

TOWNSHIP OF LOPATCONG  
Planning Board Meeting

February 26, 2020

Chairman VanVliet called the Planning Board Meeting to order. The meeting was held in the Municipal Building located at 232 S. Third Street, Phillipsburg, New Jersey.

Prayer was offered followed by the Oath of Allegiance

Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided indicating the time and place of the meeting in accordance with Chapter 231 of the Public Laws of 1975 by advertising a Notice in The Star Gazette and The Express-Times and by posting a copy on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building.”

Present: Members Clymer, Coyle, Devos, Pryor, Weeks, Mayor Mengucci, Chairman VanVliet. Also present was Attorney Bryce, Engineer Wisniewski and Planner Ritter.

**Old Business:**

**Minutes** – Chairman VanVliet asked for a motion to approve minutes of January 22, 2020. Motion by Mayor Mengucci, seconded by Member Weeks. All members in favor.

**I-78 Logistics Park Lopatcong – Block 101, Lot 1 – Final Subdivision.**

Attorney Rubright – Good evening, Susan Rubright from the law firm of Brach Eichler in Roseland, New Jersey on behalf of the applicant I-78 Logistic Park Lopatcong Urban Renewal, LLC, which is as we know redeveloping the existing site for use as a high-cube warehouse. The property under consideration is Block 101, Lot 1 and is accessed from Rt. 22 and we here this evening seeking a final subdivision approval. The property is located in the HB Highway Business Redevelopment area and it is also subject to a General Redevelopment Plan. We haven't been here for a while, so I'll just give you a brief recap and a brief history of the application at the site, at this site to date. As we know, there's part of the development is occurring in Phillipsburg as well as in Lopatcong. This Board granted preliminary site plan and subdivision approvals in September 2017 to the prior property owner. Specifically, at that time, preliminary approval was granted for the construction of a temporary access road, Rt. 22 intersection improvements, the connector road and stormwater management facilities that were associated with the roadway improvements as well as the grading of proposed Lot 1.01 and the construction of storm sewer improvements to create a pad for the future building site which is Building No. 7 which is the building that's in Lopatcong. The applicant, this applicant closed on the property in late January of 2018. In the summer of 2018, this Board approved an amendment to the GDP to increase the square footage of Building No. 7 from 950,000 square feet to 975,761 square feet and at that time, granted preliminary and final site plan approval for Building No. 7 and final approval of the connector road. We all know it's well on its way to being constructed. So, at that point, I believe there was even some discussion with the Board about the final subdivision approval and it was determined that we would, that the applicant would have the

building constructed and then come back at a later time once the improvements were constructed so that in the event that there was anything else that had to be adjusted with the subdivision lines. So, here we are tonight seeking the final subdivision approval and as I'm sure counsel will advise, the Municipal Land Use Law provides that Section 50 that the Planning Board shall grant final approval if the detailed drawings, specifications and estimates of the application for final approval conform to the standards that are established by ordinance for final approval, the conditions of preliminary approval and in the case of a major subdivision, the standards will abide by the map filing law. This section provides that in the case of a planned development, which this is, as it's a GDP, the Planning Board may permit minimal deviations from the conditions of the preliminary approval. I don't believe that we need any of, that there are any minimal changes, however. This section also provides that whenever approval is required by the County Planning Board, the local board shall condition the approval on obtaining county approval. We meet these requirements. Plans will be submitted to Warren County when the changes, there are several minimal changes that your Board engineer has set forth in a report dated today, but we will be submitting, shortly, changes and approve the subdivision to the County Planning Board. Our site engineers and surveyor have been working with your Board's engineers to address the conditions of preliminary approval and what needs to be shown on the final subdivision plans that we are presenting to the Board. We have his report and I would say, that that's been going on for a little bit of time since June cause it is, obviously, it is a large project. We have on your Board's engineer report dated today and there are minor comments on Page 5 of that report which we will be able to discuss, out site engineer Joe Jaworski from Dynamic will be processing that and discussing those with you. I have also, with me, this evening Devin Schmidt who is from Bridge Development Partners, the developer, in the event that there are any questions. I don't anticipate bringing him up for any testimony, however, since we have not been here for a while, we certainly will offer him for any questions or comments that the Board might have just in general. Okay, so, what I'd like do then is bring up Mr. Jaworski, we can qualify him and he can talk about the review letter from Mr. Wisniewski.

