

WHARTON PLANNING BOARD
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING
May 8, 2018

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Wharton Planning Board was called to order with Acting Chairman Roger Steele reading the Open Meeting Statement as required by law.

ROLL CALL was taken and the following members were present: Mayor William J. Chegwiddden, Councilman Thomas Yeager, Mr. Roger Steele, Ms. Charlotte Kelly, Mr. Jared Coursen, Mr. Brian Bosworth and Mr. Peter Rathjens. Also present were Attorney Alan Zakin, Planner Jessica Caldwell, Engineer Christopher Borinski and Secretary Patricia Craven. Excused were Chairman Ken Loury, Mr. Mark Harris, Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Ms. Jennifer O'Malley-Dorr,

The reading of the bills was next. A Motion was made by Jared Coursen and Seconded by Thomas Yeager to approve the bills as read. YEA – 7 NAY – 0

The Minutes of the January Planning Board Meeting was next. A Motion was made by Peter Rathjens and Seconded by Brian Bosworth to approve the Minutes.
YEA -7 NAY- 0

The Minutes of the March Planning Board Meeting was next. A Motion was made by Jared Coursen and Seconded by Peter Rathjens to approve the Minutes.
YEA – 6 NAY – 0 ABST – 1 (Yeager)

The Resolution for Taco Bell was read. Corrections were made, page 6 #21 and page 10 #11 the word “roof” was replaced by the word “façade”. Page 7 #4 should read Municipal Land Use Law. Page 8 #2 the word “though” should be “through”. Page 9, #7 the word “should” is replaced with the word “will” in both lines. A Motion was made by Brian Bosworth and Seconded by Jared Coursen to approve the Resolution as amended.
YEA – 7 NAY – 0 ABST – 2 (Chegwiddden, Yeager)

Next, under new business, was a discussion by Planner Caldwell on the Redevelopment Plan. Ms. Caldwell made the Board aware tonight that the Mayor and Council passed a Resolution R-54-18 that authorizes the Planning Board to undertake an investigation to determine whether all or a portion of certain properties identified on the tax maps of the Borough as Block 1317, Lots 1 through 22 constitutes a non-condemnation redevelopment area. This area is one large block surrounded by N. Main Street, Fern Ave., Second Street and E. Central Ave. She is working on a report right now which should be before the Board in July for a public hearing. She explained the process to the Board.

Next was the continuation of CCKK, LLC and JR-Bon 7. Attorney Alan Zakin summarized for the Board what has happened so far. He stated that Bill Johnson, the Municipal Attorney was in attendance tonight. He stated that he had received a cross easement agreement today from the applicant but was not sure if the Borough Planner and Engineer have had time to review it. There are also 2 new applications, one for a C variance and one is for a use variance. He read into the record his thoughts on how the Board and the applicant should view this proceeding.

"Because of the judicial order underlying this hearing as I discussed, there should not simply be the normal criteria for consideration of new variances. This hearing is mandated by the consent decree I discussed. The sole purpose of this meeting is to swiftly, completely and satisfactorily rectify these issues without having to return to court. There were specific deadlines set. The Board should consider these new "c" and "d" variance applications in this light. If they further the desired outcome of our legal settlement for the benefit of the Borough, they should be accepted. If these new applications do not meet that criteria, they should be rejected, to be considered at a later time, on their own merits, once these outstanding legal issues that have brought us here today are resolved. The Applicant should be mindful of this criteria as they discuss the benefits of these new applications." Attorney Johnson had nothing more to add. Ms. Ermel stated that she and Mr. Johnson had a discussion earlier this evening, to move things forward, about the conservation easement which is not part of this application. They have provided to the Borough reports and recommendations from the Mine experts and Forester. They are before this Board for an amended site plan and are committed to remedying the issues. She feels they had made progress at the last meeting.

Ms. Ermel stated that CCKK, LLC is the owner of Lot 20 in Wharton and Lot 2 in Rockaway. They are here before the Board for Amended and Final Site Plan approval with regard to the previously improved access drive for Building D & E, the inclusion of an additional access drive to Buildings D & E and inclusion of the western retention wall along the detention basin. They are seeking a C variance for the height and terracing of that wall on Lot 20 which they now are withdrawing because they have made changes to the wall that will keep it within the 8-foot height requirement. At our last meeting they went through the issues of waivers and they are seeking a waiver on Items #24,25,27 and 31. Also before the Board is JR Bon 7 application which is Lot 23, Building G and Lot 23.1, the water tower. They are seeking a Use Variance for Lot 23 which was a previously approved parking area for trucks but now they are looking for outside storage of equipment and materials on that parking area. This area is beyond the water tower. They are also seeking a variance for the height of the Eastern retaining wall. The height is over 8 ft and there is no terracing. For this application they are looking for waiver for Item #24 & 31.

