

The regular meeting of the Board of Health was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Present for this meeting were Tony Berberabe, Tracy Carluccio (Board Chair), Les Hamilton, Ted Peyrek, Bogdan Slecza, Charles Van Horn, Pauline Serafin, Larry Tatsch (Vice Chair), and David Wang-Iverson. Christine Rosikiewicz, Board Secretary, was present. Dan Wyckoff from the Hunterdon County Division of Health was also in attendance.

In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act this meeting was advertised as a regular meeting in the February 13, 2014 issue of the Hunterdon County Democrat. Notice of the meeting was forwarded to the Township Clerk's office, posted on the Township bulletin board and sent to the Hunterdon County Democrat, the Trenton Times, and the Star Ledger on April 10, 2014.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/AGENDA REVIEW:**Under Education and Health Issues**

Garden State Laboratories – Lab Report from 4/1/14 for the municipal building lunchroom sink

Under Items of Discussion

4/14/14 Memo from Tim Matheny, Township Administrator re: 2014 Budget Requests

Under Correspondence

Hunterdon County

Memo from James A. Gallos Re: Pool and Spa Safety Act

PRESENTATION OF MINUTES –March 18, 2014:

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to approve the minutes as composed; Mr. Tatsch seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed with Mr. Peyrek and Mr. Wang-Iverson abstaining.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Being no comments from the public Mr. Wang-Iverson made a motion to close to the public; Mr. Van Horn seconded it. All were in favor; the motion passed.

UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS**A. Hunterdon County Division of Health and Safety – Inspector's Report****1. Owens (aka Woody's) B 16, L 11 – update**

Mr. Wyckoff said the County received a report from Dave Muscalo who is overseeing the remediation project at the property. A small amount of benzene is still present in the water; this amount fluctuates from less than one to up to about six parts per billion. The project is ongoing but getting close to ending. Other contaminants have diminished below groundwater clearance standards. This project has been going on for three or four years.

B. Preview Committee

1. Septic Alteration Application B 9 L 14

Mr. Charles Tiederman introduced himself; he is a Professional Engineer in New Jersey and the engineer for B 9 L 14 on 18 Poplar Road. Ms. Carluccio said the Preview Committee met and reviewed this application. Mr. Tiederman explained that the property is on Poplar Road, right off Route 31, in a row of one acre lots. The current system is failing.

Mr. Tiederman is proposing an open bottom peat box disposal system. This system would eliminate the need for 2 ½ feet of sand in the zone of disposal and a high mound. A dosing tank and new dual compartment septic tank will also be installed. The disposal area will be 802 square feet.

Mr. Tiederman referred to the February 24, 2014 letter from the County for necessary waivers. Ms. Carluccio said that the first eleven waivers listed are always required for peat systems; the remaining are per East Amwell code.

Mr. Tiederman said a waiver is needed for the use of soil permeability class rating; he explained that the soil logs did not perk either. There was sufficient sand in the zone of disposal.

Ms. Carluccio inquired why the soil permeability class rating test was used instead of a permeability test in situ noting there was seepage at 66 inches. She noted the location of the two soil logs taken. Mr. Tiederman said he and the Township witness observed the soil log and decided there was not sufficient water to perform a pit bail test although there was pocket of water that seeped in. The rating was K1. Ms. Carluccio said this is something to consider; this test is being used as there wasn't enough water to perform the test on the site. This is allowed per code as an alternative although the Board prefers the test done on site as outlined in the ordinance.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired why soil log 2 was not tested. Mr. Tiederman said the soil was similar to the other sample.

Mr. Tatsch said he understood why the pit bail test could not be completed and inquired why the basin flood test was not done. Mr. Tiederman replied that there was not enough water.

Mr. Tiederman referred to the waiver needed for the location of the tanks; they cannot meet the East Amwell requirement of 100 feet from the well. The tanks will be located fifty feet from the well as there was no other location to put them. The well has fifty feet of casing and so meets the State's required setback distance. The well on the neighboring property is also within 100 feet. He is proposing UV treatment for both wells.

