

Minutes of the Commercial Township Land Use Board meeting was held via virtual meeting on Zoom on **May 27, 2020**.

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 6:37pm. It was advised that the meeting was being electronically recorded in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act and that anyone wishing to speak must state his or her name and address in a clear tone of voice. All joined in the Flag Salute.

SYNOPSIS:

Roll Call:

Ryan Broughton, Committee Man
John Nardone, Environmental Commission
Michael Vizzard, Mayor
LaRae Smith, Class IV Board Member
Edward Fox, Class IV Board Member
Heike Wheatly, Alternate I
Matt Wheatly, Alternate II
Frank DiDomenico, Solicitor
Steve Nardelli, Engineer
Heather Whitaker, Board Secretary
Jose Esquin, Class IV Board Member (Late 6:44)

Absent:

Dean Berry, Class IV Board Member
Aaron Harden, Class IV Board Member
Debra Karp, Class IV Board Member

Minutes:

January 29, 2020

A Motion was made by Mr. Broughton and Seconded by Ms. Smith to accept the minutes.

Roll Call

Ryan Broughton Yes
John Nardone Abstain
Michael Vizzard Yes
Edward Fox Abstain
LaRae Smith Yes
Matt Wheatly Abstain
Heike Wheatly Abstain

February 26, 2020

A motion was made by Mr. Broughton and Seconded by Mr. Nardone to accept the minutes.

Roll Call

Ryan Broughton Yes
John Nardone Yes
Michael Vizzard Abstain
Edward Fox Yes
LaRae Smith Yes
Matt Wheatly Yes
Heike Wheatly Yes

NEW BUSINESS

Kim Nguyen
Block 186 Lot 3
Bulk Variance for Fence

Mr. DiDomenico confirmed that everyone received Mr. Nardelli's report regarding Ms. Nguyen application.

Ms. Nguyen was sworn in.

According to our Ordinance Section 8.3 a fence may not be over 4' tall in a front yard if the fence is more than 25% opaque. Mr. Nardelli indicates that the fence proposed is more than 25% opaque so it would be required to be less than 4'. The report also indicates that Mr. Nardelli has everything he needs to deem the application complete.

A motion for Completeness was made by Mr. Wheatly and seconded by Mr. Nardone.

Roll Call

Ryan Broughton	Yes
John Nardone	Yes
Michael Vizzard	Yes
Edward Fox	Yes
Jose Esquilin	Yes
LaRae Smith	Yes
Matt Wheatly	Yes
Heike Wheatly	Yes

The application was deemed Complete.

Ms. Nguyen is proposing a 5' high wrought iron fence in the front yard with a 6' riser on the gate at the driveway.

Mr. DiDomenico: Why do you feel you need a 5' fence with a 6' gate?

Ms. Nguyen: I am a single woman who lives here alone with my daughter, I have had vehicles drive down my driveway at night. It's a wooded lot and people just seem to drive down my driveway. A 4' fence just doesn't really feel like much of a deterrent.

Mr. DiDomenico: So, you want it for security purposes?

Ms. Nguyen: Yes! For the safety and security of my family and myself.

Mr. DiDomenico: Is there anything else you want to tell the board about your application?

Ms. Nguyen: Not really I'm just hoping I can get this approved so I can get that gate up at the end of my driveway.

Mr. Nardelli stated he had no objections, knowing the reason why she was requesting a 5' fence.

Mr. DiDomenico then opened it up to the board for questions.

Mr. Broughton: Have you had any incidences other than people coming down your driveway?

Ms. Nguyen: Yes, I have a carpenter that comes here to help with some work and he stated that there have been many robberies in the surrounding areas and he was concerned about her being all alone in the wooded lot. My neighbor also just got robbed. I have even installed cameras and it has gone off at night. Anyone could come up that driveway at any time and you can't see them from the road. I just don't feel that I am safe without this fence and especially the gate.

With no other questions from the board, Mr. DiDomenico opened the application to public comment. With no public wishing to speak on this application, a motion was made by Mr. Nardone and seconded by Mr. Wheatly to close the application to the public.

All in favor, none opposed.

A motion was made by Mr. Nardone and seconded by Mr. Wheatly to approve a bulk variance for a 5' tall fence in the front yard of a Single Family home with a 6' peak at the Gate, would be subject with any building permits as required.

Roll Call

Ryan Broughton	Yes
John Nardone	Yes
Michael Vizzard	Yes
Edward Fox	Yes
Jose Esquilin	Yes
LaRae Smith	Yes
Matt Wheatly	Yes

The application was Approved.

