

Bound Brook Planning Board
Special Meeting December 16, 1996

The special meeting of the Planning Board was called to order at 7:42 p.m. by Vice Chairman Strain in the library of Bound Brook High School, Union Ave, Bound Brook, New Jersey.

Roll call was taken. The following members were present: Mayor Gilly, M. Gupko, F. Bruno, K. Krauser, B. Auletta, M. Wilk, L. Strain, E. Gabrielksi, T. Gaglia & Wayne Tuck. Also present were Michael Rodgers, Board Attorney & John Cilo, Board Engineer.

Mr. Strain read the "Open Public Meetings Law". This was followed by a salute to our flag.

This meeting is a continuation of the hearing and deliberations on the appeal of Advance Properties, the Tea St. project. Mr. Strain apologized to the Board & the public for the facilities. With so much going on during this time of year, this is the best we could do. He asked that every one speak up, so he/she can be heard.

Mr. Strain said we are at the point of deliberations. For the purpose of facilitating the discussion, he took the liberty to make up a document for the Board members to use as a check list to cover whatever is included. It is not meant to inhibit any items the Board wishes to cover. It is to help to move the process along. The purpose of this evening is for the Board members to continue discussions on the testimony which has been presented, so they can get to a point in which they feel comfortable (individually & collectively) to vote.

He reminded members, who had missed one or more meetings, that in order to be able to vote, they must have listened to the tapes or read the transcripts of the meeting(s) missed. They will be asked to sign a statement attesting that they have done so.

Mr. Strain remarked that we have not yet reviewed the report issued by our Engineer, John Cilo.

Mr. Cilo said Mrs. Doyle covered most of the items in her letter discussed last week. This is a physical review of the plans. You could call it "quality control". It is not to pick apart the design engineer's work but to call attention to things, which he thinks should be on the plans. It is a standard procedure done by the profession. It is done by sheets. Some of the most operative comments would be coordination. It has to do with hours physically working on the site; anti-litter regulations; regulating the safe transfer of fuel on the site; clean up & wash down equipment; provide adequate & safe control of employee parking, including employees of the contractor & subcontractor, are required during construction. Violations of any of these construction requirements shall result in a stop work order to be issued by the municipal engineer. Such order shall remain in effect until the condition is satisfactorily remedied to the satisfaction of that engineer.

Mr. Cilo continued. These are housekeeping items & how the contractor will behave on site. They are not part of the ordinance. If they are put into the resolution, the contractor will have to adhere to them.

Item #2 deals with a preconstruction meeting in which the applicant introduces his contractor & the engineers, who will stake out the site. They'll state the date at which they'll begin. They will produce all the needed permits.

Item #3 deals with a night light test. The site will be lit during a great deal of the night. They must do a night light test to guarantee that the night lights stay within the parameters specified by the Board.

Item #4 states that all nondisturbed areas shall be demarcated via a snow fence. This is to prevent the bulldozer operator from violating the area.

Item #5 is the landscaping guarantee which states that any plantings which die during the first two construction seasons are replaced. The idea is that if it lasts two years, it will last forever. However, it should be augmented by an ongoing program of maintenance. It should be overseen by the Code Official or Board Engineer, whoever is appointed to do this.

Item #6 is approval by the soil conservation district. This is a matter of law. You must maintain the soil erosion measures on site, & sometimes the applicant or builder doesn't pay attention. Should he not, the Municipal Engineer shall issue a stop work order. They would have to come before the Board & explain. Only this Board could lift it.

In case of any blasting done on site, the people must be notified. This is not to pre-empt the State law in any way.

Cut sheets shall be provided to the Municipal Engineer. As-built drawings shall be forwarded to the Engineer's office prior to the receipt of CO. We would like to have a record of where the drainage & utilities are on site.

Item #10: All conditions herein shall be incorporated into four sets of revised plans, so the Board officers & Engineer can sign them.

Item #11 is a follow-up to #10 asking for sepias. Approval has to be secured from the Somerset County Planning Board, approval from the soil conservation district and the NJ Dept. of Transportation.

Approval shall be secured from the Borough Council for sewer allocation to make sure there's enough capacity in the lines. That's something the applicant will have to demonstrate. Approvals shall be secured by the utility company servicing the project.

Mr. Cilo continued.

