

UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 2015

The Board of Supervisors of Upper Merion Township met for a Workshop Meeting on Thursday, October 8, 2015, in the Township Building. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m., followed by a pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

Supervisors present were: Greg Waks, Bill Jenaway and Carole Kenney. Also present were: Dave Kraynik, Township Manager; Sally Slook, Assistant Township Manager; Joseph McGrory, Township Solicitor; Rob Loeper, Township Planner; Scott Greenly, Associate Planner; Tom Beach, Township Engineer. Supervisor Erika Spott and Supervisor Greg Philips were absent.

VICE-CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS:

Vice-Chairman Jenaway stated Chairperson Spott was out of town on business and Supervisor Philips is serving military duty. An Executive Session was held earlier this evening to discuss legal matters and a Zoning Workshop was held on the Flood Map revisions from FEMA and revisions to the Business District Zoning Code.

DISCUSSIONS:

DEVELOPMENT PLAN: VILLAGE AT VALLEY FORGE VILLAGE
RESIDENTIAL BY BOZZUTO DEVELOPMENT; 232 UNIT AGE RESTRICTED
APARTMENT BUILDING ON 3.7 ACRES AT BRYCE LANE AND
SWEDESFORD ROAD

Rob Loeper, Township Planner, stated this is the fourth residential development at the Village at Valley Forge and the second by Bozzuto. Their first development now under construction is a rental apartment and this is different in that it is an age restricted product.

Mr. Dennis Maloomian, President of Realen, stated this development is for active adults and is catered and designed for older clientele. Utilizing the aerial, he pointed out some of the features and amenities of this product. It was noted this is a high density all structured parking project with contemporary architecture at the corner of Swedesford and Guthrie. Some amenities include a food service, activities, fitness center, pool, gardens, courtyards and an outdoor dog walk area. The 232 units are predominately one and two bedroom and built above structured parking.

Mrs. Kenney asked about the number of elevators. Mr. Peter Sikora, Development Manager, responded there will be five elevators and explained the first floor would be the enclosed parking garage and residents would not be exposed to the elements and would be able to pull in the garage, get on the elevator and go up to their apartment level.

Mrs. Kenney asked for more information about the one and two bedroom units. Mr. Maloomian responded one bedroom apartments average 900 plus square feet and the one bedroom with a den averages about 1,050/1,100 square feet. It was noted some apartments have two full bedrooms.

Mrs. Kenney asked if there are laundering facilities in each apartment. Mr. Sikora responded in the affirmative. He said each apartment unit has a full-size washer and dryer.

Mr. Waks asked how many stories in the apartment building. Mr. Sikora responded it is four stories of wood frame above a one story garage resulting in five stories total.

An unidentified person from audience asked if there is parking for one or two cars. Mr. Sikora responded there are 274 parking spaces in the garage for the 232 units.

Mr. Waks asked for the timeline for construction after approval. Mr. Maloomian responded there would be an early spring 2016 construction start with delivery of units 18-20 months after that in the summer of 2017.

Mr. Waks asked if there was any idea as to projected rents. Mr. Sikora responded this information is not published at this point in the process.

Mr. Jenaway asked if these would all be rental units. Mr. Sikora responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jenaway asked if there will be a management company handling operations that is familiar with senior type operations. Mr. Sikora responded Bozzuto Management will be managing the property and they have experience in the active adult properties.

Mr. Maloomian clarified that Bozzuto is acting as a construction manager or development consultant on the other two projects; however they are actually in a joint venture with another very large company owning this one.

Mr. Waks asked if this will be any different from the senior complex in Washington, D.C. Mr. Sikora responded every market is different but generally they are the same. He said they have seen a huge demographic shift even in their market rate apartments and that is why they decided to go with the active

adult in this location.

Mr. Jenaway asked if “active adult” means there is no continuity of care. Mr. Sikora responded there is no continuity of care and pointed out this would not be independent or assisted living.

Mr. Jenaway wanted to make it clear exactly what this particular property is going to provide. Mr. Maloomian responded this will be an age restricted development for age 55 and older.

Mr. McGrory stated ordinarily for the developments of this nature he asks for a deed restriction limiting 80% of the occupancy to age 55 or older. He asked what assurances there are that it does not convert to a market rate. Mr. Maloomian responded he is not sure this could be provided. He indicated the plan is to build this apartment building, market it, and manage it for an active adult community. Mr. Maloomian said whether or not they are required to deed restrict it is a different question.

