

**SUSSEX COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**SEPTEMBER 8, 2014**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Borisuk at 4:05 p.m. The meeting is held in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, NJSA 10:4-2 of 1975, as amended.

Present were:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Andy Borisuk, Chairman  
Dr. John Ford, Vice Chairman  
Michael Francis  
Wolfgang Gstattenbauer  
Gene Crawford, 1<sup>st</sup> Alternate  
Dan Flynn, 2<sup>nd</sup> Alternate  
John Risko, Engineering Alternate  
Rich Vohden, Freeholder Director

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

Eric Snyder, Planning Director  
Alice Brees, Principal Planner  
Antoinette Wasiewicz, Recording Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

Jack O’Krepky  
Douglas Eilender, Esq., Mandlebaum Salsburg  
Debra Lynn Nicolson, Esq.

**MINUTES**

The Minutes will be corrected to show that John Ford, Dan Flynn and Wolfgang Gstattenbauer were excused from the Special Planning Board Meeting which was held on June 16, 2014. A motion was made by Gene Crawford to approve the Minutes with the correction noted above. The motion was seconded by John Ford. All were in favor with abstentions from John Ford, Michael Francis, Wolfgang Gstattenbauer, Dan Flynn and John Risko. Motion carried.

**SITE PLAN/SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORTS**

No reports.

**PLANNING STAFF REPORT**

No report.

**APPEALS AND WAIVER REQUESTS**

A. RESOLUTION FOR MAIN & GLEN ASSOCIATES, LLC, "MILL RACE VILLAGE" SITE PLAN #77(CSS)04, SPARTA TOWNSHIP:

A motion was made by John Ford to memorialize the Resolution for Main & Glen Associates, LLC, "Mill Race Village" Site Plan. The motion was seconded by Wolfgang Gstattenbauer. A roll-call vote was taken. Results were as follows: Andy Borisuk-Yes; John Ford-Yes; Michael Francis-Yes; Wolfgang Gstattenbauer-Yes; Gene Crawford-Abstain; Dan Flynn-Yes; and Rich Vohden-Yes. Motion carried.

B. WAIVER REQUEST FOR WILLIAM COWAN, JR., SITE PLAN #14(MSP)14, BRANCHVILLE BOROUGH:

Jack O'Krepky was sworn by Eric Snyder. Mr. O'Krepky said he is with the firm of Delaware Valley Associates, an Engineering and Consulting firm that prepared the Site Plan. Mr. O'Krepky is a licensed Engineer and a licensed Planner in the State of New Jersey. He has been preparing Site Plans and Subdivisions for about 40 years in Sussex and Warren Counties in New Jersey, Orange County in New York and Pike County in Pennsylvania. He has also testified as an expert engineering witness in numerous court cases.

Mr. O'Krepky said the applicant had a fire on the property and it damaged buildings that were constructed before the 1900's. He wanted to reconstruct the buildings which will be used as a warehouse. The buildings that burned due to arson had been used for storage since the 1900's. He is here to discuss channelized access, ingress and egress, where the County Land Development Standards require curbing to channelize the vehicles entering and leaving the site. He said curbing at this particular site would be a disaster. Mr. O'Krepky said that the County Engineer's office wrote a letter saying that technically the applicant has to get a waiver because the standards require the curbing. He also said that in Branchville, there is no curbing to speak of once you get outside of the road network. The lot's configuration is similar to a triangle. He believes trucks cannot access the building without jumping the curb. All other issues with Branchville and the County have been resolved.

Andy Borisuk questioned whether the curbing could be designed for trucks to enter. Mr. O'Krepky said there isn't enough room. The site plan was displayed for the Board members to view. Mr. O'Krepky pointed out a stream, Mill Street and Newton Avenue.

The property is only suitable for low impact development. The applicant plans to rent the buildings to two or three associated contractors. The applicant is a HVAC contractor employing about 10 people. Mr. Cowan said Branchville Borough gave their approval for him to reconstruct the property based on the 12 tenants he originally had. Mr. O’Krepky pointed out on the plan the former locations of the buildings that were destroyed. Mr. Cowan will not expand the buildings. He will have less square footage in the proposed buildings than he had in the building destroyed by an arsonist. Mr. O’Krepky said it is not a good situation for a truck to be jumping the curb alongside of moving cars. The entrance to the lot has worked fine since the 1900’s. When asked, Mr. O’Krepky pointed out the entrance to the property, located on Mill Street.

