

ROBBINSVILLE TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MEETING
ROBBINSVILLE TOWNSHIP, MERCER COUNTY, NJ
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2013 7:30 P.M. – SENIOR CENTER

MINUTES

Present: Chairman Cettina, Mr. Kolibas, Ms. Breyta, Mr. Witt, Mr. Shennard, Mrs. Goodwine, Mr. Galluccio (left at 8:00 p.m.)

Absent: Mr. Silvestrov, Mrs. Van Nest, Mr. Barker

Also Present: Mr. McGough, PE, Township Engineer; Mr. Dasti, Esq., Board Attorney; Ms. Post, Board Secretary

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Cettina. Roll call for the above members was called.

SUNSHINE STATEMENT

Chairman Cettina read the following statement: “Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided as required under Chapter 231 P.L. 1975 specifying the time and place with such notice as being sent to the *Times of Trenton*, *Messenger Press* and the *Trentonian* and posted on the Municipal Building Public Notice Meeting Bulletin Board.”

FLAG SALUTE

The Board members present led the public in the salute to the flag.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Cettina mentioned receiving a letter from the Robbinsville Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) regarding a zoning change recommendation for properties just east of Route 130 and CR 526 intersection, looking at TC-2 area just south of here and the possibility of rezoning the area to HC zone and looked at it as part of the Master Plan review which will be discussed as part of the agenda later.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Cettina asked for a motion to open the meeting to public comment for matters not related to items on the agenda. A motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mr. Shennard to open the meeting to the public. All in favor. Since no one from the public addressed the Board, a motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mr. Shennard to close this portion of the meeting. All in favor.

REPORT OF OFFICERS & COMMITTEES

Ms Breyta said that the Master Plan Subcommittee held their first meeting on January 23rd, where they voted in a Chairperson (Ms. Breyta) and a Vice chairperson (Mrs. Goodwine). Mr. McGough gave an informative introduction of things happening within the town. They are getting prepared to look at the two issues that were raised in the report by Christine Cofone. One of which is a recommendation in the letter from the EDAC. She also mentioned that the Town Center Subcommittee reorganized in early fall,

and since then they have only had two issues arise, which could be handled by the Zoning Board so they are contemplating dissolving the Town Center Subcommittee due to lack of activity.

Chairman Cettina commented that at one time there were a significant number of applications for projects in Town Center. The Town Center Subcommittee came in to being to handle the various issues that came about in Town Center and was one way of breaking down some of the work. The other aspect of the subcommittee was having a place to go to be less expensive for the people to resolve problems as opposed to applying for a variance through the Zoning Board. It was written into an ordinance so the subcommittee must be because it is part of an ordinance. It is a matter of hearing from the people and the subcommittee's input. One option is to go back to Council and suggest that the ordinance be revised and provide another option to utilize the Planning Board or Zoning Board in another fashion or maybe tie it into the Planning Board Meeting as an agenda item and list the Town Center Subcommittee items in the first 15 minutes or put it at the end of the agenda.

Mrs. Goodwine said that most items could be addressed by the Zoning Board. She thinks that would be the most natural progression of what issues arise in Town Center.

Mr. Galluccio stated that it sounded like a reasonable idea to absorb it into the existing Planning Board Meeting. It is not something that they have talked through. The subcommittee as it stands right now is not getting a lot of activity or inquiries. Either one of those would solve that.

Mr. McGough agreed with Chairman Cettina's introductory remarks regarding the Town Center ordinance. His encouragement to reform the committee was to be in compliance with an ordinance created in 2005. It was a coincidence that in 2012 the deck issue came about at the same time that the subcommittee was being reformed and those types of issues are not common. He believed that they should revise the ordinance eliminating the subcommittee. When similar situations occur, those issues can be addressed by the Zoning Board.

Chairman Cettina suggested that a memo be written to Council recommending that the part of the ordinance forming the subcommittee be eliminated at the request of the subcommittee members and those types of needs can be met through the Zoning Board.

Mr. Witt asked if there was a way that they could keep the subcommittee in limbo just in case the Zoning Board gets too busy so they will not have to go through the ordinance process again, which could be time consuming.

