OCEANPORT PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
February 11, 2014

Chairman Widdis called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and gave the Statement of Compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act: "Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by notice to the Asbury Park Press and The Link News on January 23, 2014, and by the posting of same on the municipal bulletin board and Borough Web Site."

Chairman Widdis led the flag salute.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Kahle, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kleiberg, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Whitson, Mr. Fichter, Ms. DeSousa, Mr. Widdis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Councilman Bertekap, Mr. Savarese, Mr. Gruskos

OFFICIALS PRESENT: Jeanne Smith, Board Secretary, Rick DeNoia, Esq., Board Attorney and William White, Board Engineer/Planner

BOARD BUSINESS:

1. Ms. Smith advised the Minutes of November 26, 2013 would be ready for review and approval at next regular meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. PB2012-14.1 Village Center LLC **CARRIED from Jan. 14, 2014 MEETING**
   Block 88, Lot 26.01
   Request for Site Plan Amendment with Variances

A-18 Color Rendering of Rear of South Building, prepared by Hammer Land Engineering, not dated
A-19 Color Rendering of Rear of North Building prepared by Hammer Land Engineering, not dated
A-20 Mark-O-Lite Sign Co. Conceptual Drawing of Reduced Main Pylon Sign
A-21 Mark-O-Lite Sign Co. Conceptual Drawing of Reduced Sub Pylon Signs

Peter Falvo, Attorney for the Applicant, appeared before the Board and summarized the items that the Board had requested be addressed upon continuance including the landscaping of the transformer island and additional trees to be relocated. Mr. Hanrahan presented and described a Color Rendering of Rear of South Building which was marked as **Exhibit A-18** which addressed the replacement of the grasses with groupings of inkberries and junipers to shield the transformers. Mr. Hanrahan referring to A-18 the proposal of 6 arborvites in the area of the meter pad as the A.C. condenser pads would not allow. Mr. Hanrahan then presented and described a Color Rendering of the Rear of the North Building which was marked as **Exhibit A-19** which depicted the screening proposed for that part of the site. Discussion continued to where the removed trees could be relocated to which Mr. White advised he had addressed with Mayor and Council and they did not want the extra trees for Gatta Park. Mr. Falvo responded that they could alternately provide a donation to the Shade Tree Committee or provide the trees and the Borough could plant where they wanted. Mr. White asked Mr. Hanrahan how much overhang was there at the back of the stores to allow for the arborvitaes growth. Mr. Hanrahan responded that they would have to be maintained and kept trimmed. Discussion ensued. Chairman Widdis stated that the landscaping items could be worked out with the Board Engineer and asked to move on to the color of the cement walkways. Mr. Falvo responded that there hadn't been any consensus and was left that it would complement the building's façade.

Mr. Kleiberg asked how much space was between the closure around the condensers and the dumpster pad island and the grass. Mr. Rosati responded from the sidewalk to the grass approximately 6' and then another 12' to the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Kleiberg stated he was concerned that there be adequate space to walk around to the rear. Mr. Rosati felt it was of sufficient width for access.

Mr. Falvo then presented and described conceptual drawings of a reduced main pylon sign and a reduced sub pylon sign which were marked as **Exhibit A-20 and Exhibit A-21** and offered copies of each exhibit to the members of the public. Mr. Falvo described the 2 side entry signs as ground level to the peak of the sign was a total of 9'5" and the reason for the elevation chosen to comply with traffic safety requirements. Mr. Falvo then described the main sign being 16' to the peak, the base was 3', sign itself would be 10'x10' with an off-white background with maroon lettering. Mr. Falvo commented that the sign was based on 10 tenants but if a tenant took more space then that spot would be expanded.

Chairman Widdis asked what were the proposed locations of the signs. Mr. Falvo stated that the sign along Port Au Peck would be located east of the driveway behind the sidewalk and outside the site triangle; the larger sign at the intersection of Port Au Peck and East Main would run in a north-south direction with the sides facing east-west.

Chairman Widdis asked if the secondary signs were for 1 tenant. Mr. Falvo answered no, it was always set up for 2 users.

Ms. DeSousa asked if they had considered using internally lit signs. Mr. Falvo answered it wouldn't work with the materials.