Mr. McGrory indicated if they allowed at least half age 55 or older they would find that the market would become saturated and they would want to go to a market rate. He asked how to have the assurance of protecting current residents that they are in an adult community. Mr. Maloomian responded he did not feel that was necessary and said they are not restricted to creating 55 or older. Mr. McGrory pointed out when the apartments are marketed and rented the potential clientele need to know it is that kind of development. Mr. Maloomian said they are renting and not buying. He said the plan is to create a 55 and older community and not necessarily have it deed restricted as such.

Mr. McGrory noted the particular circumstances with this case because they are allowed the market rate to the same magnitude as the age restricted and while it is a voluntary act on their part, he asked if they would agree to put something in their lease that for at least a certain time period that it would be age restricted. Mr. Maloomian responded that is certainly something they could consider. Mr. McGrory pointed out the people moving in are renting a certain lifestyle and the question is how they receive the assurance that is what they are getting. Mr. McGrory indicated he needs some assurances that the renters are going to be protected. Mr. Maloomian responded that is a legitimate question for the lease, but not the deed.

An unidentified woman in the audience mentioned it sounds like anybody can come and rent an apartment who can afford it. Mr. Sikora responded as part of the qualification process applicants have to provide their birthdate and if they are not over 55 they would not qualify to rent. He said that is an operational standard, but not a deed restriction.

Mr. McGrory raised the issue of the Federal Fair Housing Act 80/20 Rule

for 55 and older housing units.

Mr. Maloomian stated he is resisting agreeing to something he does not have to agree to. He said his plan and arrangement with Bozzuto is this is a 55 and older development distinguished from the other developments that have come forward.

Mr. McGrory stated he is not going to tie this development down with a deed restriction which he would do under normal circumstances because they can build market rate with the same density. Mr. Maloomian commented they are both on the "same page," however he is resisting a legal restriction. He said he did not know what the Fair Housing Act says specifically as it relates to this situation, but the plan is 55 and older and he will clarify Mr. McGrory's question.

Mr. Sikora stated Bozzuto is in compliance with all the laws and acts applicable to this type of development.

Mr. McGrory asked about the maximum time period on a lease that they would entertain. Mr. Sikora responded he does not work for their management and does not know and noted the standard is one-two year leases.

Mr. McGrory stated the solution could be as simple as keeping it age restricted for the term of the lease so people know what they are renting is what they are getting. Mr. Maloomian responded he thought that was reasonable. He said he would research this and get back to Mr. McGrory.

Mr. Sikora mentioned Bozzuto operates projects of this nature up and down the east coast and he is sure their management company has standards, perhaps within the lease, but he did not want to misspeak. Mr. McGrory stated he did not bring up something that is not easily satisfied.

Mr. Mark McKee, Planning Commission, stated clarification is necessary for those who are 55 and older with regard to such things as visiting grandchildren. An unidentified Bozzuto representative responded it may be separate from the development process and it may be more as part of the operational process. He said Bozzuto's goal is to make sure the public knows what they are buying into and they will look into these questions. .

Cynthia Horniak, Mark Lane, asked if the garage parking spaces are extra and if they are allowed one space or two. Mr. Sikora responded they have not finalized any of the pricing and he did not know if the parking spaces were included or not.

Mr. Waks mentioned The Senior Service Center was aware of the Bozzuto presentation and that Mr. Maloomian was speaking at this workshop; however, they were unable to attend. He indicated the Bozzuto development will be before

the Planning Commission next week and the Senior Service Center representatives should be notified that there will be another presentation in the event someone would like to attend.

Mrs. Kenney asked what would happen if a couple would like to move in and one is 55 or older and the other is under 55. Mr. Sikora responded they would not qualify.

Mr. McGrory stated with the Fair Housing Act there is a 20% leeway and only one occupant has to be 55. Mr. Sikora indicated Bozzuto will comply with all laws and he did not know the specific standards. He said it is their intent to have this as an age restricted 55 plus community and that is what they are targeting and what they are designing.

