

The regular meeting of May 10, 2004 of the Washington Township Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Jones at 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

CLASS IV: R. Gregory Jones, Kathleen McGroarty, Howard Popper, Geoffrey Price, Kevin Walsh  
 ALTERNATES: Mark Bauerlein  
 CLASS I: Eric Trevena  
 CLASS II: Walter Cullen  
 CLASS III: Kim Ball Kaiser  
 OTHERS ABSENT: DiSalvo, Leavens  
 OTHERS PRESENT: Engineer Hall, Clerk Kesper, Planner Banisch, Attorney Buzak, Attorney Cofoni, Environmental Consultant Keller

Adequate notice of this meeting was sent to the Observer-Tribune and the Morristown Daily Record on January 16, 2004 and posted on the Bulletin Board on the same date. Five notices were mailed, as there were five requests.

**\*\*NO NEW CASES OR WITNESSES SHALL BE HEARD SUBSEQUENT TO 10:30 PM\*\***

Pledge of Allegiance

***MINUTES***

1. Minutes from the April 28, 2004 Regular Meeting

Ms. McGroarty made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Popper. A voice vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion carried.

***RESOLUTIONS***

04-16 Hoppe – Block 51, Lot 6.09 – High Meadow Lane – R-5 Zone – 12.239 Acres – Request for two lot minor subdivision and variance for lot without frontage on a public street – Completeness review and public hearing if deemed complete

The Resolution was reviewed.

Ms. McGroarty made a motion to approve resolution 04-16, seconded by Ms. Kaiser. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Bauerlein, Cullen, McGroarty, Price, Popper, Walsh, Kaiser, Trevena,  
 Nays: None      Absent: DiSalvo, Leavens      Ineligible: Jones

### DECISIONS ON COMPLETENESS

1. Drakestown Associates – Block 12 – Lot 4 – Drakestown Road – R-5 - 104 Acres – Request for 19 Lot Preliminary Subdivision

Mr. Jones announced that the completeness hearing has been adjourned to June 14, 2004 at applicant's request.

2. Elite Homes – Block 59, Lots 33, 37 and 40 – Beacon Hill Road and Fairmount Road – R-5 Zone – 105 Acres – Request for 6 Lot Preliminary Subdivision

Mr. Jones announced that the completeness hearing has been adjourned to June 14, 2004 at applicant's request.

The meeting was opened to the public for items not on the agenda. There were no comments from the public and the meeting was closed to the public for items not on the agenda.

### APPLICATIONS

1. Fleming – Block 40, lot 26 – Fairmount Road – R-5 Zone – 13.118 acres – Request for three lot minor subdivision with variances  
 Adjourned at applicant's request to June 14, 2004

2. Washington Township Recreation – Block 22, Lots 3.03 and 3.27 – Rock Road (Falcon Fields) – R 1 / 2 Zone 53.023 Acres – Capital Review of Recreation Fields

Andrew Holt, Applicant's Engineer

Ralph DeFranzo, Applicant – Washington Township Supervisor of Public Relations and Township Project Manager

Eleanora Murfitt, Applicant – Washington Township Recreation Director

Mr. Buzak explained the scope of a capital review and read the definition of the D-31 capital project review under the Municipal Land Use Law. He explained to the public that they could also address the Township Committee on this issue and explained that the Township Committee is the deciding government body on this issue.

Mr. Buzak addressed potential conflicts of interest before the Board. He read from the MLUL regarding conflicts of interest. He explained that Ms. Kaiser is a Township Committee member appointed to the planning board and a liaison to the recreation committee. He stated his opinion Ms. Kaiser could remain on the Board to hear the application. Mr. Cullen is a Township Committee member and the Mayor's Designee to the Planning Board. He also stated that it was his opinion that Mr. Cullen could remain on the Board to hear the application. Sgt. Trevena is a member of the Planning Board and is doing traffic counts for this project for the township. It was his opinion that Sgt. Trevena could also remain on the Board and hear the application. Regarding Mr. Jones who is on the Baseball board, it was his opinion that he could also remain on the Board, especially as baseball is not proposed to use these fields. Regarding members whose children play on township sports teams, it was his opinion that this would not preclude them from participating in the review.

Dr. Keller arrived and joined the meeting at 7:45.