Mr. Kleiberg commented that it was said that the arborvitaes would have to be watered manually and asked why couldn't a lawn sprinkler be put in. Mr. Rosati answered they could do that. Mr. Kleiberg asked about a hot box which was not addressed at all and explained for the Board the requirement of NJ American Water Co. Mr. Rosati answered that on this project that all the meters were internal to the building and was worked out with NJ American Water that there would be no pit or hot box for the site.

Mr. Kleiberg also commented that he had no problem with the locations but still thought the signs were too big and that everyone that goes through would know where the place was. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Johnson asked about the transformers and if pylons would be placed around them and was told yes. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Rosati didn't he believe the main sign at the intersection would be a distraction to anyone sitting at the intersection. Mr. Rosati answered no, signage was a natural and common aspect of a retail area.

Mr. Fichter commented that he thought the signs were still a bit big and the double sided was more suited for a single. Mr. Fichter asked there would be façade signs, was told yes, and thought that there was plenty of signage and that the proposed stand-alone signs were too big. Discussion ensued on where the signs should be located and concerns with the size.

Mr. Sullivan commented that the more he looked at it the sign to be located on Port Au Peck Avenue he thought it was an obstruction and was better where originally proposed on the other side of the driveway. Mr. Sullivan further commented that he was present for the original and that a lot of time had been spent on the elements for the site and the reason they didn't include stand-alone signs was they hadn't wanted it to look like a strip mall but to look different.

Mr. Whitson commented that he thought the signs were an improvement over what was presented last time.

Chairman Widdis opened the meeting to questions from the public.

PUBLIC:

John Czechowski, 8 Haskell Way, asked questions about the one tall sign - the rendering for the writing versus the lighting and asked if it were reversed and was told no, it was maroon lettering.

Laurie Cook, 38 Iselin Lane, asked if the signs on the building were illuminated. Mr. Kleiberg answered the ordinance permits it to be illuminated. Ms. Cook asked questions about the potential number of tenants, asked for confirmation that Two Rivers and 7-Eleven had both stated they would not sign their lease if they didn't have a sign; and asked if the property owner was a shareholder with 7-Eleven and if so why did he buy the property knowing there was no sign. Mr. Falvo answered it was the franchise that wouldn't sign.

Melissa Herring, 16 Iselin Lane, asked how bright was the illumination of the back light as they didn't look like the monument signs discussed at last hearing and asked if the 7-Eleven would be open 24hrs could there be time limits on when the lights could be illuminated. Mr. Falvo stated that the lighting from the signs would not spill out beyond the property and that the streetlights along Main Street were brighter than the signs but they would stipulate to a time limit.

Mr. Falvo stated that their presentation was concluded.

Chairman Widdis then opened the meeting to the public for statements/comments.

Henry Schulz, 40 Iselin Lane, was sworn in then presented and described photographs taken of the sign locations which were marked as **Exhibit P-1**, gave a statement concerning the previous testimony on the signs, that there were no illuminated signs in Oceanport and referenced the existing village center and Monmouth Park who both had free standing signs but were not illuminated; reasoned that additional signage was not warranted as the revised signs were still illuminated directory signs and out of character with the neighborhood.

Mr. Falvo asked who took the photographs. There was argument on whether the pictures were appropriate for Mr. Schulz to testify to as he had not taken the pictures. Afterwards the exhibit was accepted as Mr. Schulz presented the exhibits with true knowledge of what was depicted in the photographs and represented as an officer of the Jockey Club Homeowner's Association.

Mr. Schulz concluded by stating that he thought the signs were out of character with the neighborhood and to allow the signs would set a standard for all future development and that the signage allowed was more than enough.

Christina Hewitt, 19 Iselin Lane, was sworn in and gave a statement that she was very familiar with the surrounding area as a resident for more than 40 years, that they wanted to maintain a nice appearance and that it was word of mouth that would bring traffic to the site not signage and did say that she felt they were trying to compromise but that it wasn't enough.

Maria Cook, 38 Iselin Lane, was sworn in and gave a statement concerning the additional signage and that she thought the revision to a monument sign would be lighted from the ground up; was concerned with drivers passing by; that she was not concerned about lighting spilling into her backyard as she was aware of the village center to be constructed but that they understood that the project would be done tastefully and that the additional signage was not necessary.