Silvi Concrete of Chester County, LLC d/b/a Sahara Sand of Port Norris
Block 215 Lot 75 & 76
Major Site Plan & Conditional Use Variance

Michael Gruccio will be the attorney representing Silvi Concrete of Chester County. Mr. Gruccio requested a declaration of the voting members.

Mr. Fox: Frank, I will need to recuse myself from this application as I am a bordering neighbor. I will be able to vote on the other application though.

Mr. DiDomenico: That would make it 5 voting members. Would you like to proceed with 5?

Mr. Gruccio excused himself to defer with his client Sean Earlen.

Mr. Vizard: I have received concerns from the public about the traffic on Main street. The noise from the trucks and the fact that the trucks shake their houses. Would it be considered that the trucks take an alternate route down Dragston to James Moore Rd and down North Ave vs coming through the center of town?

Mr. Broughton: As a resident of James Moore Rd I would like to speak on that. I understand there may not be as much population on James Moore as there is on Main street but there are no posted speed signs and I would like to hear that if they are going to take that route that there be some assurance that the drivers will adhere to the speed limits and such.

They decided to continue.

Mr. Gruccio:

This matter was last before the board when the ownership of the property was Ricci Brothers. Silvi Concrete is coming now to get the application approved under their name. They are making a few small changes to the buildings on site, but wanted to clarify that the mining operation is something that was already approved under Ricci Brothers several times in the past. Mr. Nardelli's report, which has been sent to each of the board members. (Mr. Nardelli's report states that he would consider the application complete).

Mr. DiDomenico: This will also be a two-part hearing, like with Ms. Nguyen's application, where we will vote on completeness first and then on merit. We have Mr. Nardelli's report where he gives a very detailed explanation as to why he believes the application can be deemed complete.

A motion was made by Mr. Wheatly and seconded by Mr. Esquelin to deem the application complete.

Roll Call

John Nardone	Yes
Edward Fox	Yes
Jose Esquelin	Yes
Matt Wheatly	Yes
Heike Wheatly	Yes
LaRae Smith	Yes

The application was deemed Complete.

Mr. Mark Shourds, Planner, and Mr. Sean Earlen, Silvi Group's representative, were sworn in.

Mr. Shourds' credentials were given to accept him as an expert witness and there were no objections from the board.

Mr. Gruccio:

The site in question is located east of Dragston Rd and west of Strawberry Avenue; to the west of the site is the Downe Township/Commercial Township border. The Site contains 238.56 Acres. The permitted area is 144.11 acres. The Site is comprised of Phase 1 and Phase 2 in Commercial Township, there is no active mining in Phase 1, though Phase 2 is currently active and is planned to remain active. Designated areas A, B, C, D, & E, which will be gone over with Mr. Shourds, are anticipated plans for mining. These are within the mining area and the specifics will be covered by Mr. Shourds. The last approval granted to the Ricci Brothers was approved in 2018 by Resolution 2018-08, it states that this was the 7th renewal granted for this property. The new owner will be coming forward with some structural changes to the site, which would be for the improvement of the site. Mr. Shourds will give you technical overview, Mr. Earlen will be providing you with Operational information on the application. I do want to address two considerations from Mr. Nardelli's review before passing this on to technical review; 1) Mine setback extraction: the ordinance standard is 300' from boundary line and right of ways, also 500' between any structures and any public roadways, and 100' undisturbed buffer area. Variances run with the land and therefore these have already been granted under prior applications. Section 9.2 2A(2) states there must be a 300' separation from the mining site, mining operation and an adjoining property unless the adjacent property is owned by the same. This eliminates the need for that anyway. 2) The second consideration of Mr. Nardelli's review pertains to reclamation

bonding. The Township Committee has reviewed the bond and the bond has been received by the Township. I now pass this on to Mr. Shourds.

Mr. Shourds:

Long history with this site as well as the client. :Shows aerial view of site:::showed Dragston Road, offices, existing buildings, dredge:: Existing dredge is diesel Silvi will be using an electric dredge which is quieter and cleaner. The diesel dredge can only go to about 50 feet the new dredge can go to a depth of about 100 feet which is typically approved on other mine sites in the Township. The dredge mixes water from the pond with the minerals it is extracting. This then gets sent to the processing plant. Once at the processing plant many different methods can be used in getting to the product that gets sold from the raw materials. They use magnets, screens, many methods, and the discharge "slurry" go back into the pond. It is a closed system; the water table changes very little through the whole process based mainly on evaporation or rainfall. It does not pull from anyone's well or anything.

