

The Planning Board of the Town of Cicero held a meeting on **Wednesday, November 3, 2010** at **7:00 p.m.** in the Town Hall at 8236 South Main Street, Cicero, New York 13039.

Agenda:

- Approval of the meeting minutes from 10/18/10 (**approved**)
- Site Plan, Mavis Tire/Cole Muffler, Brewerton Road, Proposed retail store, Mastroianni Engineering (**approved**)
- Site Plan, Cicero Family Dental Care, 8382 Elta Drive, Proposed dental office, J.S. Hagan Architect, P.C. (**to return**)
- Site Plan, Dog Water Training & Therapy Center, 8226 Brewerton Road, Proposed dog training and therapy center, David B. Tyler (**to return**)

Board Members Present: Mark Marzullo (Chairman), Patrick Honors, Chuck Abbey, Robert Smith and Scott Harris (Ad Hoc Board Member)

Board Members Absent: Greg Card, Richard Cushman and Sharon May

Others Present: Vern Conway (Town Board Liaison), Wayne R. Dean (Director of Planning & Development), Neal Germain (Esquire, Germain & Germain), Mark Parrish (P.E., O'Brien & Gere) and Tonia Mosley (Planning Board Clerk)

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chairman noted emergency exits and asked that all cell phones be turned off.

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 18, 2010 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Mr. Marzullo made a motion to approve the October 18, 2010 Planning Board meeting minutes. **Mr. Honors seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

Mr. Honors:	Yes
Mr. Abbey:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Harris:	Abstain
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

**SITE PLAN, MAVIS TIRE/COLE MUFFLER
BREWERTON ROAD, PROPOSED RETAIL STORE
MASTROIANNI ENGINEERING
(SEE ATTACHMENT A: OBG LETTER DATED 11.3.10)**

Representative: Joe Mastroianni, Mastroianni Engineering

Mr. Mastroianni introduced himself. We have made a few changes to the site plan since the last meeting mostly focusing on the entrances here. We are using the existing curb cuts in the north and south ends and aligning them with the existing curb cuts to Wal-Mart. We also reduced the landscape buffer along the side to obtain two lanes.

My client is in the process of obtaining access/utility easements with the properties north and south of the site. Those properties are owned by the same entity.

Our lighting people gave me a revised lighting schematic. Basically the poles have shifted slightly in this area. We have .1 foot-candles or less by the property lines. We do have spillage of a little more than .1 in this area, but after talking with Mark it was decided because this was a traffic road and entrance, the higher level in that area was acceptable.

Mr. Smith inquired about ownership of the properties north and south of the proposed site. If they still owned your lot a sidewalk would have to go all the way across.

Mr. Marzullo noted that he had reviewed the minutes from the zone change recommendation. There was a little discussion about sidewalks but nothing that would require this applicant to go the full length. Mark Parrish had submitted a recommendation about some lawn area along the north side of the building.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Smith: The upper northwest corner has stripping. Is that paved? How big is it?

Mr. Mastroianni replied yes. This is a handicap spot. Normally handicap spaces are 10' wide. This one is about 12' to 13' wide.

The Chairman asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Parrish had none. I reviewed lighting. It seems reasonable. Landscaping and signage are shown. Signage is within the typical limits allowed by the Planning Board. Site circulation has improved since the last submittal. Layouts at the entrances are similar to what was done for the SEFCU project where an entrance is shared with the adjacent parcel. That entrance seems to work well, so I don't think that there is anything wrong with this layout.

Mr. Smith: Do we have to have the easements and cross accesses in place?

Mr. Germain: Generally you would want them in place. If they are not in place now any determination is subject to review and approval of cross access easements for the south and the north. It would be based upon a legally sufficient easement. It would be up to us to review the actual legal framework that was given.

Mr. Marzullo: Would that be required prior to a building permit?

Mr. Germain: Yes. More importantly it would be a condition of site plan approval, if you choose to make it a condition of site plan approval.