Mr. Wang-Iverson asked about the distance to the well on the neighboring property. Ms. Carluccio said there is a "boiler plate" note on the plan stating that there are no adjacent wells within 100 feet. The neighboring wells are not marked on the plot plan. The distance to neighboring wells is required on the plan. It was noted that the State code is fifty feet however the Township code is 100 feet. Mr. Tiederman said that there were no other wells within 100 feet other than the well on the subject property. He noted that any flow from the septic

system will run towards the rear of the property and the well is in the front of the property. There is a drop-off at the back of the property before a stream.

Ms. Carluccio said numbers 2, 3 and 4 from the County letter will all need waivers.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about the recommendation for the UV system. He explained that the Board usually suggests the well be tested to determine if the system is required. Mr. Teiderman said testing could be done. Ms. Carluccio added that the Board usually recommends baseline testing so results can be compared. Mr. Teiderman said the new system will be an improvement but he still recommends the UV system as well testing is only a "snapshot".

Ms. Carluccio inquired if the distance to the well will be further with the new system. Mr. Teiderman said it is about the same, around 82 feet, and referred to it on the drawing.

Ms. Carluccio referred to waiver #5 regarding the distance to the stream; the system will meet the State fifty foot setback. Mr. Teiderman said he couldn't bring the system closer to the front of the property due to the location of the well and that sixty-six feet exceeds the State standard.

Mr. Teiderman referred to #6 from the letter regarding the toe of the mound. The mound will be one foot from the property line; it does not meet the minimum requirement of twenty-five feet. The engineer will inspect the grading and certify that the grading will not lead to offsite drainage problems. A statement will be added to the as built regarding this. The disposal bed is eighteen feet from the property line. The State requirement of ten feet has been met.

Mr. Teiderman referred to #7 from the letter regarding the sizing. The minimum size is 2.08 square feet per gallon per day. For advance treatment the guidelines allow for 1.43 square feet per gallon per day. It is a four bedroom house at 640gpd; State guidelines have been met but a waiver is needed for Township requirements.

Ms. Carluccio said that according to State code for advanced wastewater treatment systems the reduction in the disposal area applies only to those soils with demonstrated high rates of permeability and prohibits the use of a percolation test for this purpose. Ms. Carluccio asked if a larger area should be attempted.

Mr. Teiderman said the zone of disposal was tested; he is not looking for treatment. He continued that the areas presented in the code are primarily for the treatment of septic tank effluent. Ms. Carluccio confirmed this State code was for disposal and not treatment. She said that the smaller area is allowed when there are high rates of permeability. Mr. Teiderman said that application rate is needed when the field is pressure dosed; in this case most of the effluent will be directed right through thirty inches of peat so the additional area is not needed. He went over the location of the well on the property and the lack of available space.

Ms. Carluccio noted that soil log 1 extends to the east so there is confidence that area is permeable. She inquired why the system couldn't be expanded further to the east to provide a margin of safety.

Mr. Teiderman said the system is beyond the required ten feet from the neighboring property per the State standards. He mentioned minimizing offsite disturbance and that moving the system would cause disturbance to the neighbor's property.

Moving the system to the west was suggested by the Board. Mr. Teiderman did not believe moving the system to the west would change anything as the effluent is treated after going through the peat filters. He noted that there are inspection ports on the corners and that the additional area would not be a benefit when a peat system is utilized. Mr. Teiderman and the Board discussed guidelines and soil testing. Ms. Carluccio inquired about a margin of safety to safely recharge. Mr. Teiderman said the numbers in the code incorporate a margin of safety adding that he could increase the size of the bed from 800sqft to 1000sqft. Mr. Carluccio inquired if the proposed system will be a better system as far as insuring the treated water is infiltrated.

Mr. Teiderman reminded the Board that the system requires a maintenance contract with required professional monitoring once a year. Mr. Tatsch commented that if the disposal bed is found to be inadequate nothing can be done by that point except to redo the bed. Mr. Teiderman referred to the 1.23 in the State code and an abundance of fill on the west side of the property. Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired if the field could be moved to the west. Mr. Teiderman referred to soil log 3 that was not suitable for this system as designed. The excess fill on the site may result in excessive permeability. It was determined that moving the system to the west would not be feasible. Mr. Teiderman expressed his confidence in the system as designed. He follows up a year after the systems he designs are built and meets with each owner to confirm that the systems are functioning as they should be.

Mr. Teiderman and Mr. Wang-Iverson exchanged comments about the soils in the bed. It was noted that there would be sand under the peat pods.