Mr. McGough said that the subcommittee could still exist without having meetings. There would not be a meeting unless there was an issue.

Chairman Cettina asked if they could revise the published meeting listing in the reorganization that requires them to give a specific time that the subcommittee would be meeting and say that any issues will be resolved within the standing Planning Board Meeting.

Mrs. Goodwine asked why the subcommittee could not be dissolved, and say if the need arises to resurrect it, you can.

Mr. Dasti said that there is only four or five months before the Planning Board reorganizes in July and the subcommittee meetings are held on the fourth Wednesday of the month. There is no meeting next week. Can you just publish a notice in the paper saying the meeting is cancelled?

Ms. Post said that she prepared a sunshine notice saying the meeting is cancelled.

Mr. Dasti suggested that they continue posting the cancelation of the subcommittee meeting until the town reorganizes in July.

Chairman Cettina said that when they reorganize if they want to keep the subcommittee as part of the Planning Board, they can say that the meetings will be combined together. They are still meeting the ordinance and they still have a defined time and the agenda can be adjusted to have a specific subcommittee item in it.

Mr. McGough said that by July, they will have time to see if there are any other issues for the need of the subcommittee.

Mr. Dasti agreed with Mr. McGough. There is not a need now, but when someone has to pay \$750 for a variance application, they will ask about the subcommittee.

Mr. McGough asked if at the reorganization meeting they can establish that the subcommittee exists and will meet only when required.

Mr. Dasti said that is fine.

Chairman Cettina said that the meetings between now and reorganization will be cancelled unless something comes up.

Ms. Breyta asked Mr. McGough on the status of what is happening on Church Street in Windsor.

Mr. McGough answered that it is a county job connecting sub pumps into the drainage system and it is being done by hand. It was supposed to be done back in September or October. He informed the County Engineer to put up signs indicating that the businesses are still open during construction, and he did that. Mr. McGough said he would follow up with the County Engineer tomorrow.

Chairman Cettina acknowledged that Mr. Galluccio took his mandatory training class and passed with flying colors. He is officially a Planning Board member. The Board congratulated Mr. Galluccio.

Mr. McGough stated that he is on or is an advisor to the EDAC and he doesn't think that the EDAC got the spirit of everything they talk about regarding the Master Plan. The discussion from last year was to look at all frontages on Route 130 and whether it should all be zoned Highway Commercial. Then it was discovered that there was a sentence in the 2009 Master Plan that said the subcommittee at that time looked at converting TC-2, Special Condition F, into Highway Commercial. However, the subcommittee found that the uses were so similar that there was no compelling reason in their mind to do it. Therefore, if Council considered changing the zone, and they did, to do so here would be construed as not being consistent with the Master Plan. The Master Plan Reexamine was contemplated as a study and a recommendation to this body as well as other officials in the town to say nothing is happening here and should they look at making everything having frontage along Route 130 Highway Commercial. This zone here, Office Warehouse, has a couple of parcels fronting on Route 130 so that letter and the discussion they had at EDAC and at Master Plan Subcommittee meeting was that it wouldn't just be the piece to TC-2, Special Condition F, it would also be the properties that front on Route 130 and the Office Warehouse Zone.

Chairman Cettina asked if the Office Warehouse Zone was changed to TC-2 in the front corner. Mr. McGough responded no and doesn't know why it was done that way. The study done last year, which was provided to the Planning Board, looked at the possibility of all of Route 130 being Highway Commercial. The only areas that do not have that are a small area in Office Warehouse (the vacancies) and a section of TC-2, Special Condition F (from Rusert's Deli and the other small businesses all the way down), and Village Commercial (Route 130 frontage along Windsor Village). The Master Plan

Subcommittee talked about problems with Village Commercial and that it will take a lot of input from the public and more deliberation to make sure that they get it right. Special Condition F and Office Warehouse is something that he suggested to the subcommittee that they reconsider fast tracking because you have to look at the entire Master Plan from 2007. The thought process was if the Planning Board and subcommittee could handle this separately and come back later and look at the entire town, they could put something there that would be per economic development.

Mr. Witt added that it makes sense to have some consistency up and down that corridor with frontage like on Route 130.