Mr. Marzullo made a motion regarding SEQR. He read: Be it further resolved that the Planning Board of the Town of Cicero hereby determines that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the environment and that this resolution shall constitute a negative declaration for the purposes of Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law of the State of New York. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

Mr. Honors:	Yes
Mr. Abbey:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Harris:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Abbey: is this the only free standing sign? How big is it?

Mr. Smith: Will it sit on the ground or will it be mounted on a pole?

Mr. Parrish: It is shown as an 8" pipe, 12.5' off the ground to the top. The free standing sign is 48.5 sq. ft. and the east and west elevations of the building each have 84.8 sq. ft. They have a total of 218 sq. ft. of signage and about 121' of building frontage.

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the site plan for Mavis Discount Tire, Wal-Mart Plaza, New York State Route 11, last revision October 31, 2010 contingent upon—I am going to ask the attorney for the easement language. Mr. Germain added contingent upon granting a cross access easement for cross access to the north and south specific properties. Said easement should be submitted to the Planning Board attorney and approved by said attorney as a condition of site plan approval. Mr. Smith added and the Planning Board Chairman. **Mr. Harris seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

Mr. Honors:	Yes
Mr. Abbey:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Harris:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Mastroianni thanked the Board.

**SITE PLAN, CICERO FAMILY DENTAL CARE
8382 ELTAL DRIVE, PROPOSED ONE-STORY DENTAL OFFICE BUILDING
J.S. HAGAN ARCHITECT, P.C.**

Representative: Jim Hagan, Architect
Dr. Sayed

Mr. Hagan introduced himself and Dr. Sayed. Dr. Sayed currently has a dental practice located at 6035 Route 11, near the former Plainville Farm Restaurant. It is an older building that is not handicap accessible. It also has limited parking with no room for expansion. As a result he began a search within the Cicero market for another site.

Dr. Sayed recently purchased Lot 4 in Elta Business Park located off Route 31. It is 9/10 of an acre on the west side of Elta Drive, with frontage on Route 31. As you recall, when this subdivision was approved, there would be no direct access to Route 31. On the east side of the

site is a daycare center and south of the site is the LJR Engineering building. The property to the west is a residential part of the subdivision. I believe that it is under contract for another use. There is an access easement from the cul-de-sac at the end of Elta Drive that runs along this property line that provides access to that residential property.

Dr. Sayed would like to construct a 3600 sq. ft building on his property. The building would be approximately 50' wide and 70' in depth. It is set back 73' from the street line at Route 31, 56' from the street line at Elta Drive and 26' from the west property line. We comply with all of the zoning setbacks. The main entrance to the building would be on the east side, facing these parking spaces. On the west side would be a staff entrance, coming around what we call the rear of the building. There are sidewalks going from the parking area to that rear entrance and also across the front of the building along the edge of the driveway.

The parcel acquired by the Dr. is larger than he needs for his practice. He is looking at the property as a place to practice and as an investment. On the submitted plans we show an option on the south side of the building for a future building or a future addition. We also show the additional parking to be provided at that point. We recognize that until we make a formal application for the addition, this Board would not approve it. When a possible tenant is identified we will know more about what might happen on the property.

The plan shows two driveways onto Elta Drive. The northern drive is located here and the southern drive is located off of the cul-de-sac. After we made this submittal we were advised that there is a section in the zoning ordinance that requires a 150' setback for this drive from an intersecting street. In my understanding that would be measured from the street line here and not the edge of the pavement. From the street line to the center line here is probably about 50' and is probably between 80-85' to Route 31.

We also learned from comments prepared by Mark that there was some concern about the location of the second drive on the cul-de-sac. I have an alternate plan, to be discussed later, that discusses these issues in more details.

Dr. Sayed would have 6 staff, including himself. He would have a typical client load of 8 patients at a time. That makes a potential total of 14 vehicles coming to the site. We have provided parking for 17 cars---10 spaces across the front for patients and 7 staff spaces located

here. We have room for additional spaces in this area.

Currently, there is a sign easement located in this front corner of the property. There is a sign constructed to provide identification for all of the Park's tenants. That sign sits on Dr. Sayed's property.

