

Township of Hillsborough – PLANNING BOARD

Approved Public Meeting Minutes

May 8, 2025

Vice Chairman Robert Peason (Chairman Pro-tem) called the Planning Board Public Meeting of May 8, 2025, to order at 7:18 pm. The meeting was held in the Courtroom of The Peter J. Biondi Building. All stood for the flag salute.

NOTICE OF MEETING

Vice Chairman Peason 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 2025 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.portal.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 John Ciccarelli	Absent - Bruce Radowitz
Present - Robert Wagner, Jr	Absent - Angelo Vitale
Present - Committeeman Shawn Lipani	Absent - Patricia Smith, <i>Secretary</i>
Present - Robert Peason, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Absent - Surajit Deb (<i>Alt. #1</i>)
Present - Carl Suraci, <i>Chairman</i>	Present - Jason Smith (<i>Alt. #2</i>)
Present - Jason Flagg	

Also in attendance: David Kois, PP, AICP, *Township Planning Director*; Samantha Ball, *Assistant Planner / Sustainability Program Manager*; Eric Bernstein, Esq., *Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein & Associates)*; Mark Mayhew, PE, CME, *Board Engineer (Pennoni Associates)*; Michael Lombardozzi, CSR, CCR, *Board Court Reporter.*; Alex Pallis, *Township Videographer (Fuerza Strategy Group)*

CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES

- None

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS

- None

PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS

- None

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

Vice Chairman Peason opens to comments from the public. He reminds of the rules, comments only no questions (there will be an additional period for questions), no comments regarding warehousing direct or indirect*, and there is a five-minute limit per person. He asks that each person state their name and address for the record.

(*warehouse-related comments and questions should be expressed during the designated public hearing portion of the meeting)

None

CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES

- **None**

Mr. Bernstein explains while there are seven members of the Board currently present Chairman Suraci, who is running late, will be the fifth for the quorum needed for the application hearing. He suggests the Board take a recess until Chairman Suraci arrives.

7:20 – The Board enters recess.

7:29 – Chairman Suraci calls the meeting back into session.

APPLICATIONS – PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Bernstein states Mr. Smith and Mr. Flagg are ineligible to participate but may remain on the dais to listen. Next, Mr. Bernstein states he has a Certification by Absent Board Member Examination of Record Eligibility to Vote for Robert Peason for the April 3, 2025, meeting therefore he is eligible to vote completing the necessary quorum for the hearing.

- **Homestead Road, LLC – File 21-PB-25-MS/MSP(V)** – (TOD: 05-31-25 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. Applicant, no longer seeking ‘c’ bulk variances. Last revised plans/reports/documents received 08-08-24. (EC Review: 03-28-22)

*PB Meeting Agenda Dates: 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; 06-22-23; 09-07-23; 09-14-23; 12-14-23; 01-11-24; 01-25-24; 03-07-24; 04-11-24; 07-11-24; 09-12-24; 11-07-24; 12-12-24; 02-13-25; 03-13-25; 04-03-25 (no testimony). **All parties agreed the application would be continued from April 03, 2024 (no testimony) to May 08, 2025 without further notice.***

Participating for the Applicant: Craig Gianetti, Esq. of Day Pitney, LLP; Gary Dean, PE of Dolan & Dean; Edward Kuc, Principal Ecologist of Eastern States Environmental Associates, Inc.; Christine Nazzaro-Cofone, PP, AICP of Cofone Consulting Group, LLC; David Robinson, LSRP of Synergy Environmental; Michael K. Ford, PE, PP, of Van Cleef Engineering Associates, LLC; and Applicant's Representatives: Glenn Stock, Eric Greif, and Kenneth Greif

Participating for the Objectors: Objector #1 - Michael Pisauero, Jr., Esq. of The Watershed Institute, Witness – Clay Emerson, PhD, PE, CMF of Princeton Hydro; Objector #2: Scott Gross, Member Representative of Local Citizens Against Traffic (LCAT), Witness - Kenneth J. Hausman, PE, Traffic Engineer; Objector #3: Brian Tarantino, Member Representative of Stop Warehouses and Trucks (SWAT), and Carlos Rodrigues, PP, FAICP of Design Solutions for a