Ms. Ermel stated that they are here tonight for the CCKK, LLC application for the 2 driveways and the retaining wall. The parking lot part of the JR Bon application will be heard at the May 15th, 2018 meeting when Mr. Fantina will be in attendance. The wall part of that application will be heard tonight,

Mr. Steele asked about the variance for the approved parking lot and when was it approved. Attorney Zakin had researched this with Planner Caldwell and Engineer Borinski and found that there was no variance but it was on the site plan that was approved. Looking at the intent from the minutes and the plans it appears that it would be used as truck parking for the tenants of Building G. Ms. Ermel stated that they are looking to change that into a storage area both for equipment and materials. The reason for this is that this site has changed from not just an industrial site but also a recreational site with children. This would keep the equipment and materials away from the areas with children. Mr. Borinski stated that it was shown on the plans as truck parking but was not mentioned in the Resolution from 2012. Mr. Steele feels this needs

to be addressed. Ms. Ermel will do some research on this and be prepared to address this issue next week.

Kevin Robine of Dykstra Walker was sworn in and qualified as an expert in Engineering. Mr. Robine referred to A-1, 1/30/18 Color Rendition of the amended site plan and pointed out on the westerly side of Lot 20, Buildings E & F which are under construction and located in Rockaway Township. There are looking for approval of improvements to the access drive leading from Building C up to Building D and Buildings E & F in Rockaway Township. The easterly access drive will be discussed by Mr. Fantina at our next meeting. The access drive was shifted to the northwest to provide safe and efficient site circulation. There will be an increase of impervious coverage of 2,888 sq. ft. on Lot 20, an increase of 43.6% which is still conforming. There is no impact to the storm water do to the westerly access drive. Building E has been reduced to allow for the new access drive as well as reduction in a parking area in Rockaway Township which reduces the impervious coverage. He pointed out the 2 detention basins that handle this area. From a storm water management standpoint there are no impacts due to the shift of the access drive due to the reduction in coverage. They are regrading around the existing westerly wall to limit the exposed height of the wall to a maximum of 8 feet. They will submit their plans to Mr. Borinski and a structural engineer for their review. This grading will not have any impact on the detention basin.

Mr. Robine went over Engineer Borinski's report dated 4/18/18

#23 – The plan will be revised.

#24 – no objection

#25 – no impact

#26 – no objection

The circulation will be addressed by the Traffic Engineer and will be shown in the revised plans.

Pat Turzi, Property Manager of the site addressed the Board. He oversees construction on the site which included the construction of both the easterly and westerly walls. The boulders that were used to construct the walls came from the site and were placed by a machine excavator. The fill material behind the rocks also came from the site. For each course of boulders that were installed the fill gets placed behind the boulders and compacted at that time so that the course of boulders doesn't shift. The west wall has one line of boulders with fill behind the front boulders and the east wall has one line of boulders behind it but the upper portion of that wall there are multiple boulders behind it. The upper boulders can be seen from both sides. They have not had to repair or modify either wall. They are planning on removing the upper layer of the westerly wall and regrading and remove a couple courses from the easterly wall. When they remove the boulders, they plan to stockpile them and within 30 days bring in a crusher to crush some of the boulders and utilize the crushed stone throughout the site. They may use some of the boulders throughout the site as well or sell them. They have no specific spot where they will stockpile them. Both walls will have boulders removed, the western wall will still need a variance. The walls were built and the, after the fact, looked at by an engineer; reverse engineering. Neither walls were on the original site plan. The fill dirt they used was native material from both the Rockaway site and the Wharton site. They have started on the water main construction on the Rockaway site this past Monday and should be done in a week.

Brian Bosworth was concerned about the safety of children climbing on these walls. This area is not a business/industrial area anymore but is turning into somewhat of a recreation area. His opinion is that they have created a hazard nuisance. Mr. Turzi stated that the westerly wall is somewhat sheltered. He stated that so far they have constructed 300,000 sq. ft. with 4 buildings and of that approximately 30,000 is recreation, about 10%. The gun range was approved but not in use and is another 9,000 sq. ft.

Building D – no recreation

Building A – Haunted House – farthest from both walls

Building B – Tumbling – 4,000 sq. ft.