We understand that the Town is trying to encourage the implementation of sidewalks along Route 31. We know that there was one constructed along the front of the daycare center. That sidewalk angles off as it gets adjacent to Elta Drive. We are proposing to start a new sidewalk directly opposite that at this point, curve that around the sign, and extend that across the entire frontage of Dr. Sayed's property. That sidewalk would fall on his property and not the State's right-of-way.

Mr. Smith: Is that a 4' sidewalk? I thought we made them keep it out of the State's right-of-way. Subsequently we learned that the State wanted them in their right-of-way.

Mr. Hagan: We are agreeable to doing whatever we have to do to make it work. The question is what would we have to do to go around the sign?

We are showing lawn area between the sidewalk and the parking area. We show two trees there. We also show lawn area adjacent to the parking area along Elta Drive. The area around the building has some extensive landscaping. The south side of the lot currently has overgrown and dead trees. It is our intention to clear that area, grade it, seed it and treat it as lawn until something is done with that portion of the property.

The site is fairly level. Because of the fill situation, we intend to have a partial basement to allow space for mechanical equipment, dead files and other supplies. It would not really be occupied space. The other half of the building would be constructed on a crawl space. As far as elevations go, the finished floor would be about 2' above the road. The land naturally slopes to the south, making our finished floor about even with Route 31. The common stormwater facility is located off site and was designed for the entire subdivision.

More discussion occurred regarding drainage.

We have site lighting shown on the plan, 3-twenty foot poles. A full photometric plan will be supplied at a later date. The driveway issue may impact the locations of those poles.

Mr. Smith: Who owns the property immediately to the west? It is not on the plan.

Mr. Dean: It is in the process of being sold, but I believe Nate (Marra) still owns it. It is the parcel with the house on it.

Mr. Parrish: Is it still a part of this subdivision?

Mr. Dean: Yes.

Mr. Hagan: The building's colors on the screen are some what indicative of what we are talking about. The siding is a material that looks like cedar shingles. These hardy panels hold up well over time. The lower portions of the building and the columns and/or piers beside the entrance-way are a stone veneer. We show a hip roof design for the main roof with gable vents at the ridge. There is also a projected gable on the entranceway. The roof would be an architectural shingle. We would have accent trims at the windows, and a fair amount of glass facing Elta Drive. Five windows face Route 31.

We show two signs to identify the practice. One faces Route 31 and the other is located on the southeast corner of the building facing Elta Drive. We are in the process of contacting a sign company for the exact size, details, etc. of the signs.

I have prepared a revised site plan to respond to some of Mark's comments. It is the drawing labeled 1A. The first item is the design drawings for the sanitary sewer. We have indicated the existing lateral here, just before the last manhole. We will be connecting our sewer lateral to that lateral.

We have noted the names and zoning districts of the adjacent property owners. Dr. Sayed would have a small dumpster. There was a concern that its location was too visible from Route 31 and so that location has changed from the original plan. We have pulled it back, closer to the staff's entrance and changed the configuration of the paving in that area to create more lawn area and landscaping. The dumpster would be enclosed within a 6' structure that is gated.

It would be built from materials similar to the building and painted with similar colors. We have added a table of zoning requirements and parking.

We have taken the southern drive and moved it about 15' north. That increases the distance between this drive and the future drive that would serve the parcel to the west. We have shown the future drive, the drive that goes into LJR Engineering and the two drives that go into the daycare center. Our drives are now opposite existing drives.

We looked at connecting this drive to the future drive of the parcel to the west. If we did we would lose potential parking space in this area. It would also make it difficult for patients to get in and out via convoluted turns.

We recognize that this drive does not comply with zoning regulations and wanted to discuss it with you and get your thoughts. With our trips per hour, this is a relatively low intensity use that is unlike the daycare center across the street which has some definite peak times. We do not feel that the traffic coming in and out of either drives would present a major problem. We would need to decide if a variance from the ZBA was required or if we needed to come back with a revised plan. Again, we do not see a conflict with what we are proposing to do.

Mr. Smith: Why do you need two drives?

Mr. Hagan. With 17 cars I guess that two drives would not be needed. But I was anticipating in the future, if the addition is put on, it would be beneficial to have two entrances. Two entrances help with circulation on the site. Because we are doing this now it seemed appropriate to incorporate it into the plan.

