

**STILLWATER TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
February 28, 2011**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Powell, Mr. Saal, Mr. Sarni, Mr. Hammond, Mr. Stachura, Mr. Lippencott, Mr. Lockwood

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Daingerfield

ALSO PRESENT: Board Attorney Morgenstern; Board Engineer Rodman

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE Stillwater Township Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on Monday, February 28, 2011, at 7:30 p.m. at the Municipal Building in Middleville, New Jersey. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Lockwood in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

The flag was saluted and roll call taken.

George Lippencott was sworn in by Attorney Morgenstern as an Alternate #1 Member, term expiring 12/31/11.

MINUTES

Mr. Powell made a **motion** to approve the minutes of January 24, 2011, seconded by Mr. Sarni.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Sarni, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes

HEARING

Michael Chaves, Block 3804, Lot 12.04, Cal. No. 560, application amendment

Mr. Lockwood announced that the Chaves application would not be heard at the meeting tonight due to insufficient notice. Mr. Stachura made a **motion** to carry the application to March 28, 2011, notice to be provided to the Sussex County Planning Department, no other notice required, seconded by Mr. Powell. The landscape plan will also be addressed at the March 28, 2011 meeting.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Hammond, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Sarni, yes, Mr. Stachura, yes, Mr. Lippencott, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes

The order of the agenda was changed to allow the Nextel of NY, Inc. &JCP&L application to be heard for completeness only; followed by Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless application for completeness and possibly a regular hearing.

HEARING

Nextel of New York, Inc. & JCP&L, Block 1703, Lot 21, Cal. No. 569, completeness only

Mr. Sarni cited a conflict and stepped down from the hearing.

Simone Sinisi of Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio, was the attorney present on behalf of the applicant. Also present and sworn in was Frank Colasurdo, Architect.

Mr. Rodman reviewed his report dated 2/25/11:

This is a variance and site plan application to the Stillwater Township Board of Adjustment for permission to construct a wireless communications facility on property presently owned by the Swartswood Fire Department, located at 931 Swartswood Road. The proposed facility will consist of a 156 foot monopole with 12 panel antennas located at the top. The top of the antennas will be 153 feet above ground level and there will also be a lightning rod at the top of the tower at a height of 156 feet. The application also proposes a 12' x 20' equipment shelter to house the supporting equipment utilized for the facility, which will be located within a 34' x 30' wireless communications compound, enclosed within an 8 foot high board on board security fence. The proposed equipment shelter has a gross square foot area of 240 square feet and is 11.25 feet high. The proposed facility is located in the Neighborhood Commercial District (NC)

in which wireless communications facilities do not appear to be either a permitted use or conditionally permitted use. Thus, use variance relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d (1) is required. A variance will also be required from Section 240-104G (1) which prohibits the erection of more than one principle residential or commercial building or use on one lot.

In addition, there are six bulk or C Variances required, four (4) involve setbacks for the tower, and two (2) involve the equipment building - one variance for height and one for area, see Stillwater Township Ordinance 240-114.

Based on the zoning officer's letter of February 3, 2011, she has recommended the following items be addressed by the Board for completeness:

1. Critical areas as defined in Section 240-104, I, J, and K of the ordinance. *See additional comment #4 below.*

2. Location, arrangement and dimensions of parking area, driveway or service areas, if any.

3. Location of all buildings on all adjoining properties (including setbacks).

In addition, the preliminary and final site plan checklist require the following items:

4. Landscaping plan has not been provided.

5. Design calculations for proposed drainage facilities have not been provided. *See additional comment # 3 below.*

6. Environmental Impact Statement has not been provided.

The following **additional comments** are made at this time:

1. The applicant should provide testimony which demonstrates that the relief sought can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and substantial impairment of the intent and purpose of the Zone Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The applicant should also provide testimony that this facility is particularly well suited for this use.

2. I would recommend that the applicant provide a metes and bounds description for the access easement and the monopole site. These easements should be included as an easement in the existing deed.

3. It appears that this application does not trigger Stillwater Stormwater Regulations since impervious area is being reduced. I would recommend the applicant provide a statement certifying this condition.

4. It appears that there may be wetlands or wetland buffer areas within 200 feet of this site. I would recommend at least a presence/absence determination be obtained from NJDEP.