Mr. Cowan was sworn by Eric Snyder. William Cowan said he has owned the subject property since 1993. His operation is air conditioning, refrigeration and heating. He has 10 employees and 12 small business tenants. The tenants bring their landscape trailers and small pick-up trucks onto the property. They also get deliveries of materials they need for their businesses; so there is some tractor trailer traffic on the property. When asked, Mr. Cowan said they do have 18-wheelers making deliveries. Mr. O’Krepky asked how an 18-wheeler would make a turn with channelized curbing at the entrances. Mr. Cowan said they would not be able to.

Mr. O’Krepky said the road does not have curbing. The trucks use the road bed easement as part of their turning radii. A truck cannot turn in a radius of 20’. The parking lot is paved to the road. John Risko asked Mr. O’Krepky if the trucks need to use the road in order to make those movements. Mr. O’Krepky said, “Yes.”

Mr. O’Krepky said in 1990 there was a Resolution by the Planning Board. He asked Mr. Cowan if this issue was raised at that time. Mr. Cowan said he was not sure if it was this Board or a town Resolution. Andy Borisuk said if it is a County Road, it was before this Board. Mr. O’Krepky said at that time, there were discussions about curbing and the Board was happy with the existing conditions. Alice Brees said there was a waiver of site plan granted by Branchville in 1990. Mr. Risko said the Branchville Board decided that they would waive the requirement for a site plan; and since there was no site plan, it was not reviewed by the County. Eric Snyder confirmed that if the town waives the site plan, the County does not require a site plan. Mr. Risko said there was no previous approval of this because the application was withdrawn.

Michael Francis asked what the benefit of a curb would be. Mr. O’Krepky said in general, curbing is a good thing and that new site plans require curbing. This is not a new site plan. There are laws and statutes for buildings that burn down regarding grandfather rights, etc. He said, as far as the County Engineer is concerned, this is a new site plan; and, in theory, the applicant has to comply with the curbing requirement. The negative criterion is that curbing cause an unsafe situation with trucks jumping the curb.

Dan Flynn asked if there are curbs on the other side of the road. Mr. O'Krepky said there are curbs that border a residential property. There is no curbing on the side where his property is located.

Mr. O'Krepky asked if the Engineer's office had any other issues. Mr. Risko said there were no specifics showing how the site would not work. Mr. Borisuk asked if curbing could be put in that is low enough for trucks to go over. Mr. Risko said that might be a good compromise but said he has not seen why specifically why curbing would not work for a design vehicle. Mr. O'Krepky said that would require him to draw in the curbing, that the applicant does not want, and it would not be acceptable to the Board when they see it because it should be obvious to an Engineer that type of design does not permit a good traffic flow. Mr. Risko said he has not seen a drawing showing the turning templates and why it would or would not work. Mr. O'Krepky said he thought just looking at the site would show automatically that there isn't enough room for trucks to enter the site. He said he can provide turning templates at the owner's expense. Mr. Cowan said if that's what needs to be done, then they would do it but that this has been a real hardship.

Freeholder Vohden said there are rules and regulations that they need to follow but that he did not see where there would be a problem to continue to use the property as it had been used. There is not a change in use. Mr. Francis agreed and said this is not a new enterprise. Other Board members also agreed. Dan Flynn said he does not object to not putting in curbs but from a Planning Board perspective, when asking for a waiver, the applicant should provide testimony where it shows that it absolutely won't work.

Mr. Borisuk asked about the acreage of the property. Mr. Cowan said it is less than two acres. He had to give right-of-ways and drainage easements. Mr. O'Krepky said it was 2.05 acres. When asked about the number of tenants, Mr. Cowan said there are a total of 12 tenants, including him. Freeholder Vohden asked if he lost any tenants. Mr. Cowan said he lost all the tenants but they will come back if he can provide them with a place.

Mr. Flynn asked if there is an issue with trucks pulling out and would a delineated area be better. He said sometimes trucks pull out wherever it is convenient compared to where they're parked for offloading and they'll make long, sweeping turns onto the road. Mr. Cowan said because of telephone poles there is an area that they do use. He pointed out the area where delivery trucks access the property and the direction in which they drive.