Mr. Parrish: With the presented configuration, you have three access points on the west side of the cul-de-sac. That is a lot of access points coming out to a cul-de-sac. The access easement is there to provide access to those parcels that we just heard might be under contract for sale. So, it is going to be developed. They are going to need this access because they can not get access to Route 31. To me it is poor access management to have that many entrances coming out into a cul-de-sac.

Our suggestion was to try and combine these entrances. We attempted to get LJR Engineering to utilize that easement when they came in with their site plan. They did not want to

accommodate that, and it was approved for a separate access. That was our suggestion and the reasons for that suggestion. It is now up to the Board to consider the plan and decide what you would like to have the applicant do.

Mr. Harris: I like that idea better. A wider entrance could access both places. There would be one road cut instead of two.

Mr. Smith: Is there any reason why they could not have another access point at a future time if they do the building?

Mr. Dean agreed stating instead of having two access points as it is shown now, cut that down to one that is away from the Route 31 intersection. If the other parcel is developed in the future, have it connect to the future drive.

Mr. Parrish: Another alternative is to maintain the 150' separation from the street-line; you could fit in an entrance just before the end of the throat of the cul-de-sac. Potentially you could have one access point there, and a future access off of that road. At least that separates it from the cul-de-sac a little bit.

All of this has impacts on the site design that Mr. Hagan would have to consider. He has expressed some of his concerns. I am sure his design is the best to maximize what they are looking to do on the site. Anything changed would impact that.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Hagan: Obviously, we have to consider what our next step will be. Tonight was the Board's first look at this. I appreciate your comments. We will take your thoughts into consideration. I would like to plan on coming back in the next 2-4 weeks with a revised plan.

The Board felt Mr. Hagan gave an excellent detailed presentation.

**SITE PLAN, DOG WATER TRAINING & THERAPY CENTER
8226 BREWERTON ROAD, PROPOSED DOG TRAINING/THERAPY CENTER
DAVID B. TYLER**

Representatives: David B. Tyler
Matthew Tyler
Jack Cooper, Jake Cooper Architectural Services

Mr. Matthew Tyler introduced himself. Within my father's storage facility I am looking to put up a portable dock and a portable pool. My current store is the Storybook Dog Bakery. I am looking to put the portable dock and portable pool up during the spring and summer for training and aqua therapy. Basically, it would be during day light hours. Traffic would be similar to the traffic generated from batting cages. Hopefully it would be a Monday through Sunday operation. I would like to have blocked hours for 3 people sharing that time to train their dogs. Nothing has ever been done like this before here. I am not sure if people will show up for it, but it is something that we would like to try.

We would like to get people interested in it and get them to train at our facility. Basically this is a test for the Central New York Region, to see if people would be interested.

Mr. Harris: If people want to use this would they have to call the storage facility to reserve a time in the pool? How would that work?

Mr. David Tyler introduced himself. Basically, I run the show during the day. I run all of the businesses. I do the storage, the dog bakery and screen repair. Patrons would call. I would answer the phone and set up an appointment to use the facility.

More and more dogs receive therapy with water for hip problems, ligament pulls, etc. People spend thousands of dollars on their dogs. There are not a lot of places for therapy. You don't need anything special. You would be able to go and exercise your dog in the pool.

Mr. Harris: I have a Japanese Akita that has hip displacement. Water exercise does not add any pressure to the hip and helps him build the muscles up around that area. It is a good idea. Who is going to watch? Will someone be there to supervise the pool area to make sure that it

is being used in accordance with what you want it to be used as?

Mr. Matthew Tyler: Yes, it is just like any pool. There are going to be rules for the 4' high pool. It will definitely be staffed.

Mr. Smith: Is the pool heated?

Mr. Matthew Tyler: It would be if needed.

Mr. Smith: You show a dog walk. Will that be paved area?

Mr. David Tyler: That is just an area to show that people can walk their dogs. It is currently paved.

Mr. Smith: What is currently in the area where you propose locating the 20 x 40 pool?

Mr. Matthew Tyler: It is just pavement.