5. Removal and restoration provisions should be addressed with the possibility of posting a bond for that purpose.

6. Any approval should be conditioned on the applicant obtaining a building permit and providing certification by an engineer that this tower has been designed to accommodate these antennas and possible additional carriers.

7. Any approval should be conditioned on providing the Board with an as-built drawing confirming the location and height prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy.

8. This application should be forwarded to the Environmental Commission for their review and reports.

9. Any approval should be conditioned on S.C.S.C.D. and S.C.P.B. and any other applicable approvals or waivers.

10. When an EIS is provided, it should be forwarded to the Environmental Commission for their review and comments.

11. Prior to any construction, a pre-construction meeting must be scheduled and inspection escrows deposited with the township.

In response to Mr. Rodman's report, Mr. Colasurdo provided the following testimony: NJDEP mapping will be provided indicating the location of any wetlands; he felt there were none close enough to trigger a permit. Mr. Colasurdo felt the visual impact will be the greatest impact and photo simulations will be provided. He agreed to do an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) if necessary, although he felt most items would not be applicable. Ms. Sinisi stated a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) screening could also be provided. Mr. Lockwood felt an EIS would be very important and the requirements of the cell tower ordinance could be addressed, including landscape issues. Mr. Rodman also encouraged an endangered species study. Mr. Colasurdo asked if he could locate the adjoining structures and distances using Google area. Mr. Morgenstern stated precise locations would be necessary for the fall zone, which is required

by ordinance. Ms. Sinisi indicated that the existing parking area would be used and no new parking is proposed.

Following further discussion, Mr. Powell made a **motion** to declare the application incomplete, with requirements for completeness referenced in Mr. Rodman's report as #1, #3, #4, and #6 including the following items to be submitted, seconded by Mr. Stachura:

1. Environmental Impact Statement
2. Proximity of all adjacent property buildings
3. Landscape Plan
4. Presence/Absence – Wetlands
5. Endangered Species

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Hammond, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Stachura, yes, Mr. Lippencott, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes

Mr. Rodman noted his report incorrectly stated that cell towers are not a conditionally permitted use in the Neighborhood Commercial Zone. It is conditionally permitted, however does not meet the required conditions.

Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Block 3101, Lot 13, Cal. No. 566, completeness hearing/application hearing

All notices appeared to be in order.

The following members cited a conflict and stepped down: Mr. Stachura, Mr. Sarni, and Mr. Hammond. David H. Soloway, Esq. of Vogel, Chait, Collins and Schneider was present on behalf of the applicant. John Ferrante, Engineer, E2Project Management, LLC, was sworn in.

Mr. Rodman reviewed the Preliminary and Final Site Plan Checklist of the following report dated 2/25/11:

This is a variance and site plan application to the Stillwater Township Board of Adjustment for permission to construct a wireless communication facility on property located at 929 Fairview Lake Road. The proposed facility will consist of a ±130 foot high lattice tower (expandable to 150 feet) with 12 panel antennas located at the top. The tops of the antennas will be ±133 feet above ground level and there will also be a lightning rod at the top of the tower with a height of ±136 feet. The application also proposes an 11 foot 6 inch by 30 foot equipment shelter to house the supporting equipment utilized for the facility, which will be located within a 50 foot x 50 foot wireless communications compound, enclosed within an 8-foot high chain link fence. The proposed equipment shelter has a gross floor area of 345 feet and is 11.08 feet in height. The proposed facility is located in the R-5 Residential District, in which wireless communications facilities do not appear to be either a permitted use or conditionally permitted use. Thus, use variance relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d(1) is required. A variance will also be required from Section 240-104G(1) which prohibits the erection of more than one principle residential or commercial building or use on one lot.

If this tower were located in a zone which permitted cell communication towers, this tower would have to be located on a Township lot.

Due to the size of this lot (69 acres), we have reviewed this only for the area within 200 feet of the proposed access and site.

The administrative official found the administrative and "d" variance checklist in complete on September 10, 2010.

