

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323
April 4, 2022

The Regular meeting of the Florence Township Board of Adjustment was held in-person and virtually via Zoom on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Chairman Lutz called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Secretary Puccio read the following statement: "I would like to announce that this meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice has been provided to the official newspapers and posted in the main hall of the Municipal Complex."

Upon roll call the following members were found to be present:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Brett Buddenbaum | Joseph Cartier |
| Larry Lutz | Anant Patel |
| Dennis Puccio | Lou Sovak |
| Daniel Studzinski | Gina Sullivan |
| Kevin Minton | |

Absent: None

Also Present: Solicitor David Frank
Engineer Hugh Dougherty
Planner Barbara Fegley

RESOLUTIONS

There were no resolutions

MINUTES

Mr. Puccio mentioned a correction needing to be made on page 24 where it stated Vice Chair Pagano instead of Vice Chair Buddenbaum

It was the Motion of Mr. Puccio, seconded by Mr. Patel to adopt the minutes from the Regular Meeting of March 7, 2022, with the correction noted. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

APPLICATIONS

Solicitor Frank mentioned that the application for 2039 Route 130 LLC that was listed on the Board's preliminary agenda would not be heard tonight due to the applicant not providing a correct published notice. The Board is unable to take jurisdiction of this application and it is anticipated for the May 2nd meeting.

- A. Application ZB#2022-03: Application by Daniel Studzinski for Bulk Variance for side yard setback to construct a single-car addition to an existing 2-car garage on property located at 15 Tall Timber Lane, Florence Township; Block 160.04, Lot 11.

Solicitor Frank mention that Mr. Studzinski is a currently serving as a member of our Zoning Board and added that even though he is a board member, it does not mean he gives up his right to be a resident of Florence Township. Mr. Studzinski cannot decide on his own application.

Daniel Studzinski was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Mr. Studzinski stated he resides at 15 Tall Timber Lane in Florence Township. He is seeking a bulk variance for side yard setback to construct a 1-car garage addition onto his already existing 2-car garage. He confirmed he received Engineer Dougherty's review letter.

Engineer Dougherty stated his letter dated 3/1/22 confirms that the applicant is seeking a side yard setback of 8.8' for adding an additional 1-car garage to his existing 2-car garage, where 15' is required. He has deemed the application complete.

Engineer Dougherty stated he provided the bulk ordinance for that zone along with his letter. Since it is an attached garage, it is part of the principal structure, and a side yard setback is required. If it was a stand-alone garage, only 5' side yard setback would be needed.

Mr. Studzinski provided the following in answer to Engineer Dougherty's and Board Members' questions:

- His development is made up of 5 different house designs. His house is like 7 others, which do have multiple car garages.
- He will be using the garage addition for car storage and restoration, which is the same use as his 2-car garage.
- 12 years ago, he built an addition and the nicest compliment he received was that you couldn't tell it was an addition. He hopes to do the same with this addition and make it look like it's always been a part of the house.
- He did the elevation plans himself.
- The proposed addition will be to the right of his house and will have an 8.8' side yard setback. There is 16' side yard setback on the left side of his house, which is enough room for emergency vehicles to access the rear of his property should there be a need.
- The fence on the right side of his house will lose 2 sections to make room for the addition, but there will still be a large gate.
- The existing propane tanks will be relocated to behind the garage. Or, instead of two 100 lb. tanks, he will get a larger single tank and locate it behind his shed. They will be in his rear yard.
- The downspouts discharge to the front of his house which drains towards the street. He is looking into having a rain barrel, if needed, and then use what's collected to water his flower bed. Right now, he will be extending the downspout to run towards the flower bed and then to the street.
- The addition will be 16' high, where 20' is allowed for an accessory structure.
- There is already an established elevation and all garages will be the same height.
- He is not changing the existing driveway entrance; it will only be widened at the top half.

Engineer Dougherty stated Mr. Studzinski testified to the characteristics of the addition, which will be similar to the existing home, and there is ample room for a fire truck to get to the back of the property if needed. He confirmed there is no issue with the amount of impervious coverage and only a bulk variance for side yard setback is needed. He added that as a condition of approval, the propane tanks and AC unit shall be shown on the plans for the garage that is submitted to the Construction Department.