Ms. Kaiser, Mr. Cullen, Mr. Jones and Mr. Trevena stated that they also did not feel they had a conflict of interest and remained on the Board to hear the capital review.

Mr. Banisch reviewed his memo of May 10, 2004 regarding this capital review. He quoted from the 2003 Master Plan and Morris County census regarding the need for active recreation and that there was a deficit of 60.2 acres of active recreation. The new fields, if developed as proposed, would add 13 acres of active recreation and reduce the deficit of active recreation in the township. He stated that as a starting point this project is consistent with the 2003 Master Plan recommendations.

Andrew Holt of Suburban Consultant Engineers stated that he had been hired by the Township to develop a Master Plan for Falcon Fields. The master plan was accepted by the Township Committee and they have started the design work for the fields. The second phase of the plan is waiting until they receive DEP approvals of regulated areas. They would like to get the first fields graded and seeded by this fall.

Eleanor Murfitt spoke about the growth in sports teams and need for the fields. Last year she put together a profile of all the sports, number of teams, children, games and practices. She indicated that all of the sports organizations had seen an increase in membership since 1998 to 2003 of from 29% to 52%. She answered Mr. Jones that she did not know if this correlated with school enrollment. She stated that part of the increase is the younger age groups playing. She explained that not all the sports currently play in both the Spring and Fall, but they are all investigating running their sports in both seasons. Rugby doesn't interfere with field usage for the other sports as it is a summer sport. She explained how baseball/softball and soccer currently use portions of the same fields. She noted that during the summer there is not much field

usage by organized sports. Organized sports start practice generally at the end of August with games after labor day and play is finished prior to Thanksgiving. Rugby is usually played on the school fields. She explained the sport game schedules and practice times. She stated that more fields would allow the groups to spread out and not over use the fields. Currently Falcon Fields has three full size and one small field.

Mr. Holt referred to the plan and pointed out the surrounding roads, developments and agricultural areas. The current site entrance remains as it is currently configured. The current parking lot would remain. He pointed out where the driveway would continue to additional parking and around the fields. They propose to build fields 1, 2, 3 and 7 and the parking and driveways for the four fields. There would be 186 parking spaces in phase 1. The parking would be gravel contained within low wooden guard rails as at Palmer Park. He pointed out the three locations for parking in phase I. Fields 1, 2 and 3 are the larger fields at 225' x 360'. He used a template to show how the fields would be striped for play. He stated that the corner of field one is 39' from the property line and 65' from the house on Falcon Lane. There is a vegetative berm proposed of 30' to be graded at a 3 to 1 slope with a center height of 5' planted with deciduous and evergreens. He answered Mr. Walsh that fencing is not proposed. The buffer would not be mowed. Between field 1 and 2 there is a 50' separation with a vertical drop of 9'. Field 2 is as tight as it can get to the wetlands and also provide drainage areas. The two fields could not be made closer without stonewalls separating them. Security lighting is proposed for the hours of play only and the lights would be on timers to automatically go off. The light would not spill off the parking area. He stated that the plan proposes 18 poles at 16' high and would be 250 watt high pressure sodium lights.

Mr. DeFranzo stated that Palmer Park is in the process of being similarly lighted to what is proposed here and Rock Spring Park has lighting that is being increased. He stated that field lighting is not proposed at this time, although conduits would be provided.

Ms. Murfitt stated that the only fields that may be possibly lighted in the future are fields 1 and 2.

Mr. Holt stated that some of the walking paths are proposed with phase I. The paths would be 6' wide and of granular material.

Mr. Holt explained the proposed stormwater management plan. The fields currently drain from northeast to southwest. The proposal includes structural and non-structural best management stormwater practices. They have included vegetative swales in the parking lots. South of field 2 they propose a small recharge site for off site flows onto this property. On the southeast side vegetative swales and other structures will be used. Proposed field 4 would be a temporary shallow recharge basin. He stated that they must meet the new stormwater management rules. He answered Mr. Hall that they have done soil samples, which showed that the soils are poor and the recharge basins will take this into account. He answered Mr. Popper

that the stormwater plan would not address 18 Partridge Lane's drainage problems as the flow to that property is from the north and it is up hill from the fields.