This application was found incomplete by the Board of Adjustment at their September 27, 2010, meeting, for the following reasons as listed on the Resolution dated September 27, 2010. Included is a status of those conditions:

Preliminary and Final Site Plan Checklist:

1. Plan scale not less than 1:100 ft- Board granted waiver for completeness
2. The plans reflect the required 2ft contours. Sheets SP-2, SP-5 through SP shows 2' contours adjacent to the tower compound and for the access road. ***Satisfactory to the Board***
3. Cliff & rock outcroppings- Drawing SP-4 does not show them very clearly. The applicant will provide better copies at the meeting on February 28, 2011. ***This item was provided***

4. Wetland delineation: Wetland delineation has been submitted to DEP and to myself and the Board - **Satisfactory to the Board**
5. Aquifer recharge area: Board granted waiver for completeness
6. Wooded area indicating predominant species: *Drawing LP-1 provides this data*
7. LOI from NJDEP: *Applicant submitted a wetland permit to NJDEP for an LOI determination. Copy of permit provided to the board.*
8. Wetland boundary: *Drawing SP-4 provides the wetland delineation*
9. Areas construction is precluded due to steep slopes and stream corridors. - *Steep slopes shown on drawing SP-4. The applicant's engineer provided testimony there are no stream corridors. This item also required that the applicant submit plans to the Stillwater Township Fire Department to request comments regarding the proposed access road and adequate access for fire trucks. The applicant's engineer stated that he had provided drawings for the Fire Company, but the fire chief has not yet received them and that he will send copies directly to the fire department by express mail. This item was addressed during testimony.*
10. Location of existing wells - *Applicant verified through field observations and also from property owner that there are no private wells within 200 ft from access road. It appears that the Resolution requires that a well search within 200 feet of the property was required. This item was addressed during testimony*
11. Location of intended septic fields. - *There are no septic fields planned and there are no septic fields within 200 ft from the access road. The Resolution indicates that the applicant was to show septic systems within 200 feet of the access road as opposed to wells within 200 feet of the property. This item was addressed during testimony*
12. Proposed drainage easements: Board granted waiver for completeness only. *However, there are no drainage easements required or proposed.*
13. Plans and proposed utility layouts – *These are shown on drawings SP-1, SP-2, and SP-5 through SP-11, with detail shown on drawing C-3, detail 3-C-3, and detail 4-C3*
14. Road orientation as it related to energy conservation - Board granted waiver for completeness
15. Natural resource inventory including soils - *This has been provided and shown on drawings SP-4, and LP-1. This item also indicated that the applicant would conduct borings along the road in the area of any new cuts. This does not appear to be addressed. This item was addressed on drawing SP-4 as "test pits"*
16. Landscape Plan - *Drawing LP-1 has been provided.*
17. Design calculations shall be provided - *Drainage calculations and report has been provided to both myself and Mr. Vreeland.*
18. Environmental impact statement - *Environmental impact has been submitted to the Township. See additional comment #17 below.*
19. Metes and bounds for the access easement for the access drive and for the tower site - *These have not been provided. The applicant's engineer states these will be provided when the application is approved.*

C Variance Checklist Items:

20. Applicant has shown critical areas within 200 ft of the access road - *This is now shown on drawing SP-1 and SP-4*
21. Location of all buildings on all adjoining properties. - *Applicant has shown the PSEG towers on drawing SP-4 and LP-1*

D Variance Checklist Items:

22. Location of existing structures and their setbacks. - *Drawing SP-1, SP-4, and LP-1 indicate all existing structures within 200 ft of the access road and within 200 ft from the property line.*

Administrative Checklist Items:

23. All registered utilities receive notice of this application. - *PSEG and all registered utilities shall be notified. Notice of this application was given to the applicable utilities.*
24. The owner of the property should be identified. - *There is an ambiguity between application and affidavit of ownership as to the ownership of the property. The applicant's engineer has stated that the applicant's attorney would address this issue. This item was addressed during testimony*

The following **additional comments** are made at this time:

1. The applicant should provide testimony which demonstrates that the relief sought can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and substantial impairment of the intent and purpose of the Zone Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The applicant should also provide testimony as to why this facility could not be located on a tower on an adjoining utility transmission line.

