

**CAUCUS PRIOR TO STRONGSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING &  
BUILDING CODE APPEALS**

**Meeting of  
October 23, 2019  
7:30 p.m.**

Board of Appeals Members Present: Kenneth Evans, John Rusnov, Richard Baldin, David Houlé, Thomas Smeader

Administration: Assistant Law Director Daniel J. Kolick

Building Department Representative: Brian Roenigk

Recording Secretary: Kathy Zamrzla

The Board members discussed the following:

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

**1) SPIRIDON AND CRISTINA POPOV, OWNERS**

- a) Requesting a variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.18 to permit a second Accessory Structure where an 80 SF Accessory Structure exists and a second 752 SF Accessory Structure is proposed;
- b) Requesting an 18' Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15 (a) , which requires a 20' Setback from the main dwelling and where an 2' Setback from the main dwelling is proposed in order to construct a 752 SF Accessory Structure;
- c) Requesting a 560 SF Floor Area variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15, which permits a 192 SF Floor Area and where a 752 SF Floor Area is proposed in order to construct an Accessory Structure;
- d) Requesting a 4' 2" Height variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.04 (g), which permits a 12' Height and where a 16' 2" Height is proposed in order to construct a 752 SF Accessory Structure; property located at 21355 Hickory Branch Trail, PPN 391-16-033, zoned R1-75.

**The Board was informed by the Building Department that they were trying to tie the roof into the house, and it will be further explained on the floor during the meeting. Brian also indicated that the first structure is a playhouse not a shed, but it is an accessory structure. The Board thought that there are two lots in this property. They also questioned whether the measurements on the drawings they were given were accurate. Then the Board discussed the measurements in item (b), and decided that the numbers must be transposed, and that's where the confusion comes from. They also mentioned that this is an existing patio that he wants to cover, and that it's a pretty private backyard.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**2) DUSTIN AND JACQUELYN HAYDEN, OWNERS**

Requesting a 16' Rear Yard Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.16 (e), which permits a 14' encroachment into the established Rear Yard Setback and where a 30' encroachment into the established Rear Yard Setback is proposed in order to construct a 906 SF Concrete Patio; property located at 15317 Forest Park Drive, PPN 398-15-058, zoned R1-75.

**The Board noted that they have received a HOA letter of approval, and indicated no issues with this variance request during the caucus.**

3) **JOHN B. DOSTAL OF JD ROOFING EXTERIOR, INC. /Frank Cimino, Esq., Representative**

An appeal to the Board of Zoning and Building Code Appeals regarding the decision of the Assistant Building Commissioner on August 21, 2019 related to reroof permit number RERF-16-2955 dated 10-17-2016.

**The Board noted that this is an appeal on an alleged building code violation. They discussed that the work was done in 2016. The Board concluded that in this situation they will be voting to either grant the appeal or to deny it. They stated that Mr. Miller is here to present the case of the Building Department, and then the appellant can present his opposition.**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**The Board discussed a clerical error to the meeting minutes of October 9, 2019 regarding the absence of Mr. Houlé, and the motion to excuse him from the meeting.**



- b) Requesting a 18' Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15 (a) , which requires a 20' Setback from the main dwelling and where an 2' Setback from the main dwelling is proposed in order to construct a 752 SF Accessory Structure;
- c) Requesting a 560 SF Floor Area variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15, which permits a 192 SF Floor Area and where a 752 SF Floor Area is proposed in order to construct an Accessory Structure;
- d) Requesting a 4' 2" Height variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.04 (g), which permits a 12' Height and where a 16' 2" Height is proposed in order to construct a 752 SF Accessory Structure; property located at 21355 Hickory Branch Trail, PPN 391-16-033, zoned R1-75.

Mr. Evans – First on the agenda tonight is Popov on Hickory Branch Trail. Please come up to the microphone and give us your name and address for the record.

Mr. Popov – Spirodon Popov, 21355 Hickory Branch Trail, Strongsville, Ohio.

Mr. Evans – Thank you. Mr. Popov you are asking for a number of variances tonight. These all have to do with an existing deck that you have. Why don't you tell us about the project, and why you need the roof? You heard us in caucus talking about a number of things including the height, and the setback from the house, and the size of the patio area. We were wondering if you would have a fire pit in it as well. So if you could take us through the project and cover those details that would be great.