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you very much.

Attorney Bryce – If you could raise your right hand. Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you are about to give the Board, is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

Joseph Jaworski – Yes, I do.

Attorney Bryce – Just please state your name and spell your last name.

Joseph Jaworski – Sure, Joseph Jaworski – j-a-w-o-r-s-k-i.

Chairman VanVliet – Mr. Jaworski, excuse me, would you mention your qualifications?

Joseph Jaworski – Yes. I'm a 1985 graduate of Rutgers's University with a degree in civil engineering. I am a licensed professional engineer in New Jersey as well as seven other states. I've testified in almost every town in New Jersey including this, this town and have been involved in this project, obviously, over the past four years.

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you.

Joseph Jaworski – You're welcome.

Chairman VanVliet – I think he's qualified.

Attorney Rubright – Great. Thank you so much. All right, Mr. Jaworski, if you can, you heard my brief introduction, if you can highlight or just review briefly the process that you've been working on with Mr. Wisniewski and then I'd like you to just go through the review letter from today's date.

Joseph Jaworski – Sure. Yeah, as I've stated, we've worked very closely with Adam and Paul throughout the process on the site plan as well as the subdivision. The previous hearing which preliminary approval was given, had a list of conditions and changes on subdivision plan. We've made all of those changes, submitted that. Adam, would you agree with that and kind of goes through in his February 26<sup>th</sup> letter all of those issues and that they've been addressed and then as Susan said, on Page 5 there are a couple of plan comments and I can run through those quickly. We did speak with Adam's office about this today. The first one is that all easements need to be reviewed and revised as necessary to reflect the as-built conditions. We did review them. The gas line easement we're actually surveying now to get the exact location of that gas line and we will adjust the easement to match that. We're going to review the other ones just to make sure but that was the one that stood out. Second, a monument must be set at the angle point on the northern property boundary. We do have monuments at all of the areas and that there's a very slight kink and we just missed that and we'll include a monument at that location. Municipal Clerk's certification on Sheet 1 should be revised to show the Township Council and the committee can certainly add that to the signature block and the last one is the clarification for a little piece of the um, on Lot 4 which is right along Lock Street that I guess through the process, inadvertently said it was to be dedicated to Lopatcong which I think it's actually the County property. So, if this gets approved tonight, we'll obviously, be going back to the County and we will address that and make sure the map reflects the correct dedication on that.

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you.

Joseph Jaworski – You're welcome.

Chairman VanVliet – That was one of the things that stood out when I just read the one letter quickly today as it was my understanding that there was no property being dedication, transferred to Lopatcong Township

Joseph Jaworski – Right.

Chairman VanVliet – and I wanted to try to avoid that because of the obvious

Joseph Jaworski – Yeah, yeah, it's just there is a little jog in the that area and

Chairman VanVliet – That actually is County property.

Joseph Jaworski – Makes sense. Actually, County property.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay, thank you for clarifying it.

Joseph Jaworski – And that, that's really it so unless there are any other questions.

Member Pryor – I have one Board question. I think you testified if I understand it correctly. All the changes to date have been in response to comments from the engineer. Have there been any changes that fall outside of that; there's some notes and so on, but any change at all, there was mention of a gas line in here or something.

Joseph Jaworski – Yeah, it was really just, we showed the gas line and easement on the subdivision plan. When it actually got built it shifted a title bit, so, we're just going?

Member Pryor – It's an as-built condition.

Joseph Jaworski – (Inaudible).

Member Pryor – Everything is (inaudible).

Joseph Jaworski – And all the areas is in the (inaudible).

Member Pryor – All in accordance with the review letter.

Joseph Jaworski – That's correct.

Engineer Wisniewski – Just to clarify or add onto what the Chairman mentioned, there is a dedication along Lock Street to the Township to provide a twenty-five-foot half width to the Lock Street right-of-way along the properties owned by 78 Logistics Park and Bridge Development. So, that is an area that's being dedicated to the Township and Lock Street, the realigned Lock Street. So, those areas are being dedicated to the Township, but in general there's no parcel that comprises the Logistics Park site that's being dedicated. There is some property being transferred as a right-of-way but it's not

Chairman VanVliet – Basically, just for Lock Street.

