daily Times and sent written notice to all persons listed in the petition as owning property within 100 feet of the premises in question and held a virtual public hearing on said application in accordance with COVID-19 Executive Orders, today, July 28, 2020. All those desired to be heard were heard and their testimony duly recorded at this hearing; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with 239-m requirements, the application did require review by the St. Lawrence County Planning Offices which was returned on June 2020 for local action with no binding comments; and

**WHEREAS**, the Ogdensburg Zoning Board Appeals, as Lead Agency conducting SEQR has determined this a Type II Action under SEQRA pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(17) and is not subject to further environmental review; and

**WHEREAS**, Members of the Board are familiar with TMN 59.023-7-38, and the area in which the proposed relief of minimum 20’ rear yard setback is sought; now therefore,

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Zoning Board of Appeals makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in this matter:

Chairman Flynn asked Ms. Smith to review the findings of Fact.

Ms. Smith read aloud the following:

- 1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created.

This test requires the Board to consider such things as the undesirable changes and potential impacts on neighboring property values and character.

Staff Comment: The proposed subdivision of 1010 Franklin Street between the MDR district and the Business district will create a 10’ rear yard setback for Parcel B (on Canton Street) and a 6’ setback for the remaining Parcel A on Franklin Street. Due to the pre-existing condition the required 20’ setback cannot be achieved and the proposed setback will provide a setback for both parcels that allows for property maintenance and appropriate screening/buffering as required by Table 1 for this subdivision. Therefore, there will be no detriment to nearby properties.

- 2. Whether the applicant can achieve his goals via a reasonable alternative which does not involve the necessity of an area variance.

This test charges the Board to investigate whether there is a reasonable construction or alternative to the proposal the applicant has made. For example, can the structure be placed so the existing zoning regulations would allow such construction without the need for a variance?

1 Staff Comment: Presently, there is 16’ between the rear building walls and therefore the minimum  
 2 20’ setback cannot be achieved without a variance.

3 3. Whether the variance is substantial.

4 The third test requires the Board consider how substantial is the variance in physical terms- i.e. to  
 5 what degree will the regulations be varied.

6 Staff Comment: The Applicant is seeking to provide a 10’ rear yard where 20’ is required but cannot  
 7 be achieved. This is a 50% reduction which is substantial.

8 4. Whether the variance will have an adverse impact on physical or environmental conditions in the  
 9 neighborhood or district.

10 The fourth test requires the Board look closely at the purely physical nature of the proposal. Included  
 11 here should be questions relating to such elements as drainage, runoff, noise, traffic patterns, access  
 12 for emergency vehicles, impact on utility services, and effect on any sensitive environmental  
 13 concerns.

14 Staff Comment: The requested subdivision and subsequent area variance will not result in any  
 15 adverse environmental conditions or sensitive environmental areas. Furthermore, the removal of the  
 16 “connecting building” will be beneficial for improving rear access for emergency vehicles.

17 5. Whether there has been any self-created difficulty.

18 The fifth test requires the Board to assess whether the request for the variance has been triggered by a  
 19 situation or difficulty which the owner has created himself. If so, the Board must weigh that fact  
 20 against the owner, but need not (as in the case of the use variance) deny relief altogether.

21 Staff Comment: This request is self-created, but this alone shall not constitute denial.

22 Ms. Smith read aloud the staff recommendation: In balancing the benefit to the Applicant against the  
 23 detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood, staff finds that the request will not result  
 24 in any potentially undesirable impacts, and the applicant does not have reasonable alternatives to this  
 25 request. Therefore, in accordance with NYS standards for granting variances staff recommends approval  
 26 as with conditions that the portion of the structure connecting the two buildings be demolished as part of  
 27 the subdivision and variance approval.

28 No further discussion, Chairman Flynn asked Ms. Smith to call the roll.

Moved:	Casselman				
Second:	Lowery				
<b>VOTE</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Chairman Flynn	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Ms. Redden-Sargent	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Casselman	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Schlieter				X	
Mr. Lalone	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Lowery (alt.)	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.