The meeting was opened for public comment and the Zoom moderator confirmed that we were muting no one.

31.

Hearing no one wishing to speak, it was the Motion of Mr. Patel, seconded by Vice Chair Buddenbaum to close public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Solicitor Frank stated that with the comments expressed by the Board Engineer and applicant, this can be seen as a C1 Variance, because we're adding to a lawfully existing structure, or we could approach it under a flexible C talking about whether this may advance some of the purposes of zoning, aesthetic regularities and amenities consistent with the zone. He added it is significant to note that the addition is consistent in terms of its setback and height with an accessory structure, so if this were built as a separate free-standing garage not attached to the main structure, it would be permissible in this location.

It was the Motion of Mr. Puccio, seconded by Vice Chair Buddenbaum to approve Application ZB#2202-03 as a C1 Variance.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Puccio, Buddenbaum, Cartier, Patel, Sovak, Sullivan, Lutz

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion Carried

Application ZB#2021-14: Application by NFI Real Estate, LLC for Preliminary Major Site Plan with Use Variance to construct a warehouse in Mansfield Township with basins, parking and associated improvements to be located in Florence Township on property located at 1091 Florence Columbus Road, Florence Township. (Wainwright Tract); Block 167.01, Lots 2.01, 2.05, 3.01, 3.02 & 4.

Chairman Lutz stated when this application was adjourned at last month's meeting, we were in the middle of public comment at the time. He opened the meeting again for public comment and stated we will begin with hearing from the professionals representing Florence Township.

Matt Madden of the law firm Madden & Madden stated he was retained by the governing body, the Mayor and the members of the Township Council, to voice their concerns and objections to the applicant's proposal. He stated that this is a very unique application in that only the accessory facilities are proposed for Florence Township, and that Mansfield Township has already approved the project. Nonetheless, because the ordinance does not allow parking lot and drive aisle as permitted principal uses, a Use Variance is required. While it may be a technical variance, or an unusual one, the applicant is still obligated to demonstrate that the proposal meets the positive and the negative criteria; that there be no substantial detriment to the zone plan or the public good, and that the proposal is consistent with the Master Plan. It's their burden to demonstrate to the Board that the property is particularly suitable for this proposed use. He has 2 witnesses with him tonight to show that these criteria have not been met.

Mr. Madden stated the following:

- The applicant's engineer testified that this is just a technical variance, and that the proposal meets the positive criteria because the improvements proposed for Florence Township are located in the SM zoning district, and that district allows warehouses. In that regard that is true, that the portions of this project that fall within Florence Township fall within the SM zoning district.
- It's also true that the SM zone allows warehouses. It is important to note that warehouses of this size, with the proposed height, are not allowed in our SM zone. He

suggested that the excess height can be a proxy for intensity of a use in this instance. And that intensity being beyond what was contemplated by Florence Township when they determined that only 30' high warehouses be allowed. He stated this is not an expert opinion; however, it seems a 50-foot-tall warehouse would be more intense in use than the 30-foot height that is allowed. So, while these are just accessory uses, they are accessory to a massive 1,000,000 sq. ft. 50' tall warehouse that would not be permitted in the SM zone without a Height Variance.