Engineer Wisniewski – Right, so, there's no like park land or anything like that.

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you.

Member Weeks – So, the new additions that we put in on Lock Street will become the Township's responsibility, correct?

Engineer Wisniewski – Correct and that was also part of the reason

Member Weeks – Sidewalks and all.

Engineer Wisniewski – Correct. The reason that a portion of the, I’m sorry, the preliminary approval was or the final approval was withheld and the preliminary was approved because DOT still hadn’t given their final determination as to the jurisdictional responsibilities of the various portions of this project so Rand Boulevard under the DOT approval for a major access permit, is under the I-78 Logistics Park entity that owns the property. Lock Street is shown as, Lock Street up to that the Rand Boulevard, the connector road, is Township responsibility of right-of-way and then, obviously, the portion of the intersection, some portion of that is DOT and the remainder is the developer’s so that was also clarified and finalized on this final submission plan.

Member Pryor – So, can I ask directly, you take no exception to this approval tonight?

Engineer Wisniewski – No. As long as

Chairman VanVliet – Traditionally, the conditions

Member Pryor – The (inaudible) still there and they’re supplemented by these notes

Engineer Wisniewski – Exactly.

Member Pryor – but outside of that, everything else is

Engineer Wisniewski – Yeah everything else in terms of lot areas, dedications match the preliminary approval, so.

Chairman VanVliet – One other area of concern that I had, has everything been worked out with the sanitary sewer location and all that coming into, going into Philipsburg?

Joseph Jaworski – Yes.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay.

Joseph Jaworski – Yes, that has all been in process and approved through DEP, through the Treatment Works approval which included or required the signoff by the actual treatment plant.

Member Pryor – Bear with me a second, did we sign that TWA, did Lopatcong sign it?

Joseph Jaworski – Yes.

Member Pryor – We did. Okay.

Joseph Jaworski – We, we, both towns were required to sign it.

Member Pryor – I understand that, I just don’t remember it, that’s all. It goes by gravity down into the P’burg section.

Joseph Jaworski – There’s a portion of Building No. 7 that’s pumped up and then, yeah, actually

it gets to the top of the hill and then it's all gravity down to

Member Pryor – And they all remain private facilities

Joseph Jaworski – Yes, the developer's responsible.

Member Pryor – Okay.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay. I just wanted to check and make sure that was handled and we don't have a problem later on.

Joseph Jaworski – Yeah.

Chairman VanVliet – I appreciate that. Any further questions?

Member Weeks – I do have one concern on the property. I don't know, it's been a concern; it's happened two, three times, the stop sign you keep putting up on Lock Street, is always put up straight and then it ends up this way. Can you please make it not do that if we're going to take it over? Do something better than what's going on there.

Engineer Wisniewski – We can add that to our punch list Brian. We are running punch lists on the site and I don't know how many pages it is right now; 15 pages, maybe.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay, any further questions? I'll open it to the public. Does anyone have any questions concerning this application? Seeing none, I'll close the public portion and entertain a motion to grant

Member Pryor – I'll make a motion to grant the final approval subject to all of the conditions discussed including a request for a more stable stop sign.

Chairman VanVliet – Do we have a second?

Member Devos – Second.

AYES: Members Clymer, Coyle, Devos, Pryor, Weeks, Mayor Mengucci, Chairman VanVliet.  
NAYS: None

Member Pryor – I'm going to request before the applicant leaves, can someone update us on the schedule?

Devin Schmidt – That would be me. I'm Devin Schmidt, I'm with Bridge Development. We are currently under construction. The majority of the building is complete. We still have some asphalt to finish outside as the weather gets better. We are working actively inside the building right now. We have a tenant in the building that is doing their fit out. They have a lot of material handling equipment to install. We're going to be building an office for them over the next few months and they hope to be in operation towards the end of this year.

Member Pryor – Towards the end of the year.

Devin Schmidt – Yeah.

Member Pryor – Okay.

Devin Schmidt – It's a fairly extensive build-out inside the building and it's going to take just a little bit of time.

Member Pryor – Yeah, I had the impression it was going to be a bit sooner, but if it's towards the end, it's towards the end, so.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay. Thank you very much.

