

**TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN
PLANNING BOARD
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY**

**REGULAR MEETING
October 4, 2023**

The regular meeting of the Township of Franklin Planning Board was held at the Municipal Building located at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, NJ, and was called to order by Vice Chair Brown, at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read, the Pledge of Allegiance said, and the roll was taken as follows:

PRESENT: Theodore Chase, Jennifer Rangnow, Charles Brown, Robert Thomas, Meher Rafiq, and Rebecca Hilbert

ABSENT: Councilman Anbarasan, Erika Inocencio, Sami Shaban, Mustapha Mansaray, and Chairman Orsini

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. James Clarkin, Board Attorney, Mark Healey, Planning Director, and Christine Woodbury, Planning & Zoning Secretary

MINUTES:

- **Regular Meeting – July 26,2023**

Mr. Thomas made a motion to approve the Minutes, as submitted. The motion was seconded by Jennifer Rangnow, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Dr. Chase, Ms. Rangnow, Vice Chair Brown, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Rafiq

AGAINST: None

- **Regular Meeting – September 6, 2023**

Mr. Thomas made a motion to approve the Minutes, as submitted. Ms. Hilbert seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Dr. Chase, Vice Chair Brown, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rafiq and Ms. Hilbert

AGAINST: None

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Dr. Chase then made a motion to open the meeting to the public for General Planning discussion, not related to any Application that had its own hearing that evening. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Seeing no one coming forward, Mr. Thomas made a motion to close the meeting to the public for general comments. Ms. Rangnow seconded the motion, and all were in favor..

HEARINGS:

- **PULEO INTERNATIONAL INC / PLN-22-00006**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Puleo International Inc. Preliminary and final Major Site Plan w/”C” Variances in which the Applicant sought approval for construction of an 80,515 sq. ft. warehouse at Atrium Drive Extension, Block 468.01, Lot 21.13, in the Business & Industry (B-I) Zone.

Mr. Lanfrit stated that the Application was filed in February of 2022, prior to the amendments to the zoning ordinance and, therefore, was being reviewed as a permitted use in the B-I Zone. He then stated that the Application before the Board was not a “spec” warehouses as opposed to others he had represented and would be presenting testimony regarding the company and its business.

Mr. Christopher Puleo, Principal, 180 Peachcroft Drive, Bernardsville, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. He then gave a brief history regarding Puleo International. He indicated that Puleo International was a family business, started by his grandmother in 1955 in Elizabeth, NJ, out of their garage in Elizabeth, NJ manufacturing Christmas trees for 37 years and were primarily a seasonal products company, with their dominant category being Christmas products and manufacture, distribute and sell items to include Christmas trees and Christmas décor as well as other categories that include Lawn & Garden, Floral and some counter seasonal items as well. He stated that they were now based in South Plainfield, NJ, with offices overseas as well where their products were also sourced. He then stated that they were in the third generation running the company and were looking to move to Franklin Township because the business continued to grow and have some presence already in Franklin Township for some contract warehousing and hope to make it their new home for their business.

Presently, Mr. Puleo indicated that they presently have twenty employees in South Plainfield, NJ, and would relocate over to the subject address. He then told the Board that there would be no manufacturing done in Franklin Township and would only have office and warehouse space. He then explained how the product would arrive at the facility, shipped in 40 ft. containers from overseas and arrive throughout the year and

then sold primarily in the 4th quarter since it was primarily Christmas products. He then went on to detail how they had a portion of their business where they ship directly to their customers from overseas and a portion where the product came into New Jersey and then was distributed to their customers. He then explained the type of customers they distributed to, including most national retailers to include Walmart, Costco, Target, etc. and including local garden centers. Mr. Puleo then explained that they had an on-line presence that was growing and one of the drivers needing additional space. He then added that the product left the site, either by UPS, Fedex or tractor trailer. He then indicated that the daily flow of tractor trailers coming to the site during the year would be smaller for 10 months of the year, less than five (5) trucks per day. He added that for two (2) months of the year, from mid-October to mid-December, there would be less than 10 of the smaller tractor trailer trucks per day for outbound to include UPS vans and Fedex vans as well. Mr. Puleo then indicated that they have standard office hours of 9 to 5, with warehouse staff getting in a bit earlier during their peak season from 7 a.m. to a little earlier in the day than 5:00 p.m., with just one (1) shift. He then added that there might only be weekend hours during the month of November when they might need some extra help on the weekends. He then told the Board that they anticipate employing between 30-35 people.