Mr. Holt explained that the fields are being designed for the first phase only because of the wetlands on the property. He stated that based on the decisions made by DEP regarding the wetland permits, phase I may be all that could be built on the fields or the current configuration of fields 4, 5 and 6 could change. He stated that the four fields proposed would not change with DEP regulations because they are all in upland areas. The fields as designed could include three small fields played on the footprint of the premier field. The utilities are proposed with the first phase. There are no sanitary facilities proposed with phase 1. There is 80' between field seven and the property lines and they propose the same type of buffer as for field 1. If they are able to build fields 4, 5 and 6 the recharge area will be moved toward Rock Road. He explained that the recharge field on proposed field 4 would be the initial grading for the field. In total, if the second phase is built as currently designed there would be 354 spaces. If they are allowed to transition average they will provide more buffers at the end of Partridge Lane.

Mr. Jones stated he is concerned with fields 1 and 7.

Mr. Holt explained that his firm's charge was to develop as many fields as possible respecting the environmental constraints.

The Board recommended shortening the graded playing panel on lot 1.

Mr. Banisch stated that if the field were moved 50' it would be outside the current vegetated area.

Ms. Murfitt answered Ms. McGroarty about the number of other soccer fields in the township and enumerated the fields that exist and stated that these fields are also in many cases the outfields for baseball. She answered Mr. Jones that she didn't know what the new grammar school fields would be.

Mr. DeFranzo stated that he was charged with developing these fields by the Township Committee and that he was not asked to look at other areas of the township for possible field development.

Ms. Murfitt reviewed for the Board the number of teams that use the existing fields. She stated that the Township needs assessment showed a need for ten new full size soccer fields to meet current and projected growth.

Ms. Murfitt stated that field 7 would be used for practices for younger children and would not be used regularly for games.

Mr. Holt stated that since the original plan was presented to the Township Committee the access from Briarwood has been eliminated, fields have been made smaller and parking reduced.

Mr. Hall stated that the radi on the driveway should be increased. He wanted the 20' gaps in the guardrails approved by the fire department to make sure that they are large enough for emergency vehicles. He recommended paving the handicapped parking spaces. He noted that the one of the paths by field one was on a slope of 3 to 1 which was significant for a path. He asked if there would be any increase in rate or volume of flow of water from this property to adjoining properties.

Mr. Holt agreed to Mr. Halls suggestions. He also confirmed that the plan would DEP stormwater requirements and that the DEP would verify and approve the stormwater plan.

Ms. Murfitt stated that activity on the fields would cease at dusk.

Mr. Hall stated that the report on mines should be reviewed, although it was his opinion it was addressed at the time of the Brush Meadows subdivision application.

Mr. DeFranzo stated that they would review the landscaping with Dr. Keller.

Dr. Keller stated that he supported the loop trail through the wetlands area but that might be difficult to permit through DEP.

Mr. Holt stated that the DEP encourages these types of trails through government owned areas and stated that he would use crossings to go over the streams and not have people walking through the stream beds.

Dr. Keller stated that the wetland areas should be marked such as is done for subdivisions and also that native plantings should be used in the buffer areas as he did not see a need to keep the buffer areas in active recreation.

Mr. DeFranzo answered Mr. Jones that they looked at designing the plan for a loop drop off for children as requested by Mayor Short and it may be difficult to achieve given the wetland buffer areas.

Mr. Holt stated that a one way drive was explored initially and may still be possible with phase 2 of the plans.

Mr. Walsh was concerned with fields 1 and 7 and parking on the surrounding streets for the field.

Mr. Jones would wanted see any signs for the park entrance be subtle.

Mr. DeFranzo that signs to direct people to appropriate parking areas could be explored. He answered the board that the only thing stopping the building of fields 1, 2, 3 and 7 was Township Committee approval to go out to bid and MCSCD.

Ms. McGroarty was concerned with the proximity of fields 1 and 7 to adjacent property owners, traffic onto Rock Road and the amount of parking.

Ms. Murfitt reiterated that there would not be a lot more teams playing at one time, just more space and that providing adequate parking would help prevent parking on surrounding neighborhood streets. She stated that by having adequate time between games, such as they do at Rock Spring Park, eliminates a lot of traffic problems

Mr. Popper agreed with the concerns of the board already expressed and reiterated that the setbacks need to be increased on fields 1 and 7.