Crowded Planet, LLC; and Objector #4: John Lanahan; Objector #5: Lucy Sandler, Sourland Conservancy Board of Trustees, Advocacy Committee Chair

1. 7:29 pm start of hearing.
2. **Craig Gianetti**, attorney for applicant, introduces himself.
3. Objectors **Brian Tarantino, John Lanahan, Scott Gross, Lori Cleveland** on behalf of the Sourland Conservatory, and **Mike Pisauro** introduce themselves.
4. Mr. Bernstein summarizes why the application has been continued to this meeting and that Mr. Dean, who was expected to appear, is not present.
5. Mr. Gianetti gives explanation as to Mr. Dean's absence and why it was necessary for him, not another member of his office, to be present for the cross-examination. He states since the April 3, 2025 meeting VanCleaf Engineering and Dolan & Dean have submitted response letters to the Board professional review letter dated March 24 and the Pennoni Associates letter dated April 2, 2025. He explains the response letters do not contain new evidentiary information. He discusses when Mr. Dean is next available to appear before the Board.
6. Mr. Tarantino argues the response letters are out of order as they contain new data and analysis not previously submitted or reviewed.
7. Mr. Lanahan discusses how he found the response letters to be confusing, mischaracterizing previous letters from the Board and incomplete.
8. Mr. Tarantino expresses issue with the Objectors not being given the opportunity to cross-examine and the response letters are not direct testimony.
9. Mr. Gross states he concurs with Mr. Tarantino and Mr. Lanahan's concerns.
10. Mr. Gianetti explains the responses in the letter are not part of direct testimony, are not for the Objectors but rather for the Board in addressing the Board engineers' review letters. He addresses Mr. Tarantino accusation the information in the response is 'out of time'.
11. Mr. Bernstein explains he disagrees with Mr. Gianetti's statement that they are not professional reports as it belies the issue of why provide them in the first place. He believes the Objectors have the right to cross-examine Mr. Dean but no one is asking to bring Mr. Ford back. He discusses the applicant's right to have their professionals to submit letters, states Mr. Dean should attend the next meeting where Objectors will be able to ask specific questions about specific items in Mr. Dean's report, but aside from that cross-examination is done. He recommends at the next meeting the public be given an opportunity to be heard, then the five Objectors can be heard and read their letters into the record if they choose, Mr. Gianetti makes his final remarks and then the Board can state its decision for this application.
12. There is a discussion between Chairman Suraci, Mr. Gianetti and Mr. Bernstein about Mr. Bernstein's recommendations.
13. Mr. Lanahan asks for clarification on the Objectors' ability to respond.
14. Chairman Suraci recommends that if any of the Board professionals supplement their reports, they clearly state if they feel any portion of the submitted letters contain new information.
15. Mr. Bernstein recommends adding to have Board professionals respond accordingly.
16. Mr. Gianetti and Mr. Tarantino continue to argue if the response letters contain new information.
17. Mr. Bernstein reminds Mr. Tarantino he previously advised him and the Objectors they had the opportunity to supplement the record with their own experts; he explains the