Mr. David Tyler: In the winter it is used for snow storage.

Mr. Abbey: Do people get in the pool also to exercise their dog?

Mr. Matthew Tyler: They can. But generally it is strictly for dogs.

Mr. Harris: You would need chemicals in it just like a regular pool.

Mr. Matthew Tyler agreed. It would have a chemical salt filter system that is appropriate for dogs and their coats.

Mr. Marzullo: Would you have three customers at a time?

Mr. Matthew Tyler: This business is barely ten years old within the United States. In doing my research, most people who do this set up block times of about one half hour. You would have a half hour or hour to group up with other people, or use the facility yourself. We would be

looking at 1-3 dogs sharing the space.

Mr. Marzullo: If that is the case, do you need all of the proposed parking? I am concerned about the traffic flow on the site. That 17' space is narrow if you have someone using the storage space. If you had someone at the storage facility that had a truck, how would other vehicles get around it?

Mr. David Tyler: We added the additional parking spaces after we went to the PB work session meeting. There seemed to be a concern about parking, especially if there was an event. We panicked about it. It is only one direction around. My people have to tell me they want to move in or out.

Mr. Marzullo: You have plenty of parking up front if you will only have 3 people at a time. I know that there is a question about the zoning of that back parcel.

Mr. Parrish: The rear portion of the site is zoned R20. This use would not be allowed in that zoning district. I can not answer how the storage unit got there.

Mr. Marzullo agreed. There would be an issue regarding commercial parking on a residential lot. You would need a zone change or a variance. It creates an issue, especially since you really don't need it.

Mr. Matthew Tyler: It seemed like parking was an issue, so we came up with this plan. We really don't need the extra parking.

Mr. Marzullo: We were really concerned about parking if you were going to have an event or 60 people on a Saturday. How many employees do you have now?

The Tylers noted three.

Mr. Marzullo: Any lighting changes?

Mr. Matthew Tyler: This is strictly during day hours. There would not be any lighting changes.

Mr. Marzullo: How about signage?

Mr. Matthew Tyler: The only thing that we would probably do with signage is alter the wording on the sign that we already have. We would probably change the name of our business a little bit. The square footage of the sign would remain the same.

Mr. Cooper noted some of Mr. Parrish's comments have not been addressed yet.

Mr. Parrish: If the extra parking is not needed and is not going to be a part of the site plan, a lot of the issues within the review letter will go away. The applicants would have to display that to the Board's satisfaction and revise the plan taking off those features.

Mr. Dean: I hope that the Board would make that a condition of approval. I would also like to see the plan limited to three people at a time plus a no event restriction.

Mr. Smith: How would an approval be worded for that?

Mr. Dean: No advertised events on site.

Mr. Marzullo: A limit of 3-4 users in the pool at one time. It would be a note right on the plan.

Mr. Germain: That might be a little too much. You might want to restrict it to a limited number of people on the site.

Mr. Matthew Tyler: What if we wanted to have, for example, a 20 dog competition on a Saturday?

Mr. Smith: Where would you put them?

Mr. Harris: You would have parking issues.

Mr. Matthew Tyler: Could we go to our neighbors and ask them to allow us to use their parking?

Mr. Smith: Your site is too tight for events. If the business takes off, you would need to make other arrangements, for example make changes to the site to provide more room. You stated this was a new business in the area and that you don't know what is going to happen. At this point neither does the Board.

Mr. Marzullo: When you go back and review this, I would suggest taking into account the parking that you have on the side and the front and be prepared to talk to us about the number of employees and the number of customers based upon the parking that you have and want to be able to bring into the site.

Mr. Matthew Tyler: If I have a busy day at the store I could have ten cars there at a time. What happens if I have to have seven spaces for the store and three for the pool?

Mr. Marzullo: Take employee parking into consideration too. Make that logic work for us at the next meeting.

Mr. Parrish: Any parking provided should comply with the code. Some of the parking on the plan does not work because they would require one-way traffic around the building. With those spaces the way they are shown the applicants only have a 15' wide drive isle. There is also an issue with the parking spaces on the south side of the building encroaching on the adjacent property. You would need to find out what the situation is with those. Potentially, the amount of parking is dwindling. I will leave it to your architect to work these details out. Again, I want to say that any parking utilized should have the appropriate circulation.