Mr. Popov – Yes sir. I do not have a fire pit or fireplace in the deck area. The deck is located in the back of my house. It's "L" shaped. I was talking to my wife about putting a roof over it for the rain and snow. Brian recommended to tie it to the roof of the house but right in the back of the house I have the dining room window. I don't have another window to the dining room. There's the front, then there's the kitchen, which I only have a patio door to. It's the same thing, it's to the back of the house, and then the family room has one window. I don't have anything in the front. I was explaining to him that if I were to attach it to the house, then I'm killing all the light. The trusses that I wanted to build for the roof are scissor trusses. I would like to have as much light as possible so I don't kill the light in my house completely.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Popov, we talked in caucus because we believe that the setback from the roof to the house is only going to be 2', is that correct?

Mr. Popov – Yes sir.

Mr. Evans – Okay.

Mr. Popov – Another thing you guys mentioned was the height. The peak of my roof right now is a 5/12, and the trusses I was working with the architect were a 4/12 peak. So they would be lower. I didn't want it to be higher than the house. If I was looking at the front of my house, I didn't want to see another roof in the back.

Mr. Evans – Okay, and the 4/12 pitch of the house is going to require that additional height because of the size of the deck that you have?

Mr. Popov – Yes. It's all the trusses. Brian has a copy. We stand by the architect. He designed the whole thing.

Mr. Evans – You do have a shed, or rather it's a playhouse, correct?

Mr. Popov – Yes.

Mr. Evans – The playhouse is used by your kids then?

Mr. Popov – Both of my kids. Yes. It's an 8' by 10' I'd say. I made it for my daughter, but I have a son now too. They share it and have toys in it. It has screened in windows on three sides, and a screen door.

Mr. Evans – You're not using it to store equipment or anything of that sort?

Mr. Popov – Absolutely not. You guys are welcome to walk into the back of my property any time. There's toys in it; dolls and cars for my son.

Mr. Evans – Alright, are there questions from the Board?

Mr. Rusnov – Just one. The roof is a solid shingle roof, correct? It's not just the trusses?

Mr. Popov – Correct.

Mr. Rusnov – It's a solid, asphalt, shingled roof.

Mr. Popov – It'll be the same as the house.

Mr. Rusnov – With the 4/12 you'll be below the height of the existing roof on the house.

Mr. Popov – That's correct sir. Yes.

Mr. Rusnov – The 4/12 needs this height to accommodate that pitch.

Mr. Popov – Yes sir.

Mr. Rusnov – Okay, that'll do it.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Baldin?

Mr. Baldin – Yes, so let me get this straight. I have not been out there yet. In caucus, I thought it was a patio. So you have an existing wooden deck?

Mr. Popov – Yes sir.

Mr. Baldin – Okay, and it's not attached to your house then? It sits off away from your house?

Mr. Popov – Correct sir.

Mr. Baldin – Do you have steps or something from your house?

Mr. Popov – It's a slab house.

Mr. Baldin – It's a slab house.

Mr. Popov – Yes, it's in Meadowood. So it's a 6" deck. The house is 8" high from the ground so when I walk from my patio it's the same height.

Mr. Baldin – Oh, you walk straight out onto it.

Mr. Popov – That's correct sir.

Mr. Baldin – Does it have sides coming up or is it just a flat wooden deck?

Mr. Popov – On one side there is a swing, and a 3' railing, then there's an 8' section, and then another 2' section.

Mr. Baldin – But basically it's a flat deck.

Mr. Popov – Yes sir.

Mr. Baldin – So you just want to put a roof over it.

Mr. Popov – Yes, correct.

Mr. Baldin – You're not planning to put any sides on it eventually?

Mr. Popov – No.

Mr. Baldin – Because we're calling this an accessory structure.

Mr. Rusnov – Rich, this will expand the uses of this deck for inclement weather. I think that's the whole purpose for the roof.

Mr. Popov – Yes sir. We just want to have it to be used all year round.

Mr. Baldin – You're worried about lighting getting into your home. You think it's going to be too dark.

Mr. Popov – Yes sir.

Mr. Houlé – The other option would be to put a window in on the side of your house that would allow light in. That wall is just a complete, solid wall right now, right?