Ms. Hilbert then asked what would be happening to their present facility in South Plainfield, NJ should their Application be approved, and they move their operations to Franklin Township. He noted that the present facility was very small at 15,000 sq. ft., which included office and warehouse and that space would likely be rented out.

Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, asked if there would be any assembly of trees on the site, and Mr. Puleo answered in the negative and that that was currently done overseas and the items would arrive within the containers completely assembled, packaged and ready to go out the door when they arrive. He added that there were no plans for any retail space on-site, and agreed to accept, as any condition of approval, the prohibition of any retail sales on site. They then discussed the possibility of returns being accepted at the site, but it was not a high volume, maybe four (4) to five (5) trailer loads a year.

Vice Chair Brown then asked if they ever plan to have community-oriented events at their facility. Mr. Puleo indicated that they have not but have supported the town with decorations for their facilities and donate to certain holiday events. They then discussed how their employees arrive to work, with Mr. Puleo indicating that most of them drive to work or carpool.

Mr. Craig Stires, Engineer, 3 West High Street, Somerville, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Stires indicated that the project he handled before the Board last month was also adjacent to the project before the Board that evening. He then discussed the proposed lot, how it was created and the surrounding land uses, noting that the lot was created in the 1980's with a total of nine(9) commercial lots, mainly for office use. He noted that all the properties were built out, with the exception of the subject property and was original two (2) lots, from Atrium Drive to Route 287. Mr. Stires referred the Board to the plan on the screen, entered into

the record as Exhibit A-1, which was a colorized compilation of the Site Plan with landscaping, the buildings, etc. He then showed the Hampton Inn in the upper left-hand corner of the exhibit, currently under construction and approved back in 2015, which included a minor subdivision to split the property. He then noted that it created a 50 ft. private easement along the bottom side of the hotel property shown on the screen and was the access to the remaining lands. He then explained that subsequent to that, they came in to subdivide the remaining lands into the lot that was being presented now (Lot 21.13) and included 4.8 acres and another lot to the southeast to include seven (7) acres. In doing that, Mr. Stires indicated that it extended the 50 ft. easement all the way to the right-of-way of 287 and became known as Atrium Drive Extension. He then noted that that it provided access to the subject lot as well as to the lot to the southeast (Woodmont property). He then told the Board that the property to the southeast just had warehousing approved last month. Mr. Stires added that the Atrium Drive Extension was located on the hotel property and passed through the recently approved Woodmont property which would ultimately be merged with Lot 21.06, which was currently the one with the five (5)-story office building, and Lot 21.14 going away. Mr. Stires then indicated that the only thing left was the access to the Puleo lot that was the subject of the Application that evening. He then discussed how access was gained to the Woodmont lot, bringing the Board's attention to Exhibit A-2, which was a colorized version of that site with an aerial view beneath. He showed on the exhibit the access to the Woodmont site from Atrium Drive that would have two (2) access sites. Mr. Stires then indicated that the access easement would allow a driveway exclusively for the Puleo site that no one else would use.

Mr. Stires then went back to the Site Plan and walked the Board through what they were proposing, methods of ingress and egress and parking. He showed the driveway from the Atrium Drive Extension circulates all the way around the proposed building on the site, with adequate circulation for the trucks as well as for emergency vehicles. Mr. Stires then noted that there were 19 physical parking spaces on the southeast side of the building, 22 on the northeast side, for a total of 41 physical spaces. He noted that there were two (2) ADA spaces and one EV space, allowing the EV parking space to add to the count of 42 parking spaces. He then told the Board that there would be six (6) loading docks along the back of the building, with one (1) drive-in dock, and were angled so that there would be better circulation and maneuverability in the back of the building so that the trucks could maneuver in and pull out, circulate and back out of Atrium Drive. He noted that the building was just under 82,000 sq. ft. and showed the limit of the office space in the front of the building and elevated above the entire footprint of the warehouse space.