- It was the traffic testimony provided by that applicant that there would be no substantial detriment to the public good as a result of the traffic increase. But there is a significant unknown as far as the end user; we don't know who the end user is and how much traffic there will really be.
- It can't easily be figured out what the ultimate impact will be, especially if this will be a high-cube parcel hub warehouse, a high-cube trans-load and short-term storage warehouse, or high-cube fulfillment center warehouse.
- Because we don't know the end user, it would be incumbent upon the applicant to present the worse-case scenario for what might go here. The applicant should use data that represents the actual potential negative impact. The applicant has not done that here and has used base-line numbers consisting of traffic counts obtained during the Covid pandemic, where we all know the traffic was significantly lower than it would be during normal times. They did not include data from their own recent studies conducted in this area and the traffic projection numbers are based on a less intense type of warehouse.
- The zoning is in place for a reason, and the powers-to-be decided that a warehouse is permitted in this zone, provided they are no more than 30' high, not one that is 50' high.
- The applicant pointed out that the Board has to consider this project as a whole, which he agrees with. The Board should do that with this proposal, and they are charged with evaluating those positive and negative criteria in light of this overall project.
- What the Board has at its disposal when deciding this application are ordinances and the 2018 Reexamination Report of the Master Plan. The Master Plan Reexamination Report is significant because you rarely see a reexamination report that speaks directly to a property that has a proposal in front of you. But the reexamination report specifically states these properties as originally having been considered for a more intense industrial node, but the township has backed off of that and have adopted an ordinance stating they do not want this type of warehouse in this zone because they do not think it is appropriate for this area are concerned about the traffic impact.
- The driveway servicing the facility, the only way in or out of this site, is proposed to be located in Florence Township. The concerns expressed by that reexamination report as far as traffic impact are incredibly relevant here.
- High-cube warehouses are a fairly new phenomenon, so there is not a long-standing body of data to analyze traffic for these types of warehouses.
- The applicant offers assurances by way of the fact that the County conducts a post-development traffic study for the ultimate end use and matches those post-development numbers to the testimony provided at the time of the hearing. The problem with that is, the building is already built. It would be up to the applicant to then take care of something post development, whether it be changes to the roadway, to access aisles, etc. which would be done while the place is in operation, not an ideal situation.

With Mr. Madden were Mr. Klein Klein, traffic expert, and Mark Remsa, professional planner. Mr. Klein and Mr. Remsa were sworn in by Solicitor Frank.

Mr. Klein stated he is a professional engineer licensed in State of NJ and is nationally certified as a traffic operations engineer. He has represented over a dozen boards during the 8 years that Klein Traffic Consulting LLC has been in business. He has also been the traffic engineer for developers. Chairman Lutz accepted Mr. Klein as an expert witness.

Mr. Klein stated, in the past, he had been hired by the Township of Roxbury for their Planning Board. In that case, the developer was building a spec building. It was made a condition of approval that when the end user was known, they had to come back to board.

For this application, he reviewed the traffic report submitted by the applicant. First, it is important to analyze existing traffic in area. He searched the NJDOT counting stations they have online and stated they do have one on Florence Columbus Road and I295. He reviewed the numbers from 2017 and 2021 and compared it to the applicant's traffic report. In some cases, counts were off by 100 trips; DOT's were higher. The numbers the applicant got during their Covid 19 study should have been adjusted. The applicant did a one-day study of traffic, which in most cases is adequate. However, in this area, incidents take place on one road, which increases traffic on the other roads. It is crucial to do a traffic analysis outside Covid 19 times to consider more accurate numbers. The applicant did include the Vanco and Margolis developments, which is good; but they did not look at historic counts to see how they compared to 2021 analysis for a more accurate analysis.

Mr. Klein stated he found numbers which were 100 higher than what was submitted. The intersection at Florence Columbus Road and Route 130 is currently a Level Service F. Just a few additional trips can cause great issues. A working high-cube parcel in Roxbury showed 700 trips, which is significantly higher than what they are saying. He stated we will hear from our planner that there are improvements planned for the Florence Columbus Road and Route 130 intersection. Burlington County will be asking for a post development traffic study. In this situation here, if the numbers are significantly more than what was represented, it is difficult to go back and make improvements while the site is operational. Additional lanes or a traffic signal would be very difficult to implement when the warehouse is operational.

Mr. Minton asked when is it time for the post-study to be done? Mr. Klein stated it is typically done 6 months after the site is operational. Mr. Minton stated he was told Margolis property post-development is only 1/3 of what was proposed, but that facility is not fully occupied. Mr. Klein stated another way that it can be done is when its 25% or 33% occupied and that total is then multiplied by 4 or 3 to get a better projection of what the post-development numbers would be. You wouldn't want to do the study when only 10% occupied. Mr. Minton asked if there is a set time when the study is done or is it based on occupancy of facility? Mr. Klein stated you would want the facility at least 1/4 or 1/3 full and the study should be done on multiple days.

Mr. Puccio asked if there should be an adjustment when no public transportation or sidewalks are available? Mr. Klein stated that because these types of uses are in a rural area, the numbers are of just trip generation and probably don't include mass transportation.