As no one else from the public wished to be heard Chairman Widdis closed that portion of the meeting.

Mr. Falvo consulted with his client and proposed a different variation of the signage dimensions, the base size and landscaping. Discussion ensued on the necessary clearance for visibility and if the revision would accomplish the purpose intended as well as a variety of other design options for the Board's consideration which was not resolved.

Mr. Kleiberg made a motion that no signs be allowed, that the other site plan improvements proposed be approved. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion commenting that he believed the big sign out front was a safety issue and would be a distraction to the traffic at the intersection, it took away from the sitting area that was planned for that part, the other 2 signs would be redundant, the signage already permitted was sufficient.

As there was some confusion on the motion, it was decided that there be separate motions for the site plan improvements and the signs.

Mr. Kleiberg made a motion to approve the site plan modifications proposed including landscaping and irrigation which was seconded by Mr. Johnson and received the following roll call:

AYES:	Mr. Whitson, Mr. Kahle, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kleiberg, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Fichter, Ms. DeSousa, Mr. Widdis
NAYES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Councilman Bertekap, Mr. Gruskos, Mr. Savarese
INELIGIBLE:	None

Ms. Smith stated the motion carried.

Mr. Kleiberg made a motion to deny the variance relief for the signs shown on A-20 and A-21 which was seconded by Mr. Johnson. Mr. Whitson voted yes and commented that he noted Mr. Falvo's attempts to work with the Board but there were still concerns from the residents. Mr. Kahle voted yes based on the size of the signs; Mr. Johnson voted yes commenting that he believed the signs to be a safety concern and a distraction; Mr. Kleiberg voted yes commenting the signs were way too big and that there were other ways to bring attention to the site; Mr. Sullivan voted yes commenting that the signs were out of character with the neighborhood and that the testimony was that the need was financial and didn't feel that should be a factor; Mr. Fichter voted yes commenting that the signs were still too large and warranted further discussion; Ms. DeSousa voted yes commenting that after consideration of the testimony by the Planner it was not in line with character and no justification for the variances; Mr. Widdis voted yes commenting that there was already sufficient signage provided and that the additional signs were redundant and agreed that the Planner had testified it was like the Grove but the proposed signage was nothing like that.

AYES:	Mr. Whitson, Mr. Kahle, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kleiberg, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Fichter, Ms. DeSousa, Mr. Widdis
NAYES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Councilman Bertekap, Mr. Gruskos, Mr. Savarese
INELIGIBLE:	None

Ms. Smith stated the motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. PB2014-02 Spengeman, William
   154 Monmouth Boulevard
   Block 12, Lot 15
   Request for Bulk Variance on Lot Width for Existing non-conforming lot

William Spengeman, Applicant and Owner, was sworn in and gave a history of the property and the damage incurred by Super Storm Sandy and was seeking to remove the existing house and construct a new home. Mr. Spengeman explained that in order to perform the work he needed relief from the zoning's requirement for lot width. Mr. Spengeman testified that he was seeking to put the new home on the same footprint as the existing home which was set back from the road more than the typical home on that side of the street and referred to the aerial graphic provided to the Board as part of the application which depicted the front yard setbacks of the adjacent properties.

Mr. White commented that his review addressed the ordinance requirements for average front and rear yard setbacks and that was the reason for Mr. Spengeman's testimony to address. Mr. White was sworn in for the record as for the prior application he had been sworn in previously.

Mr. DeNoia then questioned Mr. Spengeman concerning the availability of land for purchase from the adjacent lots in order to bring his lot to conformance. Mr. Spengeman testified that both adjacent properties were developed with single family homes and no land was available for purchase.

Chairman Widdis asked if the site would have a garage and was told no.

Chairman Widdis asked questions about the size of the proposed dwelling, the new house would not have a basement like the existing and would be elevated to meet the flood requirements.

Mr. Fichter asked what was the base flood elevation for that property. Mr. Spengeman gave the 2009 requirements and the new requirements and with the town's 2' additional feet requirement would place his first floor elevation at 12.5'. Mr. White pointed out that the plan showed a lower number which should be corrected.