Mr. Stires stated that the loading docks were designed for WB67 trucks, but that they were restricting them to WB62 trucks and noted that the plans before the Board that night was the fourth iteration of the plan, either through zoning changes or storm water changes. He then told the Board that in discussions with Mr. Puleo and Puleo International that that was sufficient for their operations because they do not get WB67s at their site. Mr. Stires noted that the small drive-in door was for small pick-ups and

drop-offs and typical for a warehouse for better accessibility to get into or out of the building.

Mr. Stires then noted that they would handle trash with a compactor between three (3) loading docks. He then told the Board that they had lighting coming in Atrium Drive Extension and lighting throughout the site that complied with the ordinance. He then drew the Board's attention to the landscaping that they were proposing, noting that they had worked with Mr. Healey's to address his comments, noting extensive landscaping along the Route 287 right-of-way and the site would be well buffered. He added that there was landscaping around the back and between the subject property and the hotel property. He then also noted that there was landscaping within the basins. Mr. Stires then testified that they did not have any landscaping proposed along Atrium Drive Extension; however, there were trees that were included in the hotel Site Plan and were approved and would be installed when the project was completed. He then pointed out the extensive landscaping that included street trees on the Woodmont property and felt that there was adequate landscaping and buffering from Route 287.

Mr. Stires then spoke of the storm water management regulations that were in place when he was first designing the site in 2021, with the first submittal in 2022. He testified that he designed the storm water management system to be consistent with those regulations. He added that there were numerous revisions made since then regarding discussions with the Township. He added that there were recent regulations brought forth by the NJDEP on July 17, 2023, noting that the Township included an ordinance stating that all unapproved applications be subject to those new NJDEP regulations, and he redesigned the plans to incorporate those changes. Mr. Stires then went on to describe the storm water plan that they were proposing to include bio-retention basins that all comply with the new NJDEP storm water regulations and accommodated for the new regulations that required compliance with the new flood hazard rules with an increased rainfall rate and design it to the year 2100 to accommodate for further increase to the rainfall rates. Mr. Stires then testified that they would continue to work with the Township Engineer (CME) to work on the final details. He then added that they had to also comply with the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission regulations related to storm water management as well and have obtained a conditional approval for that to include the Resolution and to provide the updated tree listing, but that they had approved the updated design.

Mr. Stires then introduced the "C" variances that they were seeking, as follows:

- Front Yard Parking Lot Setback: 50 ft. minimum required – approximately 42 ft. proposed (I-287).
- Front Yard Parking Lot Setback: 50 ft. minimum required – Approximately 18 ft. proposed (Atrium Drive Extension).
- Off-Premises Sign: Proposed monument sign is proposed at the end of Atrium Drive Extension (which was located on another site).

Mr. Stires added that the loading area was supposed to be twice the length of the trucks, so with the 69 ft. length, they needed 138 ft., and they have 128 ft., which should be noted in the review from CME that they were acceptable of the layout as submitted.

Regarding the last CME report from September 28, 2023, Mr. Stires testified that they could comply with all of the concerns and changes requested in that additional report. He added that the changes do not substantially alter the plan that was before the Board that evening.

In response to a comment in Mr. Healey's Planning report, Mr. Stires explained how they would be screening the parking from Route 287. He noted that they had substantial plantings along the Route 287 border with a mix of evergreens and deciduous trees. He also added that the site itself was elevated from the exit ramp so not only was there the visual of horizontal, but also vertical being located above it and highly unlikely that the parking lot would be seen travelling on the off-ramp of Exit 10. He added that they were also planning to screen the parking from the roadway entering the site and the other trees/plantings previously discussed. As just an aside, Mr. Lanfrit indicated that, just for the record, that portion of Route 287 adjacent to the subject property was the exit ramp off Route 287 (Exit 10 going onto Easton Avenue).

Mr. Stires then addressed the maintenance of Atrium Drive Extension, noting that Atrium Drive was maintained privately, along with snow removal, and that Atrium Drive Extension would be maintained privately along with it.