Mark Remsa stated he was in his 42nd year in the professional planning field. He is licensed in State of NJ and is also licensed as a landscape architect. He has been recognized as a professional witness by the NJ Superior Court. He has been before numerous boards and has sat as a planner for municipal boards. He has also been the County Planner and has worked as a planner with the traffic issues in Florence Township. Chairman Lutz accepted Mr. Remsa as an expert witness.

Mr. Remsa stated he looked at the overall industrial area from Florence Township, Mansfield Township, Burlington Township, and Burlington City and looked at rising congestion and loss of level of service at intersecting highways. Most noticeable is at the intersection of Florence Columbus Road and Route 130 and it fails today. NJDOT has done a conceptual development plan for that intersection and the idea is to completely redesign that intersection. Any additional traffic will just make it worse. The conceptual design process has concluded; but it's still a long way before construction begins, and a number of years has already passed with DOT handling the project. There is no question that intersection is a failing intersection.

Mr. Remsa visited the proposed site and examined the applicant's plans and documents that were submitted with the application. He agrees that the applicant must show the positive and negative criteria. It is not a permitted use for that zone and the focus is on the use variance. He likes to start off with a planning framework and the fundamental questions that go before his mind are:

- 1st – this is a very large piece of property, mostly in the AGR zone which we have heard they are not touching the AGR zone. If they are not planning any use for the AGR zone, why are all the different lots included in this application?
- 2nd – we heard this is just a technical variance; however, you have to look at the 2 zoning districts between Florence Township and Mansfield Township. The application looks to be for an e-commerce type of use warehouse because of the 50' height they are seeking.
- 3rd – why can't they reduce the intensity of use for the building being located in Mansfield Township building so it can reduce the overall intensity of traffic. The entrance is in Florence Township on Florence Columbus Road; meaning Florence Township will have to deal with all the traffic.

Mr. Remsa stated he has been present at all of the meetings and the question was asked why we can't restrict the warehouse from being e-commerce. We know that type of building has the potential to be e-commerce and has the potential of bringing much traffic. We know this because of the other similar warehouses that are already constructed in this area.

Proof has to be provided by the applicant for the positive and negative criteria. We have to look at the free flow of traffic that the MLUL says that we're supposed to provide when considering development applications. Listening to Mr. Klein, there's huge concern that this could have significantly more traffic than what has been presented. Sufficient spaces are provided in NJ municipalities for a variety of land uses. One allows for a much higher intensity development and one allows for lower intensity. The applicant must also promote a desirable visual environment. When you look at the site plan, there is no screening or landscaping, and it will be located right next to the AGR zone. It is true that the applicant owns the portion of the site in the AGR zone as well; but the AGR zone is designed for low intensity residential. We've already heard from residents that they can see lights from the Margolis property in Mansfield Township that now is occupied by warehouses.

The applicant must prove site suitability. In the Reexamination Report, it says that area should no longer be an industrial zone, and as described in the Master Plan, the site not suited for this type of use. The region is not suited for the extra heavy traffic load.

As for the negative criteria and what is substantially detrimental to greater good, the main detriment is the excess traffic that will be generated. And even more traffic will be generated if it ends up being e-commerce. Additional negative criteria are lack of screening, lack of landscaping and buffers, and it is not consistent with the Master Plan. The 2018 Reexamination Report explicitly rejects warehouse development in I295 area. Using the Florence Township

SM zone for only accessory uses does not meet the Master Plan intent. And it does not meet design criteria as far as buffering, landscaping, etc.

He looked at the design exceptions and compared it to Section 91 of the township ordinance. The plan does not provide sidewalks along Florence Columbus Road; they may be needed. It does not meet bikeway, street trees, landscape buffers and screens, off street parking, curbing along the driveways, and loading and parking areas should be landscaped and screened from adjoining streets, as stated in the ordinance. This application does not meet the intent of the township ordinance.

Mr. Sovak stated that the intersection at Florence Columbus Road and Route 130 is a failing intersection. In the applicant's traffic report, it stated there'd be a small number of trucks using that intersection. So, if just a few extra vehicles entering that intersection would significantly impact that intersection already, how is that handled? Is the assumption in the original traffic report valid or could it be a large fluctuation? Mr. Remsa stated that intersection fails today and when you look at what is projected on top of what is there today, the intersection will only fail worse.

