

HILLSBOROUGH TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
September 10, 2015

Chairman Steven Sireci, Jr., called the Planning Board Public Meeting of September 10, 2015 to order at 7:30 p.m. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The meeting took place in the Courtroom of the Municipal Complex.

Chairman Sireci announced the meeting had been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 ("Sunshine Law").

ROLL CALL

Deputy Mayor Greg Burchette - Absent	Sam Conard - Absent
Michael Merdinger - Present	Dr. Steven Sireci, Jr., Chairman - Present
Committeeman Frank DelCore - Present	Robert Wagner, Jr. - Present
Steve Cohen, Vice Chairman - Absent	Robert Peason (Alt. #1) - Present
Dr. Daniel Marulli, Secretary - Absent	Shawn Lipani (Alt. #2) - Present
Neil Julian - Present	

Also present: David K. Maski, PP, AICP, Township Planning Director; Eric M. Bernstein, Esq., Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein, & Associates); William H.R. White, III, PE, CME, Board Engineer (Maser Consulting P.A.); Lucille Grozinski, CCR, Board Court Reporter; and Caz Bielen, Board Videographer (Premier Media, LLC).

DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

☐ September 03, 2015

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Peason, seconded by Mr. Merdinger.

Roll Call: Mr. Wagner - yes; Mr. Lipani - yes; Mr. Peason - yes; Mr. Merdinger - yes; Chairman Sireci - yes. Motion carries.

DISPOSITION OF RESOLUTIONS

☐ Copart of Connecticut, Inc. - AMENDED - File 14-PB-15-SR

Chairman Sireci read a portion of the Resolution.

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Merdinger, seconded by Mr. Peason.

Chairman Sireci called for any discussion.

Michael Sopko, Jr. - Camplain Road

Mr. Sopko stated there has been no improvement at the Copart site since he last addressed the Board, in reference to the garbage and late night deliveries. He said he has called the Hillsborough Police several times over the course of the last three months for trucks parked in front of his house either trying to get out or trying to get into the Copart site.

Chairman Sireci asked if Mr. Sopko if the Police had come out after receiving the complaint.

Mr. Sopko said he believed it took several complaints before being able to get a response.

Chairman Sireci asked that Mr. Sopko speak with the Township Administrator and Police Chief about the specifics of when he called and the action that was taken.

Chairman Sireci said the hope is that the adoption of the Resolution will give the Township some enforcement authority for this site. The Resolution is the mechanism in which to do so.

Committeeman DelCore asked Mr. Sopko to be sure to ask any Township employee he may reach out to, to keep the Planning Board in the loop as well. He said the Applicant was made well aware that the Township will no longer accept their noncompliance.

Mr. Bernstein said unrelated to tonight's Resolution, he had asked the Zoning Official, David Kois, PP, to go out to the site earlier in the week. He said Mr. Kois provided him with a report which he will be discussing with Mr. Kois, Mr. Ferrera and Chief Kaminsky on this and other matters.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2015

Chairman Sireci said there may be current ordinances being violated, which will be addressed. This Resolution allows other measures for enforcement. The Board was looking to be able to put specific controls on that operation.

Mr. Merdinger pointed out that there are 30 and 90 day deadlines on certain conditions, in which the Applicant has to comply.

Roll Call: Mr. Wagner - yes; Mr. Julian - yes; Mr. Merdinger - yes; Mr. Peason - yes; Committeeman DelCore - yes; Chairman Sireci - yes. Motion carries.

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None

PUBLIC HEARING - SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN APPLICATIONS

- ***Krismic Associates, Inc.*** - File 14-PB-21-MSR - Block 152.06, Lot 30 (*formerly known as Block 152, Lot 25*) - 230 Route 206. Applicant seeking Minor Site Plan Approval for the expansion of a driveway from the existing parking area at United Rent-All to Route 206, on property in the C-1 District (EC Review: 11-24-14) . **ADJOURNED until further notice, with re-notice. (TOD: 01-07-16)**

Chairman Sireci announced the adjournment of the Krismic Associates, Inc. application.