::Operations Plan Rendering:: What I'm going to show you here is the area that is going to be dredged, the direction of the dredging and what changes will be coming to the site; improvements and upgrades. The dredge works around the outside, moving back and forth. A, B, C, D, & E marked on the map. Though it will be mined again deeper and even for different materials. We will be bringing stackers. :showed how the materials go through the radial stackers on site:: The trucks come in and weighed empty they get filled and get weighed again. :showed route::

A couple points about the variances. There is a 300' set back and you can't clear the first 100'. This mine however is very old, and this has been done way back. This area here was mined back probably 50 years ago. These areas here were reclaimed but reclaimed naturally. We won't reclaim these burns until near the end of the operation, creating a safety ledge in the water. We either go 15 feet at 1:5 or 25 feet at 3:1. You will have to walk 25' into the water before it is up to your chest. This keeps it pretty safe, you will either be swimming; or you will walk back to the bank because you will be buoyant at that point. These areas have been reclaimed naturally, the slope is about 3:1. This is part of Phase 1, it has not been mined in some time. It is stable at the moment, but it is not yet in its final reclamation phase.

The last thing I wanted to say about this we have a soil erosion set in place from 2018 and we will get another in place with this approval. We are making sure we don't cause any kind of erosion off-site and Soil Conservation comes in and does their investigation to make sure of that. The water, when it rains, runs down the bare ground and into the pond. So it doesn't run into a neighboring property or anything.

:: Opened for questions::

Mr. Nardelli: It was talked about in the report of a South Western minor expansion. What does that refer to? Did something change from the other plans?

Mr. Shourds: Yes it has. The property owner purchased all the properties adjoining the site. They are granting a 0 buffer for each of these, though there won't be one on each area. We are utilizing the ordinance and pushing the mining out.

Mr. Gruccio: Mr. Nardelli, I just want to state that that is still within the original area by virtue of prior board approval.

Mr. Shourds: Yes, that is true. We did not expand on the block and lots or outside of what has been approved to be mined in past applications. Mainly because we don't want to go back to CAFRA. We are taking the next steps to broaden the mining area. Does that answer your question Steve?

Mr. Nardelli: Yes. I see it now.

Mr. Shourds: We put together a planting detail, it was originally put together by Rutgers Agriculture regards to reforestation. It is what types of seedlings and such that should be planted. It's a matrix put together by Rutgers and will be added to our plan as requested.

With no other questions from the Board, Sean Earlen was introduced to present.

Brief recess while Mr. Earlen conferred with Mr. Gruccio.

Mr. Gruccio: Regarding section B and section E of Mr. Nardelli's report, you would be in more of a position to report on. Comment B regards to a traffic control plan, how does it work from a standpoint of operations for this site?

Mr. Earlen: First of all, I just want to thank everyone for having this meeting among these unusual circumstances. The plans will show a scale house or office house right near the entrance to the facility. It will be signed and we will have guards. Any truckers or visitors will have to check in. The site is governed by MSHA like OSHA but for mining sites. In terms of site circulation, there are only three or

four products on site that will need to be picked up. As far as that, there really is only one road on site. It is circular, so if you are not here to pick up the first product you move to the second or third and so forth and then move on. We use this in Southern Ocean County and in Gloucester County, it yields safe and efficient results.

Mr. Gruccio: Next under Comment E, the applicant shall provide testimony on dust control.

Mr. Earlen: The dust on site is actually minimal. It almost sounds the opposite of what it should be, but we are mining it wet, so very little dust. Any sand that is tracked onto the township or county roads, we bring in street sweepers as needed, which we have found to be every two to three weeks.

Mr. Gruccio: Can you please address the concerns about the traffic that was brought up earlier in the meeting?

Mr. Earlen: I know the Mayor said there are some concerns about noise and traffic from the residents of Main street. However, I have heard some concerns about the existing truck traffic on North Ave as well. I guess we are kind of Damned if we do damned if we don't on that. I would like to keep our route down Main Street to our other site, adhering to all local ordinances and we will gladly give out the cell phone number of our plant manager as it relates to any truck drivers so we can nip it in the bud immediately. We will be sure to adhere to all ordinances as it stands to speed and noise.

Mr. Gruccio: Township Ordinance 2015-567, certain roads are closed to truck traffic. Are you familiar with this ordinance?

Mr. Earlen: I am familiar with the ordinance and we will not be traversing any road on that ordinance.