Building C – Baseball – 8,000 sq. ft.

Gym – 4,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Turzi's office is in Building B and looks out at the parking lot between Building B & C. He pointed out the eastern wall which is south west of Building G and opposite of Building C. Ms. Ermel stated that children would have to roam through the parking and loading areas of the parking lot to get to the wall. Mr. Turzi stated that his office overlooks that parking lot and he has not see unattended children playing in the parking lot. Ms. Ermel stated that if the children were properly attended by the parents they wouldn't be free to roam the site. The entrance to Building C is on the other side of Building C. Mr. Bosworth stated that they will be constructing Building G up on the top above the wall and Mr. Turzi will not have visibility to that area. He stated that the point is that the recreation is 10% now but in another 4 years it could be at 50%. Mr. Turzi agreed and stated that that is why they have been working with the Chief of Police and have been making improvements to the site in respect to lighting, signage and striping to try and accommodate the other uses. Roger Steele feels the walls need to be compliant.

Harold Tepper was sworn in and qualified as a Structural and Geotechnical Engineer. He has visited the site 4 times and has looked at both the East and West walls.

A-1, 5/8/18 Rockery Retaining Wall Investigation dated 3/15/18 was marked into evidence. This report was prepared by Mr. Tepper of Tepper Associates. He was retained to look at the 2 walls on the property, the east and west retaining walls, to determine their suitability for continuing service, do they require any modifications and what is the status of these walls. They have both been in service for a few years. He found in his research that there are no codes for rubble walls. He found a document called "Rockery Design and Construction Guidelines" published by the Federal Highway Administration of the US Dept. of Transportation dated 11/2006. He adopted this for the basis for his investigation. This is based on rock walls built on the west coast primarily in Washington State, Idaho and Colorado. This report has good information and guidelines for the evaluation of rockery walls not just from a strength mathematical view point but also from looking at the material used in these walls. He took observations and drawing that were prepared by the applicant's engineers, that provided him with the bottom and top elevations of the wall. He also used the Geotechnical Investigation Report that was done on the property when they built the first building which told him about the soil that the rock walls were built on. They couldn't do a typical boring approach because there are too many stones so they dug test pits. The underlying formations for the Highlands area in New Jersey and for most of Wharton is gneiss and granite. He stated that you can't get much stronger than that in terms of materials. He stated that the walls are gravity retaining walls which primarily function and restrain earth by their weight. He cannot see behind the wall so he relied on Mr. Turzi as to how the wall was

constructed. There was one issue he took issue with - what is the allowable height of a wall. He looked at the wall in 2 perspectives, one was their quality, how sound are they, how good are they and what are the formation of the stone. Here we have good formation of stone. In his report he equates what he observed and what he was told to what are acceptable for this kind of wall. In addition to that he also did a structural analysis. In his opinion the walls can remain as they are. He did make recommendation that would enhance the future life of the walls. He feels the walls are structurally sound and suitable for continued service subject to his recommendations.

His recommendations are:

1. - the space in the wall be filled with a cementitious or grout material. Mr. Borinski does not recommend this because when you clog up the holes you prevent water from getting out of the holes. His recommendation was to just leave the lower rocks holes open. He is ok with leaving all the holes open as Mr. Borinski suggested. Knowing what the soil is, he does not believe it will ever allow any penetration of water into it, so he is ok with Mr. Borinski's recommendation.
2. He will refrain from any comment on the west wall until the final grading of that area is done.
3. He does not agree with the grading by the east wall. The key issue is to keep water away from the wall so the east wall will have to be regraded.
4. His recommendation to anything close to the wall or abutting the walls be of a fairly solid substance and would allow water to slope away from the retaining walls.
5. He recommends that these walls be inspected every 2 years by a licensed professional engineer to see if there is any movement or change.

Mr. Tepper addressed Mr. Borinski's memo dated 4/18/18 starting on page 6.

1. The East wall is 670 linear feet and the height is 3.1 at the lowest to 19.7 at the highest. The West wall is 350 linear feet and the height he will defer since changes are to be made on that wall.

The layers on the east wall are 3-4 course and the base is 9 ft. deep

The layers on the west wall are 3-4 courses but that will change and the base is 9 ft. deep. The base is the most critical width and these figures are based on Mr. Turzi's information Both walls are 9 ft deep at the base and vary from 6 ft to 3 ft in depth as you come upward. Neither wall is imbedded into the ground. The placement of the base rocks is on virgin ground, not on fill. His opinion is that the base rocks are satisfactory.