Ms. Breyta said that it seemed reasonable that the uses be consistent with the highway commercial. The one real issue was the setback on the rear of the property. It is significantly different in the TC-2, Special Condition F, than the Highway Commercial.

Mr. McGough said that he will have to figure out that buffer issue. It is smaller in Highway Commercial than in TC-2. Special Condition F.

Mr. Witt asked if there was a drainage easement issue.

Mr. McGough said he is going to sit down and get that together. He wants to investigate these things and get back to the Planning Board as soon as possible. A few years ago he had a significant economic development project (Wawa) brought to him on the corner where Rusert's sits, but the builder went somewhere else because they could not go there without going for a use variance and they didn't want to put the effort into it. He is going to try and get something to the Board soon.

Ms. Breyta asked if he could bring something to the meeting on the 20th of March.

Mr. McGough agreed. He also advised the Board that signs went up in the Town Center parking lots behind buildings A, B and C that mark spaces in the first three rows as reserved for the Town Center restaurant patrons between the hours of 6:00 pm to 12:00 am. He was concerned about that because it appears to segregate the restaurants from the other businesses. He spoke with Sharbell about it and the problem is that during a Planning Board discussion in the minutes, the question arose over shared parking between residential and commercial. It must be mandated that the residents use the residential parking spaces they own and are delegated. The residents have been given those parking spaces, which you need a pass to get through the gate to get in and the residents are not parking there. The residents are parking in the other spots. He called Mr. Troy to tell him that if he is going to do something where he is setting aside parking only for restaurants, he needs to go before the Planning Board because the regulations for TC parking says that if you are going to contemplate restricting uses that is within the purview of the Planning Board. He suggested that they solve the issue by saying the parking is reserved for TC businesses and not just TC restaurants. The new sign reads restaurant and retail patrons only and he believes that they are now in compliance and that Sharbell does not have to come before the Planning Board.

Chairman Cettina agreed.

Mr. McGough said that they will tow cars left there after the allowable time period which is also in compliance.

BOARD COMMENTS

There were no Board comments at this time.

MINUTES

October 24, 2012 – Eligible to vote on Town Center Subcommittee minutes: Mrs. Goodwine, Mrs. Van Nest (absent), Mr. Silvestrov (absent) and Mrs. Breyta. A motion was made by Ms. Breyta and seconded by Mrs. Goodwine to adopt the minutes as written. All in favor.

November 28, 2012 - Eligible to vote on Town Center Subcommittee minutes: Mrs. Goodwine, Mrs. Van Nest (absent), Mr. Silvestrov (absent) and Mrs. Breyta. A motion was made by Mrs. Goodwine and seconded by Ms. Breyta to adopt the minutes as written. All in favor.

January 16, 2013 – Eligible to vote on Planning Board minutes: Mr. Kolibas, Mr. Barker (absent), Ms. Breyta, Mr. Shennard, Mr. Witt, Mr. Silvestrov (absent), Mr. Galluccio and Mrs. Goodwine. A motion was made by Mrs. Goodwine and seconded by Mr. Shennard to adopt the minutes as amended by Ms. Breyta. Ms. Breyta had a correction on page 4, third paragraph down, which was to place a period at the end of the word “disappointed” and eliminate the rest of the sentence. All in favor.

(At this point in time, Mr. Galluccio left the meeting.)

BUSINESS TO DISCUSS

1. Ordinance 2013-2 – Amendment to Redevelopment Plan for Block 41, Lots 14, 36, 37.01, 37.02, 37.03, 38.02, 38.03, 38.04 and 38.012 (The Southeast Industrial Study Area) re: Fences – Review and Recommendation

Mr. McGough recalled that at one of the meetings, the Board received an ordinance regarding 8 foot high fences within the PCD Zone, which is the warehouse park. Within that zone is the Southeast Industrial Redevelopment Zone, which is where Amazon is located. The Redevelopment Plan for that area states that fences are limited to 6 feet in height, which needs to be corrected to make it consistent with the PCD Zone.

Mrs. Goodwine thought that they were not going to allow chain link fences in the front yard.