Mr. Gruccio: Is it fair to say that our proposed truck route does not oppose anything on this ordinance?

Mr. Earlen: That is correct.

The meeting was then opened to questions from the board.

Ms. Smith: If there is concern with a resident, the company is willing to allow them to bring that to someone? Maybe through the township or committee? So that they realize that they are willing to be a resource to the community but also be a part of the town as well.

Mr. Earlen: I would offer my cell number but also the Plant Manager, who will be there on daily basis. If there is a concern, we would definitely want to address that and be there for that resident to offer a solution.

Mr. Wheatly: Is there a timeline for the truck drivers or trucking hours?

Mr. Earlen: Our typical hours of operation will be from 6a - 6p, though during our heavy season we will be working outside of those hours, but that won't be the norm.

Mr. Wheatly: Is it all tri-axel dump trucks? Is that what is being used?

Mr. Earlen: Yes, sir.

Mr. Wheatly: Any idea the volume of trucks per day?

Mr. Earlen: It will be somewhat market driven, we are hoping to get in touch with local haulers so they will have a little more care for the community. However, it is expected about 4-5 trucks will be making round trips to the BiValve property (in the next application), it could be 5 trips a day per truck or it could be 10 trips. It's tough to make that commitment at this time.

Mr. Vizzard: I just wanted to say that I have no problem with what Mr. Earlen is proposing, I just wanted it known that I already had people come to me with concerns but since he has something in place to address those concerns. Since it seems they are going to be respectful of our town and the safety of our residents, I have take no issue with them.

With no other questions from the board or Engineer, the meeting was opened to the Public for questions or comments.

With no response from the public, Mr. Gruccio made some final comments.

Mr. Gruccio:

We request approval of this application; it is not out of sequence of prior approved applications. We can appreciate the concerns of the citizens regarding traffic, however Silvi Concrete will now be a citizen themselves. They will take every effort. I just want to make the comment that this property is an

approved mining operation and therefore there is an assumed amount of truck traffic in and around this site. Please do not shut down this site due to traffic that is assumed with a business like this that has been in operation for years. Thank you.

A motion was made by Mr. Wheatly and seconded by Mr. Esquilin to renew the 5-year mining permit subject to all outside agencies and subject to the requirements of Steve Nardelli's report as well as Site Plan approval.

Roll Call

John Nardone	Yes
Jose Esquilin	Yes
Matt Wheatly	Yes
Heike Wheatly	Yes
LaRae Smith	Yes

Application Approved.

Eagles Lake Reserve, Inc d/b/a Port Sahara

Block 226 Lot 6, 6.01, 7, & 7.01; Block 222 Lot 24
Minor Site Plan & Conditional Use Variance

Same people presenting Eagles Lake Reserve as was Silvi Concrete.

There are 6 voting members, the applicant chooses to proceed.

Mr. DiDomenico reviews Mr. Nardelli's report stating that the application can be deemed complete.

A motion was made by Mr. Nardone and seconded by Mr. Esquilin to deem the application complete.

Roll Call

John Nardone	Yes
Edward Fox	Yes
Jose Esquilin	Yes
Matt Wheatly	Yes
Heike Wheatly	Yes
LaRae Smith	Yes

The application was deemed complete.

Mr. Grucio:

I am representing Eagles Lake Reserve, being known locally as Port Sahara. This is an application for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the applicant to conduct a Commercial Barge Loading operation located on the southerly side of Miller Ave known as B 226 L 6, 6.01, 7, & 7.01. Along with the conditional use permit, the applicant is seeking a variance relief pertaining to the conditional use and a minor site plan approval. It is located in the Commercial/Recreational (C/R) zone. Among the allowable conditional uses for this zone are light industrial uses, freight assembly, and other similar operations, we would propose that this falls under this use. A similar operation was approved located in another C/R zone located at 8727 Berry Ave B225 L17 & 17.01 Resolution 2019-09. It is being recognized that the board approved this conditional use in similar circumstances. When the application was submitted there was an inclusion of B222 L24. That property is being withdrawn from this application due to the fact that they thought this property was also zoned the same, with discussion of the application with Mr. Nardelli, that property is zoned Conservation (C) and Public (P), neither of which allow for this use, therefore we will be removing that portion of the property from this matter. So, we will be proceeding with only B226 L6, 6.01, 7, & 7.01. The approval of the other barging property does not set a precedence but does show several parallels between the applications. We do seek approval of this application recognizing that three criteria are not necessarily met;

- 1) Depth of 300' is required, although portions do meet that, the side property lines measure 209.63' on east and 219.90' on west side.
- 2) Area of 3 acres is required, we are 2.5 acres.
- 3) Height maximum for structures is 40', we propose a telescopic stacker for loading of materials on the barge it reaches a full height of 54' 1". We did not consider the stacker a structure, we would consider it a movable equipment. Though we do recognize that it exceeds that height requirement for the zone and are willing to request a variance for it.