Mr. Whitson asked what the overall height of the house would be and was told under the 35' requirement – about 27.5'. Mr. Whitson asked if there would be any expansion on the sides of the footprint.

Mr. DeNoia asked if the existing structure was still there and was told yes. Mr. DeNoia asked additional questions about the footprint of the existing and the differences with the new footprint.

Chairman Widdis opened the meeting to questions from the public.

PUBLIC:

As no one else from the public wished to be heard Chairman Widdis closed that portion of the meeting.

Mr. Fichter made a motion to approve the application subject to the correction of the plan showing the true first floor elevation which was seconded by Mr. Sullivan and received the following roll call:

AYES:	Mr. Whitson, Mr. Kahle, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kleiberg, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Fichter, Ms. DeSousa, Mr. Widdis
NAYES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Mr. Gruskos, Councilman Bertekap, Mr. Savarese
INELIGIBLE:	None

Ms. Smith stated the motion carried.

3. PB2014-01 – AcuteCare LLC
   Main Street
   Block 110, Lot 4
   Request for Site Plan Approval

A-1 Mandatory Conceptual Review
A-2 Will Serve Letter 12 November 2013
A-3 Will Serve Letter 2 December 2013
A-4 Will Serve Letter 10 February 2014
A-5 Color Rendering of Site Development Plan Sheet 3 of 7; no revision date
A-6 Aerial Exhibit Photo View of Site Patterson Army outlined in Red 02/04/14

Mr. DeNoia stated that service had been reviewed and that jurisdiction was accepted and that Mr. White remained sworn in.

Jason Fichter recused himself due to a conflict.

Richard McOmber, Attorney for the Applicant, gave a description of the property which was located on the former Fort Monmouth lands and was otherwise known as the Patterson Army Hospital Clinic. His Client, AcuteCare Health, was the contract purchaser of the property and had been through the necessary reviews by the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority (FMERA) and was proposing reuse of the property, explained that there were no changes to the building's footprint, described the improvements to the exterior, the changes of the interior to support the PACE Program and gave a description of the PACE program whose purpose was to enable seniors that need medical care to stay in their homes and be brought in for medical services in lieu of nursing homes. Mr. McOmber further explained that the project was being pursued in 2 phases and that the application before the Board that night was only for Phase I which included the PACE program and medical offices and that Phase II would be the subject of a future application.

Mr. McOmber presented and described several documents which were marked as **Exhibits A-1, A-2, A-3 and A-4.** Mr. Whitson requested that the Board be provided their own copies of the exhibits.

Christopher P. Rosati, Professional Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, was sworn in, presented his qualifications and was accepted by the Board as an expert in the fields of engineering and planning. Mr. Rosati presented and described a Color Rendering of the Site Redevelopment Plan Sheet 3 of 7 which was marked as **Exhibit A-5** and an Aerial Photograph of the Site which was marked as **Exhibit A-6.**

Mr. Rosati testified concerning the proposed site plan, provided a description of the property and surrounding neighborhoods and buildings, and a summary of the requested variances, design waivers and exceptions. Mr. Rosati testified as to the work encompassed by Phase I referring to Exhibit A-5 which depicted the separation of Phase I and II, Phase I consisting of 24,347 s.f. for the PACE program and 17,762 s.f. to be used for medical suites and/or medical training. Mr. Rosati testified as to the ingress and egress, the driveway configuration in and around the Site, described the parking areas and described the number of parking spaces in each area including the use of Alexander Avenue, Stephenson Avenue and Murray Drive. Mr. Rosati testified that Murray Drive which consisted of approximately one-half acre was not being conveyed by the U.S. Army to FMERA at this time and, in turn, was not now being conveyed by FMERA to AcuteCare. This one half acre would be conveyed at such future time to FMERA when the property adjoining Murray Drive (not the Site) receives a FOST issued by the U.S. Army which confirmed that all environmental issues had been fully corrected by the Army on said property and at such time the additional one half acre would then be conveyed by FMERA to AcuteCare.