Mr. McGough answered that the Redevelopment Plan states that the ordinance governs unless a specifically stated exception exists in the Redevelopment Plan. They are removing the portion in the Redevelopment Plan that says a maximum 6 foot high fence. It reverts back to the ordinance for the PCD Zone special conditioning in the Redevelopment Plan. Everything else that was discussed including the part about the chain link fence in the front yard is still true.

Mrs. Goodwine reiterated that she thought they were not going to allow chain link in the front.

Mr. McGough said that is not what was voted on. This is consistent in what was introduced and adopted.

Mr. Witt doesn't believe that they excluded chain link fence in the front given the area in which they are going it is typical.

Mr. McGough said that you are talking about internal in the PCD Zone. A couple of applications had come before the Board, who agreed with the rationale for having an 8 foot high fence. Then Green Mountain (warehouse) came in and wanted to put up a gate for the purpose of having a guardhouse and the trucks had trouble seeing a 6 foot high fence. The chain link is what they are going to use and the police also like the chain link in that area so they can see in there. They don't like solid fences. The Board still has discretion to suggest a nicer fence. For instance, Project Liberty has a beautiful fence in their front yard, which is internal to the park that no one can see unless you are in there.

Chairman Cettina said that the other logic is that you don't have a lot of options when you eliminate chain link and you want to be able to see through it.

Ms. Breyta wanted to know if the Southeast Industrial Area is what the Redevelopment Plan is really called. Mr. McGough replied that is what is on the report.

Chairman Cettina asked that a motion be made. A motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mr. Shennard to recommend that the proposed ordinance is consistent with the Township Master Plan and that Council should adopt said ordinance.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Kolibas, Shennard, Breyta, Witt, Goodwine, Cettina

NAYS: None

ABSTAINS: None

With there being six (6) aye votes and no nay or abstain votes, the motion passed as recommended.

2. Ordinance 2013-3 – Amendment to Land Use Ordinance to Eliminate Proximity Clauses in the Conditional Use Section of §142-61 – Review and Recommendation

Mr. McGough said that Stuart Wiser's letter referenced a case where Exxon appealed a proximity clause (Exxon Co., U.S.A. v. Livingston Township in Essex City., 199 N.J. Super. 470 Appellate Division 1985) and the court agreed and found the clause to be unconstitutional. The town's proximity clauses have existed for a very long time and he believed they are preventing the town from getting a higher end looking gas station, which would cause the other stations to have to improve or leave. Ms. Bell learned in a class that it is unconstitutional and she showed him where it is in the Cox Zoning and Land Use book. He asked Mr. Wiser to investigate, which resulted in the memo the Board received today. If someone were to challenge that, they would win. He spoke with Mr. Roselli, who successfully challenged a proximity ordinance in Hamilton Township for an applicant. Another section in the town's ordinance states that a conditional use would go to the Planning Board and it did not mention going to the Zoning Board if the conditional use needed a variance. It should say a conditional use application shall be made to the Planning Board or Zoning Board.

Ms. Breyta noted that in addition to allowing service stations to be built within a certain distance of one another, it looks like you are also deleting the part that limits the proximity to other types of facilities.

Mr. McGough said that was also found to be unconstitutional. The Livingston Ordinance that was successfully challenged said 500 feet between public buildings (schools, churches, playgrounds, libraries, etc.).

Ms. Breyta asked if there were any other rules or guidelines in New Jersey that govern proximity of gas stations too.

Mr. Dasti said that he doesn't know if there are any statutes of that. There are a lot of gas stations on opposite corners.

Ms. Breyta's concern is say within a church or a playground.

Mr. McGough said that what the court had found was that proximity to those types of uses was not appropriate.

Mr. Dasti stated there is no rational reason to do that so the court said unless you can legitimate why they can't be closer to one another than let the market decide how close they should be.

Mr. Kolibas asked about Section F, #7 where it says no junked motor vehicle or unlicensed or unregistered motor vehicle at a service station. That means it is gone and that it has been junked. Shouldn't that be junk?

Mr. McGough responded that is existing language. Junked means that it is no longer operable and sitting there as junk. Anything that you see that is without a strike or bold is existing language.

Mr. Kolibas said if you have a situation where someone may have a collectible car or race car and it is not registered or insured, you cannot keep it there. It doesn't say that you can keep it in the bay.