30

1 Based on the above Findings of Fact, and after reviewing the application, sketches and plans at this  
2 meeting, testimony at the hearings, and other documents submitted by the Applicant, the Board  
3 determines that the proposed area variance requesting relief of *Table 1 rear yard setback* will be approved  
4 with conditions, 5 yay, 0 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent, the request is approved 5/0.  
5

6 Ms. Smith explained that the request had been approved providing a 10' rear yard setback with conditions  
7 that the connecting structure be demolished. She further noted that building permits would be required for  
8 the demolition and could be obtained from the Code Office. She stated that as for the subdivision, the  
9 application had already been submitted and there was nothing else required at this time. She asked if the  
10 applicant had questions, the Applicant responded no and thanked the board.  
11

- 12 **c. 201 Paterson Street** – Chairman Flynn asked the Applicant to orally present their request. Ms.  
13 Weegar stated that her husband Justin was going to present the request, however due to audio  
14 feedback, the request was presented by Ms. Danette Weegar. Ms. Weegar stated that she was  
15 requested to add 1' in height to their existing fence height of 4'. She stated that Paterson Street is  
16 a truck route and this will provide greater security and privacy to the property. She added that the  
17 property is a corner lot and that while she realizes it doesn't matter, she also noted that they own a  
18 large dog that can presently jump the 4' fence.

19 Motion by Mr. Lowery to approve the variance as requested relieving §221-47 E (b)(2) regarding height  
20 of fences in front yards for Tax Map Parcel 48.071-4-10, providing for a 5' fence where 4' is the  
21 dimensional standard, second by Ms. Redden-Sargent.  
22

23 Ms. Smith read aloud the following resolution:  
24

## 25 RESOLUTION

### 26 CITY OF OGDENSBURG ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

27 2020-009

28 AREA VARIANCE TMN 48.071-4-10

29  
30  
31  
32 **WHEREAS**, an application has been filed with the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Ogdensburg,  
33 St. Lawrence County, New York (“the Board”) seeking a Variance under §221-47 E (b)(2) of Chapter 221  
34 entitled Zoning, where the fence heights may not exceed 4' in front yards, Applicant requests 5'. Requested  
35 by Danette Weegar, (“Applicant”) for 201 Paterson Street, Ogdensburg, New York; and,  
36

37 **WHEREAS**, the Board, acting on said application, duly advertised in the Watertown Daily Times and sent  
38 written notice to all persons listed in the petition as owning property within 100 feet of the premises in  
39 question and held a virtual public hearing on said application in accordance with COVID-19 Executive  
40 Orders, today, July 28, 2020. All those desired to be heard were heard and their testimony duly recorded  
41 at this hearing; and  
42

43 **WHEREAS**, in accordance with 239-m requirements, the application did not require review by the St.  
44 Lawrence County Planning Offices; and  
45

46 **WHEREAS**, the Ogdensburg Zoning Board Appeals, as Lead Agency conducting SEQR has determined  
47 this a Type II Action under SEQRA pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(17) and is not subject to further  
48 environmental review; and  
49

1 **WHEREAS**, Members of the Board are familiar with TMN 48.071-4-10, and the area in which the  
2 proposed relief of §221-47 E (b) (2) is sought; now therefore,  
3

4 **BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Zoning Board of Appeals makes the following Findings of Fact and  
5 Conclusions of Law in this matter:

6 Chairman Flynn asked Ms. Smith to read aloud the findings of fact analysis.

7 Ms. Smith read aloud:

8 **FINDINGS OF FACT ANALYSIS**

9 The standard to be used in the weighing of the benefit to the applicant against the detriment to the health,  
10 safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community if the variance is granted. In making its determination,  
11 the ZBA must take into account the following factors:

12 1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to  
13 nearby properties will be created.

14 This test requires the Board to consider such things as the undesirable changes and potential impacts on  
15 neighboring property values and character.

16 Staff Comment: The proposed fence height of 5' where an existing 4' fence is existing will not  
17 substantially change the character of the neighborhood, nor will it be a detriment to nearby property  
18 owners, there is no increase in shadowing for adjacent property owners.

19 2. Whether the applicant can achieve his goals via a reasonable alternative which does not involve the  
20 necessity of an area variance.

21 This test charges the Board to investigate whether there is a reasonable construction or alternative to the  
22 proposal the applicant has made. For example, can the structure be placed so the existing zoning  
23 regulations would allow such construction without the need for a variance?

