

Township of Hillsborough – PLANNING BOARD

Approved Public Meeting Minutes

June 22, 2023

Chairman Carl Suraci called the Planning Board Regular Public Meeting of June 22, 2023, to order at 7:04 pm. The meeting was held in the Courtroom of The Peter J. Biondi Building. All stood for the flag salute.

NOTICE OF MEETING

Chairman Suraci announced the meeting has been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 (“Sunshine Law”). Notice of the 2023 Annual Meeting Schedule has been provided to the officially designated newspapers, the Township Clerk, posted on the Township’s website and available at the Hillsborough Township Municipal Complex.

Application documents have been made available on the Township’s web site <https://hillsboroughnj.civicclerk.com/>. Complete applications files are available in the Planning and Zoning Department for inspection, in accordance with the public meeting notice.

ROLL CALL

Present - Mayor Shawn Lipani	Absent - Frank DelCore
Present - Robert Wagner, Jr	Present - Ron Skobo
Present - Committeeman John Ciccarelli	Absent - Kenneth Hesthag, Secretary
Present - Robert Peason	Present - Bruce Radowitz (<i>Alt #1</i>)
Present - Carl Suraci, Chairman	Present - Patricia Smith (<i>Alt #2</i>)
Absent - Neil Julian, Vice Chairman	

Also in attendance: David Kois, PP, AICP, *Township Planning Director*; Eric Bernstein, Esq., *Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein & Associates)*; Mark Mayhew, PE, CME, *Board Engineer (Pennoni Associates)*; Michael Lombardozzi, CSR, CCR, *Board Court Reporter.*; Dylan Tollefson, *Township Videographer (Fuerza Strategy Group)*

CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES

- None

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS

- County of Somerset (Locatell) – File 23-PB-01-SV [description]

Mr. Bernstein reviews the eligible members.

Chairman Suraci calls for a motion.

Mr. Wagner motions to approve, seconded by Mayor Lipani.

Roll Call:

Yes - Mr. Wagner	Yes - Committeeman Ciccarelli
Yes - Mr. Peason	Yes - Mayor Lipani
Yes - Mr. Radowitz (<i>Alt #1</i>)	Yes - Chairman Suraci
Yes - Ms. Smith (<i>Alt #2</i>)	

Motion carries.

PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS

- 1170 Millstone LLC – Consent to Extension – Time of Decision (through 08-31-23)

Chairman Suraci asks for some background.

Mr. Bernstein explains this application has been moved previously and has not yet appeared before this Board and are asking for a continuing extension through August. He states there is another issue to discuss. He recommends action for accepting the resolution extension.

Mr. Skobo motions to accept the resolution extension, seconded by Mr. Wagner.

Roll Call:

Yes - Mr. Wagner	Yes - Ms. Smith (<i>Alt #2</i>)
Yes - Mr. Peason	Yes - Mayor Lipani
Yes - Mr. Skobo	Yes - Chairman Suraci
Yes - Mr. Radowitz (<i>Alt #1</i>)	

Motion carries.

Mr. Bernstein states for the record what had been previously addressed with several of the ongoing warehouse applications, they have the following Time of Decision Extensions:

- Homestead 279 LLC through the end of July 31.
- 303 Amwell Road, JNJ4ABO LLC through September 28, 2023
- Weston Road LLC through July 31, 2023
- 1170 Millstone LLC through August 31, 2023

CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES

- None

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR (*public comment for matters not on the agenda*)

Chairman Suraci opens comments from the public; asks the public to state their name and address and reminds there is a five-minute limit per person and to refrain from addressing warehouse applications, directly or indirectly during this time. Warehouse questions and comments made be made during the appropriate application hearing.

1. Craig Berlin, Alehouse Street – asks if the July 13, 2023 meeting is for scheduling regarding 303 Amwell Road application.
2. Mr. Bernstein states it is on the agenda, and they are waiting to hear back from Mr. O’Grodnick to confirm further. They will advise the public once they know more.
3. Chairman Suraci closes the public comment portion as there are no further questions from the public.