Mr. Popov – That wall is the master bedroom.

Mr. Houlé – I thought you said that was where the dining room was.

Mr. Rusnov – If you look at the drawing, it goes in an "L" shape, where the "L" is over here, that's the master bedroom wing.

Mr. Popov – Right, that's correct.

Mr. Rusnov – Over here is the family room, sliding glass doors, kitchen window, etc. That's it. I can't remember if there are windows on this inside wall that the deck abuts against.

Mr. Houlé – I'm assuming there isn't because he's saying it would be dark if he doesn't...

Mr. Rusnov – No, his family room and dining room would be dark.

Mr. Houlé – That's what I mean, he could cut in a window on that side, and that would allow light in.

Mr. Rusnov – To the bedroom.

Mr. Houlé – I thought the bedrooms were on the opposite side?

Mr. Rusnov – That's what I'm talking about. See this section here? This is the bedroom section. This section is the family room, kitchen, and dining room area. There are already windows and a sliding glass door there.

Mr. Houlé – On the backside.

Mr. Rusnov – Yes.

Mr. Houlé – But I was talking about the side of the house.

Mr. Rusnov – There's no point unless he wants to have a breezeway into the bedroom for a window.

Mr. Houlé – Is there a different height restriction for an accessory structure verses a barn?

Mr. Roenigk – Yes, that's the height variance over 12'.

Mr. Houlé – Is that what it normally is for a barn?

Mr. Roenigk – Yes sir.

Mr. Evans – Okay.

Mr. Baldin – You're saying it's going to be lower than the roofline of the house.

Mr. Rusnov – Yes, because of the pitch.

Mr. Roenigk – I'm sure it will be.

Mr. Baldin – I'll have to get out to see it.

Mr. Evans – Are there any other questions? You have the letter from the HOA from Meadowood. We'll get copies of it before the next meeting. All of the members of the Board will be out to visit the property to take a look at it. There will also be a notice that will go out to your neighbors within 500 feet of your property. It will state exactly the description that is written in the agenda tonight. So if you have curious neighbors that will want to ask questions, you should get together with them before the next meeting to explain simply what your plans are. That may save everyone some time and the trouble. The public hearing is on November 6<sup>th</sup>. We will invite you back at that time. It is not necessary that you stay for the rest of the meeting tonight.

Mr. Popov - Thank you very much.

Mr. Evans – Thank you.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **2) DUSTIN AND JACQUELYN HAYDEN, OWNERS**



Requesting a 16' Rear Yard Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.16 (e), which permits a 14' encroachment into the established Rear Yard Setback and where a 30' encroachment into the established Rear Yard Setback is proposed in order to construct a 906 SF Concrete Patio; property located at 15317 Forest Park Drive, PPN 398-15-058, zoned R1-75.

Mr. Evans – Our first public hearing for the evening is Hayden on Forest Park Drive. Please come up to the microphone and give us your name and address for the record.

Mr. Hayden – Dustin Hayden, 15317 Forest Park Drive, Strongsville.

Mr. Evans – For the public hearing here, will you just give us a quick description of what you're requesting the variance for? It's a rear yard setback, so please describe your project.

Mr. Hayden – Yes, we're looking to put a concrete patio off the back of the house. The variance is for the setback not being 50' off the property line. We're looking for 15'. It's basically ground level.

Mr. Evans – This is replacing a deck that is there now.

Mr. Hayden – Yes, so the kitchen-side has an existing patio, the middle section is grass area, and then the section outside of the master bedroom has a 4' wood walk deck.

Mr. Evans – Alright. Are there questions?

Mr. Smeader – We have a letter from the HOA of approval.

Mr. Evans – Thank you, Mr. Smeader.

Mr. Houlé – There's a concrete patio there currently, and you're just expanding it out further towards the side of the house.

Mr. Hayden – Yes, outside our kitchen there is a 3' wood deck that you step out on, and then it drops a few inches down to a concrete pad. That's about 15' off the back of the house. So we'll be replacing that section, but carrying the entire patio across the back of the house.

Mr. Houlé – Yes, I was out there, but I couldn't get into the yard because it was all fenced in. I didn't want to jump the fence, but I thought I had a pretty good idea. I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. Hayden – Yes.