::Discussion between Mr. DiDomenico and Mr. Nardelli decided to round the variance relief sought for height up to 55' rather than be so specific as to start measuring inches::

Mr. Shourds & Mr. Earlen were sworn in for this application.

Mr. Shourds' credentials as a Professional Planner were given as to his ability to be eligible as an expert planner for this application.

Mr. Shourds:

::Showed rendering of site plan on screen:: Site is located on the south side of Miller Ave with frontage on the Maurice River. The depths were discussed as being short on the sides but the site is wider in the middle. There are multiple uses allowed in the C/R zone and there are 8 Conditional Uses that can be applied for as well. We were trying to figure out what Use barging would best fit under. Therefore the areas, depths and such are all different based on the different uses proposed.

There is an access into the site, they will drive in by the hopper, dump the sand directly into the hopper and continue out onto Miller Ave. We are proposing an Office trailer. Any stockpile will be placed within the setbacks. There is a bathhouse from the existing marina present as well as a septic system for that building. There is a concrete pad associated with the hopper, this is raised, the trucks will actually back up onto this raised platform to dump into the hopper. There is then a conveyor that will take it to another hopper. Which will then take it to the stacker which will reach out over the riparian area to be loaded. ::shown on plan:: There is a fixed elevated section where the trucks dump into the hopper that has a conveyor in it which brings the materials to the stacker. When the stacker is telescoped to its full length it could be up to 54' 1" which we will call 55' due to materials on it.

The area required is 3 acres and we have 2.5 acres. This does not include the other lot that we own but have removed from the application. Along with the lot line depth, we do not meet these three conditions, meaning we will need a D3 variance. The following reasons are why we believe they should be granted. This zone is the only place that we can do this operation as it requires the water front. These shortcomings do not create any hardships on the operation proposed. This site is suitable for the proposed operation, it meets everything necessary for this particular operation. The stacker, where it exceeds the height, would actually be over the water not even over the land of the site. I cannot find any detriment to the area regarding the shortcomings of the requirements. Originally when I looked at this operation, I was going to submit it as an A-7 (permitted use) has been submitted as a B-8 Conditional Use criteria. A-7 only requires a 1 acre minimum and the depth is only 2 acres. The A-7 is described as; marina, shipyard, boat sales, and other marine-related business. Freight loading that has to have the water. But we have submitted due to the boards prior action at the other property and request the variances. I am satisfied that the variance can be granted without a substantial detriment to the neighbors or the use of their property as zoned. Additionally, I am satisfied that it can be granted without a substantial detriment to the Public Good and will not substantially impair the intention of the zone plan or ordinance.

There are a couple of items on Mr. Nardelli's report I would like to address. After initial construction of the site. There will only be two to three employees on site. Therefore, there is ample room for parking. The second, we proposed a screening barrier up on Miller Ave and Mr. Nardelli suggested that we put a berm up on the side bordering the Police Barracks. The applicant has no problem with putting up some screening. We would propose to do a double row of white pine, though the engineer suggested a green giants, though they only grow to be about 5' wide so we would propose white pine or a mix of white pine and evergreens. The applicant has agreed to the trees for a screening along the side property.

Opened to discussion from the board.

Mr. Nardone: Is this scope going to be only open for a limited time or will this operation be on going forever?

Mr. DiDomenico: If the board grants the conditional use, it works like a variance. It runs with the land so as long as they would like to keep that use going they can run it forever.

Mr. Nardone: My second question is, the conveyor belt. Is that powered by anything?

Mr. Shourds: It is electric. Both of the conveyers, as there are two assemblies, have electric motors that run the belts.

Ms. Smith: On this telescope, is this new as far as something that is being used? Would that be able to be seen from the road at its highest height?

Mr. Shourds: It is very narrow. You would see it when it is fully extended, it would look like a tower or something. It has a belt on it that just carries the materials out to the barge. It just gets pushed out so that it has a greater reach but it may be very infrequent that it is run at this length and height. It just allows for this. It may be run by the tide. If the tide is down it most likely will not need it's full length.