The type of rock is gneiss and granite which is shown on the Bedrock Geologic Map of New Jersey, 2016. Neither wall has any drainage pipes nor any presence of drainage geotextile. The material that was excavated is solid and is native from the site and is porous gravel and sand according to the Geotech reports. You want to keep water away from the back of the wall with grading, coarse gravel and sand. He explained that Geotechnical Engineering deals with soils, earth materials and anything related to rock. Geotextile is a fabric kind of material that lets water go through but keeps back the fines that would be detrimental. Insufficient friction between the bottom of the retaining wall and the earth it is placed on, can cause sliding. One of his analysis is overturning and another is sliding. He considered seismic issues and, in his report, he stated that he does not consider seismic issues to be of consideration. He read from his report about taking seismic issues into consideration if these conditions exist: located within 3 miles of a

fault, long duration earthquakes are expected in the region and importance of structures, he stated retaining walls are not considered such structures.

2. East wall is 3.1 ft at the lowest point and 19.7 ft at its highest point. His recommendation is to remove the rocks to reduce it to no higher than 15 ft. at any point.
West wall will be changing and will inspect it and comment once he sees the grading plan.
3. Thinking is placing small pieces of stone by hand between the rocks – it is more for visual appearance and it doesn't do anything to diminish the strength of the wall. He is ok with this.
4. Walls are good – he was not there when the walls were built.
5. Correct – could not see the back side – here we have rocks, no 2 alike. Going to one location is not representative of the balance of the wall. He does not know what an intrusive investigation would do. He doesn't want to disturb those walls, they are functioning so why cause a problem
6. Correct – could not see the back side
7. Already provided that information. From what is visual there are no fractures or foliation. Foliation is the start of deterioration of the rocks – this is granite. He saw no planes of weakness. His opinion is that testing of the rocks for soundness is not required in this situation.
8. Marked into evidence
A-2, 5/18/18 – 6 Photos of the East Wall
A-3, 5/18/18 – 2 photos of the West Wall
Photos were taken by Mr. Tepper during one of his inspections. They give you an idea of what kind of rock and boulders were used and meet the guidelines presented in the reference that he used. His recommendation of the east wall is to reduce the height in the center of the wall. You can see the back side of this wall. In his opinion the kind of rock used is great for transferring stresses to adjacent rock and materials. There will be changes to the west wall.
9. Many portions of the wall do not have any vehicular traffic traveling along their sides. There is surcharge on a small portion of the East wall for which he has not run the calculations but he anticipates the wall will be satisfactory. On the West wall he cannot comment until all the changes are made.
10. They had a Geotech consultant who excavated test pits and classified the material on the site. Mr. Tepper made no assumptions about the materials behind the wall. Even though the materials were looked at in one particular location on the property, that Geotechnical report was suitable and used for the construction of the buildings throughout the site. The Geotech report was representative of the materials and to say they now have to test behind the wall is a bit of an overreach.
11. Upward slope drainage – they do not have this condition on the East wall which he explained to the Board. He cannot comment on the West wall. He has not investigated any mine shafts on the site but was told by Mr. Turzi that there are no mine shafts on the site that are of any significance to the walls.
12. The need for a Geotechnical Engineer he does not believe is necessary especially with his background and having in his graduate studies taken an advanced course in Geotechnical. He has been involved in Geotechnical applications and also taught senior level courses at GIT to students in soil mechanics and geotechnical, so he considers himself the proper

person to be able to make, in this particular situation, Geotech comments and the investigation. He is not recommending grouting cap rocks for this site.

13. a. Using these charts at this location is not feasible. You have got to run the actual computations to make a decision.
 - b. Just a comment on his part looking at the rocks that are there.
 - c. Information from Mr. Turzi – Mr. Tepper was not on site.
 - d. The issue of height is critical – 15 ft. high is acceptable wall in this project.
 - e. It is available in the Geotechnical Consultant’s Report – his opinion is that one test pit is sufficient, you don’t need multiple test pits. Also, the information he got was that all the materials used behind the walls were from the site.
14. He disagrees. In his report he used conservative values. As far as the soil unit weight they are good in that regard.
15. Global Stability – we don’t have those conditions in these walls. The critical item is the earth and ground in front of the wall.
16. Seismic Design – he spoke about this earlier. He stated that the water line is 5 ft down – he has no issues with buried utilities. If there is a need to dig up these utilities the contractor would be responsible for temporary shoring and supports, taking into consideration the retaining walls. Mayor Chegwiddden stated that the Borough would be the contractor for the sewer and water lines.