A deed distribution for the proposed lots & roads shall be prepared & referred to the Board's Attorney & Engineer for review & approval. This is a two phase application. One is for preliminary site plan approval & for subdivision approval. We have some comments on how the subdivision map should be drawn: snow fence, and/or silt fence delineating the wetlands boundaries except for soil erosion. Control measures shall be erected prior to other improvements on site. This means the wetlands shall not be disturbed except for improvements shown on the map.

These are the 18 conditions he would recommend to the Board, if this Board chooses to approve this application.

Mr. Cilo asked Mr. Strain if he wanted him to go through the technical details - sheet by sheet.

Mr. Strain asked Mr. Driver if he had reviewed the sheets.

Mr. Driver said he had no comments on sheets 1 through 4. Concerning sheet #5, (number 3), since final architectural haven't been done, he could only provide a general area of the location of the HVAC units.

Number 7 is a question of the sidewalks. They will be in the right of way area.

Number 8: There are no sidewalks on Route 28.

Number 9 is moot, since they've agreed to move the access to the restaurant down towards the trash area or trash enclosure.

Number 10: He didn't believe that they could move that trash enclosure, but they will provide screening acceptable to the Engineer.

Mr. Cilo said this was for the fast food building.

Mr. Driver thought it referred to the 15,000 sq. ft. building.

Mr. Gaglia remarked that it did say restaurant. (C5)

Mr. Cilo said he intended the comment for the fast food.

Mr. Cilo apologized. The remark was for the retail building.

Mr. Cilo remarked that the enclosure at the 15,000 sq.ft. building is adequate.

Mr. Driver said C7, number 10 concerning the hydrants, the fire code etc. will come up again. Their discussions will be with the sub-code officials.

C8 is all right.

C9: is the issue of papers & rubbish. There will be regular maintenance, the same as the parking lot.

Mr. Rodgers noted that C9 included a fence or shrubs be placed against the westerly side. They won't be placed there?

Mr Driver responded that no fence or shrubs will be placed there. However, the area will be policed in terms of picking up any debris that blows over there.

Mr. Cilo said, in her report, Mrs. Doyle discussed a 3 ft. high berm that would be satisfactory to catch the flying papers.

Mr. Strain said that it was on the east side. Mr. Driver agreed. Mr. Cilo agreed also.

Mr. Strain mentioned sheet 9, #10 - more trees in the parking area. Mr. Driver said they talked about putting more trees between the canopies.

Mr. Cilo said it was in the parking stalls for the carts.

Mr. Driver said #10 would have to be addressed with the town. They cannot close those trails. They are in the setback area. They're not allowed to disturb that area. However, they will put up "no trespassing" signs.

Under C10 #4 the tax block & lot number must be indicated. This will be done.

C11 & C12 are fine according to Mr. Driver.

C13 #2: Given the constraints of the site, once the steel is up there will have to be access to the back through (what is designated as) the loading area in order to work on the back of the building & roof. There won't be any way to move equipment around. Mr. Cilo responded that the intent was not to limit the applicant from working around the building or on the site. The idea is to have one construction entrance, so you won't have 4 different places where people come in & out & track mud. The intent was to keep the number of access points to a minimum for soil erosion & sediment control. You don't want soil & stain going onto the streets.

Mr. Driver said C14 & C15 are all right.

C16 #9 is for the fire sub-code official. C17 is okay.

Sheet 11 #2: They will separate contracts that have to do with the traffic signal layout.

Site work will be from 7:00 am to 5 p.m. This would not apply to someone's putting up sheetrock inside one of the buildings or setting up lighting, etc. The time limitations are for the moving of heavy equipment around the site.

Mr. Rodgers had some questions for clarification.

On sheet 2C, you say check the location of the levy easement to the Borough. Should this be in the resolution?

MR. Cilo explained that there should be access to the levy from Tea St. and/or Route 28. We must make sure we have a general easement.

Mr. Rodgers mentioned C2 #11 extraneous information should be removed.

Mr. Cilo said there is just too much information. It should be pared down to show the lot lines, whatever buildings are necessary & whatever easements are needed for clarity.

Discussion followed. Mr. Rodgers said he would say that the information on the plans should be segregated in a manner satisfactory to the Engineer.

Sheet C5 #5 states that the turning radius should be checked. If it is inadequate, they'll have to change the readings or lose a parking stall. The traffic engineer should take a hard look at this. Whatever results from that check would be incorporated into the final plans.