Mr. Baldin – I think it's a slam-dunk. I don't have any questions.



unclaimed. I spoke with Mr. Miller this morning, because I just want to get a sense of what might be happening this evening. He told me at that time that another complaint had been filed, and that obviously he had just gotten it back because it had never been served. He was explaining that to me. I indicated to him that I never received it on behalf of my client, and apparently they tried to serve it directly on them. It encompasses additional basis for a complaint against Mr. Dostal, and they are not ones that have been discussed in the prior letter. Now there are specific Code sections that are being cited. I haven't had the opportunity to look it over. I met with my client around 6:15 pm or so at the Dunkin Donuts to try and go over a little bit of it with him, but I have not had the opportunity to delve into the Code sections themselves, nor to really discuss them with him. As a result of that, I feel that the last thing I'd indicate to you is that the letter that we just received, and I believe he emailed it to us today, and perhaps Mr. Kolick did also. That may be where we got it from. I called him subsequently to indicate that I was very concerned about having just received that this afternoon and not having the ability to prepare for it. I guess the last thing I will say is that the letter itself indicates that there is a 30 day time period in which to bring the matter officially before you. As a result of that, I plan on doing that. I guess what I'm asking for is the ability to file a notice of appeal on that, and to additionally have the opportunity to review this. To be honest with you, I'm somewhat confused by the Code sections that are cited. I need to talk with Mr. Miller on the basis on which he feels as though they are applicable to this particular situation. I do not believe, in my opinion after reading them, that a roofer would have the ability to do these things. At any rate, I'm requesting that this matter not go forward this evening, and perhaps to reschedule it so I have the ability first to file the appeal, secondly to go ahead and review it with my client, and I have a very sincere interest in speaking with Mr. Miller about what's included in this new complaint. Thank you.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Miller, if you could get to the microphone for a minute please. I know that there was an amended violation letter that went out. Did it raise new questions that weren't in the original?

Mr. Miller – The original violation letter that was sent generally referenced the 2013 Residential Code of Ohio which was in force when this job was started. We did not specifically reference the exact Code chapters in that letter. Once the appeal was filed, on advice of Council and the Law Department, we amended that letter and sent it Certified to Mr. Dostal. It cited those specific violations in the Code instead of a general reference. There are no new charges, it's just an amended letter that specifically clarified the issues that we're concerned with in this case.

Mr. Kolick – Were those same Code sections brought up with Mr. Dostal? I know they weren't brought up with the attorney as he explained here.

Mr. Miller – I would say that in general discussion with Mr. Dostal when he was in my office we discussed the ventilation, but to specifically say that I discussed Section 802.6, probably not.

Mr. Kolick – In that case, Mr. Chairman it's probably appropriate that we would continue the hearing. It appears that there are sections that were not brought up in earlier periods with the applicant. The attorney is correct. I know he asked me today for the Code sections, and we sent

them out to him just today. Unfortunately they did not get to the applicant. I don't know whether he just didn't pick up the Certified Mail or what happened. Do you know Mr. Cimino?

Mr. Cimino – Mr. Miller forwarded it to me. It shows two envelopes that were unclaimed and not deliverable as addressed. I think that's what it says.

Mr. Kolick – Do you know why it was undeliverable? Was it the wrong address? Or did someone not pick them up?

Mr. Cimino – I think the original statement is unclaimed, and then the other one is undeliverable as addressed.

Mr. Kolick – In light of that, Mr. Chairman, it would probably be appropriate to continue this to the next meeting since there are items that the applicant wasn't aware of. I was under the impression coming in here that at least the applicant was aware of the Code sections, and maybe it was just the attorney that wasn't. If they aren't, it would be appropriate to continue it to the next meeting. You do not need, Mr. Cimino, to file another appeal. We'll accept your current Notice of Appeal for this amended notice. You know what's included in the amended notice now, and we'll expect you to come to the next meeting and be able to address it. If the amended notice changes anything in your appeal, in other words, if after reading that you determine that it's correct, then just let us know that. You don't need to file a separate Notice of Appeal though. It stands for this amended notice as well.

Mr. Cimino – Thank you.

Mr. Kolick – That's my recommendation, but at Chairman, it is your call.