Mr. Francis said there is no history of accidents at the site and it was functioning. He would not put engineering controls on it that aren't needed from a practical standpoint. Mr. Borisuk added that it is a 30 mph zone. Mr. O'Krepky said a truck driver needs good sight distance to pull out and he is going to use the most convenient and safest way out.

Gene Crawford said she has driven on this road for many years and has never seen an accident there. Her concern is that if this Board approves to continue use as it has

been, without the site plan argument that it doesn't make sense to put curbs in, does it set a precedent in the future. Mr. Borisuk and Mr. Francis said each application stands on its own merit. Mr. Borisuk asked for confirmation that Branchville approved the current site plan. Mr. O'Krepky said that they have approved it. The meeting was opened to the public. There were no comments. The meeting was closed to the public.

**MOTION:**

A motion was made by Wolfgang Gstattenbauer to grant the waiver request. The motion was seconded by John Ford. A roll-call vote was taken. Results were as follows: Andy Borisuk-Yes; John Ford-Yes; Michal Francis-Yes; Wolfgang Gstattenbauer-Yes; Gene Crawford-Yes; Dan Flynn-Yes; and Rich Vohden-Yes. Motion carried.

C. WAIVER REQUEST FOR TOWN SQUARE GARDENS, LLC SITE  
PLAN#14(PSP)02/14, NEWTON:

Douglas Eilender, Esq. from the firm of Mandelbaum Salsburg said he represents the applicant for Town Square Gardens, LLC. He is here with David Getz, the Engineer from Lehman and Getz to request waivers. Mr. Getz will discuss in detail the various items for the Board's consideration.

David Getz was sworn by Eric Snyder. Mr. Getz said he is a Principal with Lehman and Getz Engineering in Warwick, NY. He has been a licensed Engineer in the State of New Jersey for more than 25 years.

Mr. Getz said they are here for several proposed waivers. The first waiver involves groundwater recharge. The plans for the project began several years ago and during the course of the project, the State regulations changed regarding stormwater releases. The State code requires that calculations be done for typical site plans and groundwater recharge to be provided. They are requesting a waiver from the groundwater recharge requirement for several reasons. The site is a difficult one in terms of its topography and geology. There are steep slopes, shallow bedrock and there are existing buildings located downhill of the proposed work and the area where a recharge basin would be theoretically possible. In this case, constructing a recharge basin could create some serious adverse impacts on basements or other subsurface conditions downstream. Mr. Getz said Mr. Risko also points this out in his comment letter. This recharge waiver issue has been discussed over the years with the Town of Newton. Their Engineer, David Simmons from Pellow & Associates, is on record as recommending that a fee would be provided and the town has agreed to the recommended waiver. Mr. Simmons calculated what the construction cost of \$22,615.00 for a facility to meet the requirements. Mr. Getz said the applicant is providing detention systems and one or both of those could be designed to include introducing water into the ground, but they do not think this is a good idea in this instance.

Mr. Borisuk asked where the water would discharge under heavy rain conditions. Mr. Getz said even if recharge was proposed, the basins were proposed to connect to

existing drainage systems. Some of them are owned by the County and some are owned by the Town. They've done calculations of the impacts on those systems. The calculations are being reviewed by Mr. Risko. They've designed them to prevent an increase in peak discharge to those existing facilities. Mr. Risko said they've controlled the peak flows in accordance with the State Standards but to store the volume going into the ground, the people living in the apartments below it, especially in the basements, would be flooded.

The second waiver request is to keep the existing curb radius at the northern side of the entrance drive. There is an existing entrance drive into the site (Mill Street, County Route 519.) Their plan is to widen the existing drive to 22' wide. The plan shows a shaded area on the north side showing the 35' radius. The applicant is willing to construct the radius. Mr. Getz said that Mr. Risko's recommendation was that there was not sufficient information to justify the waiver. The applicant is willing to construct both entrance radii at 35' so that it widens the throat of that entrance. They have diagrams that show how doing that lengthens the crosswalk parallel to Mill Street across the entrance drive. Turning templates show the existing radius on the north side is in the range of 10-12' based on the survey. They feel if they go to 25-30', the turning vehicle could accommodate the turn. Mr. Risko asked if he can show on the turning templates that they can make that turn in without going into the other lane. Mr. Gets said, "Yes." Mr. Risko said that would have a lesser impact on widening the crosswalk.