Attorney Rubright – Thank you so much for your time and attention.

Chairman VanVliet – Next order of business is correspondence. Zach Liptak has submitted a letter of resignation from the Planning Board for reasons well, the letter he sent me was he is moving out of the area and he has different concerns and stuff like that, so he has resigned so we'll have an opening with an alternate member.

Member Pryor – I'd like to make a motion to authorize the Chairman to drop him a little note thanking him for his service.

Chairman VanVliet – Absolutely. I'll take care of that. Other than that, okay we were scheduled to have Precast Concrete come back in tonight to officiate, you know, see what he was going to do about servicing the stormwater runoff on the property. Adam, I had a conversation with you, would you relay to the Board for the, you met with their engineer and they had a proposal and we heard nothing back from them yet.

Engineer Wisniewski – Well, I met with Mr. Zedderbaum I believe the Friday following the last Board meeting that they appeared at the meeting where they appeared before the Board and we reviewed their site plan and I provided Mr. Zedderbaum the list of Highlands model BMP's for major potential contaminant source sites and encouraged them to provide and prepare a report of some sort that indicates how they address those items that the Highlands has outlined for types of contaminant sites and he then, Mr. Zedderbaum indicated that many of those, the items that the Highlands provides to address water quality from these types of, you know, industrial sites, they already are performing such as, you know, any type of forming or material handling is handled inside or done under cover when they coat these concrete structures with different types of epoxy and other paint materials. They do that inside and there's no offsite flow of residual materials that come off these structures that they produce on their property so, I ask that he go through that. I don't recall now, but I think it was in the 15, or I didn't bring it with me, but 15 or 20 item list of best management practices that the Highlands encourages that these types of uses employ on their sites. So, that was the first item that I asked that they do and I thought that would be presented to the Board and, you know, if there were areas that they could improve upon, they

would present that and say that they would commit to improving their operations to further those Highlands goals and that the Township ultimately wants to adopt. The second thing that I asked, you know, we really discussed and Mr. Zedderbaum wasn't really clear about it, the prior five hearings or whatever was that he appeared at, really there is no stormwater management on the site. They have a network of pipes and then once they collect stormwater runoff from their paved areas, and discharge it at the back of the property towards the creek into a stone lined trench, but there's no attenuation or treatment of the runoff. There's no intonation or capture of the runoff to slow it down; there's no basin on the site so really, you know, the project isn't considered which we discussed multiple times major development because there wasn't an increase in the impervious or disturbance and, you know, what's on the site is approved back since 2004, 2005 so, but what I did ask is that they provide some sort of in-line treatment on the system they do have that would capture, you know, coffee cups, garbage, oil sediment whatever, some kind of box that they likely produce on site, it's concrete, a manhole or something that they could provide within an insert that would capture those materials and maybe once a year, they would vacuum them out and remove them and now, you know, provide some sort of water quality treatment to the site. At our meeting, Mr. Zedderbaum said he would have to speak to the property owners and the owners of Precast Manufacturing and, you know, that was a month ago now and I haven't heard anything from them. So, that's kind of where we left it and now, we're here, so.

Member Pryor – Yeah, you know, I think that's a good idea. I mean people routinely add oil separators and things like that; it's not the end of the earth to provide something like that.

Engineer Wisniewski – I don't even think it was like onerous; we're not asking him to put like an underground basin that would cause \$100,000.00

Member Pryor – That's right, yeah, yeah.

Engineer Wisniewski – and if they make the things on site, you know, they should be able to do it for minimal cost and overhead for them but, I guess, what I understand now, is that the owners are pushing back. They don't want to do anything.

Chairman VanVliet – Mr. Bryce indicated that he received a letter today; Bill Edleston who is the attorney representing Precast and he's asking that the matter be carried for further discussion action of the Board at its March 25, 2020 meeting and that it would not be necessary for him to re-notice for anything like that if we grant the

Member Pryor – He would not be carried or is that Mr. Edleston's opinion?

Chairman VanVliet – This is no, no there was a request to extend, you know, the hearing.

Attorney Bryce – If you recall at the last meeting, they were going to come back this meeting hopefully they want to get an approval of the resolution but they're still obviously they have outstanding issues, so, he just asked that carried to the next meeting

Member Pryor – And he does not have to re-notice?