Mr. Stires indicated that they were replacing them with more trees than they were taking out to satisfy the Environmental Commission's concerns. He added that they would add anti-idling signs as well.

Dr. Chase then indicated that the Environmental Commission usually asks for a bicycle rack in case any employees bicycle to the site. Mr. Stires indicated that they would find a place for a bike rack. Vice Chair Brown asked that the bicycle rack be located somewhere away from the trash area, and Mr. Stires agreed.

Ms. Hilbert then asked what property the proposed monument sign would be located on. Mr. Stires indicated that it would be located, technically, on Atrium Drive Extension, which was in an easement with the easement on the hotel property. He added that it was in the right-of-way of Atrium Drive Extension. For the record, Mr. Lanfrit stated that the hotel site was part of the Application that they noticed with the sign as part of the hotel site. He added that the agreement with the hotel operator would be provided to the Board if needed, to allow them to put the sign on that easement.

Mr. Healey then explained the reason for the sign variance was when a site was putting up a sign, they were not allowed to put it on the adjoining site. He then added that, because of the circumstances in this case, what looks like their driveway was actually a private road that goes over someone else's property and in an easement, so they were actually putting their sign on the hotel property and technically triggers a variance.

Ms. Rangnow asked for clarification on who actually will maintain the roadway there, and Mr. Lanfrit indicated that there was an association that actually would be maintaining all of the roads that they would be a part of for paving and snow plowing, etc., and not the Township. Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, explained that there was a recorded easement that obligated the various owners to take care of maintenance, repairs and snow removal, etc. and was deemed acceptable after he reviewed it.

Vice Chair Brown asked why they were not separating truck traffic from car traffic on the site and why they were setting a precedence from what other Applications had provided. Mr. Stires stated that they would enter and exit at the same points but would not co-mingle in the loading area. He noted that they designed it that way because it was the nature of the configuration of the site with a one (1)-way in and one (1) way out design. He added that they did try to separate it, but the Fire Official wanted circulation all the way around the building. He also noted that it was not a high truck traffic use. A discussion ensued regarding auto traffic and no public entering the site.

Mr. Puleo came up and noted that the site was just comprised of office and warehouse and do not have a dedicated customer area there. He noted that customers visit the company at the overseas office location and would not have an overflow of people coming to visit the subject site. He added that it would be very rare that a vendor would come to the site because the product comes finished and not much that they buy for their facility other than things like tape and shrink wrap/bubble wrap and do that through vendors that were set up already and everything was purely distribution. He stated that they have a shipping team, an online team, a finance team, warehouse staff and the management team. Mr. Thomas then opened a discussion regarding any nearby residential locations, which were far away from the site, with the exception of the Assisted Living/Nursing Home, which the Board could consider.

Mr. Healey then opened a discussion should a larger truck enter the site. Mr. Stires indicated that he showed the worst-case scenario where if a WB67 sized truck should enter the site, he felt that they could still easily circulate out of the site, with the exception of one (1) particular truck bay that he pointed out on the plans that he said would be difficult. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, then brought up the latest Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission (DRCC) report, dated November 18, 2023, where it indicated that the Application was incomplete. He then asked if there was a subsequent report that was a conditional approval, and Mr. Stires indicated that there was one, but did not know the specific date. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they would provide that report to the Board, as a condition of any approval.

Ms. Hilbert then asked for clarification with what was written in the DRCC report that they have available to them. Mr. Stires stated that the DRCC had different standards than the State, and that they had to comply with both. He told the Board that the last two conditions in the November 18, 2023 report was to update the tree species to their tree list and the Resolution needed to be provided.