C5 states that the curbing along the westerly side of Tea should be shown as to the proposed type. It is a construction detail. We have to match the other side - probably concrete.

C5 #7 discussed sidewalks along Tea St. Mr. Driver said they agreed to put sidewalks from Route 28 down to the building, & they will be located within the right of way.

C7 #11 says that the flow to certain inlets should be provided. Mr. Rodgers assumed that the flow shown will be subject to Mr. Cilo's approval or the inlet designs subject to his approval. Mr. Cilo replied that this is true. He is asking the applicant for 5 CFS or less. That's the accepted standard. Also, the detail for the monitoring unit is subject of Mr. Cilo's approval. He wants it shown on the plan.

Discussion followed about a planting schedule. The Board Planner would have to approve it.

C7A #2 asks if a spot has been given of the disposition to the two detention basins in the southwest quadrant. Is this required in the resolution?

Mr. Cilo said Mr. Kennedy mentioned the detention basins, water quality basins, which have the ability to detain the water before it goes into the Middle Brook. The Army Corps is not putting a residual basin in this area. They are going to put a pipe under 28 & take it further down to the Raritan River to be pumped out at some other point.

Mr. Gupko said he had a comment concerning references to Borough Engineer & Municipal Engineer. There are some areas of joint responsibility.

Mr. Cilo agreed. Discussion followed.

Mr. Gaglia asked if we were locked into concrete curbing. He was told that we are locked into nothing yet.

Mr. Cilo recommended that we continue with concrete if that is what is on the other side of the street.

Mr. Gaglia said he liked Belgian block on a street. It lasts longer. Mr. Cilo agreed.

Mr. Gaglia suggested that, if the curbs across the street need repair, this would be the time to change to Belgian block. Mr. Cilo agreed.

Mr. Strain suggested we move to Mrs. Doyle's letter & cover those items left in limbo after the last meeting.

Mr. Strain said that we have had Mr. Cilo's review. He assumed that the Board has come to an agreement that the terms, as discussed, are agreed upon by the applicant & acceptable to the Board. Assuming that no one can think of anything else, between now & the time we vote, this document could be included as a condition of approval as clarified.

Mr. Strain mentioned Mrs. Doyle's 12/9/96 letter. We've gone through it in some detail. Many items have already been accepted. We will not have to discuss them. The items identified in his document need further clarification & some decision on the part of the Board. He hoped that members had gone through the letter or would go through it now.

#2 mentioned the overall design. Mr. Driver said that they have agreed to that from the beginning. They will follow a design theme on the site. It will not look like a hodgepodge thrown together. Discussion followed.

Mr. Driver agreed that the building will not be white. It will be earth tones. It will be complimentary.

Mr. Wilk remarked that it should be up to the Planner to make the final interpretation on what is complimentary. Mr. Strain agreed.

Mr. Strain remarked that it is up to the Board to decide the major issues. They cannot be left to the Engineer & Planner.

Mr. Cilo remarked that if there is any major issue, the Experts can call it to the attention to the Chairman, who would refer it to the Board membership for consideration.

Discussion followed concerning earth tones & who is to decide.

Mr. Krauser quoted the ordinance, 4C. It says that within commercial areas, signs should be coordinated to create an overall appearance of uniformity of style & color.

Mr. Strain said we'll go by the ordinance, unless the Board deems otherwise. Mr. Rodgers agreed.

Landscaping was #3. It involved landscaping of the cart storage areas, & we were to have some sort of resubmitted plan.

Mr. Driver agreed to the plan. Between the canopies for the shopping carts which cover up to two ailes of parking, there would be some sort of landscaping, essentially, a tree. They will provide a revised plan. It will probably be trees. It will be subject to Mrs. Doyle's approval.

Mr. Driver stated that they will provide the drawing & the point to point design or schematic that Mr. Cilo referred to.

Mr. Krauser asked if the lighting was a high pressure sodium. He was told that this is correct.

Mr. Krauser asked that the Board make it a condition that the lighting be high pressure sodium. It's a softer light.

Mr. Strain said it was already on the site.

Mr. Driver said the lighting will be in conformance with the "pedestrian & bicycle design".

Mr. Rodgers wanted to know if the Board wanted to leave the lighting to Mrs Doyle's discretion or if they wanted him to put something in the resolution incorporating her comments concerning no spillage off the site & a zero increase in extraneous lighting coming off the property.