APPLICATIONS – PUBLIC HEARING

- Homestead Road, LLC – File 21-PB-25-MS/MSP(V) – (TOD: 06-30-23 w/Ext.) - Block 200.10, Lots 32 & 33 –203 Homestead Road and 189 Homestead Road. Applicant seeking preliminary and final major subdivision approval (determined a minor subdivision); preliminary and final major site plan approval; ‘c’ bulk variances; and waivers, to consolidate the two lots and then subdivide into two reconfigured lots; and demolish all existing structures to construct two warehouse/office buildings, with associated stormwater, parking, and site improvements, on Property in the TECD, Transitional Economic Development District. (EC Review: 03-28-22) Revised plans/report submitted 04-21-22 and 04-28-22/ Additional plans/exhibits/documents submitted 06-24-22 / Additional submission 11-28-22. Applicant, no longer seeking ‘c’ bulk variances per revised plans/reports/documents submitted 02-17-23. Copy of NJDEP application received 03-31-23. (PB agendas: 05-12-22; 07-07-22; 10-06-22 adjourned; 12-08-22; 01-12-23 – no testimony – for scheduling only; 03-02-23; 04-06-23 – canceled, rescheduled to 04-13-23; 04-13-23; 05-25-23). Application continued from May 25, 2023 without further notice.

1. The hearing commenced at 7:10 PM.
2. Committeeman Ciccarelli recuses himself.
3. Mr. Craig Gianetti, Esq., attorney for the applicant, introduces himself.
4. Brian Tarantino, Objector #3 representing SWAT, introduces himself.
5. Lucy Sandler, Objector #5 representing the Sourland Conservancy, introduces herself.
6. Scott Gross, Objector #2 representing LCAT, introduces himself.

7. Chairman Suraci reminds the Board will only take new testimony up until 9:30 pm and will end at the full testimony at 10:00 pm.
8. Mr. Gianetti gave a summary of the application. He states this morning they received the updated Board Engineer Review Letter which he states did not offer them much time to review but they did review it. He states they will be starting with Mr. Ford, their Civil Engineer, then their architect and traffic engineer.
9. Mr. Bernstein states for the purpose of the record that Michael Pisauro of the Watershed Institute, Objector #1, has arrived.
10. Mr. Gianetti states since the last meeting they have received their LOI for the NJDEP and have submitted applications for the wetlands permits based upon the LOI. He calls Mr. Ford.
11. Michael Ford, Civil engineer for the applicant, is sworn in.
12. Chairman Suraci asks if anything has changed with his credentials.
13. Mr. Ford states nothing has changed.
14. Mr. Gianetti asks Mr. Ford to confirm their recent submission of the wetland permits.
15. Mr. Ford confirms.
16. Mr. Gianetti asks Mr. Ford to give some details about the access roads and relief being sought in connection with the town's Stream Quarter Ordinance.
17. Mr. Ford states the exhibit he will be referring to is the same exhibit he left off with at the last hearing, the colorized version of the plans which is also available on Civic Clerk. Mr. Ford points out the access points on the plan and explains the purpose.
18. Mr. Gianetti asks if there is currently an unimproved road at the easterly access point that provides access to the rear of the property.
19. Mr. Ford states this is correct.
20. Mr. Gianetti asks if they are improving the road to provide better and sufficient access to developable areas of the property.
21. Mr. Ford states yes.
22. Mr. Gianetti asks if, in Mr. Ford's opinion, there is any reasonable or prudent alternative to providing such access given that the impact access already exists there.
23. Mr. Ford states no, as he presented previously it was a logical course of action to improve the existing access.
24. Mr. Gianetti asks if the westerly access road was proposed and designed at the request of the fire official as part of their review.
25. Mr. Ford states this is correct.
26. Mr. Gianetti states that is all of his direct examination of Mr. Ford.
27. Mr. Mayhew comments on the LOI ditch stating it meets the definition of Hillsborough Township stream so there will need to be the required 155 foot stream corridor established on both sides.
28. Mr. Gianetti asks Mr. Ford for details about this ditch. Mr. Ford states to his knowledge it is a man-made ditch and to his understanding based on his department's understanding of these requirements, any roadside ditch in Hillsborough could then be considered a stream corridor.
29. Mr. Gianetti read into the record NJAC 7; 78-1.1c and discusses its meaning.
30. Mr. Bernstein advises the Board that the issue will need to be addressed.
31. Mr. Kois asks Mr. Ford to address ordinances pertaining to lot cross-access requirements.
32. Mr. Ford states their planner would be best to answer that question. He then discusses the proposed lot line between the two areas and the drainage feature there. He states the access road is built identical to the other access road. And the ditch currently has a pipe that accepts storm water discharge from the neighboring property owner's operation of a commercial facility. He provides additional details of how this is functioning.
33. Chairman Suraci asks about item four in the General Comments which pertained to being denied from the MUA for wastewater.
34. Mr. Gianetti explains they did receive a will-serve letter from the MUA which was submitted in their April or February submission. Their well-letter indicated there is