Ms. Carluccio noted for the record that this reduction in the size of the disposal bed was allowed by the State and does not apply to the treatment area. The soils that have demonstrated high rates of permeability are appropriate for the reduced size in the disposal area. She explained that this is one of the reasons the Township code is stricter than the State; to insure the margin of safety is there and an appropriate area for the recharge.

A waiver for the slopes is necessary.

The engineer will apply for a GP25 permit; this is a condition of approval.

Ms. Carluccio explained that the Board can consider these waivers as they are for an existing system and the new system will be brought more into conformance with the code than the current system is now.

Ms. Carluccio summarized the waivers outlined in the letter from the County that are needed. Conditions on approval include the receipt of a GP25 permit from the DEP, a statement that the neighboring wells are over 100 feet from the proposed system to be included in the

drawing, and the results of the soil probes should be submitted (to show why the system could not be expanded to the west).

A motion was made by Mr. Tatsch to approve the septic system plan as shown with the additional approval of waivers 1 through 11 and 1 through 8, as shown on the February 24, 2014 letter from the County, and the condition of the GP25 DEP permit. Mr. Wang-Iverson seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.

2. Septic Alteration Application B 34 L 2.01

Craig Patterson, PE approached the dais and introduced himself. He explained that this application is a “unique situation”. This property went before the Board in August 2008 for approval of a septic system without permeability. The system was installed in January 2009. The system was designed as a three bedroom system. The engineer who designed the system has since passed away. The homeowner who contracted with the engineer has also since passed away. When the house went up from sale it was realized that the system was designed for three bedrooms but the home has four bedrooms.

Mr. Patterson would like to expand the existing working system from a three to four bedroom system. There are no additional tanks being proposed. In January Mr. Patterson performed two pit bail tests within fifteen feet of the system to determine permeability. There was permeability; Mr. Patterson noted that the original system was approved without it.

Ms. Carluccio noted that the Preview Committee reviewed this application and the past files. She recalled that she had been asked if the paperwork regarding the bedrooms could be changed and that she had replied no; an alteration to the system would need to be applied for. Mr. Patterson explained that the system as currently constructed meets State requirements for four bedrooms but not Township requirements. He continued that he initially asked for a waiver for the East Amwell design standard of 2.08 while instead using the State standard of 1.61 in order to avoid returning to the Board with an application. Ms. Carluccio had advised him that this probably wouldn't be acceptable to the Board and that in order to use the house as a four bedroom house the system would need to be designed for four bedrooms.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about the history of the system. Mr. Murphy (the applicant) said that in 2008 the homeowner had applied for a permit to fix the bed of the system but it was determined to be unfixable. He explained that new the system was designed for a three bedroom house and this was not realized until the home was put up for sale.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about the location of the old system. Mr. Patterson said it was closer to the house at around twenty-five feet from the house. Ms. Carluccio noted that the location of the old system is on drawings in the file. Waivers were granted for the lack of permeability and the reserve area was waived due to lack of space for it. The conditions were a hold harmless clause and an addendum to the deed regarding the lack of permeability. There was a recommendation that the tank be pumped and the water tested for bacteria annually.

Ms. Carluccio inquired why permeability was found this time but not in the past. Mr. Patterson said the original test was performed in August of 2008 noting that in August the ground is dry. A few basin flood tests were attempted but did not work. Mr. Patterson conducted a pit bail test this past January noting that January is high water season. He does not know why a pit bail test worked at that time versus the previous basin flood test. He explained that with a pit bail test you are testing the watershed and the water is under pressure. With a basin flood test you are testing a five by ten foot area with a foot of water in it. In his opinion using the water table of the watershed is why a basin flood test will work and a pit bail test won't work.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired why Mr. Patterson chose to test those areas as opposed to the end of the bed to be expanded. Mr. Patterson said he wanted to show permeability throughout the bed and on both sides of the bed. Ms. Carluccio inquired why tests were not performed in the area that the system is expanding in-to. Mr. Patterson referred to soil log A which is on the side of the bed within fifteen feet of where the system will be expanded. He explained that he wanted to show permeability on each corner. Ms. Carluccio inquired if Mr. Patterson is confident it is consistent material. Mr. Patterson replied that he is based on the two pit bails he did compared with the previous soil logs. Ms. Carluccio noted that this property is in the valley zone.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired what would be done to bring the system to East Amwell code. Mr. Patterson said he will remove the existing piping and rebuilt that part of the system with new piping. The laterals will be completely replaced; there will be a new "distribution network" to fit the requirements of a four bedroom system.

