

**WALL TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING  
MUNICIPAL MEETING ROOM  
SEPTEMBER 14, 2009**

Chairman Aromando called to order the regular meeting of the Wall Township Planning Board at 7:40 P.M. Members present were Ralph Addonizio, Laurie Aromando, first alternate Kristin Coman, Dominic DiRocco, Timothy Farrell, Mary Hearn, Todd Luttmann, Attorney Cramer, Engineer Rooney, Planner Bergailo, Planning Board Secretary Lang, Planning Board Recording Secretary Schinestuhl and Court Reporter Arnone. Members M. Clayton, Newberry, T. Clayton and Bednarski were not present.

Chairwoman Aromando announced the meeting was being held in accordance with the "Sunshine Law" and a resolution adopted on January 12, 2009.

**SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

Chairwoman Aromando stated we have three applications on for this evening, Summit/ Wall Associates, Diamond Developers & Courseview and Atlantic Medical Imaging.

**CARRIED APPLICATIONS**

**SUMMIT/WALL ASSOCIATES – PB#8-2008** – 3400 Highway 138, Block 774, Lot 8, OP-2 zone. Application complete: May 19, 2009. Carried from June 24, 2009, September 15, 2008, December 2, 2008, February 23, 2009, February 23, 2009, March 16, 2009, May 18, 2009 and June 1, 2009. Applicant requests approval to construct an office park consisting of two 64,000 s.f. two story building. Site with variances.

Keith Henderson, Esq. appeared for the applicant.

Entered into evidence:

- A-21 Revised preliminary and final site plan
- A-22 Letter from New Jersey Turnpike Authority

- PB-12 Engineering plan review prepared by Charles Rooney dated September 11, 2009
- PB-13 Letter from JCP&L dated September 8, 2009
- PB-14 Water & Sewer review prepared by Roberts Engineering dated August 11, 2009
- PB-15 Water & Sewer review prepared by Roberts Engineering dated September 4, 2009
- PB-16 Wall Township Bureau of Fire Prevention plan review dated September 14, 2009
- PB-17 Planning plan review prepared by Cheryl Bergailo dated September 10, 2009

Sworn by Reporter Arnone:

Jeremy Lange  
John Jahr  
Cheryl Bergailo  
Charles Rooney

Attorney Henderson said he will bring the Board up to date. The Board asked us to go over an interpretation of the developer's agreement. The Board asked us to reduce the building. We have done that. We went back and asked the Township to consider amending the agreement to have the driveway in the buffer. They declined. We went back to NJDOT and said this is the best we can do.

Jeremy Lange gave his credentials which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Lange said he needs to add two more exhibits.

A-23 Rendering of overall layout

A-24 Rendering of grading plan dated August 20, 2009

Mr. Lange, referring to A-15, said the applicant is proposing a 128,000 s.f. building and we changed the driveway in the northeast corner of the site. We relocated the driveway about 30' to the south 75' from the property line. We moved everything to the south and maintained the buffer.

Chairwoman Aromando said you didn't want to put it there originally because of the ramp. Did you get NJDOT approval? Mr. Lange said we are out of their jurisdiction. Everything to the north is not their jurisdiction everything to the south is. The original design we stayed as far back from the ramp as possible. The Board said the buffer was more important so we relocated the driveway to stay out of NJDOT jurisdiction. There will be proper turning movements. We modified the building to 120,000 s.f. We relocated the detention basin. We also added a second dumpster in the back northwest portion of the site. It is outside of the buffer.

Mr. Lange explained they changed the retaining wall. It is still steep. He explained they are asking for two variances. They need a variance for the location of one of the refuse containers in the front yard. We have three frontages and this is a hardship. He said they can't put them all back in the northern portion. Using A-14 he showed the side is very wooded. You are going to look clear over the dumpster. He said they meet the hardship criteria and C-2 criteria.

Chairwoman Aromando asked what the guide rail looks like. Mr. Lange said it is wooden.

Chairwoman Aromando asked if there is a buffer between the guide rail and the farm next door. Mr. Lange said yes and it will be very difficult to see.

Chairwoman Aromando asked about the basin. Mr. Lange said there is a significant amount of highway drainage. The water drains into the woods. There is a lot of erosion. We will control the run-off from the highway. There is a very large basin on the property. It exceeds the criteria. The run-off will be reduced. All water will be stored on site.