- capacity so they are not aware of or received anything saying they will refuse to serve the site.
35. Mr. Mayhew confirms the submission and content of the will-serve letter however he states the letter also warned they're not making a comment on whether there is capacity at the pump station or treatment plant. Mr. Mayhew states in his opinion it is saying they are in the sewer service area and additional investigation will be required to see if they can provide sewer capacity.
 36. There is a discussion between Chairman Suraci, Mr. Mayhew and Mr. Gianetti regarding how common this type of response is.
 37. Brian Tarantino, Objecter #3 representative of SWAT, begins his questioning. He asks questions pertaining to building 1 including but not limited to the number of truck docks, the design basis for the truck docks, if there will be comfort stations for truckers, understanding various details about the pipeline, emergency preparedness plans, and security plans.
 38. Mr. Ford addresses questions Mr. Tarantino has about their plan for stormwater management and his concerns about flooding.
 39. Mr. Bernstein asks Mr. Ford if he is aware of the Environmental Commission's reports and the comments within and directs him to address the comments.
 40. Mr. Ford explains peak reductions in flow as it pertains to impervious coverage and how it is proposed to be managed.
 41. Mr. Tarantino asks Mr. Ford to describe their Spill Prevention Control and Encounter Measures plan for the two facilities.
 42. Mr. Ford states they were responsible for stormwater runoff on the motor vehicle surfaces and they have followed and complied with the NJDEP best management practices to implement measures for treating the runoff.
 43. Mr. Tarantino concludes his questions for Mr. Ford.
 44. Lucy Sandler, Objecter #4 representative of the Sourland Conservancy, begins her questioning. Ms. Sandler asks questions pertaining to but not limited to the application sites being in a wildlife corridor, if any additional steps are taken during development to protect habitats and types of heavy machinery that will be used.
 45. Mr. Ford states the proposed project area disturbs less than 50% of the area Ms. Sandler references and much of the proposed area was already disturbed by previous activity.
 46. Ms. Sandler concludes her questions for Mr. Ford.
 47. Mike Pisauro, Jr, Objecter #1 of the Watershed Institute., begins his questioning. His questions pertain to but are not limited to the retaining wall, wetlands and infiltration basins.
 48. Chairman Suraci calls a 10-minute recess.
 49. At approximately 8:50 pm Chairman Suraci calls the meeting back into session.
 50. There is a motion to open to public comment, seconded. All were in favor, motion passes.
 51. Chairman Suraci reminds this public comment portion is for direct comments pertaining to the current witness's testimony.
 52. Mr. David Brook, 7 Winding Way, states he is not represented by any of the Objectors.
 53. Mr. Brook asks for clarification regarding the access road Mr. Ford referenced in his testimony.
 54. Mr. Ford states the easterly access given to warehouse #2 follows the existing driveway over the pipeline and over the road.
 55. Mr. Brook asks if the MUA issue was about providing access.
 56. Mr. Ford states the issue was the benefit of the access over the brook provides access to the existing sanitary sewer that runs along the north side of the brook.
 57. Mr. Brook asks if the MUA asked them to build this road.
 58. Mr. Ford states it exists now.
 59. Mr. Brook asks if they are going to make significant improvements to the road; if it is paved/has a base or is wide enough.
 60. Mr. Ford states it does need improvements and yes they will make improvements in accordance with the Township standards for access.