Mr. Evans – I have no problem doing that, I think it's appropriate. Mr. Kolick, I believe that we have others that are in the audience. Do we need to act on that at all?

Mr. Kolick – Well, if we're not going to have the hearing, they are welcome to come. I guess the property owner, and perhaps his Council are here, and they are welcome to come to the next meeting and address it then. They'll have an opportunity to speak. I would prefer that we do it all at once. That would make sense. Plus, I don't know if they saw the amended notice.

Mr. Evans – That was going to be my next question whether they knew what the specific references are. Do we need to make that information available to them?

Mr. Miller – I believe that they have made a public records request, and we forwarded everything to him. I think he has the amended notice.

Mr. Kolick – If not, then get it from our Building Department. I want everyone to know what's out here to start with. We will need to hear this at the next meeting. We have a duty under the Code that specifically says that we need to hold the public hearing in a timely and reasonable time

period without undue delay. That's the way it reads. So we expect to hear it at the next meeting, if that is your ruling here tonight, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Evans – So is November 6<sup>th</sup> amenable to you, Mr. Cimino?

Mr. Cimino – I don't believe there should be any problem with that. I guess the only thing I request is our ability to view the property.

Mr. Kolick – Is the property owner here?

Mr. Evans – Could you come up to the podium please? What is your name and address for the record?

Mr. Sisamis – John Sisamis, 16513 Morningstar Drive, Strongsville.

Mr. Evans – So Mr. Cimino has asked if it is possible to view the property.

Mr. Sisamis – I don't want him to view the property, and the reason why is that when I asked the owner of the roofing company that did the job to come out he denied coming out for me. I asked him about all the reasons of what was going on with my issue, and he barely called. I think he called once or twice, and denied me on everything. I asked him to come out then to see the property and address the issue and he refused.

Mr. Kolick – He didn't then, but it would be appropriate to allow him to see it now. Our Building Department has concluded that there is a problem. The Building Department was out there as recently as when, Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller – I was out there Monday to take measurements.

Mr. Kolick – So he was out there Monday, and concluded there was still a problem it would be appropriate for council to have the opportunity as well.

Mr. Sirucus – My name is Tony Sirucus, I'm from Akron, Ohio. Thank you, I appreciate it very much for allowing us to speak today. I object to that, not only for the reasons that Mr. Sisamis has already indicated that he asked the owner to come out to, and he flat out refused to come out and acknowledge any issue or problems. Also this property has already been view and investigated in quite, great detail on behalf of JD Roofing's insurance company, CED. They had their engineers hired by their insurance company view this property. They determined that there was improper work done. So at this point, it's harassment. This is not litigation. They are not entitled to come see the property. They have all the information that they need. They continue to fight this violation without any basis whatsoever. They have all the information, they obtained it through their own agents, and they do not need to come out and inconvenience this owner once again to view the property and conduct their inspection. They had the opportunity, and they chose not to do it. They hired other engineers to view this property, and they concluded that it was improperly done. Now they want to come view the property. No, they had their opportunity, and it's over.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Cimino, have you had other engineers or an insurance company on behalf of the client come to the property? Look, I want you to get the information, but I have no legal rights to allow you or your client or anyone to get onto the property.

Mr. Cimino – I thought the Board had the ability to uncover additional evidence, allow views of the property. I thought that was what I saw in your Code.

Mr. Kolick – No, the Code allows the Board to go see it, but not allow anyone else to accompany us other than experts or something on behalf of the Board. I can't do it if they don't allow you to do it. I would suggest that if you had insurance companies or engineers or anyone else who need measurements, you should be able to get that from your own client's people who already viewed the property. The City doesn't have the legal authority to allow you to go and see it.

Mr. Cimino – I think there's another problem that the house has that has not been uncovered, and I believe I'd like that inspected and reviewed alright?

Mr. Kolick – You can request it, but if the property owner refuses it. We have no legal authority to grant it.

Mr. Cimino – I'm putting on the table a concern that I have in relation to issues in that home that relate to both mold and the matter of infiltration of moisture. I think that it needs to be addressed in relation to the issues they have raised about the work done by my clients.

Mr. Kolick – Is that something where you'd have to get into the interior of the home to inspect? Or is that something you can view from the exterior?