Mr. Driver said that there is a sentence that says directional lights shall be arranged to minimize glare & reflection on adjacent properties. She asked us to go further and we agreed.

Mr. Gaglia said that could be better addressed with the point to point lighting plan when it comes in.

Mr. Rodgers remarked that if the plan is approved tonight, it will be the last time to review the plans, unless you reserve the right to the Planner & Engineer.

Mr. Driver remarked that Mr. Cilo was not happy with the revised plan and the lighting plan & will suggest to the Chairman that he not sign the plat. Mr. Cilo agreed.

Item #5 is the light stanchion.

Mr. Driver's position is that they should be standard construction, that they would be metal. They would be more stable than to have a wooden stanchion.

Mr. Bruno thought Mrs. Doyle wanted a metal stanchion boxed in with wood.

Mr. Gaglia said it was more as a decorative effect.

Mr. Cilo said the first two to three feet of the light stand will be a concrete circular thing about 18 in. in diameter on top of that to the pole. She was talking about pole mounting.

Discussion followed. They decided the wood would be covering from the top of the base up to the box. That was agreeable.

Mr. Gupko wanted to know if there would be heat recovery fans located on these roofs.

Mr. Driver did not know. There would be some fans on the roof, & they would be located on the west side of the building.

They agreed that the HVAC system would not be visible. They would not be along Tea St.

Mr. Krauser remarked that the testimony was that the condensing is going to be beside the roof line. That should be put in as a condition.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Rodgers remarked that whatever is not in the plans must be in the resolution.

Mr. Driver said that anything on the roof will be skirted. The condensers will be below the roof line. Then he corrected himself. He said the compressors will be below the roof line, not the condensers.

Mr. Gabrielski asked about the skirting.

Mr. Driver said they'll provide skirting so it is not visible to the residential area. They may put it on the northern side, because of the proposed senior housing.

It was agreed that there would be no storage of carts in front of the building. Also, the loading dock area will be kept clean and free of litter. All agreed.

Mr. Gaglia said that due to the location of the site, the applicant will have to pay particular attention to any foods or garbage stored outside because of the animals which live around this area. Mr. Driver replied, according to Mr. Kennedy's testimony that left over food or food products would be packed inside & shipped out on a regular basis. They are not stored outside.

Mr. Gaglia wanted it included in the resolution.

Mr. Shapiro questioned the enforceability. We have to be able to enforce the conditions. Once the building is complete, aren't our hands tied?

Mr. Strain felt it was a health issue & could be handled through the Health Dept.

Mr. Strain mentioned #20 - pedestrian crosswalks.

Mr. Driver said they agreed to put sidewalks on the eastern side of the property from Route 28. The crosswalks would be on all four corners of the intersection of Union & Tea St.

Number #25 deals with Mrs. Doyle's decorative wall as opposed to a berm.

Mr. Gaglia mentioned that she had a concern about people cutting across the berm as children tend to do. It will deteriorate soon.

Also, the headlights in the parking lot were a concern.

Mr. Driver was in favor of the berm instead of the wall.

Mr. Auletta did not think the wall was a good idea.

Mr. Wilk did not like the wall.

Mr. Strain thought that the Board was satisfied with the berm in lieu of the wall.

Mr. Rodgers noted that the berm was not on the plans. So the final configuration in the landscaping should be subject to the Planner's approval.

Mr. Strain agreed.

Mr. Driver wanted it noted that it would be a three foot berm and not a wall.

Mr. Driver hoped that the resolution would indicate that it is a condition for obtaining a certificate of occupancy that site work & construction work go forward before there was a final closure plan.

Discussion followed about delivery hours.

Mr. Wilk mentioned 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Mr. Cilo asked if that was in conformance with the site.

Mr. Driver said most will occur between 8:00 a.m. & 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Krauser mentioned that the State deals with this as a quality of life issue for the people in the surrounding area.

Mr. Strain said Board members have a timeframe of 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. before them. Did anyone have other suggestions?

Mr. Shapiro mentioned Mr. Krauser's comments. However, it is a question of enforceability. He felt we should keep time limitations for trucks out of this discussion. If a problem occurs later, the Borough Council will handle it with an ordinance.

Mr. Rodgers suggested we specify that anything in the site plan is subject to appropriate ordinance or state legislation existing or prospective.

Mr. Auletta agreed.