Attorney Bryce – That’s correct.

Member Pryor – Okay.

Attorney Bryce – It will be announced here.

Chairman VanVliet – Are we in agreement with the granting an extension on this?

Member Pryor – I would make that motion.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay do I hear a second?

Member Devos – Second.

Chairman VanVliet – Roll call it please, Beth.

AYES: Members Clymer, Coyle, Devos, Pryor, Weeks, Mayor Mengucci, Chairman VanVliet.

NAYS: None

Attorney Bryce – So, if anybody here in this audience looking for Precast, it’s going to be now carried to next month, the march meeting, and there will be no further notice. So, this is your notice.

Chairman VanVliet – I’ll open this up to general public comment, John

John Betz – Adam, if I can ask you a question. You mentioned something about residually epoxies and other things that they use to coat the castings of concrete or whatever.

Engineer Wisniewski – Right, so, typically, when they make like a sewer manhole, they coat it with epoxy.

John Betz – All right. I understand that. I worked in a place which had a paint shop. The paint shop stuff, eventually, just went down either out the open door onto the ground, the residuals at clean up time of this, of the plant and I’m just hoping what they have in there when they do cleanup is not going directly into that storm water drainage system.

Engineer Wisniewski – Well, that was the concern and you know, specifically brought up by Mr. Pryor at the prior meetings that we, you know, want to know what they’re doing; is it just flowing out and that’s why I asked them to give us a report and tell us this is how we do our work. This is how we coat; this is how we clean but we don’t have anything.

John Betz – Because it’s very important; it’s very toxic the stuff that was going out and we were told to just pitch it. Then three cleansing tanks went up after that and they were still polluting the area.

Engineer Wisniewski – Right.

John Betz – So, I just thought I mention it.

Member Pryor – Yeah, John, I think the Chairman brought it initially and then, you know, reinforced that so

John Betz – I probably wasn't here or something, so, okay thank you. Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman VanVliet – Anyone else? Seeing none, we'll close the public comment session. I'd like to bring up one other subject about the sanitary sewer it's on the, any of our applications that come in, we've been kind of just going along and taking the approvals that come in but we have no real information on what it is. I'd like to investigate the possibility of including this on our checklist at some point. Joe, you know, you're a recognized expert in the Township as a sewer engineer. Do you have any other comments?

Member Pryor – Yeah, I'm going to preface it; I do some work for Elizabeth from time to time and I do that through JMT, so I'm going to have to abstain on whatever the Board decides here but my point is, the sewer issues are often deferred until they come before Council. There's a TWA that shows up on there and if it's heavy lifting, then everybody gets frustrated because there's delays at that point and it seems like we're taking a step backwards to look at the sewer, so, I think it would make sense as the Chairman said, as the Planning Board review we get a letter from the planner, we get a letter from our review engineer, we should get a letter from our sewer engineer and if there's conditions in there, they have to be addressed. That could be incorporated in the condition of approval and I think at such time during construction or when facilities are commissioned or in some cases, dedicated, that the sewer engineer be brought in and he has his own things that he looks at and I think it would be a more complete review and a more timely review if we brought that up front and incorporated it in our approvals.

Chairman VanVliet – Any comment on that or

Engineer Wisniewski – Well, I agree. You know, the most recent case which probably springs conversation is the Strykers Road warehouse. There was some brief discussion with the Sewer Engineer Mr. Madden regarding capacities but there was never complete review of that TWA package that was submitted until after the approval was granted by the Planning Board. At that point, the entire package was provided to Dan Madden and he reviewed it but of course, you know, confirming capacity is pretty critical especially on these larger sites that have higher potential flows. So, I would agree, you know, it would definitely be hopeful to know that there's not going to be something that holds up a project following a Board approval that they are waiting and waiting because the TWA it doesn't end here, it has to go to Phillipsburg and then it has to go to DEP, so, that's the longest lead time item for a lot of developers, so.

Member Weeks – What authority do we have, I know we can talk about anything, we can bring it in and stuff, but what authority do we have as a Board to bring that sewer into that and not take it from Council's side?

Member Pryor – Council only signs the TWA.

Member Weeks – Right, but you get a report from them, from Dan, right?

Member Pryor – No, sometimes we skip.