Mr. Getz displayed new exhibits. They were marked as Exhibit A-1, A-2 and A-3 with today's date. The first diagram (Exhibit A-1) showed a 35' radius on the north side. Mr. Getz said they are already widening the radius on the south side to get the 35' radius. He said a 30' single design vehicle easily makes the turn and stays in its own lane. An exhibit they attached to the letter they submitted a week or two ago showed this design vehicle could get into the site while keeping the existing radius on the north side; but it would have to cross over the centerline of Mill Street.

Exhibit A-2 shows a 30' radius with a similar scenario. The truck can make the turn while staying on the western side of Mill Street. Even for a 25' radius, shown on Exhibit A-3, that is still the case. The difference in the length of the crosswalk across the front of the site with a 25' radius is about 54' and with a 35' radius, it's about 60'. A 30' radius, in between, is 57'. If they go with no waiver, and a 35' radius, they'd have a 60' long crosswalk.

John Risko said the goal, in a town center area, is to look at not only vehicle safety but pedestrian safety. The shorter the crosswalk the better. The applicant has demonstrated that with a 25' radius, he will have almost cut in half the distance it would go across; and based on that and by not crossing over the centerline of the road, he's met the objectives. Mr. Risko said he would recommend this waiver. Eric Snyder said the Standards specifically say that in a town center, pedestrians should be a priority.

Dan Flynn asked how steep the slope is that they are cutting into. Mr. Getz said the slope going up the driveway is steeper than Mill Street itself but the area they would

have to cut into is flat. There is a retaining wall on the other side but there will not be a wall needed at that location. Mr. Flynn asked about the project and was given the opportunity to look at the full site plan.

Mr. Getz moved on to the next waiver request. He said the County requires that cross sections be shown at intervals along the County highway for projects such as this. Because the applicant is not proposing to alter the County highway, other than the widening of the entrance drive that abuts it, they request a waiver of this requirement. Mr. Risko's letter indicated that he felt it would be acceptable as long as spot elevations are provided north and south of the site. Mr. Getz said they've started to do that and are willing to provide those spot elevations.

The fourth item he mentioned in his letter is not a waiver; it is a recent situation that arose with a review of the project. It is the issue of a crosswalk across CR 519 near the entrance of the site, directly across toward the small shopping center on the other side of the road. There was a site meeting to discuss sight distance, grading and the best location. He has shown the crosswalk at the best location for one and it is his understanding that it is the Town that needs to decide if they are in favor of it. Mr. Snyder said this is a situation where a residential use is proposed from which it is very clear that there is going to be pedestrian traffic to a commercial facility. Currently there is pedestrian cross traffic on that street from that entrance to the strip mall across the street. The nearest intersection at which you would have a crosswalk is a significant distance away; and people will not walk down to that intersection, cross the road and walk back and there is no sidewalk on the other side of the street anyway. The County feels it is important that this situation be pointed out and this needs to be addressed as a three-party process. The Town is involved since they will grant the approval and regulate the zoning; the County is involved because it is a County road and it wants the pedestrian to be properly considered when we know they will be using the County's road to cross from A to B; and the applicant is the entity that wants to create this origin/destination which will give rise to this pedestrian crossing traffic. There should be a three way agreement between the developer, the County and Town, discussing who maintains what. Alice Brees said because this is a mid-block crossing, the Freeholder Board will need to approve it. Mr. Snyder said the Planning Board will make a recommendation that this be a requirement of the approval subject to Freeholder approval of the agreement. There will be a Developers Agreement for this site plan.

The meeting was opened to the public. There were no comments. The meeting was closed to the public.

**MOTION:**

A motion was made by Michael Francis to grant the waiver requesting a 25' radius on the north side. The motion was seconded by Dan Flynn. A roll-call vote was taken. Results were as follows: Andy Borisuk-Yes; John Ford-Yes; Michael Francis-Yes; Wolfgang Gstattenbauer-Yes; Gene Crawford-Yes; Dan Flynn-Yes and Rich Vohden-Yes. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Wolfgang Gstattenbauer to allow the applicant to provide spot elevations at 10' intervals, thereby waiving the necessity to provide cross sections. The motion was seconded by Gene Crawford. A roll-call vote was taken. Results were as follows: Andy Borisuk-Yes; John Ford-Yes; Michael Francis-Yes; Wolfgang Gstattenbauer-Yes; Gene Crawford-Yes; Dan Flynn-Yes and Rich Vohden-Yes. Motion carried.