Mr. McOmber added that an easement would be established to allow ingress and egress across Murray Drive until such time as the actual conveyance of the property to the applicant took place from FMERA. There was a detailed explanation referring to the exhibits to make clear to the Board the terms of the easement and the use for ingress and egress. Mr. McOmber further explained that the roadways would be constructed to developer/owner standards – not municipal standards and once FMERA wants the road to be dedicated to the Borough that FMERA and others would construct the roadways to municipal standards and would function as private roadways until such time that was completed.

Mr. Whitson asked who then was ultimately responsible for the roads to be brought to municipal code. Mr. McOmber answered FMERA and whomever FMERA assigns to and not the responsibility of AcuteCare or the municipality.

Mr. Kleiberg asked who was responsible for the upkeep of the roads while they are not municipal roads and was told that it was the responsibility of FMERA. Discussion ensued.

Mr. DeNoia asked then the reason for AcuteCare not taking possession of the one parcel of land because of the cleanup. Mr. McOmber responded correct – FMERA would not convey the land until cleanup was completed but AcuteCare wanted the right to drive over it thus the reason for the easement.

Mr. Rosati continued testimony that the applicant proposes to provide 225 parking spaces under Phase I of the project and the FMERA Rules require 253 spaces creating a shortage of 28 spaces, compared with the requirements of Oceanport, only 211 spaces were required and requested a variance to allow 225 parking spaces. Chairman Widdis asked questions about the role of FMERA and Oceanport. Mr. White and Mr. Rosati explained the limits of FMERA's oversite and why it was their recommendation and not an approval from FMERA.

Mr. McOmber stated that the Rules also provide that only one ground-mounted sign may be placed along the frontage of the Site six feet in height whereas the applicant was requesting a variance to permit two ground-mounted signs to be placed on the frontage of the Site on Main Street and thus the applicant was seeking a variance for maximum allowable sign height of eight feet, as the Rules permit, only six feet. Mr. Rosati testified that the applicant would like to have a maximum 48 square feet for each of the two signs and that the intent was to have one at each entrance so that those travelling would not need to go into surrounding neighborhoods to turn around and that it was a safety matter for the traveling public that pass one entrance would have the next one to enter at rather than slamming on their breaks and try to turn around.

Daniel Czermak, Owner of AcuteCare, was sworn in and gave a statement to answer some of the confusion about the ownership of the roadways, in and out of the site, the access from Main Street and that they were technically private driveways into and out of the facility, however, that part of the purchase agreement was FMERA's ability to buy back the roadways if ever necessary in the future.

Mr. Whitson asked who was responsible for regulating vehicular traffic on private roads. Mr. Czermak and Mr. White answered no different than another facility. Discussion ensued. Mr. McOmber concluded by stating that with any large site when the police have asked for a letter of authority that the Applicant was willing to make same to Oceanport's police department.

Mr. Kleiberg asked about the look of the signs which Mr. Rosati answered FMERA didn't look at that but only the recommendation for 2 signs. There was discussion on what was a design waiver and what was a variance. Chairman Widdis concluded by stating that the residents were very sensitive to the issue and that it was important to be sure the residents were comfortable with what was proposed.

Mr. McOmber offered to bring back a better schematic of the signs as it did not appear that they would complete testimony that evening.

Testimony proceeded referring to FMERA's Mandatory Conceptual Review and the width of the driveway aisles. Mr. Rosati stated that the site was inherited as existed and that they were seeking approval for 1 roadway width of 20' versus 22' for Stephenson Avenue, and another 1-way aisle along the 3-story portion of the site and the exit aisle with all other aisles being 2-way with a 24' width instead of 25'. Mr. Rosati testified that for private roadways the proposed widths were acceptable and safe standards and their hope was to keep disturbances minimal and that FMERA had recommended approval.

Chairman Widdis interjected that he would prefer to pause testimony at that point and allow the Board and public to answer questions on the testimony up to that point. Mr. McOmber responded that he would like to address one more issue that was asked by the public and was told to proceed.

Mr. McOmber asked Mr. Rosati if there was a refuse location on the site and pointing to Exhibit A-5, described a concrete pad easterly of the 3-story structure which was the previously existing location for the refuse and that the area was not redesigned but that buffers and landscape screening were planned along with privacy fencing. Mr. McOmber asked if the Borough was being sought to remove refuse from the site and was told no, it would be handled by private carting as needed.

