

MINUTES

7:30 PM

PRESENT: T. Ciacciarelli
R. Dodds
P. Lubitz
J. Mathieu
E. Niemann
L. Riggio
J. Strasser
M. Synchron
D. Pierce, Attorney

ABSENT: S. McNicol

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by E. Niemann at 7:31 PM.

NOTIFICATION

In order to ensure full public participation at this meeting, all members of this Board, and members of the public are requested to speak only when recognized by the Chair so that there is no simultaneous discussion or over-talk, and further, all persons are requested to utilize the microphones which are provided for your use by the Township. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Notification of the time, date and place of this meeting has been published in the Hunterdon County Democrat and Courier News, and has been posted in the Kingwood Township Municipal Building at least 48 hours prior to this meeting and has been filed with the Municipal Clerk.

NEW AND PENDING MATTERS

Perrotti Subdivision – Block 23, Lots 11 & 11.01 – County Road 519 – Request for Extension of Major Subdivision Approval

P. Henry, applicant's attorney, was present to request an additional year's extension for the major subdivision approval. The solar facility needs to obtain two more approvals before beginning construction. The applicant would like to preserve the subdivision approval in case the solar facility does not go obtain its last approvals. The extension would go through November of 2015.

It was moved by P. Lubitz, seconded by T. Ciacciarelli and carried to grant a one year extension of the major subdivision approval. All the members present voted **AYE**, except J. Mathieu, who voted **NAY**.

Belle - Block 27, Lot 17.02 – Barbertown Point Breeze Rd – Request for Extension to File Deeds

It was moved by J. Mathieu, seconded by P. Lubitz and carried to grant a 90 day extension of time to file the deeds for Block 27, Lot 17.02. All members present voted **AYE**.

J. Mathieu, L. Riggio and J. Strasser stepped down from their positions on the Board for the following matter.

Mammaro – Block 17, Lot 8 – Route 12 – Conditional Use Application – Hearing

G. DeSapio, attorney for Accurate Waste Systems, was present this evening, along with P. Hunkele, applicant, S. Risse, engineer from Bayer-Risse Engineering and R. Kuc, ecologist from Eastern States Environmental Associates.

G. DeSapio stated the applicant requested the ability to return to address some issues raised at last month’s meeting. One issue was if it is appropriate for the Board to request the applicant to obtain an LOI and submit a full site plan application. He stated it is the applicant’s position that the present applicant does not intend to change anything about the nature of the site, improvements or use of the site, except for a different commercial use. Testimony on both issues will be provided this evening. In the interim, the applicant has received D. Banisch’s memo dated November 12, 2013. He will tailor his presentation around the memo. The applicant is providing to the Board a more detailed drawing than the one submitted for the October meeting. The additional map will be marked Exhibit A-4 and titled Conditional Use Site Layout Plan for Accurate Waste Systems, Inc. dated October 21, 2013 prepared by Bayer Risse Engineering. He distributed a copy to the Board members. He stated the map is not available in an electronic format.

S. Risse was sworn in by D. Pierce.

S. Risse stated his business is located at 78 Route 173 West, Hampton. He is a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey. He has been a professional engineer since 1992 and in his business since 1994. He provided a brief statement of his educational and professional background.

G. DeSapio requested the Board determine that S. Risse is qualified to testify as an expert. The Board agreed.

S. Risse testified that he had prepared Exhibit A-4.

G. DeSapio reviewed D. Banisch’s memo:

1. We have reviewed the following information in preparation of this report:
 - Checklist for Conditional Use application, dated 9/9/13;
 - Zoning Permit Application for Accurate Waste Systems and Applied Waste Water;
 - Existing Features Plan, Lot 8, Block 17, consisting of one (1) sheet, prepared by Charles E. Saladin, JR PLS; and
 - Photographs of adjoining Block 17, Lot 19, 866 Route 12.

G. DeSapio stated #1 is an observation of what D. Banisch reviewed and the applicant does not need to address the comment.

2. This is an application for conditional use approval for the “Service Contractor’s Truck and Equipment Storage” in the BP zone. §132-35.D(3) permits “Mechanical and business equipment storage, contractor yards and construction businesses . . . under the same ordinance conditions for wholesale greenhouses.