- ***Pierson Properties, LLC*** - 15-PB-05-MSRV - Block 151.09, Lot 220 (*formerly known as Block 151, Lot 2*) - 340 Valley Road. Applicant seeking Minor Site Plan Approval and 'c' Bulk Variances from Minimum Front Yard Setback (pre-existing nonconforming) and Minimum Rear Yard Setback (pre-existing nonconforming), for existing structures, to convert the pre-existing outdoor manufacturing concrete production facility to an asphalt production facility with new asphalt production equipment and delineated parking; and to eliminate the existing residential dwelling and convert to office use ancillary to the primary manufacturing use, on property in the GI Zoning District. (*Additional reports provided 05-29-15 at the request of the Environmental Commission*) (EC Reviews: 05-18-15 / 06-08-15). **Continued from July 09, 2015 without further notice (TOD: 10-31-15).**

Mr. Bernstein stated for the record that Mr. Lipani, Mr. Julian and Chairman Sireci had all reviewed the appropriate transcripts and/or recordings in order to be eligible to vote, should an action be taken by the Board.

Alexander Fisher, Esq. of Mauro, Savo, Camerino, Grant & Schalk representing Pierson Properties, LLC stated they had completed their presentation at the last meeting but had been advised that the Objector would have several witnesses. He said he did not see the Objector or his attorney but that he reserves the right for rebuttal.

Mr. Fisher stated after some back and forth, the report prepared by the Board's noise expert, Mr. Dotti, agreed with the findings and analysis of Mr. Zyburra. The Applicant has agreed, as a condition of approval, to affirmatively prove before operating the plant, that it meets all noise requirements.

Committeeman DelCore asked how that will occur.

Mr. Fisher said a noise study will be written to the Township, in compliance with the Administrative Codes, noise study, and regulations, and with the taking of measurements with the Plant up and running, showing that it does comply with the noise requirements. If it is not compliant, then it cannot operate.

Mr. Bernstein informed the Board that the opposing counsel should be next to testify being that the attorney for the Applicant concluded testimony.

There was some discussion over how the Board should proceed, in the absence of the opposing counsel, Ronald Gasiorowski, Esq. A witness for the opposition, Alexander Litwornia, stepped out to contact Mr. Gasiorowski as to his whereabouts.

The Board decided to continue the hearing by calling the Board's noise consultant for testimony.

Norman R. Dotti, PE, PP, INCE of Russell Acoustics, LLC was sworn in.

Chairman Sireci stated the witness has been employed by the Board for the purpose of reviewing the data and reports provided by the Applicant concerning the certainty of noise that would be produced for the

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 10, 2015

proposed asphalt factory. He recognized the report summary provided by Mr. Dotti and asked that Mr. Dotti review the conclusions he reached and how he arrived at them.

Mr. Bernstein asked that Mr. Dotti provide his qualifications for the sake of the record.

Mr. Dotti reviewed a long and detailed list of educational and professional involvements, spanning the course of forty-four years in the field of sound and vibration.

Mr. Dotti stated he had reviewed the report provided by Lewis S. Goodfriend & Assoc., the results of which had been formulated by inputting data into the model, using the software program, SoundPlan. The questions raised in reviewing the report were provided by way of the 08-27-15 initial report written to the Board. Mr. Dotti said he was able to get some clarification from Goodfriend & Associates after the issuing of his report, and made further analysis based on those discussions.

Mr. Dotti said he then looked at the model again, based on the means used to create the model. He stated he informed Goodfriend & Associates that the way they went about creating the model was "unusual, but legitimate." Mr. Dotti said what Goodfriend & Associates did was reasonable and their sound calculations were good, to a reasonable degree of engineering certainty.

Mr. Dotti explained that the existing ambient sound on the site, in addition to the noise produced by the facility, has to be considered. The existing ambient sound levels shown in the Goodfriend & Associates report were appreciable. The closest receptor being a residence across from the entrance of the Plant. The Ambient sound levels measured are significantly over what the limits are, but the Applicant is not responsible for those sounds. The expectation is that the neighbor will not hear the noise from the plant, if they meet the levels they are supposed to meet. The Applicant needs to meet the levels or pay some serious fines, and can ultimately be shut down. It is recommended as a Condition of Approval, that tests be done to show they indeed comply. A noise standard is a performance standard, so the Applicant will need to continue to meet the noise levels. If something developed down the road, any affected person can contact the County, who is mandated by the NJDEP, to come out and take sound measurements, and initiate an investigation.

Chairman Sireci asked whether the data that is fed in, comes from standards or from measurements from equipment or similar facilities.

Mr. Dotti said he was not able to answer that since he did not know where each bit of data came from. The numbers from the kind of sources seem reasonable. He said from his experience, it is probably a mix of published data and measured data. The kind of data that is put into SoundPlan, is a complete set of measurements than what would be used to consider compliance. One is for determining if it is a "legal operation", the other used for engineering purposes.

Chairman Sireci asked to hear about some of the key points of the discussion with Goodfriend & Associates that led him to conclude the data is unusual but legitimate.

Mr. Dotti explained that the times and percentages can be manipulated in many ways. Instead of running the various scenarios separately, they ran them all at one shot and then looked at the results which came out on an hour by hour basis. Each hour in their model represented a particular combination, not what was necessarily happening at that hour when the real plant is operating.

Mr. Dotti said he would have approached the data differently, but the results would have been the same.

Committeeman DelCore asked if there was a model where all that could be in operation was; worst case scenario.

Mr. Dotti said most of the sources are stationary; they do not move around the site. Modeling trucks and bucket loaders is doable, but there are some subtleties to it. He said he had discussion on the way in which the modeling was done. Goodfriend & Associates went back and recalculated the data, putting the tracks of the equipment closest to the residence, which is "Location #1," rather than calculate when the tracks are anywhere else on the site.

Chairman Sireci said is legitimate to run the worst case rather than run every other case, because only the worst case matters most.

Mr. Julian said noise can be different during various seasons and weather conditions. He asked how the Township could be assured of compliance based on when those noise tests would occur. He said he

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 10, 2015

wondered if the Applicant would be able to choose based on their selection of the optimum parameters. You need to set up the model so you can look at it fairly and under those conditions.

Mr. Dotti said the model does have some environmental factors in it. Wind can decrease sound, it does not increase it. You cannot take measurements when the wind is above 12 mph because the windfall over the microphone will give you false readings. Trees do not stop sound. It takes about 330 feet of dense woods to give a 5 dB(A) reduction in noise. Environmental factors, within 100 ft. can essentially be ignored. He explained that most people think snow absorbs noise; that is why it gets quiet when there is a significant snowfall. But what actually happens is that motor vehicle traffic slows down. It is not the acoustical characteristics of snow.

Mr. Julian asked whether it would then be acceptable for the Applicant to test under any conditions.

Mr. Dotti said the most sensitive receiver is the one across the street. At that distance, it does not matter.

Mr. Merdinger said he has taken noise measurements in the past where berms and pine trees had been added and found the noise measurements to have dropped off significantly after the landscaping had been put in place. He said since that time, the Board has had berms and staggered pines implemented at baseball fields, DPW, and numerous developments, which has significantly reduced the noise, only getting better with time as the trees grow taller and denser. The Board brought this up to this Applicant, who has agreed to put the trees in, in addition to all of the noise modification to the equipment being made. Mr. Merdinger said he did not agree with Mr. Dotti's statement that trees have no significance on noise.

Mr. Dotti said berms are great but trees do not affect noise. He stated he would be happy to provide references to that fact.

Mr. Dotti said there definitely is an out-of-sight, out-of-mind factor too. When you put up an attractive barricade, people feel better about it. It takes a lot of dense trees to have an effect on the noise. Any barrier needs to block sight between the source and the receiver. A berm is just as effective as any acoustical barrier of the same height. At great distances, acoustical barriers do not change the sound at larger distances; they are affective for people who are close up to the barrier, known as the "shadow zone." Mr. Dotti reviewed a scenario where sound would be louder on the second story of a residence vs. taking a measurement on ground level where there is some buffering. He said nighttime noise is predicated on sleep disturbance.

Chairman Sireci asked if the numbers he reviewed for the Pierson Properties site had any barriers built in.

Mr. Dotti said they had multiple barriers around various sources, which is in the SoundPlan model. There is no berm in the model but there is a barrier. A barrier is most effective for a given height either as close as possible to the source or as close as possible to the receiver. In this case you will put the barrier right around the equipment.

Mr. Bernstein noted for the record that the Review of Acoustical Study, dated 08-27-15 from Mr. Dotti; Memorandum dated 09-01-15 from Jack Zybura of Lewis S. Goodfriend & Assoc.; and follow-up letter dated 09-01-15 from Mr. Dotti are all on file.

Questions from the floor

Mr. Fisher said the Applicant will still agree to provide the trees, as previously agreed to.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Dotti if he agreed to a reasonable degree of acoustical engineering, with the projections made in Mr. Zybura's report.

Mr. Dotti said yes, with the understanding that he believed the input data was reasonable based on the methodology. He said he had not verified the input himself. He said the Applicant will have to comply and there is an enforcement mechanism in place.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Dotti if he agreed to a reasonable certainty, in the field of acoustical engineering, that those noise controls compliance can be done with the equipment proposed, or any additional that may be necessary.

Mr. Dotti concurred.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 10, 2015

Mr. Fisher asked if it is standard in the acoustical engineering industry, to receive data from a manufacturer, without actually going to the manufacturer's plant to test the equipment yourself.

Chairman Sireci asked Mr. Fisher if he had someone present who could testify as to the sources put into the model.

Mr. Fisher said Mr. Zybura had before during cross-examination, but that he could do so again.

Mr. Dotti added that one always has to look at data of any sort, from the basis of knowing your field of expertise. He said he was not of the opinion that the data was not unreasonable in this case.

Alexander Litwornia, PE

- Mr. Litwornia, speaking for the opposition, stated he was in agreement with what Mr. Dotti had said. He asked whether or not Mr. Dotti was recommending the Applicant provide more details of exactly what the remediation and barriers are supposed to be, to be indicated on the plan so that everyone knows what is supposed to be built.

Mr. Dotti said there is data in SoundPlan that addresses characteristics of the source, dimensions on barriers, attenuations of barriers, etc. He said he personally did not need more details but whether the Board wants it, is not known. He said he does not like over specifying.

- Mr. Litwornia said the Board may not know the specifics of what is required.

Mr. White said the Applicant will be putting a lot of money into sound barriers. If they do not meet the noise ordinance, they will be left between a rock and a hard place.

- Mr. Litwornia expressed his concern that the plan meets the expectation for the barriers.

Mr. Dotti said he understands the request but as stated, the sound level is what counts. The Applicant may be able to use a quieter piece of equipment that gets the net sound to be reduced and no longer need the barrier. The reduction in noise is not just a paper evaluation. What counts is whether or not the Applicant can hit the 49 dB(A) as stated, 50 dB(A) being the maximum.

Chairman Sireci said perhaps the question of what noise barriers will be provided on the plan may be more appropriate to ask the Applicant.

- Mr. Litwornia recommended to the Board that a noise study be done within 30 - 60 days, and then have another 6 months down the road, so that it can be tested in day and night conditions. Mr. Litwornia said it is standard practice within his office and that he believed it was in safe keeping for the municipality to do so.

Chairman Sireci asked Mr. Dotti if he believe conducting both tests was reasonable.

Mr. Dotti said it is not unreasonable however, he said he was not in favor of testing every year either.

- Mr. Litwornia said the concern is that in the noise study, it mentioned that there would be minimal or no nighttime operations. The State and County pave at night on any high volume road.

Mr. Merdinger said the testimony was that the recycling material would not be on-site initially. Mr. Merdinger asked Mr. Fisher to have his witness speak to how the recycling would be handled.

- Mr. Litwornia informed the Board that he had spoken with Mr. Gasiorowski. He will be unable to attend due to flooding.

Mr. Fisher called Mr. Zybura back up for testimony.

Jack Zybura, PE, LSG&A, of Lewis S. Goodfriend & Associates, still under Oath, provided the following testimony, in response to questions asked by Mr. Fisher:

Mr. Zybura said all of the data used to input into the model was provided by the manufacturer, Aztec. He said from his conversations with Aztec, they gathered that data from measurements on operational plants and operations equipment.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 10, 2015

Chairman Sireci asked for clarification as to how the barriers are factored into the model.

Mr. Zybura said they first run the model with no barriers to see how loud they are and what sources need to be worked on to bring the noise down below the Code. He said they then methodically go through and add barriers, adjusting heights until it is below the Code. Each source will be different once installed by use of acoustical lagging, jacketing or silencers. Different aspects are put in for the type of source being handled. It will take the plant to be built before they can know where the barrier can be placed.

Chairman Sireci asked if there was a game plan for how barriers would be installed, then build the plant and see where you are at to determine where you need less, more or different.

Mr. Zybura said they are independent consultants so they do not do the installation. They would recommend where to put the barriers, at what height, and with what material, until they get to where they need to be. There is a game plan as to what sources need to be addressed.

Chairman Sireci asked if the "game plan" will be submitted for the application.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Zybura if that was standard practice.

Mr. Zybura said not for asphalt plants like this. The recommendations are not submitted in plans but in written format letters. He said they work with the plant manufacturer and certain noise control manufacturers to see what products will fit where.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Zybura to explain how a noise study is done to show that a plant complies.

Mr. Zybura said once operational, some measurements will be taken at the receiving properties, at the property line, and also within the property. It is expected that on Day1, the plant will meet the daytime code, which is a lot less stringent than nighttime. From there, they will work on the noise to get it down to the nighttime levels.

Chairman Sireci asked if that would be done prior to operations commencing.

Mr. Zybura responded for the nighttime. However, in theory, they could be permitted to run during daytime hours only until the nighttime levels were satisfied.

Chairman Sireci asked Mr. Zybura to explain the change in operations to include recycling.

Mr. Zybura said they could go back to take more measurements, but the model does include that additional equipment to show a full blown plant build-out.

Chairman Sireci said the original acceptance testing will not.

Mr. Zybura said that is correct, depending on when it is done.

Mr. Fisher said he objected to the idea that using recycled asphalt is any different than using aggregate and oil to produce asphalt.

Mr. Merdinger reminded Mr. Fisher that as the attorney for the Applicant, he would not be able to testify to that. He said his understanding was that the recycling is an entirely separate operation.

Chairman Sireci asked for clarification on the noise from the recycling operations.

Mr. Zybura said the results that were presented were for the worst case scenario, with everything running. He said they did not look at what equipment could not be run while others were on. He said they also modeled it other ways so they could pick it apart to see where the contributors were, but the end result in their report is for having everything running.

Mr. Merdinger said he was not in favor of continually retesting but that he was in favor of having the second testing done once the recycling is in.

Chairman Sireci said he too was not in favor of having to re-verify but that certainly retesting should be done when there is a change in the operation.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 10, 2015

Committeeman DelCore asked what the standard is as to who administers the testing.

Mr. Zybura said when they do the first compliance testing; they are also looking to see where they may need to add noise control. He said they would do the first round of testing to get their bearings. The test can be performed by any qualified noise expert, be it Goodfriend & Assoc., another consultant, or the County.

Chairman Sireci asked what the plan is in this case, prior to operations. He said the Board will want to be able to address it in the Resolution.

Mr. White recommended the testing be done after 6 months of operations. The plant will not be in operation in the wintertime.

Chairman Sireci said he would rather not lock into an arbitrary date but rather as a matter of function, when or before the recycling is going to start, to test a set of conditions.

Mr. Dotti said an asphalt plant is rather complicated. They are seasonal and when you get a high demand, they will want to run at night. Mr. Dotti said to do it before they begin operations is difficult. He said he has seen it done 30 days after the start of operations, subject to the CO. The follow-up testing has to be picked accordingly. Mr. Dotti said there have been times when he has done the testing for an applicant he represented, while for other applications, the final testing has been done by someone else. It can be done either way. The results have to make sense.

Mr. Peason asked how one is able to differentiate between the ambient noise that may be higher and the actual asphalt noise, as noted in the noise report provided by the Applicant's consultant.

Mr. Dotti said they measured the LEQ, which is the average sound level. The measurement is at a level of 57. If that were a steady level 57, then the Applicant would have a problem. He said his guess is that the ambient is fluctuating. One needs to be able to determine the level of when the plant is at the quietest, in between all of the noise from cars, trucks, airplanes, birds, etc.

Mr. Peason said that would be left to the experts, but questioned who the expert would be to determine that.

Mr. Dotti said compliance on ambient testing needs to be done very carefully.

Mr. White suggested two sets of testing be done, one within 30 days of TCO, the second 30 days after they change operation and add the recycling aspect. They should have a chance to get everything up and running, with all of the bugs worked out.

Chairman Sireci said that sounds reasonable. The next question is who will be doing the testing.

Mr. White pointed out both of the consultants are professional engineers. Each would need to sign and seal their report so it is their license on the line if it is incorrect.

Chairman Sireci asked Mr. Fisher if the Applicant would agree to that and do the testing with their experts.

Mr. Fisher said the Applicant would comply.

For the record, **Kurt Mitchell**, of Pierson Properties, was identified in the audience.

Alexander Litwornia

- Mr. Litwornia asked Mr. Zybura to clarify a comment made on page 7 of his report, recommending the results be reviewed by a design professional.