Mr. Maloomian asked a question unrelated to this particular application about the fire station substation and whether it is needed or not. Mr. Jenaway responded in two weeks consultants will be in Upper Merion Township to look at a comprehensive approach to the delivery of fire and EMS services. He asked Mr. Waters to make sure that the consulting team connects to someone from Realen so that they can look at the site and determine density demands and potential service demands.

Mr. Maloomian indicated they have an obligation to send the Township a letter and asked for guidance on the timing of the letter.

Mr. Jenaway stated the thought process will come from the consulting team who will be looking at the overall growth of the township and the service demands today and tomorrow. Once their review is concluded everyone will have a better feel for the timing of the letter.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN: NEXT DOOR BAR AND GRILL/WEGMANS;
CONSTRUCTION OF A 10,818 SF FREE STANDING RESTAURANT AT
VILLAGE DRIVE AND NORTH GULPH ROAD AT THE VILLAGE AT VALLEY
FORGE

Mr. Rob Loeper, Township Planner, stated this originally was to be the second development at the Village at Valley Forge. Although construction started with a retaining wall and parking area behind Wegmans it was decided that was not the preferred location for their restaurant.

Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Loeper pointed out an artist's rendering of the architecture of the proposed free-standing, 10,000 square foot restaurant which will be located in front of Wegmans at North Gulph Road at the far end of the front parking lot. Mr. Loeper indicated staff had discussions regarding parking and asked the applicant to provide parking calculations. The applicant has indicated their employee parking will shift to the back lot.

Ms. Kim Grogan, representing Wegmans, provided an overview of the Next Door Bar and Grill culinary and dining experience which features a lively, open kitchen. It is proposed to have 200 indoor seats and approximately 60 additional on the patio. Once the restaurant is built there will be 552 parking spaces for customers to the food market (loss of 83 spaces) and 164 for the restaurant which exceeds the zoning code requirement. Utilizing the aerial and a rendering, Ms. Grogan pointed out various features of the site.

It was noted a landscape buffer will be provided along N. Gulph Road. Many product deliveries to the site will be taken from the food market and brought over to the restaurant.

Mrs. Kenney asked about safe pedestrian circulation if someone shops at Wegmans food store and then wanted to have lunch or dinner at the restaurant. She also asked how someone would safely walk to the restaurant from all the other buildings and residences in the Village at Valley Forge. Utilizing the aerial, Ms. Grogan pointed out the left side of the plan and the sidewalk running along the right side of the road. She indicated a cross walk is proposed at the signalized entrance so people would cross Village Drive toward the restaurant and a new sidewalk would be installed to the patio area adjacent to the front of the building.

Mrs. Kenney asked about pedestrian travel from the store. Ms. Grogan responded it would be just as it is today. The applicant could provide a crosswalk with a "yield pedestrian" sign.

Mr. Jenaway commented if that is done the signaling at the intersection may need some adjustments. He recalled there is no left turn signal. There is the standard green light on a left turn and it is a complicated traffic pattern. He suggested the applicant discuss this particular intersection with traffic safety and it may necessitate the "walking man" figure configuration.

Mr. Waks asked about the location of the outdoor seating area. Ms. Grogan pointed out the location on the diagram.

Mr. Waks asked if it is a covered outdoor seating area. Ms. Grogan responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Waks asked if there is any buffer between the seating area and the adjacent parking spaces. Ms. Grogan responded in the affirmative. She said typically they install a railing and there is an approximate 108 foot sidewalk.

In view of the loss of parking in front of the restaurant, Mr. Jenaway suggested a rear entrance would be helpful to those who will have to park in the rear particularly during inclement weather conditions.

Mr. Tom Beach, Township Engineer, stated one item in his review letter for consideration of the applicant is installing sidewalks around the perimeter of the site. The idea would be to consider putting sidewalks along N. Gulph Road and Village Drive at least to where their entrances are onto the site.

Mr. Maloomian indicated the comment about the sidewalks is appropriate and said they also had some concern about making sure the screening of the loading dock and trash area was adequate.

Mr. Jenaway noted it was mentioned the majority of food would come from the store. He emphasized the trash issues and some deliveries that would need to have protective screening.

Paul Fry, with Realen, stated in addition to the township review Realen Valley Forge is also reviewing the plan and working with Wegmans to add more landscape screening and revise the sidewalk arrangement for better connectivity.