Member Weeks – You know what I mean, somebody should.

Member Pryor – (Inaudible).

Chairman VanVliet – Didn't mean to interrupt Joe, but it's Council's responsibility for all the sewer; we don't authorize it or anything like that but I'd like to have the information in with the approval of whatever site plan we approve and go over it that we know where we stand a little bit better than we are getting that information now.

Member Pryor – The other thing it does, if I could just add this, is that when they come before Council, whatever concerns there are, there addressed when the TWA is presented.

Attorney Bryce – And just to Mr. Weeks, I don't think that it's talking about divesting the governing body of it's authority and the DEP jurisdiction over the TWA's but under the Land Use Law, utilities are part of site plan review and I think that it makes a lot of sense just to ensure that developer going in has confirmed that there's capacity at least and some type of basis to come to the Board to say, you know, this is feasible, it's not going to be in some type of

Engineer Wisniewski – And that's how we've handled it. We just get a verbal or, you know, not a verbal, but an email exchange with the sewer engineer confirming that capacity is available and at that point, you know, we would go through the site plan approval, the presentations, the Board review, the Board approval and before it, the TWA application is forwarded to the Council for approval. At that point Dan was reviewing and providing comments, you know, requesting revisions to the plan which were for this, let's say for this warehouse, new warehouse, those were made before it was presented before Council for approval.

Member Weeks – I believe, a little different. I believe that it should be almost put in the front mode because you know they're gong to have to have sewage; they're going to have to have everything hooked up and you have to be able to build that building if we approve it and they do everything and they can't have that; it's useless. Everything you just did has to change so, I (inaudible) capacity part of what Joe's saying, all right, but it should be almost in front.

Engineer Wisniewski – I guess we could do capacity because we were confirming capacity. We wouldn't advance the project. You know, the first thing we took a look at is capacity to make sure capacity is there because you can't approve a project half million square feet of warehouse if you don't know that there's capacity but that's not, we're not doing that at this point but it's a matter of design, you know, detailed review, which is what happened.

Member Weeks – Okay.

Chairman VanVliet – But at least this way we could make it one of the conditions of approval of the final site plan. That we know that we have capacity to do

Engineer Wisniewski – And if a detailed review has to happen, it happens then and it's not just a quick exchange like oh yeah, sure, there's capacity.

Member Pryor – Well if you're going to need a pump station, you have to site it and so on, and all that affects the subdivision so why put that last. It should be done when everything else is done.

Chairman VanVliet- Can we draft something?

Attorney Bryce – Yeah, I think that would most likely it will be an ordinance change

Chairman VanVliet – Okay.

Attorney Bryce – for your site plan ordinance and subdivision ordinance and probably the checklist.

Member Pryor – You know the, yeah, I don't know if the ordinance specifically excludes it, but I guess if you want to add it to the checklist, then we have to do that.

Attorney Bryce – I think so. I'll prepare one for your March meeting because there's actually another ordinance that I've been meaning to do as well or recommended ordinance and that talks about just especially on the Zoning Board level the escrows. That should really come through here to go to the governor body and come back and go through the process so we actually can do it all in one ordinance as recommended changes and if there's any other recommended changes for the ordinance, let me know and I can try to include them so that we don't waste the governing body's time.

Chairman VanVliet – It would just be our recommendation going up there. Council, they will be the ones that will set the ordinances and you know, include it on checklists and stuff like that that's going to, you know, it's been concerning me for while now discussions I've had with other Board members have, I think we should have it. So, if you would prepare that I would appreciate it. We'll have a motion to authorize the attorney to do that.

Member Weeks – I'd like to have a motion wherein to do what was just discussed.

Chairman VanVliet – Do I hear a second?

Member Coyle – I'll second it.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay, roll call, Beth, please.

AYES: Members Clymer, Coyle, Devos, Weeks, Mayor Mengucci, Chairman VanVliet

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: Member Pryor

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you. That was, any Board member have anything else to discuss or comment on? Hearing none, I'll thank everyone for coming out this evening. It wasn't exactly the longest meeting we've ever had, but I think it was productive. So, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Member Pryor – I'll make that motion.

Mayor Mengucci – Second.

Chairman VanVliet – All those favor signifying by saying yes. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret B. Dilts  
Planning Board Secretary