24 Staff Comment: The Applicant could utilize planting on the inside of the existing fence to provide greater  
25 privacy and security without the need for a variance, however that would effectively further reduce the  
26 size of the rear yard that is already nonconforming within the district and may increase shade and  
27 shadowing for adjacent parcels.

28 3. Whether the variance is substantial.

29 The third test requires the Board consider how substantial is the variance in physical terms- i.e. to what  
30 degree will the regulations be varied.

31 Staff Comment: The Applicant seeks to increase the height of an existing 4' fence to 5', an increase in 1'  
32 where 4' is the maximum allowed. This is a 25% increase from the current condition and is not  
33 substantial.

34 4. Whether the variance will have an adverse impact on physical or environmental conditions in the  
35 neighborhood or district.

36 The fourth test requires the Board look closely at the purely physical nature of the proposal. Included here  
37 should be questions relating to such elements as drainage, runoff, noise, traffic patterns, access for  
38 emergency vehicles, impact on utility services, and effect on any sensitive environmental concerns.

39 Staff Comment: As noted by the Applicant the proposed fence height does not obstruct lines of sight at  
40 the adjacent intersection of Paterson and Washington Streets, nor does the request prohibit or restrict  
41 access for emergency vehicles, utilities, or adversely impact environmental features.

42 5. Whether there has been any self-created difficulty.

43 The fifth test requires the Board to assess whether the request for the variance has been triggered by a  
44 situation or difficulty which the owner has created himself. If so, the Board must weigh that fact against  
45 the owner, but need not (as in the case of the use variance) deny relief altogether.

46 Staff Comment: As noted by the Applicant, this is a self-created hardship, but this alone shall not  
47 constitute denial.

48  
49 Ms. Smith read aloud the staff recommendation:  
50



1 In balancing the benefit to the Applicant against the detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the  
 2 neighborhood, staff finds that the request will not result in any potentially undesirable impacts, and the  
 3 applicant does not have reasonable alternatives to this request. Therefore, in accordance with NYS  
 4 standards for granting variances staff recommends approval as requested.

5  
 6 No further discussion, Chairman Flynn asked Ms. Smith to call the roll.

Moved:	Lowery				
Second:	Redden-Sargent				
<b>VOTE</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Chairman Flynn	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Ms. Redden-Sargent	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Casselman	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Schlieter				X	
Mr. Lalone	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.
Mr. Lowery (alt.)	X				I agree with the findings of fact and staff recommendation.

7  
 8 Based on the above Findings of Fact, and after reviewing the application, sketches and plans at this  
 9 meeting, testimony at the hearings, and other documents submitted by the Applicant, the Board  
 10 determines that the proposed area variance requesting relief §221-47 E (b)(2) will be approved, 5 y, 0  
 11 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent, the request is approved 5/0.

12  
 13 Ms. Smith explained that the request had been approved. She further noted that building permits would be  
 14 required and could be obtained from the Code Office. She asked if the applicant had questions, the  
 15 Applicant responded no and thanked the board.

16  
 17 **5. Old Business** – Mr. Lowery stated that the Board had not addressed the need to excuse Mr.  
 18 Schlieter at the outset of the meeting. Ms. Smith stated Mr. Schlieter had noted at the last meeting  
 19 that we would be unable to attend in July. There was consensus of the Board to excuse Mr.  
 20 Schlieter, 5/0.

21  
 22 **6. Member Comment** – Mr. Flynn inquired about future meetings using the virtual platform. There  
 23 was discussion about the current Executive Orders and Ms. Smith replied that she would be  
 24 continuing to monitor the guidance from the state and expected that the supplemental use of the  
 25 webinar for board members, applicants and the public would continue. Further discussion ensued  
 26 regarding the audio and it was agreed that the Board would start the meeting 5 minutes early and  
 27 do an audio test of each microphone for Board members attending in person.

28  
 29 **7. Adjournment** –  
 30 Motion by Mr. Casselman to adjourn the meeting was made, second by Ms. Redden-Sargent.  
 31 **Vote** – The board voted in favor 5/0, meeting adjourned at 5:29 PM.

32  
 33  
 34 **NEXT MEETING DATE:** August 25, 2020 at 4:25 PM