Ms. Elizabeth Dolan, Traffic Engineer/Principal of Dolan & Dean Traffic Engineers, 181 West High Street, Somerville, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted her qualifications. She indicated that her office prepared a Traffic report in January of 2022, and was based on an even slightly larger building than what was currently being proposed (approximately 90,000 sq. ft. vs. the 80,515 sq. ft. that was proposed that evening. Ms. Dolan then reviewed the trip generations regarding the site and then answered the questions raised by both Mr. Thomas and Dr. Chase. She noted that the larger building area from the 2022 report was used to calculate the trip generation estimates based on data published by the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE). She indicated that their study estimated 27 entering and eight exiting vehicles for the morning peak hour, for a total of 35 trips, and 11 entering and 27 exiting for the evening peak hours, for a total of 38 trips. She noted that it was not considered significant based upon the State Highway Access Management Code of 100 or more trips in an hour, they had prepared a formal analysis utilizing 2021 traffic counts and traffic from the hotel shown in the exhibit in the top left corner (north) and for an expansion at 50 Atrium plus background traffic growth to accommodate and account for ongoing and other area development at that time. She stated that they were looking at a level of service "C: or better for the movements at Davidson Avenue and Atrium Drive. She stated that the overall area had experienced a decrease in traffic, based on the change from office use to vacancies and now the lower trip generation associated with the warehousing. She then discussed the questions the Board had regarding circulation. She indicated that employees would be coming to the site and staying all day, with a low turnover in the passenger vehicle spaces along the two (2) sides of the site. She then told the Board that the trucks would travel counterclockwise to access the loading in the rear and did not find a problem with this as the overall amount of trucks was nominal. Ms. Dolan stated that ITE would indicate one (1) or two (2) trucks in a peak hour, combined with employees entering the site would allow the passenger vehicles to park up against the building with no pedestrian crossings of the aisle. She also added that there was plenty of geometry and sight lines and pavement to allow the movement of a truck while someone was exiting in a passenger vehicle. Ms. Dolan then addressed the circulation of WB67 trucks on the site, noting that she believed that the legal limit for the largest wheelbase of a truck in New Jersey was WB62.5 that were related to the kingpin configuration where the tractor and trailer meet. She then testified that she agreed with Mr. Stires that if a larger truck were to enter the site, there would be only a 4 ft. increase in length and wheelbase and that truck templates were conservative. She added that the site was designed appropriately and felt that a larger truck would still be able to circulate the site with no issues.

Ms. Dolan then discussed the access to the site along Atrium Drive Extension, noting that the subject project was the only one that would traverse the access easement there. She indicated that the volumes of traffic were fine at the Davidson Avenue/Atrium Drive area and the traffic volumes were dropping off as a vehicle would go further into the site on the Atrium Drive Extension. Ms. Dolan testified that the levels of service would be acceptable at that intersection as well. Ms. Dolan then indicated that, based on the operations and meeting the ordinance requirement, which was

conservative because it required a separation of office calculation and warehouse, she indicated that the parking provided on the site was adequate.

Mr. Clarkin then asked if the 15 angled trailer loading spaces were related to the original plan, and Ms. Dolan indicated that there were a few iterations of the plan since they had issued their report. Mr. Clarkin then asked if there was any concern for the fact that there would be as many as 35 employees and visitors, and Ms. Dolan indicated that she felt that it would accommodate the employees and the occasional visitor.

Vice Chair Brown asked what potential safety precautions would be taken during construction to minimize potential safety impacts on the surrounding area. Ms. Dolan indicated that it was a little out of her area of expertise but believed that the Applicant would have to obtain a building permit and truck routing would have to be established through that process. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Dolan then discussed the seasonal uptick in deliveries to the site, but she stated that she did not believe it was a significant increase and would not have a significant impact. A discussion ensued related to snow removal to allow for visibility, sight distances and maneuverability of trucks on the site.

Mr. James DeBarbieri, Senior Architect/Principal of DeBarbieri Architects, 97 Chestnut Street, Rutherford, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. DeBarbieri then drew the Board's attention to an enlarged colored rendering of the proposed building and entered it into the record as Exhibit A-3. He then discussed the building design, the materials that would be used to construct it and the various colors (earth tones) He. He noted that the architecture was unique for a warehouse and believed it made it architecturally pleasing He spoke about the offsets in the building and was a result of how the Atrium Drive Extension made a curve In the road and still maintaining the required setbacks. He then noted that the view that was being shown was what would be seen from the Atrium Drive Extension, to include the entrance to the site and the office portion of the building in the mezzanine above the lobby that included windows that would wrap around the building to provide light into the warehouse.