61. Mr. Brook asks the width of the pipeline easement.
62. Mr. Ford reads from their plan sheet which states the Texas Eastern Pipeline is 100 feet wide per book 988-125 and mentions a tax map document which shows 172.5 feet. Mr. Ford states there is a discrepancy between the tax map and the easement document; they show both lines on their document.
63. Mr. Brook asks for further explanation of what the measurements mean.
64. Mr. Ford explains it is not a distance between the pipeline, it's a land width of an easement.
65. Mr. Brook asks how many natural gas lines are running along the site and the sizes of the pipes.
66. Mr. Ford confirms there are four pipelines, and points out where the size information is listed. He reads the sizes; 42", 20", 20" and 36".
67. Mr. Brook asks if he knows the depth of the other three pipelines, stating Mr. Ford mentioned earlier one pipeline is more than 24" below the ground.
68. Mr. Ford states they are greater than the mentioned pipeline and points out where the information can be found. He states they represent the depths of the pipelines at the point of crossing where the existing road is to be improved.
69. Mr. Brook asks if he is aware of Township ordinance 188-75 Public Utilities, reads section C-1 into the record and asks if he agrees these four pipelines are transmission lines as defined in the township ordinance.
70. Mr. Ford states he is aware of it and that yes the plans do include a representative of the 75' width he referred to.
71. Mr. Brook asks if the proposed driveway for warehouse #2 cross the 75 feet adjacent to the right-of-way on both sides and easement over the top of the four transmission lines.
72. Mr. Ford states yes it traverses the pipelines today and will tomorrow.
73. Mr. Brook asks if the plan being presented to the planning board is proposing to cross more than 172 feet since it's not crossing the right-of-way in a perpendicular fashion and what is the widest measurement of the proposed crossing of the easement for the eastern road.
74. Mr. Ford reviews the plans and states approximately 100 feet at the location where they are crossing.
75. Mr. Brook asks if he knows why the applicant is proposing to cross the pipeline right-of-way for the installation.
76. Mr. Ford states it is a logical location due to the existing access there.
77. Mr. Brook asks if the applicant has provided justification to the Township as to why it must cross the 75-foot buffer and four pipelines.
78. Mr. Ford states it is an existing access today and thus logical to follow that same access.
79. Mr. Brook asks if there is no other reasonable access to the property other than crossing the pipeline.
80. Mr. Ford states their plan shows a second driveway that was suggested by the Township fire official which he confirms does not cross the pipeline.
81. Mr. Brook asks if he can then agree there is a reasonable alternative to accessing the property.
82. Mr. Ford states no, as there need to be two access points that comply with the Fire Official's request for two access points.
83. Mr. Brook asks if the fire officials told them where the second road needed to be.
84. Mr. Ford states they did not.
85. Mr. Brook asks what demonstration the applicant has made to waive the prohibition on crossing the buffer in the pipeline in this ordinance to justify this pipeline crossing.
86. Mr. Ford explains that utilizing the existing driveway is not creating a new crossing but rather improving an existing crossing.
87. Mr. Brook asks if there were any exceptional or practical difficulties they encountered when designing the road.