Mr. Hamilton inquired if the dosing will be better on the new side than the existing side. Mr. Patterson said it will be the same as it is a pressure dosing system. Mr. Hamilton inquired about the condition of the existing bed. Mr. Patterson said it has been used a little but there have not been many people living in the home although the new part will be new. There will be equal distribution. Mr. Hamilton noted that Mr. Patterson can see the condition of the existing laterals when he digs.

Ms. Carluccio inquired why reserved testing was not done. Mr. Patterson said this was because he was only trying to meet the previous approval; he was not looking for anything new at the time. It was noted that reserve testing was waived for the original system.

Ms. Carluccio inquired about the distances from the well to the other components. Mr. Patterson said it could be added; the system is more than 100ft from the well for the home and the well on the neighboring property. Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about the distance from the tanks to the wells. Mr. Patterson believes there is 100ft of distance. Ms. Carluccio asked that the distance from the well to the system components be added to the drawing.

Mr. Carluccio inquired about #3 from the April 4, 2014 letter from the County regarding only two soil logs being performed. Mr. Patterson said that there are five soil logs; three original and two new ones. Ms. Carluccio said this needs to be considered as a waiver.

Ms. Carluccio summarized that this is a request for a septic alteration design with no expansion to meet the needs of a four bedroom existing house. A waiver is requested for the required reserve area and for two pit bails and only two new soil logs being completed. There is a condition that all distances are shown from all the components of the proposed system to the well on the plot plan.

Ms. Carluccio said the approval conditions in place from before should be kept in place. These include regular pumping of the tank and that the well be tested regularly, at least annually.

Mr. Wang-Iverson moved to approve the system with the two waivers that were specified in the County letter and with the conditions that distances are added to the drawings and that the conditions that were part of the original approval in 2008 are maintained. Mr. Hamilton seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.

3. Site Plan – Hess Express B 15.01 L 2

This item was held until later in the meeting as there were no representatives from Hess present.

Items of Discussion

A. Peacock's Country Store – rebuilding after 2/29/14 fire

This item was moved up on the agenda as Mr. Robertson, owner, Peacock's, was present. Ms. Carluccio explained that there was no application; this was only a discussion to bring the Board up to speed on what is going on with the property.

Mr. Jeff Robertson approached the dais and introduced himself. Ms. Carluccio explained that Mr. Robertson has been in touch via phone with her and Mr. Wang-Iverson to find out what he needs to do if he is going to rebuild and what approvals will be necessary.

Ms. Carluccio said that she has reviewed the Township files which began around 1966. The building was built in the 1800's. She went over a history of the property. It was used mainly for a commercial use; in later years a residential use was added. Over the years apartments were added. For a few years in the late 1960's the building was not in use. There were three bathrooms and an outhouse at that time. The character of the building remained constant through the years. The last time the property went to the Board was when the store wanted to use a modified grease trap; this was allowed but the type of cooking was limited and a maintenance schedule put into place.

The Board's concern is the well and septic. The zoning would be considered by other Boards. The last approval related to the septic system was in 1984 to expand the system into the reserve area; there were ten apartments at that time. An as-built for the septic system is in the file. The system was originally constructed in 1974.

Ms. Carluccio explained that the Preview Committee's review showed that there were certain requirements including alarms and annual pumping of the tank. There is a well, which has a

UV system, on the edge of the parking lot. There is a Department of Community Affairs document in the file that indicates that there are nine apartments. Older documents indicated 8 apartments and two commercial units. The change of use variance approved in 1988 required the expansion of the system when the use was changed from a printing commercial establishment to a store with a kitchen. At that time ten apartments were in use and one commercial use.

Ms. Carluccio explained that the septic system is on the other side of the stream running behind the building. There is a cast iron pipe incased in concrete that goes under the stream to the land on the other side. The current system was approved in 1984 and installed in 1985. The change of use variance followed those actions.