Mr. Cimino – We do have pictures from the inside from the one inspection that was done, but I think there needs to be an evaluation, in my opinion, of the work that was done on the exterior of the home. I think that this work was done perhaps without the City's knowledge and that there was no inspection of this work that was done. I think that there is an issue that relates to that work that was perhaps done by some outside contractor that did not come to the City and request their inspection of the work that was done.

Mr. Kolick – Again, my question is whether that is something you can see from the exterior of the home as opposed to intruding upon their privacy to get to the interior of the home?

Mr. Cimino – This one issue can perhaps be done from the outside of the home?

Mr. Kolick – Counsel, can they at least have a time that they can see the exterior of the home without intruding upon your man's privacy and seeing the interior of the home? I'd like to at least have that arranged. I don't see why we can't at least get that accomplished.

Mr. Sirucus – No, I'm still inclined to say no on the same basis. The answer is really no. I think we appreciate what Mr. Cimino is trying to do here, but he's trying to open other issues which are

not before the panel. The question of the panel are whether there were Building Code violations committed by this roofer? That's the question that has to be answered.

Mr. Kolick – Look, we will keep the issues limited to the roofing issue. I'm not an expert, nor is this Board, whether there could have been other things that may have been done that may have affected the roof. If they didn't affect the roof, I'm not concerned about it. I'm not concerned, at least at this point, whether there was something done that the City didn't know about involving the homeowner. That isn't my concern. My only concern is only things that are related to what the City has cited him for which is the roofing situation.

Mr. Sirucus – I don't think that is what Mr. Cirmino's intention is, so the answer is no. We object to that as well.

Mr. Cirmino – I would indicate to clarify my position that it's my statement to you that I believe that there is something else happening at the home in relation to some construction that was done by Mr. Sisamis, and again I indicate that it was done without the City's involvement. I think it has a bearing on the moisture and infiltration into the roof area, and into the areas where a number of these pictures have been taken where it reflects mold accumulation.

Mr. Kolick – Well, then I guess your client can testify to that, and to what it's about, but I have no legal authority to get you onto the property. The City doesn't have that legal authority. We have authority for the City to go in, and I think the City has gone in. Any pictures that the City has are available to both of your counsels. Hopefully you can find what you need from those pictures without any more intrusion into the home. Our files are open. They are public records open to both parties. You're welcome to see those. You'll need to come to the next meeting though prepared to present your respective positions on it then. Okay?

Mr. Cirmino – Thank you very much.

Mr. Kolick – The only other thing I suggest is that if you have had insurance companies or anyone else go look at this, then maybe their files are open to you as well. Hopefully you can find through them what you are looking for as well.

Mr. Cirmino – I'll do a public records request.

Mr. Kolick – That's fine. There will be no problem. Just come into the City. You can call Mr. Miller and he can make arrangements with you to come in and see it at your convenience between now and the next meeting. Same thing for your counsel, if you want to see anything in the file, they are public records. They are open to you. I suggest that you actually come in and look at them. Sometimes copying and sending photos isn't the best way to do it. You don't get the same effect without seeing the original photos. We'll welcome a written request, but we still recommend that you come in and see the actual photographs, okay? Then with your permission, Mr. Chairman, we can continue this to the next meeting.

Mr. Evans – We will do that. I’m assuming at this point that all of you will have the opportunity to prepare materials by then. I’m not hearing that the November 6<sup>th</sup> date is not amenable to you you, so we will then table this and bring it back onto the agenda then for all parties to present their materials.

Mr. Kolick – Please make those arrangements. We don’t want to kick this thing again. Council gives us only a certain amount of time to act. We have to have this hearing at the November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. We’ll open up whatever we can to all parties, but we expect you to come to the November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting prepared to present your respective positions. You each have an opportunity procedurally to question the Building Department on anything they have. You’ll have an opportunity to present whatever evidence that either one of you want to present. You’ll have an opportunity to examine one another’s witnesses whomever comes up to speak. So it will be complete due process, okay? Alright.

Mr. Evans – Alright, so this is tabled to November 6<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Cirmino – Thank you.

Mr. Evans – Thank you. Is there anything else to come before the Board this evening? Then we will stand adjourned.

Signature on File	Signature on File	November 6, 2019
Mr. Evans, Chairman	Carol Brill, Recording Sec’y	Approval Date