Mr. Gruccio: Despite the discrepancies due to the area, depth, and height does this site remain suitable for this operation and use?

Mr. Shourds: Yes.

Mr. Gruccio: One other question. If one drove along the river front would one see large cranes and stacking equipment on other properties as well, would they not?

Mr. Shourds: There are other properties, one in particular comes to mind, that have the same types of equipment, industrial type uses, yes.

Mr. Gruccio: So, this would not be uncommon in respect to other properties in the BiValve area. Sean, do you have anything to add to the operation?

Mr. Earlen: The typical hours of operation would be 6a-6p, though at our busiest season that could extend some. In reference to traffic, we anticipate anywhere from 3-5 tri-axel dump trucks to be making several trips. There is no proposed additional lighting on site but all the equipment and the trailer will have lighting on them that would be sufficient. We plan 2-3 employees on the site. If there are any concerns from neighbors or residents regarding traffic, we would want to know and we intend to follow all ordinances with regard to traffic. There will be a representative available for this purpose, the manager for the Plant on Dragston will be the same manager for this facility. The entrance and exit gates will be labeled accordingly and there will be an address sign hung on the gate. These signs will be within ordinance requirements.

Mr. Gruccio: Why do you think this site is suitable for a Barging Operation?

Mr. Earlen: It is an industrial area with river frontage that affords the water depth for barging to be taken out to sea as well as being situated close to the Dragston Mining site. The sites are only about 2-3 miles apart.

Mr. Gruccio: If you were not to travel to this barging site, would it be correct to say it would put more traffic in the Commercial Township community in order to ship the materials elsewhere causing traffic to be more abundant throughout the community?

Mr. Earlen: That is correct.

With no further questions from Mr. Nardelli or from the Board the meeting was opened to the Public.

Mr. Vizzard: I just wanted to point out that the Township is putting out about \$2.4 Million to improve the roads down by the riverfront to help the businesses. We would expect that Silvi would respect that and to make sure that any sands that may be spilled would be cleaned up and that they would do their part to help ensure roadways. Also, that they would get all required building permits would be filed and obtained for any permanent structures on site. I see that there is a temporary office building on the plans, I don't know how temporary but that once a more permanent solution is made that they would go through the proper channels.

Mr. DiDomenico: We will be sure to put that in the resolution.

With nothing else from the Public, a Motion was made by Mr. Wheately and seconded by Mr. Nardone to close the meeting to the public.

Roll Call

John Nardone	Yes
Edward Fox	Yes
Jose Esquilin	Yes
Matt Wheately	Yes
Heike Wheately	Yes
LaRae Smith	Yes

A Motion was made by Mr. Wheately and seconded by Mr. Nardone to approve a Conditional Use for Light Industrial/Freight Handling, a Variance for Depth, Variance for Area, Variance for Height, and Minor Site Plan.

Roll Call

Mr. Nardone: Yes, all the negative criteria is insubstantial.

Mr. Fox: Yes, It's what's required to run the business and operate it. Nothing seems out of place, my only concern was the traffic and they seem to have addressed that well.

Mr. Esquilin: Yes, I don't see any negative effects. It seems standard.

Mr. Wheately: I vote yes, due to the testimony of the Expert Witnesses.

Ms. Wheately: I vote yes, everything seems to be in compliance. I see no reason to deny running a business.

Ms. Smith: Yes, my reasons are expert testimony, of course. This business would be lucrative to the community and they took the time to really explain it all to us especially with all the new board members.

The Application was Approved.

**CORRESPONDENCE
BOARD BUSINESS**

BILL LIST

APPROVE BILL LIST

A Motion was made by Mr. Wheatly and Seconded by Mr. Vizzard to approve the bill list.

Roll Call

Ryan Broughton	Yes
John Nardone	Yes
Michael Vizzard	Yes
Edward Fox	Yes
Jose Esquelin	Yes
LaRae Smith	Yes
Matt Wheatly	Yes

OPEN TO PUBLIC

A motion was made by Mr. Esquelin and seconded by Mr. Wheatly to open the meeting to the public. All were in favor, none opposed.

With no public comment, a motion was made by Mr. Esquelin and seconded by Mr. Wheatly to close the meeting to the public.

All were in favor, none opposed.

ADJORN MEETING

With no other business, a motion was made by Mr. Nardone and Seconded by Mr. Wheatly to adjourn the meeting.

All were in favor, none opposed.

Heather N. Whitaker
Board Secretary

Next meeting: June 24, 2020

