

January 12th, 2021

BRIELLE PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2021

The Reorganizational Meeting of the Brielle Planning Board was held on Tuesday, January 12th, 2021 at 6:00 p.m. virtually. Ms. Trainor read the OPMA compliance statement. After a Salute to the Flag and a moment of silent prayer, roll call was taken:

Present – Mayor Thomas Nicol, Councilman Frank Garruzzo, Mr. James Stenson, Ms. Corrine Trainor, Mr. James Maclearie, Mr. Christian Siano, Ms. Karen Brisben, Mr. Andrew Chermak and Ms. Madeline Ferraro

Absent – Mr. Glenn Miller

Also present were Mr. David Clark, Board Attorney, Mr. Alan Hilla, Board Engineer and Ms. Denise Murphy, Recording Secretary.

APPOINTMENTS TO
PLANNING BOARD:

Mayor Thomas Nicol through 12/31/21
Councilman Frank Garruzzo through 12/31/21
Karen S. Brisben through 12/31/21
James Maclearie through 12/31/24

NOMINATION &
ELECTION OF:

Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson

Corrine Trainor was appointed as Chairperson and Jim Maclearie as Vice-Chairperson on a motion by Mayor Nicol, seconded by Councilman Garruzzo and then by roll call vote:

Ayes: Mayor Thomas Nicol, Councilman Frank Garruzzo, Karen Brisben, Andrew Chermak, James Maclearie, Chris Siano, James Stenson, and Corinne Trainor.

Noes: None

The following Resolutions were then presented for approval for 2021:

RESOLUTION FOR BOARD ATTORNEY & BOARD ENGINEER FOR 2021

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:11-5(1)(a)(i) permits the Planning Board to award a professional services contract without public advertising for bids and bidding, and

WHEREAS, the Brielle Planning Board has determined that there is a need for legal services and engineering services during 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Brielle Planning Board has determined to provide the need to acquire legal services and engineering services as a non-fair and open contract pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 1:44A-20.5; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Finance Officer of the Borough of Brielle has determined to certify in writing that the value of the legal services and engineering services may exceed \$17,500; and

WHEREAS, the term of these contracts are one year (January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021); and

WHEREAS, David Clark of Gluckwalrath, LLC has proposed to provide legal services and Alan Hilla, Jr. of H2M Architecture, LLC, has proposed to provide engineering services; and

WHEREAS, both Mr. Clark and Mr. Hilla have completed and submitted a Business Entity Disclosure Certification which certifies that they have not made any reportable contributions to any political or candidate committee in the Borough of Brielle in the previous year, and that the contracts will prohibit them from making any reportable contributions through the term of the contracts; and

WHEREAS, a certification as to the availability of funds executed by the Chief Finance Officer is attached to this Resolution pursuant to the provisions of N.J.A.C. 5:30-4;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Borough of Brielle that:

1. The Business Disclosure Entity Certification of both Mr. Clark and Mr. Hilla as well as the Determination of Value Certification of the Chief Finance Officer shall be filed in the office of the Municipal Clerk and shall be available for public inspection.
2. The Planning Board is hereby authorized and directed to execute a contract with Mr. Clark to provide legal services and Mr. Hilla to provide engineering services for the 2021 contract year.
3. A notice stating the nature, duration, service and the amount of this contract shall be published in the Coast Star newspaper and this Resolution shall be maintained on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Board Secretary.
4. A certified copy of this Resolution shall be sent to Mr. Clark and Mr. Hilla.

MEETING DATES FOR BRIELLE PLANNING BOARD FOR 2021

WHEREAS, an act of the Legislature known as the "Open Public Meetings Act" enacted October 21, 1975, requires that advance notice be given of all regularly scheduled meetings of the Planning/Zoning Board of the Borough of Brielle, this act becoming effective January 19, 1976;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning/Zoning Board of the Borough of Brielle that:

1. The regularly scheduled public business meetings of the Brielle Planning Board shall be held virtually at 6:00 p.m. on the second Tuesday of each month. Login Information as follows:
<https://www.gotomeet.me/BrielleBorough/pb>
access code: 794-656-477
phone (if needed) 1-866-899-4679
2. A copy of this Resolution shall be posted on the public bulletin board in the Borough Hall and published in one of the official newspapers of the Borough.

OFFICIAL NEWSPAPERS OF THE BRIELLE PLANNING BOARD FOR 2021

RESOLVED, that the Asbury Park Press and the Coast Star Newspaper are designated as the official newspapers for publishing legal notices of the Brielle Planning Board.

RESOLUTION FOR PLANNING/ZONING BOARD SECRETARIES FOR 2021

WHEREAS, there is a need for a Secretary of the Board and a Recording Secretary, and

WHEREAS, the Board has money in the Salary Ordinance to cover the expenses associated with these positions,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Karen S. Brisben be appointed Secretary of the Board for 2021 at a salary of \$5,000 annually and Denise Murphy be appointed as Recording Secretary for the year 2021 at a salary of \$5,000 annually.

A motion was made by Councilman Garruzzo to approve the above Resolutions, this seconded by James Stenson and approved unanimously by voice vote, all aye.

Corinne Trainor then asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of December 8th, 2020, this done by James Stenson, seconded by Janes Maclearie, and approved by a unanimous vote, all aye.

CORRESPONDENCE Copy of application to DEP for construction of in-ground pool for 403 Leslie Avenue, Bl. 51, Lot 9.01, owned by Karen & Jennifer Kamm

OLD BUSINESS: Consideration of approval of Resolution for variance relief for Block 54.01, Lot 5, 616 Cedarcrest Drive, owned by Peter & Tara Christou, to allow replacement of a Bilco style basement entry door with a full stairway enclosure.

Corinne Trainor started by stating that she trusts that everyone has had an opportunity to read the resolution and unless there are any edits or changes, she would request a motion to approve. A motion to approve was then made by Councilman Garruzzo, seconded by Mayor Nicol and then by roll call vote.

Ayes: Mayor Nicol, Councilman Garruzzo, James Stenson, Corinne Trainor, James Maclearie, Chris Siano, Karen Brisben, Andrew Chermak

Noes: None

OTHER OLD BUSINESS: Continuation of hearing for Major Subdivision for Block 64.06, Lot 18, 619 Rankin Road, owned by 619 Rankin Road, LLC (applicant Bojac Realty), to create 5 buildable lots.