88. Mr. Ford states he does not believe there were difficulties, but other locations would potentially impact other restricted areas like stream waters.
89. Mr. Brook asks if he was involved in designing the western roadway nearest the hwy 206 bypass and asks the distance from the roadway to the railroad overpass.
90. Mr. Ford states he was involved with the design, and they will be presenting a Plan and Profile sheet with regards to lines of sight and clear sight distance during traffic testimony.
91. Mr. Brook asks if there is a reason the road was designed so close to the bypass.
92. Mr. Ford states they made an effort to avoid additional encroachments into the stream corridor in that area.
93. Mr. Brook asks about the grading on Homestead Road.
94. Mr. Ford provides the location of the information on the Plan and Profile Sheet.
95. Mr. Brook asks if there are plans for the applicant planting a natural buffer for the properties on White Meadow and Winding Way.
96. Mr. Ford states they did not plan to plant along the pipeline so as to avoid disturbing the pipeline area and the 75 foot area under the pipeline ordinance. He indicates that they have provided plantings on the plan.
97. Mr. Brook asks if the applicant will agree to deed restrict and preserve that property in perpetuity.
98. Mr. Gianetti indicates that the Applicant will comply with the NJDEP requirements.
99. Mr. Brook asks if a Township document search was conducted for these two properties and their histories.
100. Mr. Ford states he believes as part of their survey elements there were requests for existing deeds of record. He states part of their initial work was to establish existing conditions on site including the boundaries of the site, the topography, the vegetation, existing conditions, any improvements etc.
101. Mr. Brook begins to make statements about a buried barn on the property.
102. Mr. Bernstein interjects reminding this is a period for Objectors questions for this witness and that there will be another opportunity for Objects to present to the Board for consideration anything relative to the ability to build or not build etc. at this site. This would be the appropriate time for his statements.
103. Mr. Brook has no further questions.
104. Mr. Bill Martin, 237 Hillsborough Road, states he is a member of the public, not a lawyer and not represented by any of the Objectors.
105. Mr. Martin presents an enlarged picture of Exhibit 33 on the site plan revision 217 23 focusing on the end of the driveway with a truck turning radius. He asks if a truck that is exiting the property is completely within the incoming lane and if the truck exiting the property is crossing over the centerline, going up toward hwy 206.
106. Mr. Ford clarifies which drawing and area he is referring to then he states it does not cross the median on Homestead Road but does conflict with on-site traffic and depends on the direction of the traffic.
107. There is further discussion and review of the image by Mr. Ford and Mr. Martin.
108. Mr. Grant Kolmer, 144 Taylor Ave, asks if there are three underground basins
109. Mr. Ford states no, there are five subsurface infiltration basins for groundwater recharging and three above ground basins.
110. Mr. Kolmer asks Mr. Ford to clarify his previous funnel analogy.
111. Mr. Kolmer asks what is a catastrophic event that would overrun the basins which they engineered.
112. Mr. Ford explains they are designed for the 100 year storm.
113. Mr. Kolmer asks that means the 100-year storm will not overrun these basins.
114. Mr. Ford explains that the basins all have an emergency spillway where water would flow over and these basins are designed so there would be no flow over the emergency spillway during the 100-year storm.
115. Mr. Kolmer asks where the emergency spillway goes.

116. Mr. Ford states it is on the downslope side of all three basins. He points out where they will flow on the Exhibit.
117. Mr. Kolmer asks if the inlet flood protections for the new DEP regulations for stream corridors would not impact the horizontal distance of flooding from the streams.
118. Mr. Ford states he believes what Mr. Kolmer is referring to his response to a question about if they studied the existing stream levels not the basin designs. He explains his response.
119. Mr. Kolmer has no further questions.
120. Ms. Gulliford, 7 Hunt Club Road states she is not represented by any of the Objectors.
121. Ms. Gulliford asks, with regard to the cross access between the two proposed lots, if it would go up the western side of the larger building and go across two streams.
122. Mr. Ford states that would be a zoning issue addressed by their Planner's testimony and any further connection would result in additional disturbances of critical areas.
123. Ms. Gulliford asks if there is something on top of the circular driveway around the smaller building perhaps for emergency vehicles.
124. Mr. Ford states there are grass pavers, designed to hold the weight of firetrucks, for emergency access only.
125. Ms. Gulliford asks for clarification on the landscaping shown in the drawing.
126. Ms. Gulliford asks if the pipes are the original pipeline put into place in 19472.
127. Mr. Ford states he believes in his testimony he said he did not know the age of the pipeline.
128. Ms. Gulliford asks if there are large portions of the lots that are undevelopable.
129. Mr. Ford states he doesn't believe he testified regarding areas that would not be developed other than to explain why the conductivity to answer Mr. Kois' question. He explains there are the existing stream corridors that have restricted areas and limits.
130. Ms. Gulliford has no further questions.
131. Mr. Rich Garmin, 53 Winding Way, states he is not represented by any of the Objectors.
132. Mr. Garmin asks if both access roads to building #2 cross the stream and if so how are they fortifying the crossings?
133. Mr. Ford states yes and there will be new structures installed at both of the locations.
134. Mr. Garmin asks if that includes bridges and widening.
135. Mr. Ford states yes.
136. Mr. Garmin has no further questions.
137. Ms. Judy Haas, 2 Titus, states she is not associated with any of the Objectors.
138. Ms. Haas asks if there are charging stations for electric vehicles and if so where on the site plans they are located.
139. Mr. Ford states the site plans show spaces for electronic charging stations and they have agreed to comply with NJ Governor's Order pertaining to electronic vehicles (EV). He points out where in the parking area they are proposed to be located, a total of eight charging stations.
140. Ms. Haas points out there are none near the smaller building and asks if and where they will be for building #2.
141. Mr. Ford states there is a note on the plans referencing the State requirements for electric vehicles which they agreed to comply with.
142. Ms. Haas states she is concerned with the lack of EV spots at the second building.
143. Mr. Ford states they agree and agree to provide the locations, have the calculation on the detail sheet and will clarify the spaces will be provided in accordance with the State law at building two.
144. Ms. Haas asks if there are any other amenities at one building and not the other.
145. Mr. Ford states he does not know of any other discrepancies.
146. Ms. Haas has no further questions.
147. Ms. Mattei, 6 Cornel Trail states she is the Director of Commercial Real Estate at ReMax In-Style Realty and prior to 1988 she was an industrial manufacturing manager for Proctor & Gamble Co. in Port Ivory, Staten Island.