Ms. Horniak asked about the green technology being proposed. Ms. Grogan responded the restaurant will have all LED fixtures and water reducing fixtures in rest rooms. She indicated the food market is looking to install more solar panels but they want to see if it will be a viable option in Rochester, NY.

Ms. Horniak asked about the use of pervious paving in parking lots. [Mr. Fry] responded the difficulty would be this is a limestone and sinkhole prone area and a different technology is used.

Mr. Beach pointed out since it is currently all parking lot, the addition of green space will actually reduce impervious.

Mr. Jenaway pointed out on almost every plan coming before the Board of Supervisors the Board is asking for the opportunity for pervious paving to be used wherever possible.

Ms. Grogan indicated construction on the restaurant should begin in the spring and open late summer/early fall [2016].

DEVELOPMENT PLAN: KOP MALL RESTAURANT PAD; CONSTRUCTION OF A 8,400 SF FREE STANDING RESTAURANT ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE MALL PROPERTY, EAST OF THE SHAKE SHACK RESTAURANT

Mr. Loeper stated the location of the proposed 8,000 square foot restaurant is opposite the Atrium Building on the outer ring of the Mall area.

Denise Yarnoff, Esq., Riley Riper Hollin & Colagreco, indicated the name of the restaurant is True Foods which has 12 locations in various states, mostly in the west, and offers healthy casual eating.

Utilizing the aerial, Keith J. Marshall, PE, Nave Newell, provided an overview of the 8,400 square foot site including the location of the entrance, the transportation center and the proposed restaurant and patio

Mr. Marshall indicated there has been a great deal of discussion about connectivity and intersection improvements and they remain committed to this aspect of the expansion project. Sidewalks will have a different configuration to accommodate True Foods. The sidewalk will now be along the curb line to allow pedestrians at the intersection to come in and still cross at the stop sign intersection that goes down into the transportation center. A side walk is proposed along Mall Boulevard and into the front entrance to True Foods on the western side of the building.

There is a slight reduction in impervious coverage. Previously the parking lot was uncontrolled and stormwater management has been added to this area. Impervious in the parking lot will be controlled with an underground basin that will outlet into an existing storm system on the property.

Mr. Marshall pointed out the location on the sidewalks on the screen. He said the entrance will remain the same into the parking field. He also indicated the location where the major part of the construction will take place and the section of the parking lot which will have a mill and overlay. It was noted the parking lot will expand slightly toward the Mall and Mall Boulevard in order to accomplish the proper parking stall size. Mr. Marshall pointed out this zoning district allows for smaller parking stalls on the outskirts of the mall. In order to accommodate the 17 ½ by 9 foot stall serving the restaurant the curb line was bumped out slightly to make that work.

Mr. Jenaway asked how that affects the impervious percentages. Mr. Marshall responded there is some additional green space around the building that was not there before. It is a minor reduction in impervious. Mr. Marshall said it is important to note that this previously was an uncontrolled impervious surface that will now have associated stormwater management.

Ms. Yarnoff pointed out all the impervious and green area requirements have been met. A rendering of the proposed building was shown.

Mr. Marshall pointed out the entrance on the western side of the building which would face Shake Shack and the location of the covered patio. The details for the inside of the restaurant and seating are still being worked out.

Mr. Waks asked that the applicant have these additional details when they

come to the Board of Supervisors business meeting. Ms. Yarnoff indicated more details will be provided at that time.

Mr. Waks recalled the crosswalk the Board of Supervisors requested when Shake Shack was built and asked if a crosswalk is planned for True Foods.

A discussion followed about connectivity for Mall shoppers to access the site safely and the best location for a crosswalk.

Ms. Yarnoff indicated the applicant will also look at signage to alert pedestrians to the location of the crosswalk.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN: 190 TOWN CENTER ROAD: BEAUTIFUL BEGINNINGS DAY CARE FACILITY (POSTAL DISTRIBUTION CENTER PROPERTY); DISCUSSION OF PLAN TO CONVERT FORMER POSTAL DISTRIBUTION CENTER INTO A DAYCARE FACILITY

Mr. Loeper stated this is not an official development plan at this point. Although no application has been submitted, staff has been working with the applicant on various issues for a day care facility.