Mr. Keith Henderson stated for the record that he represents the applicant and is from the law firm of C. Keith Henderson and Henderson in Manasquan, NJ. Mr. Henderson stated that he would like to report back to the Planning Board before starting with testimony. Mr. Henderson stated that he told the Board at the last meeting that they were working hard with the neighbors to try to resolve some discrepancies and differences of opinion that existed between the developer and the neighbors. Mr. Henderson announced that he is happy to report to the Board that they have entered into agreements with four property owners and have resolved our differences in all four cases.

Mr. Henderson then stated that he wanted to check with the Board to see if they would be given additional time, since there is nothing else on the agenda tonight, and hoped they might be able to get through most of the application. Ms. Trainor responded by asking Mr. Henderson what he had to present to complete his application. Mr. Henderson replied that he had a traffic engineer and a planner. Mr. Henderson then addressed a letter read into the record at the last meeting from the Environmental Commission. Mr. Henderson stated they were not able to respond because it came in on the 7th and the meeting was on December 8th. Mr. Henderson stated that if he did not have the time to address it, he would like to get to the two other experts. Mr. Henderson stated that they have been here for other meetings and that he would like to finish up the Planner and Traffic Engineer.

Ms. Trainor stated that the Board would start with their normal 45 minutes, and then will ask the Board for a motion for more time and if a motion were made and approved then the Board would hear the applicant longer. Ms. Trainor stated that she wanted to give to Mr. Henderson some

assurance that the Board is open and interested in finalizing the application to the extent they are able to tonight.

Ms. Trainor then noted that this application was first introduced on November 12th, 2019 when the Board heard from Mr. Van Horn and that the Board has spent the last three Planning Board meetings hearing testimony from Mr. Carr, the applicants engineer and planner.

Mr. Henderson called his first witness, Mr. Andrew Jafolla, a traffic engineer.

Mr. Jafolla was sworn in by Mr. Clark, Board Attorney

Mr. Jafolla stated that he is a principal at Dynamic Traffic. Mr. Clark asked Mr. Jafolla if he would be testifying as a traffic engineer and if he has an engineering license. Mr. Jafolla replied that he is professionally registered in New Jersey and a certified professional traffic operation engineer.

Ms. Trainor accepted Mr. Jafolla as a traffic engineer.

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Jafolla if he was retained by the applicant to explore any traffic issues that might affect this application. Mr. Jafolla answered that yes, his firm was retained for that purpose. Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Jafolla if his office did an analysis of what approvals from a traffic point of view might be required. Mr. Jafolla responded that the approvals that are needed are from the Board and from an impact perspective they looked at two things, sight distance and trip generation. Mr. Jafolla stated that trip generation was briefly touched on by the site engineer and that he was also here to provide a little bit more clarity about the numbers provided.

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Jafolla, when he did the analysis of the site, if he explored the Municipal Ordinances to see if there was a Sight Distance Ordinance. Mr. Jafolla replied yes, but this is not necessarily a Sight Distance Ordinance but more of a specification on an area that should be kept clear of shrubs over a certain height. Mr. Jafolla continued by stating that in order to determine what distance is required for this specific location and the specific environmental conditions on this route, they looked to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, (AASHTO) policy on geometric highway design. Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Jafolla to explain to the Board what the national standards are based upon. Mr. Jafolla answered that the AASHTO standard specifies the minimum distance that is required for a vehicle to come to a complete stop, given the speed traveling and the perception reaction time of the vehicle for that the person driving and also the rate of deceleration. Mr. Jafolla stated that on this specific road, the posted speed limit is 25 miles per hour and that typically a design speed of five miles per hour over that posted speed limit would be used, for 30 mile per hour design. Mr. Jafolla stated that for a 25 mile per hour posted speed limit, 155 feet of visibility would be needed when exiting the new road and that for a 30 mile per hour speed, 200 feet of visibility would be needed. Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Jafolla if he would recommend the 200 feet. Mr. Jafolla responded yes and stated that this would meet the design speed for the road. Mr. Jafolla stated that there are a number of trees that are located along the frontage of the property and that as part of the site improvements, these trees would be removed and that this would provide adequate lines of sight. Mr. Jafolla continued by saying that just to the south of proposed Squan Brook Way, there are holly bushes that are overhanging within the right of way that they would recommend be limbed up to about 10 feet off the pavement and that this is

consistent with the Ordinance. Mr. Jafolla stated that all this work is within the right of way or within the property that is under control by the applicant. Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Jafolla if this completes his testimony on line of sight. Mr. Jafolla answered, yes.

Mr. Henderson stated that Mr. Jafolla referred to a second issue of investigation and asked him to review that with the Board. Mr. Jafolla responded that in the environmental impact statement that he believed was testified to in the prior hearing, there was some testimony regarding the traffic generation. Mr. Jafolla stated that he does concur with the trip generation that was provided in that impact statement but wants to provide some clarity as to where that came from. Mr. Jafolla stated that within the statement it was provided that there's 47 trips on a typical weekday, four occurring during the morning peak hour, morning rush hour and five trips during the afternoon rush hour. Mr. Jafolla continued by saying this information comes directly out of the Trip Generation Manual published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Mr. Jafolla explained that this manual publishes the average trip generation rate on a per dwelling unit basis and that rate is based on studies that have been performed across the country, over a span of the last 30 years. Mr. Jafolla stated that based on these numbers, there is no further analysis that would typically be warranted on a project of this size.

Mr. Henderson stated that he had no further questions.

Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Hilla if he had any questions for Mr. Jafolla. Mr. Hilla stated that to the west of the proposed intersection, part of the triangle that the sight distance covers is across private property, part of it covers the applicant property and then part of it crosses parallel to the front lot line of Lot 17. Mr. Hilla continued by saying that he knows this is beyond the ability of the applicant and outside the confines of the applicants property but by ordinance, a homeowner could put a six-foot fence at that front property line and asked Mr. Jafolla if there is a way to ameliorate that circumstance because once this application is approved, those things are out of the Board's purview and then maybe the safety that's implied here is no longer the case. Mr. Jafolla responded by saying that he understood Mr. Hilla's concern and that he would get more specific about the sight distance calculation and how that is measured. Mr. Jafolla stated that Mr. Hilla is correct that a portion of that 200-foot sight line distance, the line of sight does cross into that adjacent property. Mr. Jafolla stated that sight distance is typically measured where the driver's eye is located 15-feet behind the edge of the pavement line which means that this is measured in a way that the front of the vehicle that is entering onto Rankin Road is about nine to ten feet before hitting the edge of pavement line. Mr. Jafolla stated that if there was to ever be an obstruction constructed in the future, he would expect that the front of the vehicle that is entering Rankin Road would just end up being more aligned with that edge of pavement line and would bring that driver's eye out in front crossing that right of way line. Mr. Jafolla stated that measuring the AASHTO distance, as shown on the plans, that this is how it is plotted but in reality, there is a little bit of room for someone who is leaving Squan Brook Way and entering Rankin Road to creep up further and still be outside the confines of Rankin Road and have even additional sight distance if something were to be constructed on that adjacent property.

Mr. Hilla stated that the sight triangle to the east includes a couple of obstructions including a fence within the right of way and a utility pole. Mr. Hilla the utility pole is fairly close to where

the driver would be on Squan Brook Way. Mr. Hilla asked Mr. Jafolla how this would affect the ability at this location. Mr. Jafolla responded that the utility pole is about 40 feet away and typically a utility pole is not considered an obstruction when it is within a sight triangle. Mr. Jafolla stated that he doesn't have a concern with the utility pole because the cross-section of the utility pole is not going to block the full view of the vehicle that is 16 feet long or so.

Mr. Jafolla stated that the fence is a post and rail fence that has openings and is in the right of way. Mr. Jafolla continued that in his opinion the fence can remain based on viewing it but if it is something of a concern for the Board, it could be looked at for removal because it is in the right of way.

Mr. Hilla asked Mr. Jafolla to discuss the fact that the position of Scott Road and the left turn out of Scott Road falls shorter than from Squan Brook Way. Mr. Jafolla responded that he would not envision that someone pulling out of Scott Road would have enough time to really accelerate to the full 30 miles per hour and that this is common when you have roads adjacent to each other. Mr. Jafolla stated that if someone exiting Scott Road were to move first, Squan Brook Way would almost have immediate visibility of someone turning into Scott Road and would have the opportunity to either wait for the vehicle to pass or to continue on because they would both be accelerating concurrently, and the vehicle wouldn't be at full speed. Mr. Jafolla stated that this is not a concern of his. Mr. Hilla stated that he had no further questions.

Ms. Trainor stated that it was time to take questions from the Board.

Councilman Garruzzo asked Mr. Jafolla if there was any analysis done on the actual traffic that comes up and down Rankin Road, speeding cars, or anything along those lines. Mr. Jafolla answered that they didn't record any existing speeds or volume simply because of the very, very low intensity associated with this type of development.

Mr. Maclearie asked Mr. Hilla if the 47 trips per day falls into what he would have thought for a 5-resident street. Mr. Maclearie stated that if you have five at rush time, if you have two working people a day, that is going to be ten. Mr. Maclearie stated then when he heard the number, he thought it was low. Mr. Hilla responded that traffic is not really something that he does and that he doesn't have an opinion one way or the other. Mr. Jafolla stated that this is a question they hear often. Mr. Jafolla continued by saying that if you have two working parents and someone leaving could happen but the odds of that happening in all five households, concurrently, to rise to that level where in every household is creating that level of trip generation is unlikely to have it happening altogether. Mr. Jafolla stated that they look at it on the average basis. Mr. Jafolla took it a step further by saying in a very exaggerated, worst case scenario, if every household had four trips in the morning rush hour it would still only be 20 trips and still wouldn't rise to the threshold.

Ms. Brisben stated she had no questions but said that she appreciated hearing from the traffic engineer and that she found it a very interesting and informative report.

Mr. Chermark asked Mr. Jafolla if any consideration had been taken into actual cars parked on Rankin Road and around the intersection. Mr. Jafolla responded that when he was at the site, he didn't observe any cars parked there. Mr. Jafolla stated that by looking through the community

and stated that all the houses had driveways and it appeared that people were using them. Mr. Jafolla continued by saying that someone could park out on the road, something that occurs in many residential communities and what this does is allows someone to creep up a little further to the edge of the parking lane or maybe they would not proceed, where their view would be obstructed by that parked vehicle and look beyond it on the backside before they pull out. Mr. Jafolla stated that this is an occurrence that happens in residential areas but that he does not anticipate it given the level of parking, based on the driveway setups.

Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Jafolla if the 100 hundred trips that he is referencing is an industry standard. Mr. Jafolla answered that it is an industry standard published by Institute of Transportation Engineers, (ITE), and the other standard out there is New Jersey Department of Transportation, (NJDOT). Mr. Jafolla stated that the NJDOT also recognizes that as a standard and in fact, the NJ DOT doesn't require any kind of analysis until you reach 200 trips.

Ms. Trainor stated that all questions from the Board have been heard and now this is time for questions from the public. Mr. Trainor announced that for those who wished to ask a question would need to type their name into the chat box in the GoToMeeting software and the Board will proceed in the order that they announced themselves.

Mr. Clark swore in Ms. Jeniene Stango, 620 Rankin Road, Brielle, NJ

Ms. Stango asked Mr. Jafolla if there was any consideration, understanding or recognition of the pedestrian use of this road. Mr. Jafolla responded that it was a nice day when he was out there and that there were several people walking, but he didn't think the level of traffic being proposed for this subdivision is something that would create such an intensity that would end up having multiple cars on the road, two cars passing side-by-side, and pedestrians competing for space. Mr. Jafolla stated that although the analysis shows that there is going to be five additional trips during the peak hours, one trip every twelve minutes, it is not something that he envisions and that the common pedestrian is going to be recognized on the street because of the low intensity. Ms. Stango asked Mr. Jafolla where he got the idea of five cars and how he felt he had a good idea of pedestrian activity when going at this time of year and the problems with traffic going both ways on the street.

Mr. Henderson stated that he objected to Ms. Stango combining opinions and questions. Ms. Trainor stated to Ms. Stango that the Board will give some leeway and asked Ms. Stango to streamline her questions going forward.