Ms. Carluccio said that when Mr. Robertson called she explained to him that the Board looks at whether the design flow to the system will be exceeded or changed. If the building was to be expanded and the design flow increased to the existing system then the system will need to be brought up to code. At this time Mr. Robertson will not be expanding the use of the system. Mr. Robertson has submitted calculations from his engineer determining what use will be. Ms. Carluccio noted that the plot plain is the only document in the file regarding the septic; there are no plans or soil tests similar to what is used today when applying.

Ms. Carluccio contacted the State and reviewed State code 7:9-A. A system that exceeds 2000gpd requires a TWA (Treatment Works Approval) and a NJPDES (New Jersey Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit). This system does exceed that. Since the usage is over 2000gpd this property is taken out of the jurisdiction of the Board of Health and jurisdiction goes to the State for approval. Ms. Carluccio referred to 7:9-A – 3.3H where it indicates that NJPDES permit from the state DEP is required if there isn't one already in place. She noted that it is not uncommon across the State for older buildings to not have this permit. If a system was installed before 1990 the building is grandfathered under State code. A NJPDES permit is still needed but the property owner does not need to go through the full approval process; a T-1 General Permit can be applied for from the State DEP instead.

Ms. Carluccio said that the Board can ask the applicant to copy the Board and the County on all correspondence and the Board can review any applications submitted. She indicated that Mr. Robertson can bring all his questions to the State. She referred to her conversation with Mr. Ron Banister from the State. Mr. Bannister said there must be no expansion to the system and it must be within the existing design flow in order to be considered a grandfathered system eligible for T-1. There can be no change of use that results in the change of the type of waste or flows. The system will need to be inspected and certified by an engineer that it is working and there is no malfunction. Any repair that is needed needs to be done according to code. A Township Water Quality Management Plan revision will need to be made. Ms. Carluccio explained that every system that is over 2000gpd needs to be noted in the Water Quality Management Plan for the Township according to the State Water Quality Management Plan regulations; this plan is maintained by the Hunterdon County Planning Department for the Township. The State just revised the approval system; the Township updated their management plan three years ago. This change for Peacocks would not be a true amendment to the management plan as it is an existing use so it will not require a public hearing to make

this change. Since it is only a revision the County can advise the Board of Health on what needs to be done; Ms. Carluccio will inquire with the County about accomplishing the revision.

Ms. Carluccio said that the first step is for the Board to send the applicant a letter informing of the need for the NJPDES permit and asking that the Township be copied on all correspondence between the applicant and the State; the County will be copied on this letter. An approval is usually given within thirty days of when all necessary information is received by the State DEP from the applicant. Required information includes the existing approvals and plot plans.

Mr. Carluccio inquired if Mr. Robertson had anything to add.

Mr. Robertson stated that going forward there would be less septic use.

Mr. Robertson recalled how when Mr. McCaughnahan purchased the property it was boarded up and the inside of the store was left exactly intact by the previous owner. National Geographic stated that it was the "best preserved example" of the time period and was to photograph it. Unfortunately before they could do this the store was changed.

Mr. Robertson said he would call Mr. Banister at the State; Ms. Carluccio provided Mr. Banister's phone number to him.

Mr. Hamilton made a motion for the Board to send a letter to Mr. Robertson; Mr. Tatsch seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.

Mr. Tatsch inquired how long the site will be left as it is. Mr. Robertson said he does not plan to do anything with it until he finds out if he can afford to rebuild it. His next step is to get the State approval; then he will see the construction official.

Ms. Carluccio asked if he would be replacing the well. Mr. Robertson said he will.

PREVIEW COMMITTEE (REVISITED)

Site Plan – Hess Express B 15.01 L 2

Ms. Carluccio said that Hess is not present tonight; an application has not been submitted yet, this item is to discuss what the plan for the site is. The Board has previously sent a letter to Hess to advise that there are limits on the site. They are seeking approvals to build a Hess Express, which is a convenience store. A NJDES permit and Water Quality Management Plan amendment will be needed if the septic goes over 2000gpd. There is a well on the property that was polluted from gas tanks and underwent a successful cleanup. The Board will need to review the certification of the well.