Mr. Gabrielski asked if garbage collection would be included.

Mayor Gilly mentioned that we have an ordinance concerning garbage collection. It may not begin before 6:00 a.m.

Mr. Strain said the next item is the sidewalk on the west side of Tea St. from Union Ave. north & extending to just before the end of the building.

Mr. Driver said that, after the changes are incorporated, the sidewalk will extend up close to the building, but not to it's back.

Mr. Bruno stated that Mr. Cilo recommended that, if the curb on the right side is deteriorated enough, then Belgian block should be used to replace it as well as on the west side of the street.

Mr. Cilo said that within the site itself, the curbing parallel to the face of any building would be concrete and the rest of it would be Belgian granite block. This is for safety reasons.

Mr. Strain said that Tea St. will match the existing curbing. He reaffirmed that all curbing on Tea St. would be concrete. Inside the development, parallel to the building, it will be concrete. The rest will be Belgian block.

Mr. Gabrielski asked if there would be a sidewalk from the fast food restaurant to the other sidewalk.

Mr. Driver said they had agreed to provide a paved pathway through the landscaped area at the intersection of Tea & 28. This would permit a pedestrian to get into the fast food without going over the landscaping & without having to do down to an ingress egress area.

Mr. Driver asked that they leave the concrete throughout the site as noted on the plans.

Mr. Strain disagreed. Mr. Cilo concurred with him. The philosophy of the Borough is to have Belgian block curbing throughout the interior of the lot & only in the front of the buildings have concrete, for safety reasons only. For the rest of the site, it is easier to maintain Belgian block, replacing them as needed.

Both Mr. Driver & Mr. Cilo agreed that this should not include the loading dock area. There is no aesthetic reason for putting Belgian block in that area.

Mr. Driver said that, wherever there is pedestrian traffic or where it abuts a sidewalk, concrete will be installed.

Mr. Rodgers gave a summation. The original wording was concrete along Tea St. & parallel to the front of the building & in the loading dock area. All the rest is Belgian block unless waived by the Planner &/or the Engineer for safety reasons.

Mr. Wilk agreed. Mr. Driver agreed.

The subject of storm water management was discussed. Mr. Driver said the exact location of that easement is subject to a review of the Board Engineer or Municipal Engineer. They have agreed to provide that.

Mr. Strain said that the Board was asked to consider the impact of this application on the intersection of Thompson & Union. He suggested we consider a recommendation to the Borough Council that they petition the County Engineer to study that intersection at some point following the construction phase or opening phase of this project.

Mr. Gaglia agreed completely. He believed they should start a study shortly. For the second time in six months, that light has been taken down by a tractor trailer.

Mr. Strain called for a recess at 9:30 p.m.

Mrs. Doyle joined the meeting at this point.

Mr. Strain called the meeting back to order at 9:45 p.m.

Mr. Strain said the next major issue is the impact of traffic on Tea St. and the surrounding area. Alternate I has been proposed in our Engineer's Study dated 12/02/96.

Mr. Cilo recommended that the Board endorse Alternate I. He asked that a copy be submitted as formal inclusion in the minutes of this meeting. It doesn't do everything or everything that the neighbors want. However, it comes closest to satisfying most of the interests of the neighborhood at large. He suggested that Alternate I be included in the resolution. The applicant has suggested moving the primary entrance to Shop Rite south about 100 ft. This is to avoid the turning conflicts with Giles Biondi Court traffic. The proposal to put sidewalks up Tea St. on a westerly side from Union Ave to the first major access point, the southerly access to the site is good.

Mr. Wilk thought the applicant would continue the sidewalk to the entrance.

Mr. Strain believed it would be extended to the southeast corner of the building (or 100 ft. would remain).

Mr. Driver said that it would. He said it may not abut up to the building, but it's going to be before the southeast corner.

possibility of a barrier down Tea St. If it is left open on the southerly end, anybody can come in. You can't restrict the residents who live there. If you shut it off, then the only way people can come into Legion Court & Giles Biondi Court is to make a right turn out. How are they going to get back in? If you let them back in, you negate the value of a median.

The other way to do it would be to put a barrier & then put two lanes in each direction in & out on the east side of the barrier & two lanes on the west side of the barrier. What you're doing is separating the traffic from the site traffic from the neighborhood traffic. It still doesn't eliminate or reduce the traffic coming into Cedarcrest.