Mr. Bauerlein agreed with the previous comments and was also concerned about the amount of security lighting, that 18 poles at 16' high seemed like a lot of lighting for a park that closed at dusk. He also was concerned with turf management and affects on wetlands.

Ms. Murfitt explained the best management practices that minimize the uses of fertilized and pesticides and insecticides and the use of organic fertilizers, which the Township uses.

Mr. Holt answered Mr. Jones that if the other fields are not built because of DEP it would may allow re-design of the four proposed fields.

The meeting was opened to the public for questions and comments.

Suzanne O'Niel – Blackberry Place – stated that she is a representative of the surrounding neighborhoods and that their intent was not want to stop the project but to voice concerns that relate to the items discussed by the board. She referred to a color copy of Mr. Holt's maps that showed in color the surrounding lots. She noted that there had been other development ideas submitted to the Township Committee, even if this plan is considered the best. She asked that the Township apply the same rules as applied to other landowners. She stated that the proposal uses all of the developable land on the site. She asked that the project be scaled back by reducing the size or number of the fields proposed.

Bob Malone – 11 Falcon Lane – distributed a summary of objections and resolutions for this field. There were concerns for safety and over development of the fields. They did not want to see concession stands and lighting. He asked for a traffic study as the township requires of others. He reiterated the concerns regarding the small setbacks. He showed photographs of the existing tree line along field 1. He was concerned with the cost of this development and environmental issues and asked that the DEP reports be received prior to any work commencing on the fields. He did not want to see Palmer and Rock Spring parks funding linked with this project. He reviewed the measures that he would like to see the Planning Board recommend such as no access from Falcon Lane, Briarwood Road or Partridge Lane. He stated that Falcon Lane is used now for dropping off children. He showed photographs of the walkthrough from Partridge Lane and Falcon Lane into Falcon Fields. He asked that lights be

prohibited by all parties. He asked that a more inexpensive option field development be explored and that use of the fields by those outside the Township be prohibited or restricted, especially if they are for revenue to pay for the improvements. He suggested that the fields be limited to a particular age group and that existing fields be used and managed optimally.

Virginia Chanda – 4 Thornapple Court referred to a photograph board that showed the distance of 86' from her property line.

Lex Crane – Falcon Lane was concerned with drainage onto his property.

Mr. Holt stated that the berm would not be a dam that would cause water flow onto his property. He stated that the drainage area is small. The water will continue to flow the way it naturally flows today.

John Cullen – 7 Shade Tree Place – Stated that he is on the Travel Soccer Club Board of Directors, that he lines the fields for the organization as a volunteer and concurred with Ms. Murfitt about the scheduling difficulties. He was concerned with decreasing the size of fields and the detriment that this will have on the fields. He also stated that adequate parking would eliminate parking on neighborhood streets. As for the trash, if there were adequate trash receptacles trash would not be a problem. He explained that lighting helps with scheduling. He wanted the township to respect and support youth sports.

Mr. Salomon - 3 Thornapple Court asked about the county and state facilities located in the Township and if they were considered in the recreation and open space numbers.

Mr. Banisch explained how these lands were counted in the Master Plan and that they are not in the active recreation inventory because the county and state fields are not open to the township for scheduling of games and practices.

The meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Jones made a motion to direct the Board secretary to draft letter to the Township Committee stating the Planning Board has found the Falcon Fields project is consistent with the Washington Township Master Plan and consistent with the overall goals of the Master Plan. Seconded by Mr. Price. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Bauerlein, Cullen, Jones, Kaiser, McGroarty, Popper, Price, Trevena, Walsh,  
Nays: None                      Abstentions: None                      Absent: DiSalvo, Leavens

Mr. Jones made a motion to direct the Board secretary to draft a letter to the Township Committee with the recommendations discussed this evening including:

1. Township Committee strongly consider a redesign which would result in fields , 7 and 1 being further into the property with larger setbacks and privacy to neighbors, making the setbacks meet 150' as much as possible.
2. The parking lot lights are excessive and should be scaled down to minimum necessary for safety.
3. Encourage Township Committee to keep a close watch on future recreation needs so we do not overbuild due to highlands, etc.
4. Minimize disturbance of existing tree line along Falcon Lane and field 1 and include a fence to exclude public access
5. Patriots path be added to the plan.
6. Conservation markers along the limits of the freshwater wetlands and buffer maintained in a low maintenance area and not mowed up to the wood line.
7. Speed tables on driveway.
8. All effort be made that Falcon Lane, Partridge Lane and Brush Meadow roads not become overflow parking or foot entrance for general public into the fields – and limited parking .