- applicant is responding to the letters of the professionals as is their right to do and he can include his complaints about the response letters in his final arguments.
18. Chairman Suraci asks for clarification if it is typical with applications to allow subs to provide information that professionals request, nothing out of the ordinary for something to be submitted after a vote occurs.
 19. Mr. Bernstein agrees but states he believes the appropriate time is during closing arguments.
 20. There is a discussion about scheduling, timing and quorum.
 21. Mr. Gianetti proposes starting the public questions tonight.
 22. Mr. Bernstein advises waiting as he believes most members of the public will want to come to the next meeting and may have additional questions.
 23. Board members discuss this recommendation. Committeeman Lipani asks for a show of hands from the public as to who would be interested in speaking tonight. The Board decides to allow for public comment tonight but those members of the public will not be permitted to speak again at the next meeting.
 24. Chairman Suraci calls for a motion to open to public comment for the application as a whole with the understanding of the conditions that they will not be permitted to come back before the Board with regard to this application.
 25. Committeeman Lipani motions, seconded by Mr. Wagner. All are in favor, none opposed. Motion carries.
 26. Before proceeding, Mr. Bernstein states he realizes he needs confirmation from Mr. Wager for the record that he has also submitted his certification from the April 3, 2025 meeting.
 27. Mr. Wagner confirms off mic.
 28. **Gail Martin**, Hillsborough Rd – states she is not a member of SWAT but supports what they do. She states as part of a grassroots project she has a paper petition of 666 signatures against the warehouses. She explained the canvas the affected neighborhood door-to-door explaining proposed warehouse application and asked if the resident would like to sign petition. She prepares to read the text on the petition into the record.
 29. Mr. Gianetti objects to the inclusion of a signed petition to the record.
 30. Mr. Bernstein states Ms. Martin can indicate she spoke to a bunch of people and this is were their opinions, however he believes the Board can take judicial notice that there is such a petition but it is not part of the record for purposes of determining this application. He states Ms. Martin can give it to Mr. Kois to keep for the purpose of the record but it will not be part of Civic Clerk or the overall record.
 31. Ms. Martin asks for clarification if it will be included in the transcript.
 32. Chairman Suraci confirms whatever she states will be in the transcript.
 33. Mr. Bernstein states if she wishes she may read the text of the petition with the understanding of what it is.
 34. Ms. Martin reads the text of the petition (not the names) into the record.
 35. Ms. Martin makes her own comments stating her belief of the widespread impact of the warehouse, including but not limited to the trucks, noise, truck traffic throughout the surrounding neighborhoods, proposed main-street area and air quality. She expressed concern about the impact on road maintenance, keeping the residential neighborhoods residential and the influx of tractor trailer traffic. She discusses flaws she has seen in the project plan during her attendance of various meetings. She states the application is not good for Hillsborough Township or its residents and that it only seems to be good for the applicant who lives in Florida. She expresses concern that the applicant has not submitted a noise report and discusses the overwhelming amount of noise that will impact the neighboring residents. She expresses frustration over that applicant's claims of what the

tenant will *not* be using the warehouse for while seemingly withholding what the tenant *will* be using the warehouse for. She states she believes the warehouse belongs in an industrial park near major highways and not on Homestead Road a two-lane road across from 1,000+ acres of farmland, open space and residential areas. She discusses its proximity to the high school and concerns of new, inexperienced drivers having to maneuver around tractor trailers. She states it is not safe and is an accident waiting to happen. She discusses how Township officials strengthened the community impact requirements with an Impact Statement by sponsored by Committeeman Carl Suraci dated February 15, 2008. She reads a portion of the statement into the record. Ms. Martin states she is submitting the original petition and signatures to the Board. She concludes by saying “if these warehouses are approved, Hillsborough will no longer be able to use the tagline, ‘One of the best places to live in America’ and removed from the list of one of the top five destinations of the year. Do the right thing and deny this application.”