In his opinion, from a safety point of view, the median concept should not be endorsed by the Board.

Mr. Krauser made a motion to approve the site plan with all the conditions as discussed this evening.

Mr. Strain named the documents to be included: all the site plan paraphernalia, all the studies & specifically the 12/9/96 letter from Mrs. Doyle, the 11/12/96 letter from Mr. Cilo, & all the changes & additions that have been made thereto.

Mr. Wilk seconded the motion.

Mr. Rodgers asked for clarification. Mr. Krauser, in his motion, said all the conditions discussed this evening. In Mrs. Doyle's letter, there were many items not discussed tonight, because they weren't considered controversial. He understood they should be included in the motion.

Mr. Wilk agreed.

MR. Rodgers continued. Because of the complexity and, at times, confusion, the Board has to reserve some flexibility to finalize the resolution, when it sees a draft of it. The resolution has to be in the intent & spirit of the discussion.

Also, all of the conditions that are not black & white, documentation thereof is subject to when revised plans are submitted to the approval of the appropriate professionals.

Mr. Wilk agreed. So did Mr. Strain.

Mr. Strain said that before we vote, we have to determine who is eligible to vote.

Mr. Rodgers said some Board members missed some meetings & have read the transcripts. Since we don't have a formal document for members to sign, he will write one now. He will put all the names on one certification. After each name, he will write the meetings missed. Each member who reads it certifies that the has read the transcripts of the meetings missed.

Mr. Gupko - December 2 - He stated he read the transcript.

Mr. Bruno - November 20, 26 & late for December 2 - He read them.

Mr. Krauser - November 7, 14, 20 - He read them.

Mr. Auletta November 26 - Dec. 2 (late), 11 - He didn't read them.

Mr. Strain - no absences
Mr. Shapiro - late -November 7, 20, 26 - He read all of them.
Mr. Gabrielski - no absences
Mr. Gaglia - December 2 - He read it.
Mr. Tuck - no absences
Mr. Wilk - December 2 - He read the transcript.
Members signed the form prepared by Mr. Rodgers.

Mr. Rodgers asked if Alternate I was a condition of the approval.
He was told that it was.
Discussion followed.

Although he would not be permitted to vote, Mr. Auletta made a statement affirming his approval of the proposed site plan.

Mr. Krauser had no further comments.

Mr. Gaglia said this is supposed to help our tax situation. However, the real problem is the building we're in now (the High School). The Board of Education saps 70% to 80% of our tax dollars. This isn't going to cure it. Everybody here should start attending the Bd of Ed meetings, express their opinions & think before voting on their budgets. Maybe we can do something for the town.

Mr. Wilk agreed with Mr. Gaglia. He was not in favor of developing this end of the property. He had hoped it would be the west end. However, he feels it is a good project.

Mr. Bruno felt that if Bridgewater got the project, we would still have the traffic but no ratables.

Mr. Gupko wished the applicant would have agreed to some of his suggestions like the location of the loading dock & dead ending Tea St. at Giles Biondi. The project will have an impact. Unfortunately, some people will not benefit.

Mr. Tuck had no comments.

Mr. Shapiro said he has had nightmares about the project. From the beginning, he felt he could not vote for this project unless there was a definite Little League placement. The Council tells him there is. He is going to hold them to it. In a few weeks, he will be a member & will bring it up every chance he gets.

Mr. Gabrielski said he is not 100% happy about this project. The timing is a little bit too fast. The project does fit the zone. But we could have done a little better.

Mr. Strain said he felt like many of the Board members. Originally the property to be developed did not include the Little League field & the fire house & the armory. There are some problems with this plan. It is a positive step for the town. The ratables will help.

Roll call vote was taken. "Yes" votes were received from: M. Gupko, W. Tuck, K. Krauser, F. Bruno, M. Wilk, L. Strain, E. Gabrielski, T. Gaglia.

"Abstain" vote received from J. Shapiro. The motion carried.

Mr. Wilk made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Krauser.

Mr. Driver asked for a special meeting for the resolution to be available to be voted on by the Board, so that it could be advertised.

Mr. Strain suggested Thursday, December 19th at 7:30 p.m. in the Borough Hall for the purpose of adopting the formal resolution. It will be a continuation of this meeting.

All were in favor of the adjournment, so moved.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen M. Lynch
Recording Secretary

He would provide notice to the newspapers tomorrow.