148. Ms. Mattei asks operational questions.
149. Mr. Gianetti and Chairman Suraci tell her those questions would be appropriate during the operational testimonies.
150. Ms. Mattei has no further questions.
151. Ms. Jo O'Connell, 20 White Meadow Road, points out where the streams cross into a neighboring property and asks if this is one of the areas that would flood during a catastrophic event.
152. Mr. Ford states no and that he was referring to the design of the detention basins which requires per regulations a provision for emergency spillway in the event there is a storm event that exceeds the 100-year storm the basins are designed for.
153. Ms. O'Connell asks if the extra water would end up in any of the houses in this area.
154. Mr. Ford states this is not extra order but rather a design provision required by the code to control the events that exceed the design event.
155. Ms. O'Connell asks if there is currently a lot of traffic on the road along the pipeline.
156. Mr. Ford states he is not the traffic engineer and does not know of any studies done currently.
157. Ms. O'Connell had no further questions.
158. Ms. Thuy Anh Le, 4 Ivy Lane, asks if Mr. Ford's company has done detailed analysis to reflect the natural flow of the streams.
159. Mr. Ford states there has been a study for where the two crossings are being proposed. He explains how the delineated area is referred to as Method Five and what it is.
160. Ms. Anh Le asks him to clarify why Method Five will be utilized over Method Six.
161. Ms. Anh Le asks if his analysis of Method Five reflects the propensity of the Roycebrook to overflow and affect other parts of the town.
162. Mr. Ford states this establishes the limits of that flood plain on this site.
163. Ms. Anh Le asks which analysis would allow them to understand the impact across the town.
164. Mr. Ford states the stormwater analysis includes a control of the peak flow discharging from the site which is dictated by the Township ordinance as well as the NJDEP state code.
165. Ms. Anh Le has no further questions.
166. Mr. Robert Hollingshead, 31 Winding Way states he is representing himself.
167. Mr. Hollingshead asks if they will be asking for a variance for not being able to buffer the pipeline right away.
168. Mr. Ford states they are not asking for any relief regarding buffering of the pipeline; he reviews the 75 feet within the pipeline area discussed earlier.
169. Mr. Hollingshead asks if it is possible for the parking area to run off water.
170. Mr. Ford states there are opportunities for infiltration.
171. Mr. Hollingshead asks if he believes they have maximized what could be built on that property.
172. Mr. Ford states the Township code allows up to 60% impervious coverage and they are well below that.
173. Mr. Hollingshead has no further questions.
174. Chairman Suraci states there is no one else waiting to ask questions.
175. Chairman Suraci and Mr. Giannetti discussing wrapping up Mr. Ford's testimony and which testimony they can start with at the next meeting.
176. There is a discussion about setting the date of their next meeting.
177. Mr. Bernstein notifies the applicant and Objectors when their reports need to be submitted by.
178. Mayor Lipani motions to carry this hearing until Thursday, September 7, 2023, without further notice and continuing to Thursday, September 14, 2023, without further notice, time of decision extended to September 30, 2023, all reports due by August 18, 2023, seconded by Mr. Skobo.

Roll Call:

Planning Board meeting minutes
June 22, 2023 - Approved

Yes - Mr. Wagner

Yes - Mr. Peason

Yes - Mr. Skobo

Yes - Ms. Smith (*Alt #2*)

Yes - Committeeman Ciccarelli

Yes - Mayor Lipani

Yes - Chairman Suraci

Motion carries. The hearing ended at 10:21 PM.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Committeeman Ciccarelli. Motion carries unanimously.

The meeting is adjourned at approximately 10:22 pm.

Submitted by Robyn Bittle-Abramo
Recording Secretary