Mr. DeBarbieri noted that the building had minimal mechanical equipment, with the warehouse portion only including heating, with the units positioned on the roof back 50 ft. from the edge. Additionally, there would be two (2) units for the office area that would provide A/C and heat. Mr. DeBarbieri indicated that all of the units would not be visible from the ramp from Route 287 or from Atrium Drive Extension. He added that the roof would be designed to also be solar ready.

Mr. Healey asked to see any exhibits/plans of the other facades of the proposed building. Mr. DeBarbieri then showed the elevations of the building and discussed the details of the facades.

Mr. Kevin O'Brien, Planner, Shamrock Enterprises, Madison House, Suite B, Madison Avenue, Rahway, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. O'Brien then discussed the variances that the Applicant was seeking, noting that the first one was related to the Front Yard Parking Lot Setback to Interstate 287 and justified that variance based upon the existing greenery and the proposed landscaping and was basically invisible from the highway or exit ramp based on the travel speeds of the vehicles on that roadway. He then addressed the Front Yard Parking Lot Setback to Atrium Drive Extension and felt it was justified due to the fact that it was on a private right-of-way of the Applicants own creation. He added that there would be no public view of the parking or the warehouse from any public right-of-way. Mr. O'Brien then stated that there would be an open, treed area directly across from the parking lot. He then addressed the off-premises sign on the extension was justified because it was a wayfinding sign and was necessary since the building was not visible from the street or Route 27, particularly for truckers who do not always access the site. He then spoke about the last variance, which was for the loading space distance and noted that he believed that it was a de minimus exception to the ordinance and could be granted. Mr. O'Brien then discussed how the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) gave support for the requested variances. He then indicated that they were seeking the variances under the flexible C-2 standard and discussed how the benefits outweighed any detriments and that he did not believe that there were any negative impacts in the grant of the variances. Mr. O'Brien then discussed the benefits to the Township in the way of tax ratables, permanent employment on-site to support local business, and the temporary construction employment that would also support local businesses. Finally, Mr. O'Brien did not see any substantial detriments to the public good and without substantial impairment to the zone plan and zoning ordinance by granting the variances. He added that the benefits of granting the variances substantially outweigh any detriments.

Vice Chair Brown made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Mr. Alex Strauss, 285 Hazlitt Lane, Somerset, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Strauss asked Mr. Puleo if they would be agreeable to put up decorations on the vegetation and/or building for people in the area/hotel guests to enjoy. Mr. Puleo indicated that they could certainly do that if the town ordinances allow it for decorations on commercial buildings. Mr. Strauss opened a discussion regarding any grading differences between the warehouse and hotels in the area for noise buffering. Mr. Stires indicated that they were a little lower in grading than the hotels and that there was a berm between the parking lot of the hotel and the driveway on the southerly side of the Hampton Hotel. Mr. Strauss then asked if any attempt was made to have a truck area on the side of the building near Route 287 and the exit ramp. Mr. Stires indicated that he believed it was placed there early on, however, it would be placed in what was the front yard of the property. He added that the Township staff also wanted the site buffered from Route 287.

Seeing no one further coming forward, Mr. Thomas made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Ms. Rangnow seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Mr. Lanfrit then gave his closing summation.

Dr. Chase made a motion to approve the Application with Variances and conditions enumerated by the Board Attorney to include compliance with Mr. Healey's report, CME report, Sewerage Authority report, no idling comment in the Environmental Commission report, no retail sales, limit size of trucks to the WB 62, add bicycle racks, make the building solar ready, no assembly on-site, and use of earth tone colors indicated on the Exhibit A-3 . The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Dr. Chase, Ms. Rangnow, Vice Chair Brown, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rafiq, and Ms. Hilbert

AGAINST: None

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

There were no Committee Reports discussed.

WORK SESSION / NEW BUSINESS:

There was no Work Session or New Business discussed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

The Board did not enter into Executive Session.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Thomas made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:12 p.m., and the motion was seconded by Ms. Hilbert. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary
January 7, 2023