Mr. Whitson stated that they indicated that they need almost all of the 230 parking spots for Phase I and asked where they would get the parking space for Phase II. Mr. McOmber answered that when they returned to FMERA and this Board that they would have to demonstrate it at that time and that the parking requirements would differ with the use which they would not be able to answer until they returned for Phase II. Discussion ensued on potential scenarios.

Mr. White commented that there was some concern with the access and circulation that would happen later on and that the circulation plan was not in compliance with the long term. Mr. McOmber in response stated that they would be providing additional testimony to address each item expressed in Mr. White's review letter when the hearing continued.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the chain link fence would be coming down and was told after construction was completed.

Chairman Widdis asked would the property be "re-fenced" or would FMERA be putting up new fence. Mr. Czermak answered that he had addressed with FMERA several times and that the plan was not to re-fence and that FMERA would be responsible for security and the site would be open. The concrete barriers would also be removed. Discussion ensued on how the parking, the public access would all work with the security.

Chairman Widdis asked about backing out of the angled parking spaces and his concern that backing out was hard to do and was it still an acceptable standard and was told yes, the angled parking was an acceptable method of parking.

Mr. Kahle stated that it was said the private roads that the town would take over at a later date the responsibility to be improved to town standards. Mr. Rosati answered that the responsibility of improvement to municipal standards would be made before assumed by the town. Mr. Kahle asked if AcuteCare would have any responsibility in that. Mr. McOmber answered that AcuteCare has a contract with FMERA that states that AcuteCare was not responsible to bring them up to public standards. There was additional discussion on what the process and terms would be for a municipality to accept the roads and in this particular case FMERA.

Mr. Kahle asked about the 2 lane road after Alexander if it would be widened to the loading zone. Mr. Rosati answered no, it would be 20' wide as it was considered only for deliveries and staff. Mr. White confirmed that that was acceptable standards.

Ms. DeSousa stated her question had been asked by Mr. Whitson and that she had concerns with the ability to provide sufficient parking and the buffer with surrounding property owners. Ms. DeSousa asked if there was an anticipated roll out date for Phase II and if they had a plan for addressing the parking. Mr. McOmber answered they did not have that worked out square foot for foot but would have to go back to FMERA. Mr. Czermak elaborated further that Phase II had its challenges due to the narrowness of that building and that their focus was on getting the PACE program up. There was still uncertainty on the use of that building due to its characteristics.

Chairman Widdis opened the meeting to questions from the public.

PUBLIC:

As no one else from the public wished to be heard Chairman Widdis closed that portion of the meeting.

Mr. McOmber requested that the hearing be carried to the February 25, 2014 meeting without additional notice which was granted.

RESOLUTIONS:

4. PB2013-10 Donatelli, Guy & Carol - As the Resolution was made available to the Board previously, Mr. DeNoia summarized the Resolution after which Mr. Whitson made a motion to approve the resolution which was seconded by Mr. Johnson and received the following roll call:

AYES:	Mr. Whitson, Mr. Kahle, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kleiberg, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Fichter, Ms. DeSousa, Mr. Widdis
NAYES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Councilman Bertekap, Mr. Gruskos, Mr. Savarese
INELIGIBLE:	None

Ms. Smith stated the motion carried. **PR-14-03**

5. PB2013-08 Vencel, Michael - As the Resolution was made available to the Board previously, Mr. DeNoia summarized the Resolution after which Mr. Whitson made a motion to approve the resolution which was seconded by Mr. Kahle and received the following roll call:

AYES:	Mr. Whitson, Mr. Kahle, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kleiberg, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Fichter, Ms. DeSousa, Mr. Widdis
NAYES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Councilman Bertekap, Mr. Gruskos, Mr. Savarese
INELIGIBLE:	None

Ms. Smith stated the motion carried. **PR-14-04**

PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: Chairman Widdis opened the meeting to Petitions from the Public and as no one from the public wished to be heard, Chairman Widdis closed that portion of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:44 p.m. on a motion by Mr. Kleiberg which was seconded by Mr. Sullivan and approved by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

JEANNE SMITH
Secretary