Chairwoman Aromando asked for an operation manual and schedule. Mr. Lange said he will submit that.

Mr. Rooney said he is satisfied with the Stormwater Management design.

Mr. Lange explained they are not cutting down any vegetation where the driveway is. He said they are providing significant landscaping. The lights will have outside shields.

Chairwoman Aromando said the guide rail will be 485'. Mr. Lange said we have added it to the plan. He said the driveway and parking lot will be protected. This is a permitted use. We are under the bulk requirements.

Chairwoman Aromando asked him to go through the Engineer's letter. Mr. Lange said he already discussed the variances. He said they added the trash enclosure and moved it out of the buffer.

Mr. Rooney asked would you need additional recycling because of medical office waste. Mr. Lange said he doesn't believe the medical waste is going to be stored outside. This is adequate even for medical use.

Mr. Lange, using A-23, showed the Board where all the land-banked parking will be located.

Attorney Henderson said Wall Township or we can decide when to use the banked parking. Chairwoman Aromando said that would be code enforcement, someone from the township.

Ms. Hearn asked if the banked parking was included in the total parking spaces. Mr. Lange said yes.

Mr. Rooney said how will that occur if the owner decides to use the banked spots. Mr. Lange said he would go into the Planning and Building Departments. He said the banked spots would be a condition of approval.

Mr. Lange went over Ms. Bergailo's review letter. He said the only comment he has is on the third page section 5H, hours for the lighting. We do not have a tenant so at this time it will be dusk to dawn. Chairwoman Aromando asked if the parking lot lighting is more for security. Ms. Bergailo said she would like to see a reduction in light levels after the offices are closed. Put a note to that effect on the plans. Mr. Lange agreed. Chairwoman Aromando asked for the time on that. Mr. Lange said after the last tenant closes. Ms. Bergailo said that is ok. Mr. Addonizio asked how much you are going to reduce the lighting. Mr. Lange said 50% of the lighting maybe more.

Louis Thomson, Allenwood Road, asked where is the overflow of water going to go. Mr. Lange said to the southwest pipe from the highway.

Mr. Thomson said his concern is the water from the parking lot. The run-off is going to be a lot different than what it is now. Mr. Lange said the basin is significantly larger and it exceeds the requirements. Chairwoman Aromando said there will be less run-off once this is developed. Mr. Lange said it will eliminate run-off from the two year storm.

Mr. Thomson said once it is in place the water is going to end up in our fields at our farm. Mr. Lange said the highway run-off is highly polluted. It goes on to your farm. We are going to eliminate all that. Chairwoman Aromando asked if there will be a filtration system. Mr. Lange said yes. He said the water is being filtered and then it will go into the ground as opposed to what is happening now.

John Jahr, traffic expert gave his credentials which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Jahr said his study was done in August 2008. It included traffic on West Hurley Pond Road, Allenwood Road and 138. He went through the study. We show the level of service in 2010. W. Hurley Pond Road is a level A & B, Allenwood & 138 have a level of service A – E. The level service E is southbound on Allenwood now. AAHO gave us some guides. A is the best level and F is the worse. These levels are without the project being built. The project will have no major impact. The site will generate some traffic. In the neighborhood it would be minimal. We did two analysis general office and medical.

Chairwoman Aromando said the maximum allowed would be 50% medical. Mr. Jahr said 50% medical and 50% general office. He explained a good traffic report is as conservative as you can get. He said he predicted what the maximum possible is. The actual level of services are somewhere in between. He explained Allenwood would still have acceptable levels of service with the exception of the southbound side. It is a D in the AM now and will remain a D. The southbound will go to level F, from 80 second delay to over 120 second delay. We do not think this is going to be anything major. We are not changing the zoning.

Chairwoman Aromando said you are saying this will go from E to F. Mr. Jahr said just southbound.

Chairwoman Aromando asked how many cars you are expecting to come out in the PM. Mr. Jahr said their contribution will only be about 90 vehicles. He said the level of service at the driveway will be B & C.

Chairwoman Aromando said there is a lot of concern regarding traffic and I would like all the Board members to have your report. Mr. Jahr said he will submit additional copies so everyone will have one. Mrs. Lang said they need 17 copies.

Chairwoman Aromando said we will carry this application to November 2, 2009.