Mr. Dasti said you can say that stock cars are allowed, but then you may have an argument about what a stock car is. There's no way to define every situation.

A motion was made to open the meeting to the public by Mrs. Goodwine and seconded by Ms. Breyta at 8:25 p.m. All in favor.

Marilyn Yasko, 16 Church Street in Windsor, has a comment about the gas station in Windsor that was mentioned earlier, which is in her backyard. Going through the hearings, Livingston was brought up, but what was said at the time is that things could be looked differently than another building going in, but every town in the area has these restrictions for distance. She is a chemical engineer as well as a resident with a degree from Rutgers. She has a PE behind her name like Mr. McGough. She does not do gas stations nor planning and zoning. Her specialty is in chemical factory work. She works with chemicals much more dangerous than gasoline. What she does for her company, Firmenich, is write the code that runs the automation, look at it for safety and make sure that it will happen the same way over and over again. She is schooled in how to safely handle these chemicals. One of the things she reads up on a regular basis is the National Fire Protection Code, which actually contains these distances in it. This is where municipalities got it from and every municipalities use this in their code. The ideas came out of safety. What if there is a church nearby and the gas station blows up while there are 400 people in the church within proximity? She found information on the Petroleum Institute website that said 100 gas stations, 3 in Mercer County received aviation fuel instead of gasoline fuel within the past year. A day or so ago, a parking lot collapsed because someone started a power saw near a gas station that was shut down, but still had fumes in the tank. In Howell a few months ago, a two car crash resulted in one car being pushed into a gas pump and caused a fire to the canopy and it took about four hours to put it out. There is a reason for this proximity. The wackiest things happen. Would you ever think that a fire hydrant would cause a gas station fire? Think about it when you think proximity.

Mr. Dasti acknowledged that gasoline and benzene are dangerous products. Mrs. Yasko does not have to go through all the articles she found on the internet.

Mr. Witt asked if the areas they are talking about, is that applicable.

Mr. McGough said they are talking Highway Commercial.

Mrs. Yasko interjected to say that is the HC Zone, but it is also the VC Zone.

Ms. Breyta said that it is not the VC Zone.

Mr. McGough said this ordinance is to amend the special conditions for the Highway Commercial, and it goes into service stations to merely take out the proximity clauses.

Mrs. Yasko asked does it change everything on Route 130 and does it not change VC Zone.

Mr. Dasti said it only affects the HC Zone and does not affect the VC Zone.

Mrs. Yasko cited another example of when a tank in Illinois leaked into the sewer system and affected all of the residents on that sewer system.

Mr. Dasti said that there is no question that it is dangerous, but do any of your examples happen because there are two gas stations near each other.

Mrs. Yasko said when you have one right next to the other and one catches on fire, and then the second one can be affected. Now you have a larger issue. She would put a big concrete wall between them, but you can't do that here so instead you put distance. She asked how many more gas stations the town needs. When she stands on her corner, she can see four gas stations on Route 130 and another one is coming in, but when you go on Route 33, you do not see one.

Mr. Dasti understands Mrs. Yasko's concerns, but she must understand the function of the Planning Board versus the Council. This is an ordinance that has been proposed or suggested by the Council. It has to come to the Planning Board solely to determine whether or not it is in compliance with the Master Plan and they have a letter from the planner saying that it is in compliance with the Master Plan. Mr. Dasti suggested that Mrs. Yasko should take her concerns to the Council because it is their ordinance.

Mrs. Yasko agreed, but she felt that people here are intelligent and can look at both sides of the coin and decide whether they want to put their ideas forward to Council telling them what they really think.

Chairman Cettina said it is not the Planning Board's role to establish ordinances. Their role is to determine whether a proposed ordinance advanced by the Council is in compliance with the Master Plan. Mrs. Yasko's comments should be addressed to the Council when this comes up for a second reading. The difficulty that the Planning Board faces is that they measure it against the Master Plan, and when they look at it from that perspective, they have to utilize the professionals' opinions of whether it matches or doesn't match the Master Plan. They take into consideration the reasons behind it. He said that the analogy that she made earlier was reasonable regarding distances, but it is not up to them to decide that. He again encouraged her to bring it to Council and put it the way she put it to them. The Council may weigh that as well as the area and risk associated with it and what services they are trying to provide.