A motion was made by John Ford to grant the waiver for the groundwater recharge requirement and the detention facility in order to prevent the impact on the exterior buildings down from the site. The motion was seconded by Wolfgang Gstattenbauer. A roll-call vote was taken. Results were as follows: Andy Borisuk-Yes; John Ford-Yes; Michael Francis-Yes; Wolfgang Gstattenbauer-Yes; Gene Crawford-Yes; Dan Flynn-Yes and Rich Vohden-Yes. Motion carried.

Eric Snyder said these are subject to the applicant entering into a Development Agreement.

Chairman Borisuk asked about the crosswalk. Eric Snyder said the crosswalk is not a waiver. It is a requirement of having granted this approval. He said he will write the Resolution. This will be subject to the Planning Board's review, the Freeholder acceptance and the Developers Agreement.

D. DRAFT DEVELOPERS AGREEMENT:

Debra Lynn Nicolson, Esq. said she represents the applicant, 85 Sparta LLC, for the combined "7-11 store" and gas station site at the intersection of Routes 517 and 181, where the existing Shell Station is located. The Developers Agreement involved the Department of Transportation (D.O.T.), Sparta Township, the County and her client. Mr. Risko has had some successful negotiations with Sparta, who has agreed to join in a three-party agreement; so this will be further amended to indicate that Sparta is a signatory to this, limited to the default provision on the maintenance of the sidewalk. Ms. Nicolson said she also had a request for a modification in language that permits a temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO.) She said when you have dual users, often between the developer and the end user, the building has to get to a certain stage of completion and then it gets turned over. In this case, to 7-11; and they finish all of the build-out inside. They do this with a temporary CO. She did not want there to be a prohibition on the issuance of a temporary CO. They cannot get a permanent CO from Sparta until the building has all of the internal work done, but it will be done by two different developers. The site developer does all of the improvements, then turns it over to the 7-11 operator, who then finishes building out, and then they go to Sparta for their permanent CO. Also, depending on when this project gets started, there may be some weather issues, paving, finishing up work and she wants to have up front, that if they encounter those circumstances, final CO can trigger all of these requirements, but temporary CO's are possible.

Andy Borisuk questioned whether a CO is needed during the construction phase. Ms. Nicolson said with the Developers Agreement, there was a prohibition that a CO cannot be issued until all of this is accomplished. Frequently, they need to have a

temporary CO. Mr. Borisuk said a CO gives the right to open for business. Ms. Nicolson said in this Developers Agreement, Condition 5 says that, "All of these improvements, prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy from Sparta Township, the intersection improvements (Routes 517 and 181) shall be completed by the Developer at his expense, including construction of sidewalks, crosswalks, curb ramps and upgrades to traffic signal as set forth and as approved by the New Jersey Department of Transportation." Ms. Nicolson said the applicant may be ready for a temporary CO to permit the completion of the building by 7-11 before this has occurred. They do not want a definitional situation to prevent the conclusion of that construction because they cannot turn it over from one developer to the second developer without the temporary CO. She added that in combined projects, that is a typical standard. The DOT might not issue their final signalization plan because they might want to see a couple of weeks of test patterns. She said that the Developers Agreement is basically a sidewalk maintenance agreement and does not feel there are any risks to the County. Eric Snyder said the County's concern is that the most vulnerable population lives at Knoll Heights. Those residents had been able to walk to the grocery store by only crossing Knoll Road. They no longer can. The 7-11 is going to be a major attractor. Mr. Snyder said in more than 40 years, he has never seen a temporary revoked. How do you throw a 7-11 out if the improvements don't get done? Andy Borisuk asked what a temporary CO will allow the applicant to do. Ms. Nicolson said the builder/developer for the site has a measure of completeness that they can turn over to the occupier/user that finishes the site and finishes all of the tenant specific improvements. She said it can be conditioned saying that it is a temporary CO not for business purposes but to signify a stage of construction completion. Alice Brees asked for confirmation that the condition would mean the 7-11 wouldn't be able to open. Ms. Nicolson said they wouldn't be able to open on the temporary CO without having satisfied the County requirement, but it would be a level of completeness for the builder/site developer to turn over to finish the building. Mr. Snyder asked if Ms. Nicolson could come up with language that would indicate to the various developers on site that when construction has gotten to this point, and they are then ready to turn the building over ready to turn the building over to the other party to finish. He said he is not aware of anything in the New Jersey Uniform Construction Code that even allows for a temporary CO. He said he will speak to Dennis McConnell about this. If somebody builds a building to code, according to plans that were submitted for the building permit, they are entitled to a CO. He has an issue with CO language itself. The Board members agreed it was out of their jurisdiction. A lengthy discussion followed.