2. There appears to be some confusion, the map and application list Gerald and Irma Castner as the property owner, whereas the Affidavit of Ownership/Letter of Authorization lists property owners as Castners A General Partnership with signatures of Rodney and Roger Castner.
3. I would recommend that the applicant provide a metes and bounds description for the access easement and the monopole site. These easements should be included as an easement in the existing deed.
4. Due to the length of the proposed access road (2,290 feet) and the 50' x 50' area required for the compound and a disturbance area of 64,427 square feet, the application must conform to the Stillwater Storm water Regulations. Details for providing drainage along the road will be required. The Township Engineer and storm water coordinator Mike Vreeland have provided a storm water report dated February 24, 2011. These comments should be addressed as well as the following:
Either the applicant and/or the property owner will be responsible to maintain the storm water management measures and structures. Nevertheless, we recommend that the Township be granted a right-to-access the property in order to ensure these facilities are functioning properly.
We recommend that should it be determined at any time that the stormwater management system is not functioning properly, the cost of any corrective actions should be the responsibility of the owner.
The calculations utilize the rational method to determine the volume of runoff. As defined on Page 5-5 of the NJ BMP Manual, only the modified rational method (MRM) is suitable for calculating volume. The calculations utilize a single rainfall duration to determine the volume of runoff, while MRM must use multiple storm durations to determine the maximum increase in storage volume. See the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations Appendix A-9 for detailed example of the MRM.
5. The cross section shown on Sheet SP-5 should indicate the direction and percent pitch of the roadway cross slope (i.e. indicate if the roadway is to be pitched into the swale and at what slope).
6. The design report includes construction and maintenance considerations on Sheet 2-13. These construction requirements should be included on the plan.
7. An operation and maintenance manual for Stormwater Facilities should be prepared, submitted and approved.
8. Sheet SE-2 indicates 0.853 acres of disturbance, however the drainage report indicates over 1 acre of disturbance. This discrepancy must be corrected.
9. The plans should include a table, or other means, to more clearly define the beginning and ending station of the various road surface construction types shown on Sheet C-4.
10. At various locations on the roadway plan it indicates "reinforced slope with Geoweb." The extents of the reinforced slope should be better defined. A hatching or shading pattern should be used to define the limits of the reinforced slope.
11. The Geoweb reinforcement on the plans indicate they are to be used "As Needed (Verify in Field)," however no explanation is given as to who, or by what criteria would be used to define whether the reinforcement is required. I would prefer to see this note removed from the plans. If during construction the applicant determines that other means of stabilization could be utilized, it would need to be signed and sealed by a licensed Geotechnical Engineer, and approved by the Township Engineer.
12. It should be noted that portions of this access road are very steep, exceeding 21%. Who will be responsible for maintaining this road and will emergency vehicles be able to access this road? I would recommend that the Stillwater Fire Company and Ambulance Corps review their ability to access this site.
13. I would recommend that the applicant provide an FCC RF Compliance Assessment Report for this tower, an RF Propagation Map and a visual analysis.
14. Removal and restoration provisions should be addressed with the possibility of posting a bond for that purpose.
15. Any approval should be conditioned on the applicant obtaining a building permit and providing certification by an engineer that this tower has been designed to accommodate these antennas and possible additional carriers.
16. Any approval should be conditioned on providing the Board with an as-built drawing confirming the location and height prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy.
17. This EIS should be forwarded to the Environmental Commission for their review and reports.
The Zoning Officer has provided the following comments in her letter of February 18, 2011, regarding the EIS which should be addressed:
Environmental Impact Statement; page 6., section 4.2 Alternatives Evaluation outlines the process that was used to determine the proposed location and states that the location was selected according to Township

Ordinance 420-114J. Our ordinance requires a comprehensive plan which is outlined to determine need and site selection, this requirement was only partially covered in the report.

EIS; page 6, section 4.2 continued; The ordinance also requires location priorities be addressed once the wireless antenna is determined to be needed. The analysis provided in the EIS shows that only one property owned by Stillwater Township was considered by the applicant. The existing wireless antenna at the intersection of Mt. Holly Road and Middleville Road was not considered for co-location.

Page 7.; The applicant only mentions co-location with reference to the existing PSE&G towers but states that the proposed replacement of those towers removed that option. PSE&G has not received final approval. The replacement of the existing PSE&G towers is currently being challenged in court due to among other things reduced need and may not receive final approval.