36. **Joe O’Connell**, White Meadow Road, states her house is almost 250 years old and, like Hillsborough, has seen a lot of changes in that time. She discusses the TEC zone, how it is supposed to be neighborhood friendly and who she feels these potential changes do not meet that standard. She discusses the topography of the area and how floodwaters, noise, odors, and diesel fumes flow north from the Homestead property, permeating the area for extended periods of time. She discusses how this became evident in the 1980s and 1990s when a noxious substance was spread on the farm fields and the impact it had. She gives examples of this including but not limited to how since her property is set in a sort of depression smoke from neighbor’s BBQs, fireworks and diesel fumes accumulate in her yard making the air around her house intolerable. She discusses the issues legal directions for trucks to travel in this area which includes a very steep, sight-restricted hill across a narrow bridge leading into what has been designated as part of the town center which endeavors to be a pedestrian-friendly zone. She states the other option would be for them to travel onto Willow Road which is weight restricted, which would be a violation. She asks and speculates about how truck traffic direction would be enforced. Next, she discusses neighboring properties having conservation easements, direct connection between resident properties and the river running alongside Clerico Lane and first-hand witnessing the easement becoming a flash-flood river flowing through her front yard and spanning 60-70 feet wide and 2 to 3 feet deep as it travels toward the farm at the far end of Clerico Lane. She expresses concerns about the proposed structure impacting the flooding issues of the Royce Brook which flows through Clerico Lane and gives examples from Hurricane Ida in which one woman lost her life and a family escaped possible fatality by abandoning their car in the flood waters. Ms. O’Connell states through OPRA she complied a list of 64 cars in the area that were left abandoned and flooded due to Hurricane Ida with another 30-40 vehicles left in the parking lot The Landing. She points out the application does not include the sidewalks and bike lanes which connect to the adjoining residential neighborhoods as required by the TEC Zone. She expresses her concern that the application is not neighborhood friendly and does not meet TEC Zone requirements. She concludes by stating “we need to be good, responsible ancestors doing what’s right for Hillsborough not just for the next 20 years but for the next 250+ years.”
37. **Nestor Pla**, Stage Coach Way, states he is not affiliated with the Objectors. He states he is against the warehouse, his family deserves better and explains how his family moved to Hillsborough because it was a desirable place to live. He states he is a retired sergeant first-class of the NJ State Police and was the Assistant Unit-Head of the Commercial Carrier Safety Inspection Unit . He explains the Unit covered the entire state of NJ and included specialized enforcement of federal regulations that govern the trucking industry,

Title 49 and during his time has stopped and inspected thousands of trucks and drivers. He states based on his knowledge he has several concerns: 1. the heavy truck traffic 24 hours a day 7 days a week. 2. “truck drivers make money when the wheels on their trucks turn”. He explains that drivers will not follow restricted roadway signs because they would rather face a fine than be late with their delivery and discusses his experience pulling over truck drivers in this type of situation. 3. “hours of service”, he discusses truck drivers’ mandated resting periods, as listed in part 395 of title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, which can only be enforced by NJ State Troopers that are trained and certified to conduct federal inspections. He discusses truck drivers’ misuse of electronic logging devices to capture their movements. 4. Noise – he discusses how truck drivers wear and tear their brakes by using their engine to slow down, also known as the Jake brake, and how this noise will impact the surrounding area. 5. Impact of truck traffic on hwy 206 which includes how trucks will slow down the average rate of traffic thus causing increased back-up. Mr. Pla reiterates he speaks from his experience. In closing he states based on his knowledge of the Municipal Land Use Law, he believes the applicant has failed to meet the burden of proof for the Board to act in favor of the application and he asks the Board to deny the application.

38. **Candy Meyer**, Fairfield Lane, states she is not represented by any of the Objectors. She states she does not see how the applicant’s proposed buildings are consistent with the TEC Zone and discusses code 188-1072, the transitional economic development zoning for Hillsborough. She reads part of section C, item nine into the record and states she does not recall hearing anything in the testimony regarding the loading areas screening. She next reads a portion of section F, item one into the record and she references retaining walls discussed during testimony and how would not fit into existing topography.
39. **Ina Sivriver**, Tally Ho Trail, states she is not represented by the Objectors. She discusses the argument “we all shop online so we can’t complain about warehouses” and how there are nearby warehouses in Somerset, NJ and that Hillsborough is not an appropriate location. She discusses the how some of the Objector’s expert witnesses were met with an “aggressive attitude” by the applicant’s attorney. She discusses the lack of noise report or study; asks who will be responsible for the air pollution, ruined roads and increased traffic and accidents. She discusses her concerns about how the warehouse with impact and create more flooding issues. She expresses concern that new warehouses would be automated and not actually create many new jobs. She concludes by discussing how Hillsborough township will be responsible for any damage created by the warehouse and not the applicant and asks the Board to deny the application.
40. **Chris Dawson**, Hunt Club Road, states he is not with the Objectors. He states Homestead Road was not constructed for trailer traffic and does not want his taxes used for road repair from damage by tractor trailer traffic. He proposes, if passed, that Homestead LLC post a road bond to pay for future road repair. He states the traffic study was limited to Homestead Road and, in his opinion, was insufficient. He states traffic on hwy 206 will be impacted, trucks cannot easily access the byway, Willow Road and hwy 206 are the only possible exits from Homestead Road and the 4000 lb weight restriction on Willow Road is unenforceable. He states last week he witnessed a tractor trailer turn onto Willow Road from Homestead Road and it was not pulled over or ticketed. In closing to show the 4,000 lb weight restriction is “pointless” he lists vehicles which are over the limit including Amazon delivery trucks, landscaping trailers, SUVs, and school buses.
41. **Jim Vonderhorst**, Webber Ave, states he is not represented by SWAT. He states he appreciate the time given to the public to share their thoughts on all the warehouse applications. He states he has attended almost all of the warehouse application meetings

and this warehouse application is the one that scares him the most. He states he believes the most critical issue out of all the issues residents addressed is the “enormous impact of the hundreds, if not thousands, of diesel truck trips every week on the health of both adults and children in the surrounding community”. He discusses the applicant’s air quality report dated August 31, 2022 which claimed minimal impact from diesel fumes and was based on a single monitoring station in Camden and another in Trenton, NJ. He next discusses Consumer Reports’ series of five investigative reports, in partnership with the Environmental Defense Fund, focusing on the dangers of warehouse truck air pollution which was first released in July 2023. He reads into the record the five key findings. He concludes by discussing how long he has lived in Hillsborough, his love of the town and applauds both previous generations of management as well as the existing Boards for all they have done to make “Hillsborough the best place to live in America.” He urges the Board members to live up to that and to deny the application.

42. Mr. Gianetti objects to the reference in the record to an expert report that was not submitted to the Board and no testimony provided on.
43. Chairman Suraci notes his objections.
44. **Sunni Bolar**, Winding Way, states she is not a member of SWAT. Ms. Bolar states her property is next to the proposed warehouse separated by the Royce Brook and expresses her concern over the “deadly impact” this warehouse will have on her home and property. She discusses her experience during and impact on her property & home during Tropical Storm Ida in 2021 including dealing with FEMA after. She states with large amounts of rain her property floods leaving her basement knee-deep in water and is concerned with the proposed warehouse and extra flow of water the Royce Brook will flood even more often and drastically leaving her home and neighboring homes on Winding Way underwater. Next, she discusses her concern about the extreme noise pollution the warehouse will generate including her experience when the site was rented-out which caused constant noise of trucks operating all day long and states “it was deafening just to be in my backyard”. She points out the proposed docks will be pointing Winding way and predicts the noise-pollution will be “100-fold more”. She states she is concerned she will not be able to sleep at night. Ms. Bolar discusses the proposed height of proposed warehouse, its location on top of the hill and the proposed lighting in comparison to her house at the base which she is worried at night will look like a lit football field. She discusses having moved from New York to New Jersey to escape the noise, smoke and light pollution. She questions why the loading docks are not going to face Homestead Road. She discusses how her backyard beautify habitat for wildlife and birds and how as an avid birder, she has “recorded 68 species of birds on her property including Bald Eagles” one of which she last record on March 30, 2025. She posted the video of this sitting on a public Hillsborough forum on Facebook. She expresses concern the proposed warehouse construction will result in habitat destruction for wildlife and many species due to deforestation. In conclusion she reminds of the life already lost during flooding in Hillsborough and asks the Board to vote against the proposed warehouse.
45. **John Provieri**, Homestead Road and have a house in Montgomery Twp, states he is not affiliate with the Objectors. Mr. Provieri discusses the history of the area when ash dump sites, bot toxic and not toxic, were being considered in the area and discusses his experience as a member of the civic group, Refuse, talking to each municipality in Somerset County about their concern of the possibility of the dump sites made necessary by state mandate. He stated the Hillsborough Mayor at the time, Pete Biondi, number one concern was not the non-toxic nature of the dump site but rather trucking and traffic impacts to the town, particularly in this area. He states the addition of the hwy 206 bypass

may have alleviated some of the traffic, but he reminds the proposed warehouse has 90 loading bays and asks the Board to consider how much traffic that can generate and states he believes it is more than this community can handle.

46. **Tara Baldwin**, Franklin Drive, states she is not affiliated with the Objectors. Ms. Baldwin states she has questions she wanted to ask Gary Dean but since she is unable to attend the June 5, 2025 meeting she would like to go over them now. She states her questions related to the proximity of the sites used by Mr. Dean as the basis in his analysis. Her concerns include the used sites are not as remote as the Hillsborough site from an interstate and the proposed site's proximity to and use of residential roads.
47. **Thuy Anh Le**, 4 Ivy Lane, states she is not affiliated with the Objectors. She states her appreciation for all the people committed to Hillsborough Township including all the residents attending meetings, Township committee members and the Planning Board. Ms. Le she wanted to remind everyone that when visiting the Building Department there are two signs, one about being one of the '100 Best Places to Live' and another underneath stating "Attention! Incomplete applications will not be accepted." She reminds the Board for the past three years they have heard how incomplete this application has been including not meeting zoning requirements for the TECD zone and not meeting township ordinances. She asks the Board to consider why a professional developer, or some being represented by Mr. Gianetti, was even allowed to submit such an application. She discusses as a 30-year resident how proud she is to live in Branchburg and that as a former Board of Education member she understands and empathizes with the weight of the decision before the Planning Board.
48. **Bob Hollings**, Winding Way, states he is not affiliated with the Objectors. He reminds the properties on Winding Way and Valley Drive are on wells, states there is an old contaminated well on the warehouse site, an old landfill in the south east corner of the property, its contents remain undetermined. He expresses concern that disturbing the ground will cause contamination to seep into area wells. He reiterates as other have about turning the building if approved, discusses size of the proposed building in comparison to area houses, buffering and how it is too large to be properly buffered, and height of proposed lights when considering the grade and height of the building.
49. **David Brook**, Winding Way, states he is not apart of any of the Objector organizations. He asks for clarification on the current public comment and opening up again at the June 5, 2025 meeting to people who have not spoken.
50. Chairman Suraci confirms that is correct.
51. Mr. Brook has no further comment.
52. There are no further comments from the public.
53. Mr. Bernstein explains the order of events at the next meeting and who will be permitted to speak.
54. A motion to extend this meeting to Thursday, June 5, 2025 at 7:00 pm is made by Vice Chairman Peason, seconded by Mayor Ciccarelli.

Roll Call:

Yes - Mr. Wagner
Yes - Committeeman Lipani
Yes - Mayor Ciccarelli
Yes - Vice Chairman Peason
Yes - Chairman Suraci

Motion carries

55. 8:58 pm end of hearing.

Mr. Bernstein states for the record, he reminds the Board members he has spoken with who are eligible to hear the remand on Harvard Way LLC, the matter will be heard on July 10, 2025 at 7:00 pm and notice will be provided by the applicant in advance; council for the carrier will be in attendance, an executive session will be needed as proposed in the previous meeting.

Chairman Suraci asks if the May 22, 2025 business meeting needs to be canceled.

Vice Chairman Wagner motion to cancel the May 22, 2025 business meeting, seconded by Mayor Ciccarelli.

Roll Call:

Yes - Mr. Wagner

Yes - Mayor Ciccarelli

Yes - Mr. Flagg

Yes - Vice Chairman Peason

Yes - Mr. Smith

Yes - Chairman Suraci

Yes - Committeeman Lipani

Motion carries

Mr. Kois reminds the public there is still a survey open regarding the Master Plan. A paper copy is available at the rear of the meeting room or online at [engageHillsboroughNJ.org](https://engagehillsboroughnj.org) . The survey will end May 18, 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Mayor Ciccarelli, seconded by Committeeman Lipani. Motion carries unanimously.

9:01 pm meeting is adjourned.

*Submitted by Robyn Bittle-Abramo
Recording Secretary*