Mandy Wtulich, owner and director of Beautiful Beginnings Child Care Center provided an overview of her background and experience as a day care provider with a present location in Wayne at the Calvary Fellowship Church, 505 E. Swedesford Road (a half mile north of Gateway Shopping Center). It is necessary to relocate the daycare center because the church has been sold and she has a need for expansion. She currently has 75 children and 25 staff and if relocated she plans on having 32 full time staff, 15 part-time staff, and 122 children. The site that is now being considered for relocation is the former Post Office distribution center in King of Prussia.

Mrs. Wtulich indicated the reason she is before the Board of Supervisors is to either have some EDU's forgiven or the traffic impact fees reduced or deferred so that she could afford to move into this building which needs some renovation inside.

Peter Moriarty (Mrs. Wtulich's brother), an architect, indicated he is assisting Mrs. Wtulich in ascertaining the degree of support as well as any clear impediments to the relocation of the Beautiful Beginnings Day Care facility to the King of Prussia location. They are trying to determine if it is a feasible project from a constructability and occupancy standpoint and if there is the revenue generation to support it. He noted to date they only have a signed letter of intent.

Mr. Moriarty stated because of the former use almost all the changes will happen to the building and the exterior would not involve many changes. He listed some of his comments about the site as follows:

- Interior partitions needed in the interior of the building
- Curb cut should be made for an entrance only into the parking lot off of Town Center Road
- Current exit ramp onto Prince Frederick
- Parking spaces for about 45 cars on site
- One third of the site which is existing parking would be converted into a playground area
- A roofed play area in the dock area
- Play area at the corner of Town Center Road and Prince Frederick with a planting buffer
- No use for a repair garage other than possibly for parking cars
- During due diligence process figure out how to install an elevator from lower to upper level

Mr. Loeper commented on some of the items staff has been discussing with Mrs. Wtulich in terms of transportation impact and EDU's. He said one of the problems with this facility is it was built back in the 1960's. It has been difficult getting traffic counts for this type of postal facility because over the years it was a carriers' annex and sorting facility and not a typical post office. Mr. Loeper indicated one thing that will probably have a higher impact is the number of children in the facility since water usage will increase and additional EDU's would be necessary for sanitary usage. Staff has asked Mrs. Wtulich to see if the Post Office can provide some historical records for the site. Staff will also reach out for other resources either from Aqua or internally for historical billings to get a better idea of what kind of credit would normally be assigned. Another problem is the fact that the building has been pretty much vacant for a few years making it difficult to compare former use to future use. Mr. Loeper said these are some of the issues staff has been working on and will be working on with Boles Smyth Engineers, the Transportation Authority and Municipal Utility Authority.

Mr. Loeper stated from a site planning standpoint it appears the real improvements are the additional driveway and the reduction of impervious on top of the retaining wall on Prince Frederick. From a stormwater standpoint it would be a positive condition.

Mrs. Wtulich indicated her current water usage is just under \$5,000 a year for 75 children. Mr. McGrory commented as a possible scenario that Mrs. Wtulich's could open with that equivalent amount of water and pay EDU's as she is incurring more water usage. It was noted EDU's cannot be waived. Mr. Loeper said if Mrs. Wtulich could provide the gallons she is purchasing on a monthly basis that is the type of information staff needs.

Mr. Beach commented he has not seen the plan and noted it is a major plus that the impervious coverage is reduced. Part of the review will be circulation because it is an existing site and such things as the number of parking

spaces.

Mr. Jenaway indicated more beneficial than what exists today would be the single access on the road.

Mr. Jenaway mentioned the left turn exit needs review as to any site line issues. Mr. Moriarty responded he does not believe there is a site line problem but it would be part of due diligence.

Mr. Jenaway noted back in the early to mid-1980's the post office was not only a retail facility and distribution center, they also had about 200 post office boxes which means traffic counts were probably significantly higher. He suggested the Post Office should be able to provide more details.

Because of the former repair garage (lubertorium) on the site, Mr. Beach suggested asking if the Post Office as a Phase 1 environmental study.

Mr. Loeper indicated Mr. Greenly has also reached out to the Post Office to find out how many routes were delivered out of this facility.

Mr. Waks commented if something can be done to improve the aesthetics for that portion of Prince Frederick it would be a nice improvement. Mr. Moriarty said they would put landscaping around the lower planting area to soften the whole edge.