Mr. Jafolla stated how they determine the five trips is based on an industry publication used for residential developments throughout the country. Mr. Jafolla stated that it is utilized by Traffic Engineers throughout New Jersey and that it is the standard. Mr. Jafolla stated that when he projects five trips, this is not necessarily his opinion or thought but is his interpretation of the nationally recognized data that is out there, this is his projection of the data. Mr. Jafolla stated that what this data does is it studies existing single-family residential developments through the state and determines the number of trips per dwelling unit, utilizing that rate to project the number of trips for this project. Mr. Jafolla stated that by industry standard with a five-unit development and worst-case peak hour, it would be a trip per unit, which is how they come up with five trips here.

Mr. Jafolla stated that he couldn't say that he had a full understanding of the pedestrian activity because he doesn't live there but that he does understand similarly spaced residential developments in Monmouth County. Mr. Jafolla stated that he would expect more people be out in the summer in a residential community, but this is irrelevant to his conclusion that this project is not going to adversely impact existing pedestrian movements in this area because the level of intensity associated with this proposed project is so low.

Ms. Stango asked Mr. Jafolla if he noticed the blind spot on Rankin Road. Mr. Jafolla asked Ms. Stango if she was referring to the curve that is located just to the west of this site, or the horizontal curve on which this proposed road is located. Ms. Stango responded, both. Mr. Jafolla responded by saying that they looked to see that there would be sufficient sight distance for this specific proposal. Mr. Jafolla stated that this driveway is located along the interior of that curve and there is a lot of vegetation presently along the frontage of what will be developed. Mr. Jafolla said that as part of this project, a lot of that vegetation contributing to a possibly perceived blind spot would end up being cleared. Mr. Jafolla stated that he didn't know what blind spot Ms. Stango was referring to but if he is referring to the inside part of Rankin Road curve where Squan Brook Way is proposed, he would envision that driving along Rankin Road would be easier with the vegetation cleared.

Ms. Stango asked Mr. Jafolla to clarify how he came up with five cars. Mr. Henderson objected to this question. Ms. Trainor stated to Mr. Henderson that she believes that Ms. Stango could ask the question again but has already done so and that Mr. Jafolla has responded to her question in this regard. Ms. Trainor stated to Ms. Stango that she had already asked this question, that Mr. Henderson has objected twice, and this is going to be the last time Mr. Jafolla is going to answer this question. Mr. Jafolla responded that he thinks one thing that is being confused is this distinction between the number of cars that an individual household may own and park in their driveway, versus the number of trips exiting a specific household during a peak hour. Mr. Jafolla continued by saying that the number of vehicles that are present on a given property are not related to the number of trips that would be expected during the morning and afternoon rush hour. Mr. Jafolla stated that this is really related to the need for someone to move from their household, either to a work environment, or to a school environment and it really doesn't matter how many cars that you have on the property to do that. Mr. Jafolla stated that is the distinction between the number of cars at the household versus the trips. Mr. Jafolla stated that the five trips came from the Institute of Transportation Engineers which summarizes a trip rate per dwelling unit that would be expected during the morning rush hour and afternoon rush hour. Ms. Stango stated she had no further questions.

Ms. Trainor announced that Mr. Richard Curran, 826 William Drive, Brielle, NJ was the next to enter his name and that he had appeared before with respect to this application.

Mr. Curran asked Mr. Jafolla what time of the day he visited the property and how long he stayed. Mr. Jafolla answered that he was there this afternoon around 3:00 PM and stayed for about a half hour. Mr. Curran asked Mr. Jafolla if by looking at the code, 25 miles an hour is 155 feet, 30 miles per hour with 200 feet, does that mean it's another 45 feet for each 5 miles per hour. Mr. Jafolla

answered no, it is a non-linear relationship. Mr. Curran asked Mr. Jafolla if someone is going 35 or 40, what does it become. Mr. Jafolla responded at 35, its 250 and at 40, it's 305.

Mr. Curran asked Mr. Jafolla if the code he referred to makes any consideration for sidewalk or no sidewalk. Mr. Jafolla responded that there really isn't a code that would account for if there is or isn't a sidewalk, pedestrians have rights to utilize an existing road in absence of the sidewalk pedestrians walk at a much slower speed than a vehicle traveling at 25, 30 miles per hour, so if there is visibility that is allotted for a vehicle traveling along Rankin Road, than a pedestrian that would be within that same roadway would also be visible.

Mr. Curran asked Mr. Jafolla if the narrowness of Rankin Road has any bearing on his calculations. Mr. Jafolla responded that no, because anyone coming out of Squan Brook Way, regardless of the width of Rankin Road would need to wait for a clear area along Rankin Road to turn in or out of the road. Mr. Jafolla continued by saying the narrowness isn't a consideration because they are not having them turn into the road concurrent with other vehicles that are occupying that same width, they would wait for that road to be clear before they turn.

Mr. Curran asked Mr. Jafolla if the code is assuming that the drivers are all doing the right thing and if there is not a margin for space. Mr. Jafolla responded that the methodology that the 200 feet of sight distance for 30 mile per hour road, does include an allotment for perception and reaction time, and how long does it take to view an oncoming obstruction and then get your foot on the brake pedal. Mr. Jafolla stated that this is called perception reaction time and the AASHTO uses a very large number for that as a factor of safety. Mr. Jafolla stated that the other consideration is that the rate of deceleration at which this stopping site distance is calculated that rate of deceleration, is something that's been in effect for several decades now.

Mr. Curran asked Mr. Jafolla if the growth in the backyard at the property adjacent to this proposed development is going to have to be removed to achieve the sightlines envisioned. Mr. Jafolla answered that no, there isn't anything that's needed to provide clear line of sights along that property line. Mr. Jafolla continued by saying that the areas that would require some limbing up would be along the frontage of Rankin Road, within the right of way, to about within 10 feet above grade. Mr. Curran stated he had no further questions.

Ms. Trainor announced that the last person to enter their name is Mr. Lackey. Ms. Trainor stated that Mr. Lackey has appeared before and did not need to be sworn in.

Mr. Lackey asked Mr. Jafolla if he considered the speed that drivers drive when they are traveling southbound on Rankin Road from Schoolhouse Road towards Riverview Drive. Mr. Jafolla answered that they consider the design speed of 30 miles per hour for that approach.

Mr. Lackey asked Mr. Jafolla if an actual driver were driving 40 miles per hour, would that impact his opinion as to the safety of the design. Mr. Jafolla responded that by looking that direction, there would quite a bit more visibility when the trees along the frontage are cleared out. Mr. Jafolla continued by saying there is one small tree located on the property, just to the west, but you can see beyond that tree, up the hill, in which the distance would actually be visible 300 to 500 feet, which corresponds to a speed of 45 miles per hour. Mr. Jafolla stated that they looked at 200 feet,

which is for a design speed of 30 miles per hour, so there is quite a bit more distance looking in that direction.

Mr. Lackey stated that Mr. Jafolla's response seemed to be analyzing from the perspective of the driver coming out of Squan Brook Way and onto Rankin Road. Mr. Lackey asked if he had that correct to which Mr. Jafolla responded that it would be in both directions. Mr. Lackey asked Mr. Jafolla if his response would apply to a driver going south, down the hill on Rankin Road toward Riverview Drive, doing 40 miles per hour. Mr. Jafolla replied he was not sure what Mr. Lackey was summarizing but what he would say is that for a stopping sight distance to Squan Brook Way, and that he is not testifying to the available stopping sight distance along Rankin Road in general, he is specifically testifying for a user who's exiting proposed Squan Brook Way, that there would be sight distance in excess of 200 feet, in the range of 300 to 500 feet. Mr. Jafolla stated that as far as sight distances beyond Squan Brook Way, when traveling from Schoolhouse down Rankin Road, they didn't view that because that isn't really related to this application because that would be an existing operational consideration.

Mr. Lackey asked Mr. Jafolla if someone is stopped at the stop sign on Squan Brook Way and there is a car traveling down the hill on Rankin Road from Schoolhouse Road, towards Squan Brook Way, the sightline and ability to stop of the driver driving south towards Squan Brook Way is irrelevant. Mr. Jafolla answered no and that he didn't think Mr. Lackey summarized his testimony. Mr. Jafolla stated that he certainly thinks it is relevant that someone should have the ability to come to a complete stop if they were to view an obstruction within Rankin Road, however, the idea here is that someone who is waiting on Squan Brook Way at the stop sign and they're waiting to enter Rankin Road has a full view of Rankin Road so that they do not decide to enter if there is a vehicle approaching and that is what they want to provide. Mr. Jafolla stated if someone who is on Squan Brook Way and decides to erroneously enter Rankin Road, you want to make sure that that vehicle that is on Rankin Road has the ability to stop, that is what we looked at and that is what they provided in accordance with industry standards.

Mr. Lackey asked Mr. Jafolla if he generated a written report. Mr. Jafolla replied that they had not.

Mr. Lackey stated he had no further questions but is going to make a reservation of rights to consult a traffic expert and potentially supply a report and/or testimony.

Ms. Trainor announced that there weren't any other members of the public that had entered their names and asked Mr. Henderson if he had any redirect. Mr. Henderson replied that he did not.

Ms. Trainor stated that before continuing, 45 minutes had passed and asked for a motion to continue to 8:00 PM and then the Board would reassess. Ms. Brisben made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stenson and then by roll call vote:

Ayes: Mayor Thomas Nicol, Councilman Frank Garruzzo, Karen Brisben, Andrew Chermack, James Maclearie, Chris Siano, James Stenson, and Corinne Trainor.

Noes: None

Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Henderson to call his next witness. Mr. Henderson called Ms. Barbara Ehlen, a professional planner with Beacon Planning. Mr. Clark swore in Ms. Ehlen.

Mr. Henderson asked Ms. Ehlen if she had testified before this Planning Board before and if her credentials were excepted as an expert planner. Ms. Ehlen replied, yes.

Mr. Henderson asked Ms. Trainor that based upon the prior approval of Ms. Ehlen, she should be approved again. Ms. Trainor stated that the Board approves in Ms. Ehlen's capacity as a planner.

Mr. Henderson asked Ms. Ehlen if she had visited the site and if she is familiar with the neighborhood. Ms. Ehlen replied that she walked the neighborhood and site and asked if she could share her screen to give context. Mr. Clark replied that he thought if something is shown, it needs to be referred to and say it is part of the application or and needs to be marked so it can be identified. Mr. Clark asked Ms. Ehlen to submit a copy to the Planning Board Secretary so it is in the file. Mr. Clark marked this as Exhibit A2.

Ms. Ehlen stated that she prepared this Exhibit, A2, herself and it is an aerial exhibit on the subject property and the surrounding neighborhoods. Ms. Ehlen stated that the subject property or the approximate boundaries are outlined in yellow. Ms. Ehlen stated that the subject property is dramatically oversized for the zone, it contains approximately 172,000 square feet where actually only 15,000 square feet required for an interior lot and 15,625 square feet is required for a corner lot. Ms. Ehlen stated she wanted to show how dramatically oversized this parcel is compared to its neighbors. Ms. Ehlen then showed the Board how the proposed development pattern consists of a cul-de-sac and where it would come in. Ms. Ehlen stated that this is actually similar to what is south-east of the property at Scott Road and Club Road where cul-de-sacs were used to develop properties that were most likely similar in that they contained more depth than width.

Ms. Ehlen displayed Exhibit A3, which she stated was sheet three of ten, the preliminary and final major subdivision plan, prepared by Lindstrom, Diessner and Carr, dated May 29th, 2019 with revisions July 21st, 2019. Mr. Ehlen stated that this exhibit depicts the overall site plan of the proposed project. Ms. Ehlen stated that the applicant is proposing subdividing the property into five single lots, the existing dwelling is proposed to remain and will be relocated, and the existing garage is supposed to be demolished and removed. Ms. Ehlen stated that the variance being requested is only associated with one lot and as discussed is more of a technical variance due to the unique shape of the proposed lot. Ms. Ehlen continued by saying that the applicant is requesting lot depth, 125 feet required where 61.3 is proposed and the depth deviation is not across the full lot. Ms. Ehlen stated that the lot more than meets the minimum lot area standard and all other setbacks and development regulations, such as lot coverage, building coverage and building setbacks.

Ms. Ehlen stated that when discussing variances, she likes to start with the Communities Master Plan. Ms. Ehlen stated that Principles of the 2000 Master Plan include encouraging residential development in locations and densities, which are compatible with existing development patterns and can be privately serviced by public roadways, utilities, and services. Ms. Ehlen stated that this application is directly on point with this. Ms. Ehlen continued by saying that the applicant is proposing five residential dwellings within the developed area of the community. Ms. Ehlen stated

that the density is right on point, roadway access, water, sewer, all infrastructure is readily accessible to this parcel. Ms. Ehlen stated that the second principle is to encourage the development pattern, which will protect and enhance the long term economic, environmental, and social welfare values of the present, future residents of Brielle. Ms. Ehlen stated that this is a development pattern that is sought by the community, relocating single family in a single-family neighborhood.

Ms. Ehlen noted that the 2000 Master Plan references the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan, and the parcel is located within Planning Area One. Ms. Ehlen continued by saying that pursuant to the state development redevelopment plan communities within Planning Area One are visioned to accommodate future growth or take advantage of existing infrastructure which this parcel can do.

Ms. Ehlen referenced the 2016 Master Plan re-examination states that the predominate change that has occurred is the development of residential homes on pre-existing, vacant parcels within the south western area of the Borough, infill development throughout the Borough and redevelopment for in part, Super Storm Sandy. Ms. Ehlen stated that for the most part these developments are keeping with the zone plans within the municipality. Ms. Ehlen stated that the applicant is proposing a development that respects the use and density envisioned for this area, each of the parcels meets or exceeds minimum lot area requirements and only one parcel requires a technical variance. Ms. Ehlen stated that this is keeping with the description of the 2000 Examination Report.

Ms. Ehlen stated she looked to the municipal land use law for special reasons and would opine that the application promotes to provide adequate light, air, open space and each lot has sufficient space to accommodate a single family detached dwelling, respect associated setbacks, HAIFA, height limitations, coverage limitations, and to promote the establishment, of appropriate population, densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods, communities, and regions and preservation of the environment.

Ms. Ehlen referenced three different cases that referred to lot size.

Ms. Ehlen stated that the proposed subdivision presents a better zoning alternative as it brings the oversized lot into closer visual conformity to the surrounding neighborhood and no longer is a standout. Ms. Ehlen stated that with respect to the substantial detriments that would have to be found to deny the variance, she doesn't see any. Ms. Ehlen stated that the community permitted this density, so it anticipated any traffic generated by this type of use, much like a community focuses its retail along a more public roadway. Ms. Ehlen stated as discussed, it does promote the goals of the Master Plan as well the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Ehlen stated that it is her professional opinion that the benefits outweigh the negative impacts in this case.

Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Henderson if he had any other questions for Ms. Ehlen. Mr. Henderson replied that he did not.

Ms. Trainor stated it was time to take questions from the Board. Hearing none, Ms. Trainor asked if there any questions for Ms. Ehlen from the public. Hearing none, the testimony of Ms. Ehlen was concluded.

Mr. Henderson stated that back in 2018, the applicant applied to New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) for information on the wetlands and received a report and approval which is incorporated and referenced in the plans. Mr. Henderson stated that when this application was made the Planning Board, Environmental Commission and the Mayor and Council were all cc'd and that he had copies of the certified mail receipts. Mr. Henderson stated that the Planning Board has all that environmental information and has a copy of the actual NJDEP letter, which was the wetland interpretation. Mr. Henderson stated that he could put all this into evidence again and have someone testify.

Mr. Henderson stated that if there are any more environmental questions, he would be happy to call a witness to deal with them. Mr. Henderson referenced that the Environmental Commission questioned the soils analysis and stated that he sent Mr. Hilla a fairly extensive soils analysis for that area.

Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Clark if he agreed with Mr. Henderson that the environmental NJDEP correspondence is part of the record.

Mr. Clark stated he needed some clarification and asked Mr. Henderson if he is saying that this was submitted as part of the applicant's application or is, he saying that he filed for NJDEP approval before the application was filed and cc'd the Planning Board. Mr. Henderson responded that it is a little bit of both. Mr. Henderson stated that the application for the line of where they could go had to be filed before they could actually create the map. Mr. Henderson stated that they started doing that and asked for the letter of interpretation back in 2018. Mr. Henderson stated that he believed they got the letter back dated March of 2019 and that it is referenced on the site plan. Mr. Henderson stated that what he is also saying is that the application itself was not prepared by the engineering firm in this case, but by an environmental company that specialized in this back in 2018 and a copy of that application, in case anyone had an objection, went to the Planning Board, Environmental Committee and to the Borough Council by certified mail.

Mr. Clark stated that what he thinks is that the Planning Board gets copied on applications that go to other agencies like the NJDEP. Mr. Clark stated it is noted on the record that the Board has received a piece of correspondence, but when the Board is now actively considering an application, he is not sure that the Board would or should be required to remember that three years ago the Board was cc'd on a letter before the application was filed. Mr. Clark stated that the Board may not have appreciated the significance since they would not necessarily have known an application was coming. Mr. Clark continued by saying that the concern that he would have would be if someone pulled the file on this application to look at the documents on file, would those pre-application documents that had been cc'd to the Board and/or Council and others be in the file or not. Mr. Clark stated he didn't know the answer to that, but he feels that if there were things submitted as part of the application package then the Board Members has the full package, and any member of the public would have the ability to have that and would maybe have a copy too. Mr. Clark stated his thought that the applicant would present, represent or there would be some representation in this proceeding of what they are so the Board knows what those things are.

Ms. Trainor stated to Mr. Henderson that it appears that unless he has submitted it with his application, the Board would not recognize that correspondence as being evidential in part of or in support of the application right now, so to the extent that Mr. Henderson thinks he needs to present it, he should. Ms. Trainor continued by saying to Mr. Henderson if he is happy to go forward without it, it is up to him.

Mr. Henderson responded that he wanted to go with the Board's preference and stated that he thinks the Board would like him to present it.

Ms. Trainor responded that she didn't think this was something that she has seen and stated that many members on the Board were not on the Board back then and that it appears, from what Mr. Clark stated, it is not part of the package, so it has not been considered yet.