Mr. Turzi mentioned that there are mines on the property but not in the area of the walls. Mr. Borinski stated that there are plans that show the mine locations but it is possible that there are none in the area of the walls. He would have to check that.

17. Not addressed
18. There are ways to determine what is behind the wall but all of them are intrusive excavation. Drilling is not feasible. His best source was Mr. Turzi. He believes that if those walls were no properly constructed that they would have already collapsed and he sees no evidence of that taking place.

Mr. Turzi stated that the west wall was started in 2008 and completed in 2017, the east wall was started in 2015 and finished in 2017. Mr. Tepper feels that even though the east wall is only 2 years old if it wasn’t constructed right it would have collapsed and he saw no signs of collapsing. The east wall has an additional loading on it from that part of the wall that extends on the back side. He saw no sign of any of the upper rocks moving out further than the lower rocks. The walls are built on virgin solid material and you have the material in the strongest condition it can be and the material itself, based on the test pits, is superb material. These are assumptions based on what he has been told, which has a lot of fact behind it and his opinion from just looking at the condition of the walls and what is there.

19. There is no stone layer behind the walls.
20. The overflow structure is about 3 ft. lower than the lowest part of the retaining wall so the water cannot reach the retaining wall.
21. Easement was already discussed.
22. 30 ft. encroaches into the easement and will be addressed by to Mr. Fantina
23. He would propose that in the highest areas of the wall they establish survey points with permanent markers that a surveyor can measure from a given vertical line over to the retaining wall. This way you would be able to pick up any movement of the wall.
24. No comments.
25. Previously commented on.

Ms. Ermel summarized Mr. Turrel's testimony in reference to the East Wall

- 1 – Reduction of the wall so that no portion of the wall is higher than 15 feet. Discarding the excess boulders that are removed.
- 2 – Establish Survey Points so that later they can determine if the wall has moved.
- 3 - Chinking on the wall.

Ms. Ermel stated that these items are acceptable.

Mr. Tepper stated that there are professional criteria for this type of wall to be constructed. He stated that the material behind the wall is highly impervious. The grading, which is important, should be graded away from the wall so that the water does not hit the upper portion of the backside of the wall. With chinking and openings, you somewhat alleviate that. This wall has multiple openings in it for draining. If he had a say from the beginning he would have put in drainage. Mr. Steele asked if this exact wall had been presented to the Board to be built like this with drainage and maybe not as high, would it be reasonable for the Board to accept. Mr. Tepper stated yes it would, you would have to have the right materials and the right stones. He believes it was built properly.

Engineer Borinski would like to see the Geotechnical Report that was used to formulate the report. Mr. Tepper agreed. Mr. Tepper's recommendation is that they revise both walls. Mr. Borinski would like to see a draft of both the east and west walls. Mr. Robine will get it to Mr. Borinski in a day or two, Ms. Ermel will reach out to Mr. Fantina for that draft.

Mr. Borinski stated that a portion of the easement is under the highest part of the east wall which is a concern if they need to get to these utilities in the future. Mr. Robine will give more detail of the easement location and the wall on the revised plans. Once the revisions are done Mr. Tepper will have an addendum to his report. Mr. Borinski stated that 2006 FHWA Rockery Wall Manual is the standard for these types of walls. Mr. Tepper stated he did a massive search and before that there is nothing. Mr. Borinski stated that these are not typical materials used for walls. There are similar walls around but not in Wharton. Most are only 3 to 4 ft. high.

Mr. Tepper stated that for future inspections of the walls he would base it on the guidelines that provides criteria for the inspections. He could put something together for an inspector. Mr. Borinski would recommend getting a base line survey points now.

Pat Turzi stated that they are willing to expand the easement further into Lot 20 so that if there is an issue they can run new pipes away from the wall. Right now, there is gas, sewer and water in the easement.

The meeting was open and closed to the public 3 times for questions for Mr. Tepper, Mr. Robine and Mr. Turzi.

At this time Acting Chairman Steele stated that they would take a 5 minute break.