EIS; page 23, section 5.11.3 Steps to Minimize Adverse Impacts acknowledges that the proposed project will adversely affect historic resources and that efforts will be designed to help minimize the impacts. It should be noted that the existing PSE&G towers, numbered 45/1 and 45/2 on the PSE&G Susquehanna River to Roseland Plan and Profile Map dated November 26, 2008, page 11 Kittatinny-Newton Section T-2298, indicates that the existing PSE&G towers are 105' high, the proposed wireless antenna will be 133' high at the highest point.

18. Any approval should be conditioned on S.C.S.C.D. and S.C.P.B. and any other applicable approvals or waivers.

19. Prior to any construction, a pre-construction meeting must be scheduled and inspection escrows deposited with the township.

In response to Mr. Rodman's review of the site plan checklist, Mr. Ferrante provided the following testimony: With reference to #9 of the report, Mr. Ferrante indicated he had spoken with the Stillwater Fire Chief who verbally stated he did not see a problem with access, however snow removal would have to be addressed. Mr. Ferrante stated the applicant has agreed to provide snow removal. David VanGorden, Stillwater Fire Chief, was present, and he indicated he had conducted a site survey and reviewed the plan and saw no problems. With reference to #10 and #11, Mr. Ferrante testified there are no residences located within 200 feet; there is a vacant home located on the property and that can be added to the drawing, depicting the location of the well. Mr. Rodman felt that was sufficient, noting the property is a 69 acre lot. There was question as to whether or not the 200 feet distance was from the property or the access road. Mr. Rodman indicated it was from the property. Mr. Soloway noted there was a discrepancy, as #9 indicates all wells 200 feet from the property and #10 indicates all septs 200 feet from the access road. With reference to #19 of the site plan checklist, Mr. Ferrante testified that the metes and bounds for the access drive and tower site will be provided upon approval of the application so that any changes could be accurately reflected. With reference to #24 of the site plan checklist, Mr. Ferrante stated the actual owner is "Castner's" and this change will be made to the plans with a letter to be provided with a copy of the deed indicating ownership.

Mr. Soloway addressed the Zoning Officer's reported dated 2/18/11 indicating that #1, #2, and #3 have been addressed; and stating that #4, #5, and #6 are comments addressed in an EIS, are not completeness items and will be addressed during testimony. Mr. Morgenstern disagreed stating that the new ordinance requires such items for completeness. Mr. Soloway stated he was not aware of a new ordinance. The secretary stated the Zoning Officer had indicated she provided it to Mr. Soloway. At this point, the ordinance was provided to Mr. Soloway and a short recess was taken at 8:40 p.m. to allow him to review it.

The Board reconvened at 8:52 p.m.

Mr. Soloway stated the items required in the comprehensive plan are normally addressed during testimony. He stated a radiofrequency(RF) expert would provide an exhibit of the area to be covered and address the required items. Mr. Soloway was concerned with providing the following items within one month: Letter of Intent; page 4(iv) Visual Sight Distance Analysis (balloon test). He felt a balloon test would be very difficult during the winter and it would be hard to provide adequate notice for it. Mr. Soloway asked if a waiver could be granted for this item until a later date. Mr. Soloway stated a written report would be provided by the Fire Chief and the fire department will request an emergency antenna to be placed on the tower.

The following items were discussed and will be submitted or addressed by the applicant:

1. Radiofrequency (RF) Report
2. Emissions Report
3. Structural information and structural integrity report – Mr. Ferrante can prepare a report on loads, co-locators, with the actual structural analysis to be provided following approval
4. Proposed Letter of Intent
5. If possible, a visual study
6. Site plan checklist #10 of Mr. Rodman's report – well to be shown on property
7. Site plan checklist #19 of Mr. Rodman's report – metes and bounds for access road to be waived for completeness only
8. Site plan checklist #24 of Mr. Rodman's report – clarification of ownership
9. Zoning Officer's report item #4 – comprehensive plan
10. Zoning Officer's report item #5 – location priorities
11. Zoning Officer's report item #6 – possibility of co-locating on PSE&G tower
12. Preliminary structural analysis – designed for co-locators and structurally sound
13. Letter from applicant's Attorney indicating co-locators will be provided for.