G. DeSapio stated #1 is an observation of the type of application the applicant is making and the applicant does not need to address the comment.

3. Based upon the information submitted, it appears that this application should be for combined conditional use and site plan approval. Conditions establishing the need for site plan approval appear to be established as indicated in comment #11 below.

G. DeSapio stated he would like to hold #3 until #11.

4. Article VI, §132-102.M. identifies the following requirements for “Greenhouses/agricultural wholesale” uses:

- (1) Wholesale greenhouses shall be set back a minimum of 150 feet from the public right-of-way.
- (2) A buffer screen planting shall be provided around the perimeter of each greenhouse where such structure is visible from the public right-of-way. The buffer area shall be located within 50 feet of the greenhouse structure, be a minimum of 25 feet in depth and shall be otherwise provided in accordance with § 132-54, Performance standards for all uses.

- The application states that the building on Lot 8 is “located more than 150 feet from State Highway 12.” *The setback dimension should be provided on a plan.*
- The application states that “Photographs 1 and 2 attached to this application show that there is a planting buffer which shields the building and equipment parking from view;”

G. DeSapio stated #4 is an observation D. Banisch made about the application and what provisions of the ordinance apply to this application. In response to the first bullet point, S. Risse testified the building on Lot 8 is 259.2’ at its closest point.

5. Application states that:

- “. . . no modifications to the building or site are proposed by the applicant.”
- “. . . the building on site will be occupied by two employees, who will be present 5 days per week to perform light maintenance on equipment, brakes jobs, oil changes, repair light and perform work around the site.”
- Equipment to be stored on site, includes:
 - FARQ tanks - Large storage tanks which are transported empty to location of need, never transported full and will never contain any material on the Kingwood site (approximately 2);
 - Dredge (1);
 - Storage of pumps and other equipment in the building;
 - 5 truck tractors; 7 truck trailers; and
 - Tank trucks – straight trucks (5) ranging in size from 3,500 to 6,000 gallons.

G. DeSapio stated #5 is a recital of the information provided on the application. No further testimony will be given on #5.

6. The application states that “The present use of the lot is for an excavating business and farm nursery operation. The proposed use . . . is for a service contractor’s truck and equipment storage for a licensed liquid waste hauling business and support services. No waste is stored or returned to the Kingwood site, just trucks and equipment would be staged there.”

G. DeSapio stated #6 is a further recital of what the application shows.

G. DeSapio stated testimony was given last month in response to #5 and 6.

7. The existing features plan shows a gravel entrance driveway, and a combination asphalt and gravel driveway that encircle a 42’ x 118’ building. Along both sides of the asphalt portion of the driveway are a total of 14 “concrete block material storage bins” that are used by the present excavating business and farm nursery operation. There is existing trailer storage/parking along the westerly side line adjacent to a Locktown Road residential property line.

G. DeSapio stated #7 is an observation of what D. Banisch observed at the site. He will supplement the comment with a little testimony from S. Risse.

S. Risse identified the area of asphalt on the map. He stated it is located at the end of the building and underneath the concrete blocks on the south side of the entrance driveway. The rest of the area is gravel. The traffic pattern will be through the entranceway to the north side of the building, around the westerly side of the building, along the southerly side of the building and out the northerly side. He testified north is at the top of the page and south is on the bottom of the page. The areas on the map that are marked as employee and truck parking are not delineated but just available parking areas for trucks and automobiles. He measured the area and did some sort of graphic demonstration of how many vehicles can fit in the area. The applicant has indicated he is not going to make any changes to the building and parking areas and the existing improvements are sufficient for his purposes and no changes will be made. It is his understanding that the concrete storage bins will be removed. The bins had been used by the current owner for mulch or gravel. They are readily removable and not anchored to the ground.

8. Existing site conditions not shown on the plan include a large pile of asphalt “millings” located to the south of the existing building. A dirt pile is located adjacent to the asphalt millings. An abandoned compacted earth go-cart track is located south of the pile of millings, which is no longer in use.

G. DeSapio stated he will recall P. Hunkele, who was sworn in last month. P. Hunkele stated he is aware of the millings on the property and his understanding with the current owner is that the millings will be removed. P. Hunkele indicated on the map the go-cart track, which is located south of the building. He testified the current owner is going to seed it and it will return to hay production.