ROLL CALL was taken and the following members were present: Mayor William J. Chegwidden, Councilman Thomas Yeager, Mr. Roger Steele, Ms. Charlotte Kelly, Mr. Jared Coursen, Mr. Brian Bosworth and Mr. Peter Rathjens. Also present were Attorney Alan Zakin,

Planner Jessica Caldwell, Engineer Christopher Borinski and Secretary Patricia Craven. Excused were Chairman Ken Loury, Mr. Mark Harris, Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Ms. Jennifer O'Malley-Dorr,

Gary Dean, Traffic Engineer for Dolan and Dean was sworn in and qualified as an expert Traffic Engineer. Mr. Dean was asked to address the Boards concerns of onsite traffic circulation. His charge is to evaluation the entire property and the proposed Building G and to make way find and circulation through the site better for those not familiar with the site, particularly for the recreation components. He made several visits to the site and observed the driveways and their configuration. He pointed out on A-1 the single driveway into the site from W. Dewey Ave. There is a directory sign just off W. Dewey Ave.

Marked into evidence was:

A-4 – 5/8/18 – color rendition of the Main Directory – showing Building A – G each in a different color.

As you proceed into the site there are 4 driveways off of the main driveway which he pointed out on the plans. He stated that the northerly side of each building is for the employee/customers and the southerly side of each building is for the loading area. The majority of the parking is on the northerly side of each building.

His objective is to provide an easily understood and comprehensive way finding sign package that anybody can follow with 2 queues. The queues come from the main directory sign – not just the color coding for each building but the letter designation for each building.

A-5 – 5/8/18 – Color Rendition Way Finding Sign #1 – What he has done is used as simple a scheme as possible that keys to the existing color coding of each building. This is a photo rendering of similar industrial way finding signs. What you will see is the building number with a simple arrow right at the edge of the road at each key decision point throughout the site.

A-6 – 5/18/18 – Color Rendition Way Finding Sign #2 – Shows 2 sides of the sign

A-7 – 5/18/18 – Color Rendition Building Sign – shows the signs on the building. The buildings are currently lettered but lack the proper color. Because they have recreational uses that are open at night he recommends they be illuminated, a simple internal glow.

A-8 – 5/18/18 – Dykstra Walker Amended Final Site Plan Signing and Striping Plan

He marked it in Red showing the way finding signs, building signs and ways to better organize the traffic flow throughout the site. Some of the driveways are very wide and this helps better define the intersections and help organize the onsite traffic flow, which he explained in detail to the Board. With these recommendations they have tried to bring some organization, as the site evolves, to better accommodate the different types of user groups that come onto the property. The main directory sign will be updated.

Planner Caldwell stated that she likes the plan and this is what they have been looking for for quite a while.

Mr. Dean commented on Mr. Borinski's memo.

Item # 31 - Mr. Dean agrees and they will add a stop bar and stop sign.

Item # 32 – They are also proposing to stop the automobile traffic exiting from the north side of the building. This might not be clear on the exhibit. Mr. Borinski stated that that would work. He will work with Dykstra Walker to clarify the plan.

Mr. Dean stated that he noticed that the parking spaces behind building A are striped red. He stated that when the Scare House went in they were supposed to be orange keeping with the theme. He said that red usually suggests fire or some type of restriction so he suggested that they change them to orange.

Chief Fernandez said that they have been waiting for this for quite some time and he has been working with Pat Turzi on this for a while. The sign out front does work. They have the Building Letters on the buildings. which are not lit, so at night they are difficult to see. He thinks this would be a huge improvement. The chief has not seen these sign plans, Mr. Dean will give him his copies. They will redo the faded striping that already exist. Attorney Zakin stated that a prior condition was “Safety precautions must now meet the standards for recreational facilities... this includes all appropriate road striping and signage as well as appropriate precautions including fencing around retention ponds and all construction area, along route 80 and any other areas that may present attractive nuisance to children.” Also, a condition would be signage, striping and traffic safety would be approved by the Police Chief, Planner and Engineer. Mr. Turzi stated that he would discuss the Title 39 with his Attorney and get back to us at the next meeting.

Mr. Steele stated that a potential condition of approval would be lighting of signs.

Mr. Dean pointed out and explained the circulation around Buildings D & G. Chief Fernandez asked about a “truck only” exit sign at the one exit driveway of Building G. He also stated that they can review having exit signs on the back of the way finding signs.

The meeting was open to the public and then closed to the public.

Attorney Zakin stated that Engineer Fantina will be at our next meeting on 5/15/18. He said that Attorney Johnson stated that there will be a conference with the judge on June 7th. He would like to propose another special meeting on before this conference to finalize everything. After some discussion they decided on May 31 at 7 pm. A Motion was made by Thomas Yeager and Seconded by Brian Bosworth to carry this application to May 15, 2018 Special Meeting.

A Motion was made by Brian Bosworth and Seconded by Charlotte Kelly to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 pm.

Patricia M. Craven – Secretary

Ken Loury - Chairman