John Risko asked if the D.O.T. approved the plans. Ms. Nicolson said they gave verbal approval and it is in permit processing. The local people have given approval. Mr. Snyder recommended that Dennis McConnell come up with language in the Developers Agreement that might not involve the CO per se, but involves language that would allow her do what she wants to do and ensures that the business does not open until all of the safety improvements are in place. He asked if the Board was willing to make a motion to that effect. Ms. Nicolson said she agrees with language that says the business will not be opened for consumer business until everything is satisfied; and that the technical language should meet the contractual agreements of the developers.

The meeting was opened to the public. There was no public present. The meeting was closed to the public.

**MOTION:**

A motion was made by Wolfgang Gstattenbauer that County Counsel develops language for the Developers Agreement that would meet the objectives as set forth by Ms. Nicolson and the Board's concerns with public safety. Sparta is to be a third party signatory limited to their default provision. The motion was seconded by Michael Francis. A roll-call vote was taken. Results were as follows: Andy Borisuk-Yes; John Ford-Yes; Michael Francis-Yes; Wolfgang Gstattenbauer-Yes; Gene Crawford-Yes; Dan Flynn-Yes and Rich Vohden-Abstain. Motion carried.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

A. AMENDMENTS TO LAND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:

Eric Snyder reported that they will prepare, with cooperation of the Engineering Division, some further amendments to the Land Development Standards. The templates and the details that are in the County Land Development Standards can be improved. The Engineers have found, over time, that there are better ways of doing things and they have a number of details that need to be changed. The Planning Board will be provided with draft language and some different draft details for their review and hopefully approval before they go to the Freeholder Board.

Mr. Snyder said just as with Master Plans and Ordinances, you have to go back and take a look at them to see if they still make sense. The last substantial amendments to the Land Development Standards were done in 2008.

B. COMPLETE STREETS:

The Planning Board members were provided with the Complete Streets book. The Special Meeting regarding Complete Streets was the introduction to the larger conversation on considering adoption of a County Complete Streets Policy. Mr. Snyder wants the Board to look at the book because he wants to continue the discussion as to what they would recommend that the Freeholders adopt or not adopt. Complete Streets is a subset of Context Sensitive Design which determine where improvements need to be made to address the needs of some segment or segments of the population. Complete Streets involves intent to change the signals that people see that indicate that the character of an area has changed and that behaviors, particularly driving behaviors should also change.

Mr. Snyder said Complete Streets will be a recurring item on the Planning Board agenda until a resolution is reached.

Mr. Risko said there is a project going on in Hopatcong by the River Styx Bridge on County Route 607 that involves the municipality. By State Statute, the County is

responsible curb to curb for the pavement, and we accept that responsibility. But we also recognize that there is a need for pedestrian facilities. The County is trying to partner with the municipalities to take responsibility and jurisdiction for the sidewalks. The County will paint the crosswalks and everything else, but it is a team effort.

Alice Brees said River Styx is discussed on Page 49 of the Complete Streets book. It was one of the Study Pilot Areas. Also, Town Square Gardens, which was discussed today, was another area. It is on Page 45. We're already starting to get into the implementation of the study.

Freeholder Vohden said there was a Transportation Planning Authority meeting this morning. They are finishing up a Safe Streets Study of four municipalities: a city, an urban area, municipality and a shore community. This was prompted by the fact that every 2.1 days a pedestrian is killed in New Jersey. The final results are due next month. The study is showing that incidents are way down because of education and other steps that are being taken.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

None

#### **OPEN TO PUBLIC**

None

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

All business having been completed, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Wolfgang Gstatenbauer. The motion was seconded by Michael Francis and carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.