Mr. Klein stated the Highway Capacity Manual is what is used for projections. One can project traffic into that intersection to see how effects intersection. It is only going to be worse because of more development. DOT comes in to see if there is a need for double left-hand turn lanes, jug handles, etc. The applicant has projected 20% of the total trips will go through that intersection and 80% to I295. There is a fluctuation from day to day.

Mr. Studzinski stated we already have a failing intersection and with 2 proposed warehouses and us being years away from intersection improvement, it will continue to get worse. It should be getting better and not worse. Mr. Remsa stated unfortunately, development of land is much faster than development of improvements to infrastructure.

Chairman Lutz stated we are still in public comment, so anyone else wishing to comment on this application may do so at this time.

Kristan Marter of 220 E. Front Street confirmed with Solicitor Frank that she still considered herself sworn. Ms. Marter expressed her concern for all the vehicles, cars, and trucks that will be turning either right or left into the facility on an already heavily travelled road with there being no traffic light or additional turning lanes in place prior to construction. That road is already overburdened because of the development in Mansfield Township, Florence Township, and Burlington Township that adding additional trips on what is already there will have a significant impact. She also asked that if this special use variance gets approved, does that affect the entire property located in Florence Township including the homes along Florence Columbus Road that NFI has already purchased, or just the piece that will have the accessory uses. Solicitor Frank stated that this Board can only decide on what is before them and only that part of the property being used for the accessory uses; not for any other piece of the property or other properties that they may now own.

Christine Pukenas of 1073 Florence Columbus Road was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Ms. Pukenas stated she has lived on Florence Columbus Road for 45 years and has seen a significant traffic increase on the road. NFI will be her new neighbor. She stated she appreciates the township hiring their own expert witnesses. She stated it is difficult to get out of her driveway, even at 6 a.m. Today there was an accident on Florence Columbus Road and Old York Road and the traffic was backed past I295. She is also concerned about the stormwater runoff because the fields on that property were for crops and absorbing the rain. NFI has not shared anything

about what we are going to be looking at and they're buying up all the properties on Florence Columbus Road. She was hoping to get a neighbor that would be more forgiving and give more to the community.

Michelle Rosenblum of 19 Buttonwood Drive confirmed with Solicitor Frank that she still considered herself sworn. Ms. Rosenblum stated she wanted to make an additional point that immediately down the road from these large warehouses is a successful summer camp that has quite a bit of traffic seasonably. Traffic counts were not done during the height of the summer to see how much traffic levels can really be. Adding more traffic just leads to potentially dangerous situations and stated we have to take this all into consideration.

Cynthia Constantini of 24 Challandar Way was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Ms. Constantini stated she was also glad to hear that the township hired its own traffic expert. She also agrees that the traffic study should have been done during the summer when Liberty Lake summer camp is open and all the shore traffic that travels Florence Columbus Road. This needs to be considered and was not. Her other concern is the pollution from the additional traffic, trucks running while being loaded and unloaded, diesel fumes, etc. when there is no buffer being proposed. She lives in a 55+ community where the residents have enough health issues already. She said there is no way these warehouses can be built without the additional turning lanes already in place and if we can make demands that the applicant has to pay for road improvements. Solicitor Frank stated that Florence Columbus Road is the county's jurisdiction, and they decide if the road needs improvements and what those improvements will be. Ms. Constantini asked if there's a way we could get the county involved first before deciding on this application. Solicitor Frank stated that the Zoning Board cannot demand that and we are here for the Use Variance. The applicant has their application before the Burlington County Planning Board who will determine off tract improvements. Ms. Constantini asked if we have the right to go to the county to make that request. Solicitor Frank stated from what he knows of the governing body, they are actively in touch with the county regarding this. They have been very engaged with the county and working very hard with all traffic issues and projects being proposed. Ms. Constantini stated her development will get noise, traffic and pollution and asked if this application is approved, can the township council stop that approval. Solicitor Frank stated he honestly does not know if we have an ordinance that provides for that, and municipal regulation cannot limit everything. Ms. Constantini stated that we need to head this off now and not have to wait 5 – 6 years to fix things. Once it's approved, where do we go? She hopes the Board takes these things into consideration and tries to protect our interests.