Seconded by Mr. Walsh. A voice vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion carried.

3. Mascharka – Block 42, Lots 13 & 14 – Hacklebarney Road – R-5 Zone – 16.90 Acres – Request for three lot minor subdivision with variances (pre-existing)

Lloyd Tubman, Applicant's Attorney  
Harry Metzler, Applicant's Surveyor

Harry Metzler was sworn in and presented his qualifications to the board and was accepted by the board as an expert witness.

Mr. Metzler referred to the plans and pointed out the property and the existing home, which is 16' off of Old Farmers Road. He noted that the lot line goes through the house and that the lot line would be relocated to the first hedge row. The second hedge row is the boundary for the third lot. He pointed out the 300' setbacks from the streams on and across the street from the property. Sheet 2 of 5 was marked A-1. Sheet 4 of 5 was marked A-2. He pointed out the flag staffs, Hackelbarney Road and Old Farmers Road. He noted the sight triangle on Hackelbarney Road, and the conservation easements for the stream hedgerows and steep slopes. He stated that these lots are currently actively farmed and asked for a waiver of conservation easement markers as long as the property is actively farmed.

Ms. Tubman was asking for a front yard setback variance for the existing home. She stated that Mr. Mascharka has invested over \$300,000 in restoring the home and it is not a home that is going to be knocked down and rebuilt.

Mr. Metzler stated that a driveway has been started based on a previous driveway permit issuance. He pointed out the steep slope areas and noted that the amount of steep slope disturbance required for the driveway is allowable.

Ms. Tubman stated that Mr. Mascharka would supplement the second hedgerow with additional trees as suggested by Mr. Banisch. She stated that the applicant was willing to put up a buffer along the street as long as the applicant could put in a garage or barn, outside the 100' setback, as long as the property was farmed. She noted that a perk test was also within this area, but it would not affect the vista.

Mr. Hall referred to his letter of May 6<sup>th</sup> regarding mandatory cluster and whether the TM track would trigger it. He noted that the open space land of the TM group is separated from this track by 1000'.

Mr. Buzak stated that based on the current cluster ordinance, mandatory cluster would not apply to this application because mandatory cluster is not triggered by the open land parcel because it is not in public ownership, as well as the fact that it was not contiguous to this parcel.

Mr. Hall reviewed the waivers requested on lot A, which he thought should be in the conservation easement.

Ms. Tubman asked for a waiver from the steep slope restrictions for the areas currently in farmland as long as the property is farmed. She stated that a building permit would trigger the need for conservation markers.

Mr. Hall noted that the conservation easement on the hedgerows would have to allow for the driveway, but the remainder should go into a conservation easement.

Ms. Tubman agreed.

Mr. Hall stated that because of the area of disturbance being over two acres, this application would have to comply with current stormwater management regulations. He did not recommend deferring the stormwater management design to the time of individual lot grading plans and stated that it should be part of the minor subdivision plans.

Ms. Tubman stated that they would meet with Mr. Hall and Dr. Keller to work out the required stormwater management plan.

Mr. Hall stated that based on the key map this area is within Comb Land Fill potential water contamination.

Ms. Tubman answered that this property is serviced by public water.

Mr. Metzler stated that the applicant does not want to shift the driveway as suggested by Mr. Hall.

Mr. Cullen stated that when he and Mr. Bauerlein walked the property the driveway was not taking down any trees.

Mr. Metzler agreed that the applicant would not be taking down any trees with the driveway as proposed.

Ms. Tubman stated that they were asking for a waiver of soil disturbance permit as the soil will stay on site or be moved across the street to Mr. Mascharka's farm.

Mr. Hall stated that this was acceptable but the distribution of soil should be shown on the individual lot grading plans.

Ms. Tubman stated that the applicant agreed to Mr. Banisch's request that if the existing house were abandoned and rebuilt it would be relocated to the rear of the property and use the common driveway.