Mr. Cooper asked for another copy of the site plan review letter and the minutes from this meeting.

Mr. Harris made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

IN AS MUCH AS THERE WAS NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:15 P.M.

Dated: November 10, 2010

Tonia Mosley, PB Clerk

ATTACHMENT A

November 3, 2010

Planning Board

Town of Cicero
P.O. Box 1517
Cicero, New York 13039-1517
Attention: Mark Marzullo, Chairman

RE: Mavis Tire/Cole Muffler Cicero Market Site Plan Review
FILE: 0101/25439.392

Dear Board Members:

We have reviewed the following materials in regard to the above referenced project for compliance with Town Code requirements relative to Site Plans and effect on Town utilities and roads:

1. Site Plan dated September 10, 2010 last revised October 31, 2010
2. Grading and Drainage Plan dated September 10, 2010 last revised October 31, 2010
3. Landscaping Plan dated September 10, 2010 last revised October 31, 2010
4. Lighting Simulation Plan dated September 10, 2010 revised October 12, 2010
5. Details (3 sheets) dated September 10, 2010 revised October 12, 2010
6. Exterior Elevations dated October 18, 2010.

Mastroianni Engineering prepared Items 1 to 5 and Pierce Engineering, P.C. prepared Item 6.

The 0.94 -acre site is located on the east side of U.S. Route 11 and is an outparcel on the Cicero Market (Walmart) site. The lot is currently vacant. It is proposed to construct an approximately 6,900 square foot building for retail sales of tires, mufflers and other automotive products along with associated parking, landscaping and other site improvements. The site is zoned GC, General Commercial. Our comments on the Site Plan are as follows:

1. The site has frontage on U.S. Route 11, which is a State highway under the jurisdiction of the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). Access to the site is to be provided from driveways onto the internal access drive on the Cicero Market site. The access drives will be shared with the adjacent parcel when that parcel is developed. The Board should review the number of parking spaces and site circulation with the Developer. A 5-foot wide sidewalk has been provided within the Route 11 right-of-way along the site frontage, which will require a permit from the NYSDOT. It is noted that sidewalk will need to be provided along the frontage of the adjacent parcels to provide for a continuous sidewalk along the Cicero Market site.
2. Stormwater runoff from the site is tributary to stormwater facilities on the Walmart site. Mitigation for stormwater quantity and quality were provided as part of the original development of the Walmart site. As the project disturbs less than 1-acre of area a NYSDEC SPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities is not required for the project.
3. The site is located within the Cicero Sewer District. Sanitary sewer service is to be provided by extension of a lateral from an 8-inch Town sewer located within an easement along Route 11. A note has been provided on the Plan indicating the Town should be contacted to coordinate installation of the lateral within the Town easement.

ATTACHMENT A CONTINUED

4. The site is located within the Cicero Water District. Water service is to be provided by extension of a water service from a water main located along Route 11. The Plan also indicates it will be necessary to relocate a fire hydrant to accommodate the sidewalk along Route 11. The Applicant should contact the Onondaga County Water Authority (OCWA) regarding provision of the water service and relocation of the hydrant.
5. The Board should review the landscaping, lighting, signage, buffering and architectural elevations with the Developer. The following are comments regarding these and other miscellaneous issues:
 - a. The lighting generally appears reasonable but the site and light pole layout on the Lighting Simulation Plan should be revised to be consistent with the other plans.
 - b. Signage is to consist of building mounted signs on the east and west sides of the building along with a free standing sign on the east side of the site. The total area of the signage is 218 square feet. For the Board's information the building frontage is approximately 121 feet.
6. The site does not contain a Federal Wetland as identified on the National Wetland Inventory Map or a State Wetland as identified on the New York State Freshwater Wetland Map.
7. The site is not located within a 100-year flood plain or floodway as identified on the 1994 FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

O'BRIEN & GERE ENGINEERS, INC.



Mark C. Parrish, P.E.
Managing Engineer