Mr. Hilla stated that there is also a package that Mr. Carr had sent him directly with the soil information that was to back up or correct what was perceived through the Environmental Commission's letter as well as a package received today from them with further soil information.

Ms. Trainor stated to Mr. Henderson, for everyone's clarification, for the good of the order, all of this is raised in response to the December 7th, 2020 letter from the Environmental Commission letter. Mr. Henderson responded that this is correct.

Mr. Henderson stated that if that is going to be addressed that he would ask that he permitted to get the environmental company to testify at the next hearing because it was not prepared by their engineer because it was prepared by an environmental firm and can be discussed and marked into evidence.

Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Hilla if he reviewed that December 7th, 2020 Environmental Commission letter that was read into the record at the last meeting. Mr. Hilla replied, yes. Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Hilla in his estimation, does it require the Board's further consideration and the consideration of the two reports that were the correspondence between the applicant and NJDEP on the one side, and that soil boring environmental investigation on the other. Mr. Hilla responded by saying that even though the application was filed in 2018, wasn't necessarily in the context of this application and how it applies to this application. Mr. Hilla continued by saying that line was established and approved by the NJDEP, but he thinks what we're looking for is a discussion of the permitting that went into it, and how this application is within the foursquare of the environmental regulations. Mr. Hilla stated that the second part goes to the Environmental Commission's discussion which he thinks is fairly compelling information that the applicant provided to him, but it is not for him to present it to the Board, it is for the applicant and professionals to present.

Ms. Trainor stated that so everyone is on the same page, she reminded the Board members about the December 7th letter and in normal times a representative from the Environmental Commission would come in and cross-examine these witnesses or present comment or argument with respect to these issues. Mr. Trainor stated in normal times, in a worldwide pandemic, the Board would not read into the record someone's comments like we are now advised to do as a Planning Board, as a best practice and that is what the Board did. Ms. Trainor stated that in this letter, Mr. Robert Houseal indicated that he had a recommendation that the applicant confirm the generalized soil

data used for the Stormwater Management Report dated May 29th, 2019. Ms. Trainor stated that this is directed towards Mr. Carr's claim on page six of his report. Ms. Trainor stated that the second point is that the Environmental Commission recommends that the applicant account the deliberate strategy of stormwater infiltration.

Ms. Trainor stated to Mr. Henderson to the extent that you need additional witnesses to number one, confirm the generalized soil data and that you want to do so in support of your application, it will be carried to next month. Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Henderson if in the extent that he needs an additional witness and wants to account for the deliberate strategy of stormwater infiltration would he like to carry to next month.

Mr. Henderson responded by saying if you look at the first paragraph of that letter, Mr. Houseal's sources differ and that he doesn't say what his sources are. Mr. Henderson stated that he finds this to be grossly inaccurate. Ms. Trainor responded by saying that is why she put all that on the record, because we are operating in special times where the Planning Board is advised to read these kinds of things into the record. Ms. Trainor stated to Mr. Henderson that if he thinks his application needs to respond and you need to do so through a witness, then the Board would respect that.

Mr. Henderson stated to Ms. Trainor that he would like to recall Mr. Carr. Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Carr if back in 2018 if he called for an environmental firm to prepare an application before the NJDEP for a letter of interpretation. Mr. Carr responded, yes. Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Carr what the letter of interpretation is and does. Mr. Carr replied that basically, a letter for interpretation is a ruling by the NJDEP to establish and approve two items, the presence or absence of wetlands on a particular site and if there are wetlands on a site to establish required buffers on the site. Mr. Carr stated this is typically done as a predecessor to most projects, or at least concurrently with most projects. Mr. Carr stated that a letter of interpretation had been obtained. Mr. Carr stated that by reference, their plan indicates in a couple of instances, on the cover sheet it lists in general note number seven that the wetland boundary was delineated by DuBois Environmental Consultants, surveyed by Lindstrom, Diessner & Carr, LLC on August 20th, 2018. Mr. Carr continued by saying that based on that information and based on the information from the NJDEP that information was then added it to the plan set prior to submission to the Board. Mr. Carr stated there are two lines that appear on the plan, one is the actual wetland boundary, and the second line is a 50-foot buffer line established by NJDEP. Mr. Carr stated that both photos lines are shown on the applicable plans, the existing condition plans, the grading plans. Mr. Carr stated that the permit number that was issued by NJDEP is also referenced in there, and that's typically how that information is submitted to a Board. Mr. Carr stated that in his 40 years' experience, he has never submitted an entire package that was submitted to the NJDEP as a back up to this, and that often times as a condition of approval, they will provide approval letters from other outside agencies.

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Carr is he had an opportunity to review the letter from the Environmental Committee that was received just before the last meeting. Mr. Carr replied that he did. Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Carr if he could comment on the soil issue. Mr. Carr responded that Mr. Houseal had stated that he disagreed with their soil information, and subsequent to that, he provided Mr. Hilla additional information and this information is readily published and is

information that environmental firms and engineering firms use as authoritative documents. Mr. Carr stated that this information is published by the United States Department of Agricultural and it is a soils analysis site specific for the area. Mr. Carr stated that he submitted that information as back up to what was already submitted as part of the original application. Mr. Carr stated that he provided additional site-specific soil borings prepared under his direction by his firm on this site. Mr. Carr stated that the soil samples were sent to Rutgers Soil Testing Laboratory which is an authoritative source used by engineers and environmental firms and that information was received and forwarded to Mr. Hilla as a second source of information that substantiated the information provided on the original application.

Mr. Carr stated that there is nothing in Mr. Houseal's letter that indicates where he obtained his information so he can't speak of what he put in his memo.

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Carr if he could comment on the second paragraph in the letter. Mr. Carr responded that the second paragraph has to do with groundwater, infiltration, and clay layers. Mr. Carr stated that he would speak of the clay layer first. Mr. Carr stated that this is some of the opinion that Mr. Houseal has and that he provides no backup data and doesn't know where he obtained his information. Mr. Carr stated that using the authoritative sources from the United States Department of Agriculture, site-specific soil borings, and lab tests performed by Rutgers Soil Testing Laboratory, neither of which said there is presence of clay on the site. Mr. Carr stated that the soil testing revealed that the soils are what is known as K5 soils which are extremely permeable, sandy soils with an absence of clay.

Mr. Carr stated that regarding storm water infiltration, he is guided by rules and regulations promulgated by the NJDEP, specifically what can be infiltrated and what cannot be infiltrated. Mr. Carr continued by saying that the calculations he submitted are in accordance with the Stormwater regulations, there was nothing deliberate and no type of strategy to eliminate or hide from Mr. Houseal any infiltration or sources into Rick's Run. Mr. Carr stated that streams are normally fed by groundwater, which is not surprising, as water flows downhill and will eventually reach a low area and that's generally a source of water for streams, so is not uncommon. Mr. Carr stated that they are not trying to analyze what the sources are, their job is to determine stormwater management as it relates to this site and control stormwater, so it does not negatively impact the site and surrounding areas. Mr. Carr stated that he believes that they have done that in accordance with the NJDEP Stormwater Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Henderson stated that he had no further questions for Mr. Carr.

Ms. Trainor stated it was time to take questions from the Board.

Mayor Nicol stated that he had questions from residents and other entities in Brielle that have an extreme concern about the runoff on this project, the existence of a pond that is unnatural to this area and was man made, the history of this pond, and why this pond was allowed and not picked up by the NJDEP. Mr. Carr responded that he cannot answer the question regarding the history of the pond, how or why it was constructed but it appears to be basically just an esthetic feature of the site and is concrete lined. Mr. Carr stated that water enters in through a slough from the stream and is controlled as an outlet discharged to the stream. Mr. Carr stated he can only surmise that it

was constructed prior to NJDEP regulations. Mr. Carr stated that NJDEP is aware of it and it was a part of their application, they have determined that it is a man-made, preexisting feature and is allowed to remain. Mr. Carr stated that it in itself is not considered a wetland area because of the lining of the pond.

Mayor Nicol stated that he would like to make Mr. Henderson and Mr. Carr aware of the fact that in the recent history of Rick's Run the Borough of Brielle had a tremendous amount of siltation come downstream from a development upstream that created quite a problem for both the Borough and the golf course. Mayor Nicol stated that the Borough does not want that to reoccur.

Mr. Henderson asked Mayor Nicol if he was saying that this originated upstream from this proposed project. Mayor Nicol replied, yes but that water and silt flow downstream. Mr. Henderson asked Mayor Nicol if the silt was from this site or someplace else. Mayor Nicol responded that it was from another development and that there is a concern about siltation getting into the stream and affecting not only the body of water but the siltation downstream.

Mr. Carr responded that the site is developed with one house already and is sure everyone is familiar with the lawn areas and vegetation there. Mr. Carr stated that as part of the NJDEP letter of interpretation permit, they will have a 50-foot buffer that will remain undisturbed. Mayor Nicol asked if this is between the development and the stream. Mr. Carr replied that this is correct and that there is a minimum of the 50-foot buffer and that they have certain stormwater controls that they will be implementing in there as well, a series of recharge infiltration system for runoff that is collected from the roadway. Mr. Carr stated that then it will go into a small forebay and then through the existing pond before reaching the stream, so it goes through three systems. Mr. Carr stated that they have an application into the Soil Conservation District, who will certify the plans and methods that will be utilized and implemented during construction. Mr. Carr stated that these are all included on the plan so Mr. Hilla will have the opportunity to see and make sure those are maintained during construction and inspections, as well as the Soil Conservations Districts, they will inspect during construction as well. Mayor Nicol had no further questions.

Ms. Brisben stated that the Board received a revised Stormwater Management Report on July 21st, 2020 and asked Mr. Carr if this is part of what he is referring to and can the Board refer to that report. Mr. Carr responded, yes, that this is part of the application package that was submitted to the Board. Ms. Brisben stated that it is on file at Borough Hall if anyone from the public would like to look at it.

Ms. Brisben stated on page four of ten on the site plan, there is a grading and drainage plan that seems to have what Mr. Carr was referring to. Ms. Brisben asked Mr. Carr if this is correct. Mr. Carr responded, yes, that this is the actual construction and layout of the stormwater management systems that he spoke about earlier. Ms. Brisben had no further questions.

Mr. Hilla stated that he does corroborate with what Mr. Carr had said with the information that he did provide the soil borings that he received today. Mr. Hilla stated that this was straightforward and after last month's meeting he did receive the soil information that replied to paragraph one of Mr. Houseal's letter. Mr. Hilla stated that Mr. Houseal may have in referenced older material that

January 12th, 2021

in coming up with the soil type, but what Mr. Carr provided straightens that right out. Mr. Hilla stated that this is why he suggested it be provided to the Board as well.

Ms. Trainor asked Mr. Clark if the Board moves forward tonight if they could condition that. Mr. Clark replied that yes, the Board could condition any approvals upon the submission, of any documents, including the confirming permits and approvals.

Ms. Trainor announced that there was one person who had entered their name but stated that it is 8:00 PM and that she had promised that the Board could revisit the issue with the Board. Ms. Trainor stated that she would leave it to the Board if anyone would like to make a motion to finish this witness and conclude the testimony or adjourn and carry the application to next month. Ms. Trainor asked for a motion either way.

Mr. Maclearie made a motion to carry the application to the next meeting, seconded by Mr. Stenson and then by roll call vote:

Ayes: Mayor Nicol, Councilman Garruzzo, James Stenson, Corinne Trainor, James Maclearie, Chris Siano, Andrew Chermak

Noes: Karen Brisben

Ms. Trainor asked if there was any other business that anyone would like to present to the Board.

Mr. Clark stated that if the Board is going to carry this application, then all the Board has to do with Mr. Henderson's case is finish up Mr. Carr. Mr. Clark continued by saying that then any objectors who want to present their own testimony will need to be ready to proceed at the next meeting because he thinks Mr. Henderson's case is almost over.

Ms. Trainor stated that to the extent that anyone in the public or any objector has anything to present to the Board, please be ready to do that at the next meeting, or we may be submitting this to the Board for a vote.

Ms. Trainor asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Stenson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Maclearie, and unanimously approved by the Board, all ayes.

Ms. Denise Murphy, Recording Secretary

Approved: February 9th, 2021

January 12th, 2021