At this point, the report provided by the Environmental Commission was reviewed. The report expressed concern with the access road and the PSE&G road; however it was not clear exactly what the concern was. Mr. Ferrante testified the access road extends to the tower site and does not cross wetlands; the PSE&G road diverges from the access road and crosses over the wetlands. An exhibit will be provided and characterization of the wetlands will be addressed. Mr. Soloway asked if he could contact the Environmental Commission for clarification. Mrs. Wunder will provide the contact information for the Chairperson to Mr. Soloway.

Mr. Powell made a **motion** declaring the application incomplete, with site plan checklist items #10, #19 and #24 of Mr. Rodman's report dated 2/25/11, seconded by Mr. Lippencott.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Lippencott, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes
Mr. Powell made a **motion** to carry the hearing to March 28, 2011, no further notice being required, seconded by Mr. Lippencott.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Lippencott, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes

RESOLUTION

William and Beverly Gordon, Block 2201, Lot 16, Cal. No. 568

Mr. Sarni made a **motion** to adopt the Resolution, seconded by Mr. Powell.

The following terms and conditions applying:

1. The Applicants shall obtain a letter or decision from the Sussex County Health Department verifying that the existing septic system is acceptable to serve the proposed dwelling before a Certificate of Occupancy is issued for the dwelling.
2. Roof drains for the proposed dwelling shall be connected to drywells in accordance with NJDEP Best Management Practices Manual for stormwater discharge.
3. If the road is damaged during construction, Applicant shall repair the same to the satisfaction of the Construction Official of Stillwater Township on 72 hours notice from the Township Construction Official or else the building permit and/or certificate of occupancy may be revoked or withheld.
4. The within variance expires within nine months from the date of this Resolution unless implemented pursuant to the ordinances of Stillwater Township.
5. Applicant shall comply with all other laws, rules and regulations and obtain all required governmental permits and approvals in the implementation of this variance.
6. No permanent certificate of occupancy shall be issued until all conditions of the Resolution have been met.
7. All taxes and fees shall be paid to the Township of Stillwater.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Sarni, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes

OTHER BUSINESS

Courtney Pipher, Block 2401, Lots 57, 59.01, 59.02, Cal. No. 544, Request for Extension of Approval

A letter was received from Courtney Pipher requesting a one-year extension for variance approval originally granted on November 26, 2007, and expiring on December 27, 2010. Following a brief discussion on the matter, Mr. Hammond made a **motion** to grant a nine-month extension, expiration date of November 28, 2011, requiring the applicant to provide adequate notice should the applicant request an additional extension, seconded by Mr. Stachura.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Hammond, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Sarni, yes, Mr. Lippencott, yes, Mr. Stachura, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes

BILLS

Mr. Sarni made a **motion** to pay the following bills, seconded by Mr. Lippencott:

<u>Dolan & Dolan</u> :	General (January 2011)	\$307.65
	Monthly Meeting (January 2011)	\$280.00
	Escrow – Gordon	\$325.50
	Escrow – Habitat for Humanity	\$ 61.50
	Escrow – Cellco Partnership	\$250.00

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Sarni, yes, Mr. Hammond, yes, Mr. Lippencott, yes, Mr. Stachura, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes

Mr. Stachura made a **motion** to pay the following bills, seconded by Mr. Hammond:

Rodman Associates:	Monthly Meeting (January 2011)	\$ 84.75
	Escrow – Gordon	\$339.00

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Powell, yes, Mr. Saal, yes, Mr. Sarni, yes, Mr. Hammond, yes, Mr. Lippencott, yes, Mr. Stachura, yes, Mr. Lockwood, yes

Correspondence:

NJPO Planner

At this point, this portion of the meeting was opened to the public at 9:33 p.m. There being no members of the public wishing to speak this portion of the meeting was closed at 9:33 p.m.

Liaison Report: Committeewoman Straway attended the meeting for Committeeman Gross.

There being no further business, Mr. Powell made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m., seconded by Mr. Hammond. In a voice vote, all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Wunder, Board Secretary

Laurence Lockwood, Chairman