Ms. Tubman stated that underbrush and vines and not trees had been removed from the hedgerows and that they would not be removing any trees except for necessary maintenance.

Ms. Tubman stated that if the deeds for sight easements have not been recorded that would be done

The meeting was opened to the public.

Bob Wies – 14 Flintlock stated that wanted to buy a five acre site from the previous owner to put up a home for himself and the previous owner told him that it would be a mistake to sell the piece of land because of the power lines and slopes and he would not sell it. The also stated that the water on Old Farmers Road is contaminated. He objected to this subdivision as it was his opinion that this land does not support two more homes.

The meeting was closed to the public for questions or comments this evening and the meeting was adjourned to June 14, 2004.

4 U.S. Homes – Block 19, Lots 5, 6, 7 – Newburgh and Schooley's Mountain Road Senior Housing Overlay Zone – 122 Acres – Concept Plan for 197 Age Restricted Housing Units

Joel Kobert, Applicant's Attorney  
Stan Omland, Applicant's Engineer  
Tom Barton, Applicant's Architect

Mr. Kobert stated that the applicant had a TCC with the board professionals and the building scale has been reduced and other concerns of the board and staff have been addressed.

Mr. Barton stated that they have listened to the board and fire department concerns and they have reduced the scale of the buildings, using 12, 15 and 18 unit buildings.

**MAY 10, 2004**

The units are all the same size, but the living units vary in size. The new buildings are 120' long versus the previous 300' long design. He stated that these smaller size buildings allow for the development to use the site more efficiently and protect the viewshed and wetlands to a greater extent. There is a boulevard entrance to a community center. The existing home will be retained as a residence. 22 parking spaces are underground for each unit. There is no parking in front of the buildings at the request of the fire department. All units would have fire sprinklers and are handicapped accessible.

Mr. Omland stated that building coverage and impervious coverage remains within 1% of the previous plan. The number of dwelling units remain the same as in the previous plan, 360 dwelling units.

Mr. Kobert stated that the existing farmhouse would be retained under this plan as a residence. He stated that it is the applicant's opinion that this size project would not support commercial development on the property.

Mr. Barton explained the reason this development would not support on site commercial development was the number of units, the fact that it is off the main road and the amount of commercial development in close proximity to this property.

Mr. Kobert stated that he did not have a problem having in the ordinance the ability to have a professional office or commercial, but they were not proposing it at this time. He stated that the applicant is aware that they will be required to put in one or two traffic signals.

Mr. Barton stated that they were looking at the possibility of finding another entrance for emergency vehicles as requested by the fire department.

Mr. Kobert stated that the applicant would like not to pursue the single family development plan and asked the board to authorize the board professionals to work on ordinance changes to allow the manor housing concept as presented this evening to move forward.

Mr. Hall stated that he preferred this building over the previous plan presented. He stated that based on the fact that the current ordinance allows for 197 single family homes or 360 attached housing units, he did not object to the plan presented.

Mr. Kobert briefly reviewed the changes that would have to be made to the current ordinance to permit the proposed use. He stated that he would like to have an ordinance amendment to the Township Committee within 30 days.

The board did not object to the ordinance development as proposed by Mr. Kobert.

***DISCUSSION/ CORRESPONDENCE***

1. Vouchers

Mr. Bauerlein made a motion to approve the vouchers reviewed by the chairman and found in order, seconded by Ms. Kaiser. A voice vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion carried.

2. May 5, 2004 correspondence from Health Officer RE: OFP Block 37, Lot 9

Noted for the record.

3. April 28, 2004 Correspondence from E. Buzak RE: TM/Scudese Litigation

Mr. Buzak stated that this was his reply to Mr. Somers correspondence.

4. May 6, 2004 Correspondence from E. Buzak RE: Scudese v Washington Township Amended Complaint

Mr. Buzak stated that this was a complaint from the Scudese's regarding the Planning Board's final approval of the TM application, which he would be replying to.

5. April 19, 2004 Correspondence from ANJEC re: Freshwater Wetlands Manual

Noted for the Record

6. May 12, 2004 Correspondence from WTBOE RE: Highlands Legislation

Noted for the record

Mr. Trevena made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Kaiser. A voice vote was taken, all were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

---

Virginia R. Kesper