9. §132-54 requires buffering at least 50’ in width and planted accordance to ordinance standards. This is a conditional use requirement and is not addressed on the Existing Features Plan.

S. Risse testified there is a natural vegetative buffer around the entire perimeter of the property. On the enlargement portion of A-4, lower right hand corner, he depicted generally where the buffer area was located along with some dimensions. The buffer required around the greenhouse building is 50’. In various points in the tree line, the depth of the vegetative buffer is 25’. The growth extends past the property line. The actual buffer is not entirely on the applicant’s property but is greater than 25’.

G. DeSapio stated the applicable section of the ordinance is 132-102.M.2, which addresses conditional uses reads as follows:

A buffer screen planting shall be provided around the perimeter of each greenhouse where such structure is visible from the public right of way. The buffer area shall be located within 50’ of the greenhouse structure, be a minimum of 25’ in depth and shall be otherwise provided in accordance with 132.54.

G. DeSapio stated the applicant’s proposed use would require a buffer of 25’. The map shows for most of the area it is a minimum of 25’ and he is prepared to talk to the Board in the areas where it is less than 25’. The applicant would be willing to enhance the buffer if it is currently insignificant. He stated with the testimony and supplement map, there should be enough before the Board for them to evaluate if sufficient buffer exists or it needs enhancement in some areas.

10. In the absence of buffering details, it does not appear that consistency with conditional use standards in the ordinance may be evaluated.

11. §132-110.A requires a preliminary site plan application for modifications to an existing nonresidential use. This application appears to require site modifications (i.e. removal of existing landscaping bins, removal of asphalt millings, site restoration, building modifications, parking and circulation improvements). A site plan and application should be submitted.

G. DeSapio stated the applicant understood that they had met the two conditional use standards, buffering and setbacks. The existing operation has been there since 1987 and the applicant is not making any changes so there would be no need for a site plan. D. Banisch is stating that the application is requiring site modifications. The current owner intends to remove the landscaping bins, which are not permanent fixtures. They are blocks not affixed to anything. The applicant thinks the removal of the bins would enhance the site. If their removal triggers a site plan, the applicant can leave them there. The applicant is trying to not do anything which would trigger a site plan. The applicant is proposing to remove them because they are not fixtures, would enhance the site and make it more attractive. The asphalt millings are not a fixture. It is not a modification which would trigger a site plan. As an example, he stated if there was a junk car at the back of the property and the applicant proposed to remove the junk car, he would hope it would not trigger a site plan. The removal of the items would clean up the appearance of the property. The applicant is proposing site restoration and doesn't propose any improvements except to remove the blocks and clean up the site. There are no intended building modifications or parking and circulation improvements.

G. DeSapio inquired of the Board if they felt that it was a large issue that a site plan may have been required in 2006 when certain improvements were done and since it was not done in 2006, it should be done now. E. Niemann responded yes.

P. Mammaro was sworn in by D. Pierce.

P. Mammaro stated he lives at 187 West Portal Road, Asbury, NJ. He has owned the property for 28 years. The property has been used for a landscaping, paving and nursery growing business since he has owned it. The drawing shows there is an existing Morton building. The property originally had six greenhouses south of the parking area between where the gravel ends and the go-cart track. The flooring in the greenhouses was 1.5" clean gravel. The greenhouses were removed in 1989-1990. He kept two of the greenhouses. He seeded the area with hay. In 2008 he installed the bins over the gravel area to separate the different types of material he was offering for sale to the public. He located the bins since the gravel was already there and could be seen from the road. He placed some paving over the gravel under the bins to alleviate him picking up the gravel when he sold the mulch. Between 2006 and 2008 he made the area a little smaller.

G. DeSapio asked R. Dodds to put the pointer in the triangular planted area, which is identifiable and see if it existed in 2006. He submitted that the reference to the triangular area confirms the P. Mammaro's testimony that he did not extend the area. It is at the end of the triangular area in 2008.

G. DeSapio asked P. Mammaro if he thought he was doing any wrong. P. Mammaro responded he did not think there was a law preventing paving in an area. He had done paving all over the state and never has obtained a permit. He did not consciously do anything wrong.

G. DeSapio stated the applicant respectfully believes that what happened in 2006 should not trigger the necessity of a site plan today. On the assumption that maybe it should have triggered a site plan in 2006, someone could argue because of the paving, the applicant is prepared to make a proposal to the Board to deal with this situation. The proposal for the Board is based upon the fact that two things could have happened in 2006. The zoning officer would have come around and informed the owner that he could not put down the asphalt and bins unless he obtained a site plan. The owner would have then been faced with two choices, to

come in and get site plan approval or remove the offending condition. If it was removed there would be no need for site plan approval.

G. DeSapio asked of P. Hunkele if after last month's meeting, he would consider whether or not he might agree to do something in the area which was constructed in 2006 if the Board requested it. P. Hunkele responded yes.

G. DeSapio marked a plan titled 2006 Site Expansion Reclamation Plan prepared by Bayer Risse and dated on October 21, 2013, Exhibit A-5.

S. Risse confirmed his firm prepared the drawing marked as Exhibit A-5. S. Risse stated he was requested to compare the differences between 2006 and what is currently on the site. On the plan, he proposed, if the Board desired, to remove the area and revegetate and refarm it. He identified and calculated the space to be 6,406 sq ft. He testified it is practicable and accomplishable.

P. Hunkele testified if the Board wanted this area reverted back to what it looked like in 2006, he agrees to perform the reclamation.

G. DeSapio stated the essence of his presentation is that nothing happened in 2006 that would have triggered a site plan. The improvement was gravel and it was paved. There is no need for site plan approval for pavement. If he had been cited, he would have torn it up and restored it to a natural area but would not be required to get into a full blown site plan. The applicant is offering to remove the bins and leave the area as it is or remove the bins and restore the 6,406 sq ft area and put it into a natural state.

P. Hunkele testified there is some urgency or need to try and move forward without having to go through a full site plan. If the Board requires a full site plan, it would put this project out of reach for him, with money being the biggest factor. Its tough times for everyone, especially small businesses. There are uncertainties of how the Affordable Health Care Act will affect his company. A big portion of his business is residential septic. A lot of households don't have that money. It is recommended for a septic to be pumped every two or three years but if a person does not have the money, they don't do the pumping. His sales are down and with fuel and healthcare costs these are tough financial times.

12. §§132-53.C(1) (a) and (b) identify pavement standards. The Existing Features Plan does not appear to comply with these sections of the ordinance for (a) areas of ingress or egress, loading and unloading areas, interior driveways or access aisles and other areas likely to experience similar heavy traffic, or for (b) parking areas and other areas likely to experience similar light traffic. Drive aisles and parking spaces are not dimensioned as per ordinance or for the types of vehicles described as part of the proposed use and no area is defined for employee parking.

P. Hunkele testified that he does not intend to change any of the existing parking or driveways on the site except if the Board wanted removal of some of the asphalt. He stated the current conditions are adequate for his needs. No private customers will come to the site. The only people that come to the site are his employees or vendors. He is familiar with each of the vehicles used in his operation and does some of the driving himself. There are no physical constraints on the site to his operation.

13. The existing features plan does not identify parking areas and outdoor storage equipment areas. A plan should be submitted identifying parking and vehicle and equipment storage areas for truck tractors, trailers, straight trucks, dredge and FARQ tanks. Employee parking should be identified.

P. Hunkele testified the employee parking will be on the south side of the building in the hash marks which are not perpendicular to the building lines on the plan. There will be longer parking areas further to the south which is currently used by the owner.

14. Applicant should confirm whether the existing excavating business and farm nursery operation will be discontinued as part of this application.

P. Hunkele testified the current use will be discontinued. He will continue having the property hayed twice a year.

15. Applicant should state whether the existing concrete block material storage bins will be removed and provide details of site restoration.

P. Hunkele testified the concrete block storage bins will be removed. The asphalt and gravel will be removed and the area returned back to an agricultural application. In regards to where the millings are located, the area will be restored. Gravel will be used to maintain the current gravel areas.

16. Applicant should state whether the existing pile of millings and topsoil will be removed and how the site will be restored. This should be detailed on a plan. The status of the existing go-cart track should be addressed. The applicant should identify where the millings to be removed from the site will be located, and confirm that this material will not be stockpiled at another location in the Township.

P. Mammaro testified the millings will be removed by the end of the month. The go-cart track will be restored and seeded with hay.

17. Building modifications required to conduct the truck and equipment service activities should be described in the application.

P. Hunkele testified there will be no building modifications.

18. Signs and site lighting and hours of operation of lighting should be identified on a plan.

P. Hunkele testified there will be no signs or site lighting.

19. Hours of operation should be identified on a plan and identify hours for regular truck and equipment pick up and drop off in the am and pm hours.

P. Hunkele testified hours of operation will be from 5:00 AM to approximately 3:00 PM, except when an emergency occurs after the regular hours.

20. Noise will be generated by vehicles that will be picked up in the am and parked and stored overnight. The location of proposed parking of trucks and noise generating activity should be located away from existing residential uses. Noise levels generated by the vehicles to be stored on site should be identified for conformity with ordinance standards at the property line.

P. Hunkele stated most of his equipment is 5 years or less and they meet a certain decibel ratings in exhaust noises. The trucks are no louder than a car. He stated all of their trucks are real-time GPS tracked. With fuel being a considerable expense, the trucks are warmed up approximately 10 minutes in the winter and 5 minutes in the summer.

21. Information should be submitted regarding the presence/absence of on site environmental features that are subject to regulation.

E. Kuc was sworn in by D. Pierce.

E. Kuc stated he is a principal ecologist with Eastern States Environmental in Kunkeltown, PA. He provided his educational background to the Board. He has been with the firm for 23 years. Prior to joining Eastern States Environmental he worked for the NJDEP. He stated he was involved in the initial development of the Freshwater Wetlands Act.

The Board accepted his credentials and determined him able to provide expert testimony

E. Kuc testified he was engaged to do a wetlands review of this particular parcel. He was originally requested to evaluate the overall property from a standpoint of determining the extent of how the property would be limited with the Freshwater Wetlands Act. He prepared his evaluation in April of 2013. He did not prepare a detailed wetlands determination. He went to the site, did a field inspection, determined what areas of the site are considered jurisdictional wetlands by the DEP, determine the problems areas, the resource value classification, buffer zones and the potential utilization of the property.

G. DeSapio had the drawing E. Kuc prepared as Exhibit A-6.

E. Kuc testified he did not prepare a detailed wetlands delineation for submission to the DEP. He studied what areas of the property could be considered to satisfy the areas as jurisdictional wetlands. They are indicated as the crosshatched areas on the plan. The wetlands extend to the agricultural field to the east, the south region of the property and offsite to properties to the west. The reason they review offsite properties is that transitional areas do not respect property lines. Also determined to be wetlands is a triangular area of trees off of the northern corner. Those areas would satisfy the criteria of jurisdictional wetlands. The wetlands are adjacent to the markings. He was recommended by S. Risse and retained and hired by Accurate Waste System. He was contracted to review the overall property, determine the limitations should the applicant want to utilize the entire property, and advise what kind of regulatory approvals would be necessary from the DEP with the proposed possible use. He is familiar with the regulatory requirements of the State of NJ as he has been involved with the application of other LOIs. He stated an LOI is a verification of the wetlands lines on the property. It is not a permit should one desire to utilize a property differently than it is at present. An LOI will legally verify where the wetlands and buffers are on a property. There is no requirement to obtain an LOI before activities are conducted on a property. If activity is conducted on a property without an LOI and it is conducted in a wetlands or buffer area, a violation notice may be issued. The time frame to obtain an LOI from the DEP would be four to six months on a parcel this size. He testified it would be the expenditure of a significant amount of money for results that are irrelevant to the purpose of the project. He testified that an owner can continue an existing operation in a wetlands or wetlands transition area. He could not cut down the woods to make more cultivated fields. As long as the applicant uses the site without any changes to the improvements of the property, they require no permits or approvals from the DEP. There have been no DEP violations that have been issued or allegations that there is a violation of the Freshwater Wetlands Act for the property. He stated the restoration of the 6400 sq ft area to an agricultural use is a benefit. He stated the imagery he provided was from the NJGeo website. He stated only field inspection can verify limitations. Some of the sites use a combination of old soil data and aerial photography. They are sometimes very accurate and sometimes they are extremely off in their delineations. The delineation on this property is inaccurate. There are definitely wetlands in the wooded area but the site does not indicate that area as wetlands. If he was delineating the property, his delineation would match more closely with the map he provided to the Board for last month's meeting. In this area, topography, soils and vegetation show a wetlands where NJGeo wetlands

does not and is a prime example of why these maps are not reliable. Through an OPRA request, he checked to make sure there are no DEP violations on the property. He did not check for any violations on the surrounding properties. He reviewed the map and indicated where he would determine jurisdictional wetlands would be present. He reviewed the differences between wetlands and jurisdictional wetlands to the Board. In a response to a question by a Board member that the installation of the bins was a change of use, he stated if you review the overhead from 1995, there was some type of disturbance in the area. By a strict interpretation, perhaps having the bins in a wetlands transitional area might have been a violation but would have to be interpreted by the DEP. At a maximum it would have been a use within a wetlands transitional area in an already disturbed area. In this type of case, conclusive evidence would have to be found. There is no conclusive evidence looking at the maps. In relation to a wetlands disturbance, the DEP would not look at something of that small of a character. If a violation was issued, there are three options, claim an exemption, deem it an agricultural operation or restore to the original condition. I consider impervious coverage as water cannot readily percolate down through the surface and create a quick easy run off situation having virtually no absorption. I would consider millings, compacted gravel and dirt as impervious surfaces. Different regulations pertain to impervious coverage in different circumstances. Previously compacted gravel was not considered impervious but now it is generally accepted as impervious. His determinations are based on a field inspection he completed. Converting the go-cart track into an agricultural use is not a regulated activity. The area around the building is a regulated area but utilizing what is there for the applicant's purpose does not require any DEP approval or waiver. An LOI would not be recommended and would not provide any additional information. If the property was going to be developed, an LOI would be recommended. Once the wetlands are delineated in the field, a person is extremely limited to what you can do on a property except for agricultural uses. The intermediate wetlands on the western portion of the property extend 50' onto the property.

S. Risse testified he does not have the wetlands plotted on the plan. He identified the dotted lines on the plan being the building setback.

E. Kuc testified that the tree line would be in the wetlands transitional area. The wetlands transitional area would probably extend further than the 50' side yard setback. The wetlands transitional area extends into the area that is disturbed and the continued utilization of the area does not constitute a regulated activity because it is already disturbed. If the use is changed from agricultural to some other use, it would be regulated.

22. This report represents our review comments on the information received to date. We will continue our review of this application and submit comments once additional information is received.

P. Mammaro testified the millings will be removed from the site to an area outside of Kingwood. There is a well on the property but no septic system. He testified the current activity on the site is nursery, hay, landscaping, paving and excavating. He testified all of his equipment will be removed, including the large tractor trailer.

P. Hunkele testified the site will not have any lights. The bathroom facilities will be through Port-A-Johns. The well is located on the eastern end of the barn. He testified that approximately seven to eight trucks will be dispatched from the site daily.

P. Lubitz commended the applicant for a very complete presentation.

D. Pierce stated, in reference to #9, regarding the vegetative buffer required for this application, the required screening is 25'.

G. DeSapio stated the ordinance pertains to the buffer from the property line. He is not sure if the buffer area was surveyed. If the applicant must install additional buffering to meet the ordinance requirements he is agreeable.

P. Hunkele testified he is willing to install additional screening if necessary.

It was moved by P. Lubitz, seconded by T. Ciaccarelli and carried to grant approval of site plan and a conditional use with conditions for Block 17, Lot 8. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

J. Mathieu, L. Riggio and J. Strasser resumed their positions on the Board at this time.

Proposed Site Plan Ordinance Amendment

D. Pierce stated the ordinance before the Board contains the revisions suggested at last month's meeting.

It was moved by R. Dodds, seconded by M. Synchron and carried to recommend introduction and adoption on first reading to the Township Committee. All members voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

Approval of Minutes

It was moved R. Dodds, seconded by P. Lubitz and carried to approve the minutes of October 10, 2013. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**, except J. Mathieu, L. Riggio and J. Strasser who **ABSTAINED**.

APPLICATION STATUS

CORRESPONDENCE

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by P. Lubitz, seconded by R. Dodds and carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:09 PM. All members present voted **AYE**.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Laudenschach, Secretary