John Fratinardo of 4 Yockus Lane confirmed with Solicitor Frank that he still considered himself sworn. Mr. Fratinardo stated the speed limit on Florence Columbus Road is 50 m.p.h. and with the people coming off I295 at 50 m.p.h., or more, there'll be a very dangerous situation with the added traffic and no traffic light.

Adam Schoen of 210 E. Front Street was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Mr. Schoen stated he grew up on a farm across from the Wainwright farm. He could count 1 or 2 cars years ago along Florence Columbus Road. Now, he has sat for 7 minutes just trying to get out of the drive of the farm. He is fortunate that his farm also has access to Old York Road and is looking to put in another driveway for that access; however, that driveway will be over 900 feet long and quite an expense just so he does not have to access Florence Columbus Road and its traffic. Warehouse lights are supposed to be downward facing, but the ones from the Mansfield Township warehouses are very bright. His property borders the Lounsberry farm for 2300 feet and both warehouses will be very intrusive. What drew him to this town was that when you

37.

come off of I295, you were greeted by farmland; now there'll be warehouses. He stated he still will not sell his farm or go anywhere.

James Fevola of 39 Ridgway Drive confirmed with Solicitor Frank that he still considered himself sworn. Mr. Fevola stated he can't really add much to what has already been mentioned. He is concerned about the diesel engines, carbon monoxide, nitrous oxide, and particulates. With not knowing the end user, he is concerned if there will be refrigerated trucks with engines running, or all engines running in the winter. For every gallon of diesel, 6 lbs. of carbon monoxide go into the atmosphere. We are trying to preserve our environment and that will not happen with warehouses being built. He doesn't see the benefit to the residents of Florence Township; it only benefits the developer. Don't we as citizens have some duty to protect our town? He understands the laws, but at some point, we have to stand up and say 'enough already'. The warehouse down the road in Mansfield is only 1/3 occupied, and we need another one?

It was the Motion of Mr. Cartier, seconded by Mr. Patel to close public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Mr. Gillespie stated he has 17 pages of notes from tonight and last month's meeting and has a lot to consider. He is still expecting updated review letters from the Board's Engineer and Planner on their submitted updated EIS that was submitted on 3/28/22. They have analyzed Fire Marshal Richardson's testimony and would prefer to talk with him outside of the meeting before they come back before the Board. They would like to ask for a continuance for this application to next month's meeting, May 2, 2022, and request that Mr. Madden, Mr. Klein, and Mr. Remsa be available at that meeting for cross examination. He is expecting to be able to ask the Board to vote on this application and start the NFI, Lounsberry Tract application, so they are also requesting that the NFI, Lounsberry Tract application be adjourned to the May 2, 2022, meeting as well; both with no further notice required. Mr. Gillespie also stated they agree to the extension of time for the Board to make a decision on these applications.

Mr. Sovak asked Mr. Gillespie that if the Board will have the status on their applications before the county and the traffic issues before it goes to a vote. Mr. Gillespie stated they hope to have that information available. They are trying to run parallel paths and hope to have more information to give to the Board.

It was the Motion of Mr. Patel, seconded by Mr. Cartier to adjourn Application ZB#2021-14 and Application ZB#2021-13 to the May 2, 2022, meeting to be held at 7:30 PM with no further notice required. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Solicitor Frank stated to the public that this application and the next application, known as the Lounsberry Tract, will be adjourned to the May 2, 2022, meeting to be held at 7:30 PM and to consider this as their notice.

The Board took a brief recess at 9:27 p.m.

The meeting was back in session at 9:33 p.m.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Solicitor Frank stated this public comment portion of the meeting is for general comments only and not for comments on any of the applications presented tonight.

38.

The meeting was opened for public comment.

The Zoom moderator confirmed that no one was being muted by us.

Hearing no one wishing to speak, it was the Motion of Mr. Patel, seconded by Vice Chair Buddenbaum. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

ADJOURNMENT

It was the Motion of Mr. Patel, seconded by Vice Chair Buddenbaum to adjourn the meeting at 9:33 p.m. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Dennis Puccio, Secretary

/kf