Mr. Zybura said the results would need to be reviewed for structural compliance, wind loads, etc. He said Goodfriend & Assoc., is not a structural or civil engineers. They want to be sure that anything put in is Code compliant. Another professional will have to review those installations. He said they provide the required noise reduction and some sample products that can meet those standards.

- Mr. Litwornia said he did not see in Mr. Zybura's report, at what distance the noise levels were measured.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 10, 2015

Mr. Zybura said all of the data provided by the manufacturer was provided in terms of sound power, which is independent of distance.

- Mr. Litwornia asked if impulse sound was taken into consideration in the model.

Mr. Zybura said only as far as it was in the manufacturer's source data. They did not specify whether it was an impulsive source or a continuous source.

- Mr. Litwornia said the impulsive source he is concerned about is the loading and unloading of trucks, which is not manufacturing equipment.

Mr. Zybura said the truck data was used from their own data base, which was the maximum sound level occurring during whatever truck event that had been measured.

- Mr. Litwornia asked if it included the dumping of macadam into a truck.

Mr. Zybura confirmed that was included.

- Mr. Litwornia asked how the number of trucks on-site was determined.

Mr. Zybura said the entire path a truck would take was modeled as a radiating line source. He said they took the level from one truck and applied it across the whole path so that the whole path is radiating at the same time.

- Mr. Litwornia asked if that would vary if you have not one truck but ten trucks circulating at the same time.

Mr. Zybura said there would still be ten trucks distributed amongst the line, which is how it was modeled.

- Mr. Litwornia asked if it would change if there were twenty trucks.

Mr. Zybura said he did not think it would, based on what was modeled.

- Mr. Litwornia asked whether or not the Board will be requesting within the Resolution that the follow-up noise reports be signed and sealed.

Confirmation was reiterated.

Mr. White reminded the Board that at the last meeting, the Applicant offered to eliminate the residence.

Mr. Fisher confirmed the offer was made, in the alternative, to offer a variance free application, to destroy the front residence, instead of making an adaptive reuse as an office, and the rear building, which is too close to the setback, instead of making it a reuse building for the operation. Testimony for the Applicant stated it was a waste to do so, but the offer was made, if the preference of the Board.

Mr. Maski asked Mr. Fisher to confirm previous testimony given, that the Applicant will agree to meet all of the recommendations in Mr. White's memo of 05-28-15 and Ms. Shiffman's memo of 06-04-15.

Mr. Fisher confirmed compliance.

Mr. Maski asked Mr. Fisher to confirm previous testimony that the lighting pole heights will be lowered, but that the lighting will still be higher than 35 ft., necessitating a design waiver.

Mr. Fisher said they agreed to work to the Engineer's satisfaction. He said the testimony was that it was unrealistic to have the lighting so that it would not require a waiver.

No further questions / comments from the Public.

There was discussion on the offer to demolish the existing structures or reuse them as an office and building for operations.

Chairman Sireci said the Board was in favor of keeping the existing buildings rather than demolish them.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2015

Close Public

A motion to approve application 15-PB-05-MSRV, with all applicable items, including the trees, agreed to noise testing after operations, and all stipulations and agreements made by the Applicant, was made by Mr. Merdinger, seconded by Mr. Peason.

Roll Call: Mr. Wagner – yes; Mr. Julian – yes; Mr. Merdinger – yes; Mr. Peason – yes; Mr. Lipani – yes; Committeeman DelCore – yes; Chairman Sireci – yes. Motion carries.

Mr. Maski noted there was no business scheduled to the September 24th meeting.

A motion to cancel the meeting of 09-24-15 was made and seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed. Motion carries.

PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS

- Discussion of November Meeting Schedule

Mr. Bernstein informed the Board, an additional meeting would likely be needed in November, being that only one meeting had been approved.

After discussion, a meeting date of November 19th was determined.

A motion to add a public meeting date on 11-19-15 at 7:30 p.m. was made and seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed. Motion carries.

Mr. Maski reminded the Board an Acting Secretary would need to be elected, in the absence of Secretary Marulli, so that the final plans submitted for an applicant could be signed.

A motion to elect Mr. Wagner as Acting Secretary was made and seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed. Motion carried.

Chairman called for the meeting to be adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

*Submitted by:
Debra Padgett
Administrative Assistant / Planning Board Clerk*