Attorney Henderson waived the time limits.

**DIAMOND DEVELOPERS & COURSEVILLE, LLC – PB#1-2009** – 5338 Megill Road, Block 913, Lot 16, RR-6 zone. Application complete: January 29, 2009. Carried from April 20, 2009 and June 1, 2009

Gerald Sonnenblick, Esq. appeared for the applicant.

Sworn by Reporter Arnone:

Graham MacFarlane  
Cheryl Bergailo  
Charles Rooney

Attorney Cramer reviewed the file and stated the Board has jurisdiction to proceed.

Entered into evidence:

- A-1 Jurisdictional Items
- A-2 Preliminary & Final Site Plan last revised August 14, 2009
- A-3 EIS prepared by Trident Environmental consultants dated April 2008
- A-4 Stormwater Management dated August 2009
- A-5 JCP&L plan review dated August 2009
- A-6 Aerial map of the project
  
- PB-1 Engineering plan review prepared by Charles Rooney dated February 23, 2009
- PB-2 Planning plan review prepared by Cheryl Bergailo dated February 20, 2009
- PB-3 Revised planning review prepared by Cheryl Bergailo dated February 25, 2009
- PB-4 Memo from Ken Critchlow, DPW, dated February 24, 2009
- PB-5 Wall Township Fire Prevention plan review dated February 3, 2009
- PB-6 E-mail from Denise Siegel, Tax Assessor, dated January 29, 2009
- PB-7 Water/sewer plan review prepared by Roberts Engineering dated July 27, 2009
- PB-8 Planning plan review prepared by Cheryl Bergailo dated September 3, 2009
- PB-9 Engineering plan review prepared by Charles Rooney dated September 10, 2009

Graham J. MacFarlane gave his credentials which were accepted by the Board.

Attorney Sonnenblick said this is an unusual application. Six acres of the site will be developed in Howell. If we were to develop this with the detention basin in Howell there would be room for one residential lot in Wall. That is the way it would work out. We designed a plan with eight lots in Howell and the detention basin in Wall. We went to Howell on November 13, 2008 and received pre approval. Now we have to come to Wall. All traffic and money will go to Howell. We went to Howell and asked if they would agree to a municipal lot line change to give this property to Howell. In our approval from Howell we did have a homeowners association and they would be responsible to maintain the Stormwater basin. I understand why you would not want to have anything to do with this basin. It will be maintained by the homeowners association. It should be the responsibility of Howell to maintain the basin. The only thing in Wall is the detention basin.

Chairwoman Aromando said we did request that we give the property to Howell because they are going to have all the homes and receive all the taxes. The only thing Wall would have would be the basin and the responsibility. You did speak to them. Did you send a letter to them? We have nothing in our records. Is there anything we can put in our files? Attorney Sonnenblick said he did not make a formal request. They stated that we should proceed here first. After tonight I will send a letter based on this meeting. I understand you don't want any responsibility.

Chairwoman Aromando said put something on the record. The Township Committee feels the same as this Board does. I would like to see something from Howell stating that they would not negotiate with Wall.

Chairwoman Aromando said Wall does not want the responsibility and liability of having a detention basin. It would just be a liability. Attorney Sonnenblick said the water would flow through Wall even if the basin is not in Wall.

Mr. Addonizio asked did you ever approach Howell about giving all this to Wall. Attorney Sonnenblick said the majority of the property is in Howell. For the small portion that is in Wall we would rather Howell take the property.

Mr. MacFarlane showed the general location of the property and the boundary. 51 acres are in Howell and eight acres are in Wall. The frontage is on Megill Road. No access in Wall. He showed the layout of the street, services and residential lots. There are eight homes to be constructed in Howell. The site will be accessed by a single road. The property has wetlands. The site does have some constraints. Howell has created some design waivers.

Mr. MacFarlane explained the topography is from west to east. The detention basin will service run-off collected from the development. The basin is a two component system. The basin has been located so it has a 50' perimeter.

Attorney Sonnenblick asked is there an area in Wall where a single family lot can be. Mr. MacFarlane said yes where the basin is proposed, lot 18.09. It can be swapped.

Attorney Sonnenblick asked Mr. MacFarlane to go over Mr. Rooney's report. Mr. MacFarlane said the Stormwater Management meets the bulk requirements except for side yard setback. The Wall ordinance has setbacks for buildings they do not have any requirements for setback of a detention basin, street, curb, etc. He said he does not believe any variances are needed.

Attorney Sonnenblick asked if this would have an effect on adjoining properties. Mr. MacFarlane said no.

Mr. Rooney said the side yard setback should be complied with. No structure should be placed in the setback. Mr. MacFarlane read from the ordinance regarding setbacks. Chairwoman Aromando said you are saying no side yard setback because it does not have a structure.

Attorney Sonnenblick, regarding Item 1.4 in Mr. Rooney's review letter, if Howell did not go along with this at the end of the day it should be the homeowner's responsibility. It would be deed restricted. He said we could not get final approval in Howell. Attorney Cramer suggested some sort of maintenance guarantee.

Mr. Luttman said Howell agreed to the guarantee. Attorney Sonnenblick said no. It would be easier for us to put the basin in Howell as long as the building is there. Mr. Rooney said a maintenance guarantee is only limited to a few years. Attorney Sonnenblick said it is more than

just a two year maintenance bond for a detention basin. Mr. Rooney said he is concerned about indemnification. He is also concerned about liability. Our concern is the homeowners association not doing what they are supposed to do.

Chairwoman Aromando said if they dissolve the association who is left holding the bag. Attorney Sonnenblick said there is liability and maintenance issues. Mr. Luttmann said he finds it difficult that you would be able to guarantee that into the future. Attorney Sonnenblick said Howell will have to step up to the plate.

Attorney Cramer suggested consolidating the lots into one single lot. Move the basin to the next lot over. Keep all the residential and basin in Howell. Put the basin in a conservation easement. He said there is no benefit to Wall to allow this.

Chairwoman Aromando asked about landscaping around the basin. Mr. MacFarlane said there is a landscaping plan. It shows the landscaping around the basin. There will be a 50' buffer around the basin. There will be a small berm. It will not be visible from the road.

Chairwoman Aromando asked who is maintaining the trees, etc. Mr. MacFarlane said the association. Chairwoman Aromando said if that sub-division was in Wall we would take that basin and attach it to one property.

Ms. Bergailo said this Board in the past had it attached to the lot. The homeowner association never works out and then the town has to take over the basin.

Mr. Farrell said in his neighborhood the association has the responsibility of the basin.

Chairwoman Aromando said attach that basin to the homeowner and it would not be the responsibility of Wall.

Attorney Sonnenblick said dealing with Howell and not the association would be best. They would have to take full responsibility.

Mr. MacFarlane, going over Mr. Rooney's review letter, said item 2.2 raises some concerns regarding the wetlands. We are obligated to satisfy the State regulations. Item 2.3.1 he said they will comply.

Mr. Rooney said go back to 2.2 there is wetland delineated on site with no buffer. You need a transition waiver. Mr. MacFarlane said they have received an LOI from DEP. Mr. Rooney asked them to provide him with a copy.

Mr. MacFarlane, referring to item 2.3.2, said it does not meet the definition of a dam. We have to go through DEP for permits so we have to comply. Mr. Rooney said he disagrees it is a dam.

Mr. MacFarlane, referring to 2.3.3, said they will provide the calculations for the proposed collection systems.

Mr. MacFarlane, referring to 2.3.4, said the plan shows access road for the basin on the west side. We have proposed a retaining wall. Ms. Bergailo said she has a problem with the retaining wall. Chairwoman Aromando said kids can get in there. She is concerned about safety. Mr. MacFarlane said they will meet all State requirements. The design is in accordance with all State regulations. It is very low density. This will not generate a great deal of children. The wall will not cause any ponding.

Mr. Rooney said the maintenance of this basin sitting in the woods is going to need a lot of attention. You will get leaves collecting in here. This basin may not fit on this piece of property. We do need more information.

Chairwoman Aromando said we will open up the application to the public at the next meeting. We have to let him finish his testimony first. We are carrying this to November 2, 2009.

Attorney Sonnenblick waived the time limits.

Chairwoman Aromando said no new noticing is required.

9:40 P.M. the Board recessed.

9:50 P.M. the meeting resumed.

**ATLANTIC MEDICAL IMAGING** – PB#-5-2009 – 2399 Highway 34, Block 845, Lot 31, OP-10 zone. Application complete: May 7, 2009. Carried from July 20, 2009. Applicant seeks to construct additional monument sign on south side of Route 34 entrance to be same dimension as existing monument on north side of entrance. Site with variances.

Craig Gianetti, Esq. appeared for the applicant.

Attorney Gianetti explained the applicant is here for a sign variance not to allow a fourth ground sign where three exist but to add to the existing. We submitted revised plans adding AMI to the existing ground sign.

Chairwoman Aromando said she and Ms. Hearn listened to the testimony. There are signed affidavits on file. We will be able to vote.

Entered into evidence:

PB-3 Planning plan review prepared by Cheryl Bergailo dated September 11, 2009

PB-4 Engineering plan review prepared by Charles Rooney dated September 14, 2009

Sean Savage, previously sworn, explained the revised plan. He said they are just expanding the existing sign on 34S.

Mr. Addonizio asked for the size of the existing sign. Mr. Savage said 5' – 7'.

Mr. Addonizio said the new range will be between 6½' – 9'. Mr. Savage said he knows they discussed 1' – 2'. He said that won't be large enough.

Attorney Gianetti went over the dimensions.

Mr. Savage said the sign has an approximate 18½' setback.

Attorney Gianetti asked if there was anything that needed to be addressed. Mr. Savage said no we can comply.

Chairwoman Aromando said all these signs were approved back in 2005. Ramshorn Management came back for a sign variance in 2008. According to our ordinance one freestanding sign for the entire complex is allowed. How many do you have? Mr. Savage said three. Chairwoman Aromando asked how many on the building. One sign per building is allowed. Ms. Bergailo said the building signage complies on this site. They have one AMI sign which is permitted.

Chairwoman Aromando read part of the approval resolution regarding the signs. Mr. Savage said all the signs on site now were approved.

Chairwoman Aromando said you came back in 2008 and now again in 2009. Attorney Gianetti said this is for a specific tenant.

Mr. DiRocco said the original freestanding sign is to the south of the entrance. Mr. Savage said correct.

Mr. DiRocco said you are eliminating the additional sign and considering the expansion of the existing sign. Mr. Savage said correct. Mr. DiRocco said no additional sign you are just expanding. Mr. Savage said correct.

Mr. Farrell said he has gone by AMI many times and there are one or two vehicles parked in the driveway with AMI logos. Is that considered advertising? It is parked out in the street. Attorney Cramer said they are not considered signage according to our ordinance. Signs have to be affixed to something. Mrs. Coman said there is something in our ordinance stating they cannot always be parked there. Attorney Gianetti said he will check the ordinance. These are vehicles they use that have logos on them.

Sanyogita Chavan, Planner, gave her credentials which were accepted by the Board.

Ms. Chavan said she reviewed all the letters and went out to the site. She said she drove around and investigated the area. She also reviewed the Master Plan and the surrounding area. She explained they are proposing to increase the size of the sign. It complies with the ordinance requirements regarding area, height and setbacks. The total amount of signs exceed what is

allowed.

Ms. Chavan said the Board can grant this, the benefits out way the detriment. There is no hardship regarding the sign. It promotes general safety. It is beneficial to the community. She explained it is hard to see the sign driving 55 MPH and on the other side. There is not enough time to get over to make a right turn. It is time sensitive. There is a lot of confusion. Driving northbound they do not see the façade sign. The lettering is not visible.

Attorney Gianetti said the existing sign is insufficient. Ms. Chavan said that is correct.

Attorney Gianetti said you looked at the negative criteria. Ms. Chavan said yes. The sign will be 2' higher. It is not out of scale.

Attorney Gianetti said based on your review the dimensions would not cause a substantial detriment. Ms. Chavan said that is correct.

Chairwoman Aromando said because the sign is larger this is going to bring in more business to AMI. Ms. Chavan said what I am trying to say is the existing sign is not visible enough to locate the facility. With this sign it will be easier to find this building.

Chairwoman Aromando said because your business is serious we should take that into consideration. Ms. Chavan said the sign is not out of character in the area.

Attorney Gianetti said these are not people driving down the road and just decide I am going to AMI. These are patients being referred to AMI and are going specifically to that place.

Chairwoman Aromando said patients are going to get in their car and drive to their appointment. They can use map quest, GPS, etc. Attorney Gianetti said this is based on specific complaints from patients.

Chairwoman Aromando said in 2008 that is why we approved the 300' turn in sign. You put a second sign on 34 which was to notify people that the driveway is coming up. We are going to set a precedence here stating bigger signs are going to make businesses easier to find. You have AMI on the building. You have more than what we normally allow. Attorney Gianetti said the original application was to have an additional sign. The Board said keep the three and make the existing sign bigger.

Chairwoman Aromando said she has serious concerns. Her opinion is you got your shot in 2005 and 2008. She said she really doesn't feel like setting precedence.

Mr. Addonizio said if your patients are late they are not giving themselves enough time to get to the site. He said it could not be any easier to get to your facility. The AMI sign stands out like no other sign in Wall.

Mr. Addonizio said there are street signs under the traffic lights, right. Ms. Chavan said right. Mr. Addonizio said they are not missing. Ms. Chavan said no. Mr. Addonizio said where else in Wall are there signs this large. Ms. Chavan said Shop-Rite. This site is 11 acres. It is a large site.

Attorney Gianetti asked if Ms. Chavan took photos of the signage in the surrounding area. Ms. Chavan said yes the one that jumped out was the Shop-Rite sign. She said she has a GPS and a map quest map. She did not take directions from AMI and she had a hard time finding it. She said she could not get over and make that turn.

Mr. Addonizio said he doesn't think the faculty is giving proper directions. Paynters Road is the first road you come to. He said on the photos he can see the AMI sign on the building.

Mr. Farrell said the Ramshorn sign everything blends in. The letters should be in a color you can see. You can see the AMI sign on the building.

Chairwoman Aromando said her issue tonight is we are going to set precedence. Because they are going to have a serious test we have to make signs bigger.

Mr. DiRocco said our ordinance permits one free-standing sign. He asked for the square footage of the proposed sign. Ms. Chavan said 126 s.f.

Mr. DiRocco said we judge each application on their own merits. It is still within the square footage that is allowed. The applicant came back with something better than what was originally introduced.

Mr. Luttmann said the new sign will be 126 s.f. the two other signs that they have one is 8 s.f. and the other is 12 s.f. What we have done in the past is used the total square footage of all the signs. 146 s.f. is still under the 150 s.f. allowed.

Chairwoman Aromando asked if it was actually 8 s.f. Ms. Bergailo said the existing sign is 36 s.f. That does not include the block. The others are 8 s.f. and 12 s.f.

Ms. Hearn said she agrees that we should look at these on a case to case basis. The existing sign and the sign proposed are much more aesthetically pleasing. I would like to see more signs like this. She said her office is on 138 and after her client's third visit they still can't find her office. She asked the planner if she thinks this will correct the problem. Ms. Chavan said she believes so. Ms. Hearn said it is difficult to read that sign because of no contrast.

Chairwoman Aromando said according to the July 20<sup>th</sup> testimony he said he was not sure this would solve his problem. He said he had billboards on 34 and he is no longer advertising on them.

Attorney Gianetti said he just wants to make sure his patients get to the office.

Mrs. Coman said there needs to be a contrast of colors. You can't see the numbers they blend in.

Mr. Farrell said if approved the actual colors of the sign, layout, back drop should be approved by the planner. He said he goes there all the time and does not have a hard time seeing the sign.

The application was open and closed to the public.

Mr. DiRocco moved to approve the amended site plan subject to payment of taxes. The applicant will comply with the requirements of Freehold Soil Conservation District, Monmouth County Planning Board, Monmouth County Board of Health, NJDEP and NJDOT. The applicant will comply with Wall Township Affordable Housing Trust Fund. The applicant shall comply with the review letters of the Board Professionals. The amended site plan will increase the sign from 36 s.f. to 72 s.f. Ms. Hearn seconded the motion which was approved by a roll call vote. (Mr. DiRocco, Ms. Hearn, Mrs. Coman, Mr. Luttmann voted yes, Messrs. Addonizio, Farrell and Ms. Aromando voted no.) The application was approved.

#### **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

Mr. Addonizio moved to approve the minutes of the Regular and Workshop Meetings of May 4, 2009, May 18, 2009, June 1, 2009, June 15, 2009 and July 13, 2009. Mr. Luttmann seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved by a roll call vote.

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 10:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Schinestuhl  
Recording Secretary