Mr. Tatsch referred to the calculations in the letter from the County; he does not believe they match the State code book. The letter refers to 25gpd per filling station times twelve filling stations which equals 1500gpd. The State code refers to ten gallons per car served per day. Comments were made about this being a large amount of water. Ms. Carluccio was advised by

the engineer for Hess that there is a table that indicates 125gpd. The engineer advised her that an exact determination on the plans has not been made yet; they will be meeting with the County. Hess is still working with Zoning; at this time the actual floor plan for the building is not complete. The use will be converted from a restaurant to a convenience store. Water use in a restaurant is calculated per seat; for a convenience store square footage is used and the use is less. The engineer believes this change of use will reduce the design flow and allow the use to be under 2000gpd. Hess is concerned that the 125gpd per pump that the State requires is way too high. Currently there are 8 pumps; twelve pumps are proposed. This regulation will prevent this expansion. Hess would like to change the use to a convenience store to keep the use under 2000gpd and is providing documentation to the County to show how other Hess stations in the State do not generate this much flow. It was noted that approvals have been granted in the past using actual flow data. Using calculations instead of the tables is allowed per State code; this would need to be verified. Ms. Carluccio recalled an example of when calculations were used in the past in the Township. The County will need approval from the State to accept the calculation. The engineer said there is room to expand the septic system if needed; this may be done but Hess would like to avoid that if possible.

Mr. Tatsch noted that he had referred to the older version of State code; the code has been updated since.

Ms. Carluccio said the County will bring this application to the Board of Health since all non-residential uses need Board of Health approval.

Mr. Tatsch read from the code; Treatment Works Approval can be applied for in lieu of using the chart. Comments were made about 125gpd per pump being high; restroom use is higher in the shore part of the State than what would occur locally. Comments were also made on the requirements for the retail area.

Ms. Carluccio said the well needs to be reviewed. If the well use is to expand by twenty percent or greater than the well will need to be recertified. An analysis will need to be completed to determine the use; a meter may be required.

C. New Business

There was no New Business.

D. Unfinished Business

1. Report from Ordinance Committee

Ms. Carluccio reported that the Ordinance Committee met and discussed the water supply ordinance. Mr. Tatsch has provided Ms. Carluccio and Mr. Wang-Iverson with proposed changes for their review. The proposed changes would make parts of the ordinance less ambiguous. There will be no changes in concept or requirements.

ITEMS OF DISCUSSION

A. Education and Health Issues

1. 2/26/14 Info: Active Shooter Workshop for Private Sector, Law Enforcement and First Responders

Ms. Carluccio inquired about this item; it is an announcement for first responder workshops.

B. Board Secretary's Report

Ms. Rosikiewicz reported that she and Mr. Hamilton attended the Annual County Board of Health meeting at the end of March. She reported that the liaison, Dan Wyckoff, will be able to attend the Board of Health meetings free of charge this year. Handouts and information was provided on topics such as emergency planning, mold, bedbugs, and diseases. County and Township statistics were provided for food licenses, septic approvals, complaints, and reported diseases. There was a presentation on the County nursing program which provides education programs for seniors and disabled County residents called "Brunch and Learn" about topics such as summer food safety, lyme disease and hearing health. Mr. Rainey discussed ticks and mosquitos including diseases they carry.

The County will be providing Townships with a survey on the possibility of a County Animal Control Officer being hired by the County to serve municipalities who opt for this service. The cost for animal control services could be included in the County contract with the municipalities. Once this cost is determined County contracts will be sent to the municipalities.

The County is requesting local Board of Healths advise them of residents who would be unable to leave the house during a power outage or other emergency. They are requesting feedback from local boards about any programs they would like to see. Lastly, the County requested that problems with black flies be reported to them.

Mr. Hamilton commented favorably about the numerous activities of the County health department and the annual meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE

There were no comments on any correspondence.

BILLS OF THE EVENING

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to pay the bills of the evening; Mr. Wang-Iverson seconded it. All were in favor; the motion carried.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Frances Gavigan, 123 Wertsville Road, approached the dais. She said a friend of hers was at the Hunter Pace on Sunday. Their horse broke its halter and ran away into the woods. Her friend reported to her that there were at least two dead cows by the stream; one appeared that it had been there for a while. Ms. Gavigan was not certain if the cows were in East Amwell or Hillsborough; she will try to determine this. She commented about the need to know if something is killing things.

Being no further comments from any public present Mr. Wang-Iverson made a motion to close the meeting to the public; seconded by Mr. Hamilton. All were in favor; the motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Tatsch motioned, seconded by Mr. Wang-Iverson, to adjourn the meeting at 9:23 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine A. Rosikiewicz