Mrs. Yasko asked if there is a way for them to reassess if it complies or not to think about it. There is a NFPA code that has these rules in it and we are going against the fire protection code.

Mr. Dasti said all new gas stations have to comply with the current fire codes and be approved by the Fire Marshall.

Mrs. Yasko said that part of that code says that it should be "X" distance from the street.

Mr. Dasti said this ordinance says that any new gas stations will have to comply with the fire codes. If we remove something, it doesn't mean that they are exempt from the law.

Mrs. Yasko said that NFPA is not a law. It is something that is written by the National Fire Protection Agency to suggest to you how to build something written by professionals.

Mrs. Goodwine said that one of the courses that a builder goes through when they come to us to build a gas station is that the application gets sent to the Fire Marshall for approval. The Fire Marshall will come back to us and say he doesn't concur with this because NFPA code says whatever these standards are.

Mrs. Yasko said that unless the Fire Marshall has a separate set of guidelines, which he doesn't, it exists in this code.

Mr. Dasti said that any new application would have to come to the Planning Board or the Zoning Board for site plan and it would be referred to the Fire Marshall for review and approval.

Mrs. Yasko said that as soon as you strike this, the Fire Marshall has no recourse.

Mr. Dasti stated that is not true.

Mrs. Yasko said the NFPA is not a law. There is no zoning variance to stop it from being built.

Chairman Cettina said there is a process, where the applicant is required to meet the requirements of the Fire Marshall. The Board will not give approval until the Fire Marshall says that it is okay. If the Fire Marshall comes to us and says that he doesn't agree with it, then the Board does not approve it.

Since no one else from the public stepped forward to address the Board, a motion was made by Mrs. Goodwine and seconded by Mr. Witt to close the public comment portion of the meeting at 8:40 p.m. All in favor.

Chairman Cettina asked for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mrs. Goodwine to recommend that the proposed ordinance is consistent with the Township Master Plan and that Council should adopt said ordinance.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Kolibas, Shennard, Breyta, Witt, Goodwine, Cettina

NAYS: None

ABSTAINS: None

With there being six (6) aye votes and no nay or abstain votes, the motion passed as recommended.

3. Ordinance 2013-5 – Amendment to Land Use Ordinance to Add Service Stations with Convenience Store as a Conditional Use in Section §142-25, Entitled “PCD Zone Planned Commercial Development Zone” – Review and Recommendation

Mr. McGough stated that the PCD Zone borders the turnpike, Old York Road, Gordon Road and 195. Mr. Wisner prepared an analysis of the Master Plan and found that it was consistent to allow service stations with a convenience store. He read Mr. Wisner's letter that basically stated that the uses in question do advance the goals and objectives of the 2007 Master Plan Reexamination.

Ms. Breyta said the ordinance has Type 1 and 2 principle permitted uses. Under Type 1 it talks about retail and related uses suitable for the convenience of the employees. Is there any difference why they are making it a conditional use as opposed to a principle permitted use.

Mr. McGough said yes. The reason he is recommending that as opposed to just a permitted use is because the boundaries of this include Gordon Road and Old York Road. Making it a conditional use triggers a condition that says they cannot be within 150 feet of a residence.

Ms. Breyta asked where it says that conditional uses have to be 150 feet from a residence.

Mr. McGough said it is under 142-61.F(5), which was left in because they felt it was constitutional.

Mr. Witt made a motion to open to the public at 8:50 p.m. and Mr. Shennard seconded his motion. All in Favor. No one from the public came forward to address the Board. A motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mr. Shennard to close the public portion. All in favor.

A motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Ms. Breyta to recommend that the proposed ordinance is consistent with the Master Plan and that Council should adopt said ordinance.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Kolibas, Shennard, Breyta, Witt, Goodwine, Cettina

NAYS: None

ABSTAINS: None

With there being six (6) aye votes and no nay or abstain votes, the motion passed as recommended.

ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to discuss, a motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mrs. Goodwine to adjourn the meeting. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elide M. Post
Planning Board Secretary

Transcribed by: Jewel Timberlake-Morgan

ADOPTED: MARCH 20, 2013