Mrs. Kenney suggested installing low water usage plumbing facilities. Mrs. Wtulich responded they have done that at their current location.

Mrs. Kenney asked for more details as to safety considerations for the exit and outside play area at the corner of Town Center and Prince Frederick. Mr. Moriarty responded they will do what they have to do for safety but they are not that far along in the process and still do not have an agreement of sale.

A discussion followed about the site vision for the exit during which Mr. Jenaway said it might wind up being a right turn only, but that is something the applicant can review with traffic safety.

John Waters, Chief Safety and Codes, mentioned the possible remains of a sign noted earlier [at the exit] was actually a mirror. Mr. Jenaway commented the mirror might have been necessary to see traffic and it was probably problematic back then.

Mr. Moriarty commented on the number of times he has been to the site and he found it much harder going in than coming out.

Mr. Jenaway asked if Mr. Moriarty was referring to going up Town Center.

Mr. Moriarty said he was referring to going up the ramp and that it was much easier going out than coming in.

Mr. Waks suggested a speed bump on the way out might be a good idea because of pedestrians who could be walking on the sidewalk at any time.

Mr. McKee indicated he shared Mrs. Kenney's concern about the entrance. He suggested curb cuts be made wide enough going in and out and possibly have restrictions during certain hours. Mr. Jenaway noted it might be necessary to take out two parking spots off of Town Center.

Mr. McKee indicated he favors the playground upstairs and believes that can be safely done. He was more concerned about the corner, but with the improvements with the car wash at Henderson and Prince Frederick it should help with access to the site.

TEMPORARY USE PERMIT FOR RUPPERT LANDSCAPING, 214 W. CHURCH ROAD

Mike Monde, Manager, Ruppert Landscaping, stated his landscape architect has gone through the process of applying for a temporary use permit and provided some background about their landscaping company which has grown to a \$9 million operation in this area. The unique aspect of Ruppert Landscaping is that of the 15 facilities they operate out of they own 13. Unfortunately the Church Road property is about a half an acre too small for their use and is the reason they applied for temporary status and have not purchased the property.

The Church Road facility was opened as a branch with the intent of staying for 24 months. Everything up to this point has been on a 30-90 lease. Mr. Monde indicated Craig Ruppert asked him to find a larger site they can build on. The expectation was to have an agreement of sale or purchase by this time but he has been unsuccessful with the realtor in finding a permanent location. Mr. Monde would like to have a deal within the next 6 months on two acres of raw land so they can move their operation to a facility that they own. While this is in flux right now they would like to maintain a temporary status for the time being.

Mr. Jenaway stated the other issue that came up in the original discussion was the structure itself. He pointed out while it is okay as a construction trailer or temporary office, it would not be acceptable for long term use under the township code.

Mrs. Kenney asked about the possibility of using the existing house behind the trailer. Mr. Monde responded house is too small and the reason they bought the trailer was to house their office staff. He said the only way he could pull the trailer out and use the house and stay there would be for a very small four or five truck operation.

Mr. Waks asked if there have been any complaints from the residents who live along Church Road or any of the nearby side streets. Mr. Kraynik indicated he was not aware of any complaints and it was subsequently confirmed by Safety and Codes that there have been no complaints.

Mrs. Kenney noted the temporary use permit expired on December 31, 2014 and asked why the delay in asking for another extension. Mr. Monde responded he was not trying to bypass the process and wants to comply with all the codes, and regrets the lack of proper paperwork follow up on the part of staff.

Mr. Jenaway asked if Mr. Monde is looking for a 12-month extension. Mr. Monde responded in the affirmative. He said he is asking for a 12-month extension but would hope they would be out of the location in six months.

Mr. Kraynik stated some guidance from the Board is needed as to the length of the new temporary permit and then staff can work it out accordingly.

Mr. Jenaway indicated after some consultations, Mr. Kraynik will get back to Mr. Monde on this matter.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, it was moved by Mr. Waks, seconded by Mrs. Kenney, all voting "Aye" to adjourn the meeting. None opposed. Motion approved 3-0. Adjournment occurred at 9:06 p.m.

DAVID G. KRAYNIK
SECRETARY-TREASURER/
TOWNSHIP MANAGER

rap
Minutes Approved:
Minutes Entered: