

READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH MEETING

September 17, 2008 7:00 pm

Chair William C. Nugent called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and announced that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act have been met and that this meeting has been duly advertised.

Christina Albrecht	present	Raymond Facinelli	absent	Tanya Rohrbach	present
Daniel Allen	present	Beatrice Muir	present	Wendy Sheay	present @ 7:35
Jane Butula	present	William C. Nugent	present		

Also Present: Board of Health Attorney, Marisa A. Taormina, Esq.
Hunterdon County Health Dept.: Debra Vaccarella

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. **Minutes** of August 20, 2008. (*-Facinelli, Rohrbach vote*).

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Albrecht, seconded by Ms. Muir to approve the minutes of 8/20/08.

On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Albrecht	Aye	Ms. Butula	Aye		
Dr. Allen	Aye	Ms. Muir	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye

B. CORRESPONDENCE

1. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 7/23/08 regarding oil transformer non PCB, Route 22-523.

2. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 7/25/08 regarding oil heating #2.

3. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 8/9/08 regarding oil heating #2.

4. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 8/9/08 regarding oil heating #2.

5. **Public Notice dated 8/27/08** regarding request for NJDEP General permit #10B.

6. **HCHD – memo dated 7/15/08** – complaint report.

Ms. Vaccarella stated this has been referred per this letter to the DCA, they have jurisdiction over facilities such as this.

7. **HCHD – memo dated 7/31/08** – complaint report.

Ms. Vaccarella stated the same is true of this item.

8. **HCHD LINCS** - dated 8/18/08. Public Health Advisory.

Ms. Butula stated this is a follow up from the HCHD regarding rabies vaccine.

9. **HCHD – memo dated 8/26/08** – notice of confinement.

10. **HCHD – memo dated 8/26/08** – notice of confinement.

11. **HCHD – memo dated 8/29/08** – notice of confinement.

12. **HCHD – memo dated 8/29/08** – notice of confinement.

13. **HCHD – 8/27/08** - Animal Bite Report.

14. **HCHD – 8/27/08** - Animal Bite Report.

15. **EC memo dated 9/8/08 re: “Stormwater Mgmt. and Natural Techniques Road Show”.**

16. **Block 45.02/Lot 75 NJDEP letter dated 9/2/08** regarding no further action.

17. **Block 36/Lot 47 & 48 memo dated 8/13/08** from RT Engr. to RT Planning.

18. **Block 95/Lot 10 NJDEP letter dated 8/12/08** regarding no further action.

19. **Block 10/Lot 20 NJDEP letter dated 8/11/08** regarding no further action.

20. **Block 35/Lot 37 NJDEP letter dated 7/28/08** regarding UST.

21. **Block 56/Lot 2 NJDEP permit** for flood hazard area. .

22. **Block 70/Lot 31.01 NJDEP LOI** line verification.

23. **Block 4/Lot 49 NJDEP Site Investigation** report.

Ms. Butula stated this is a follow up regarding the Merck Child Learning Center.

24. **Block 36/Lot 47 & 48 NJDEP LOI** presence/absence.

25. **Block 49/Lot 4 NJDEP letter dated 7/28/08** regarding UST.

Ms. Butula noted this is a child care center. Ms. Vaccarella stated HCHD does go out to the site.

26. **Block 70/Lot 27.10 NJDEP letter dated 8/12/08** regarding no further action.

27. **NALBOH – 3rd quarter 2008 w/state insert NJLBHA.**

Ms. Butula stated that regarding 'Preparedness', perhaps a newsletter article could be submitted.

Chair Nugent stated that the 3 year time requirement for publishing the septic system maintenance article may warrant re-publication.

28. HCHD – “On-Site Septic Disposal Seminar” 10/29/08.

29. NJLBOHA – 9/24/08 and 10/23/08 Conferences.

C. SEPTIC REPAIRS

1. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 48/L 21. *Final field 8/6/08*
2. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 55/L 13.22. *No work done as of 9/9/08*
3. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 39/L 67. *Final field 8/13/08*
4. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 48/L 40. *No work done as of 9/9/08*
5. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 43/L 10.03. *Final field 8/13/08*
6. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 13/L 7. *No work done as of 9/9/08*
7. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 28/L 24. *Final field 9/9/08*
8. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 73/L 31.03. *No work done as of 9/9/08*

From the 8/20/08 agenda, item C.1. :

9. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 72.01/L 34.14. *Final field 7/23/08*

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. **8/20/08 agenda item B. 3. NJDEP – new website KCSNJ Known Contaminated Sites in NJ.**
www.nj.gov/dep/srp/kcsnj

A. Readington Township – Active, Pending, Closed sites.

There was some discussion of the data as extracted from the website.

2. **7/16/08 agenda item B. 1. Penn Jersey Complaint.**
3. **Block 50/Lot 3 GP25 permit - complete application on file in BOH office with revised map.**

Noted.

4. **Gas station on east bound side of Route 202 and Pleasant Run Road.**

Ms. Vaccarella noted the location of this request.

5. **70/38.19 – inquiry into soil log approvals from 1994.**

Chair Nugent asked if there was any status to follow up the 9/9/08 fax. Ms. Vaccarella stated if it were re-faxed, it would be addressed tomorrow.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. **NJDHSS – 2007 Right To Know.**

Noted.

2. **Rabies Clinic – Saturday, October 18, 2008, 9:00 – 11:00, at Three Bridges Firehouse.**

Following the 9/17/08 BOH meeting, the date was changed to Saturday, Oct. 25th.

F. APPROVALS

1. **Block 75/Lot 37 – Tiedeman; Harder, Locust Rd.**

Escrow fees paid 6/2/08, Ck# 3450, \$750.

Previously heard 7/16/08, carried 8/20/08.

Mr. Charles Tiedeman, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. Mr. Harder was also in attendance. This is for an alteration to his septic system on Block 75/Lot 37. The presentation given at the July meeting indicated that the existing lateral was near failure. The liquid level was above ½ way, indicating that the lateral was soon to fail, it is a single lateral exiting the tank. The proposed system is a new disposal field, gravity dosed, pump fed. Relief is requested for a permeability test requirement for a basin flood, both tests done were 1” short of passing, resulting in the disposal bed was oversized to decrease the rate of application. There were 4 questions raised at the July meeting which were answered in correspondence dated 8/5/08, summarized as follows, 1) # of bedrooms – 5 bedroom dwelling; 2) size of septic tank – 1250 gallon tank;

3) final readings - 60" for soil log 4; 4) credentials of wetlands expert – Tom Norkevich's credentials were included with the aforementioned letter to the board.

Ms. Taormina confirmed with Mr. Tiedeman that he has testified to being a licensed engineer in the State of NJ, did prepare the design before the board this evening, in his professional opinion, the proposed system is more in conformity with the State Code than the current system, and absent of use will provide long term satisfactory performance to the homeowner. Aside from the provision regarding the pit bail, are there any other state ordinances that are not being adhered to?

Mr. Tiedeman stated yes to all of the questions, and regarding the pit bail, the permeability is the only waiver being requested. The homeowner is aware of all the regulations regarding the deed restriction.

Chair Nugent stated regarding the noticing, there was one neighbor, Mr. Wayne Richie, 530 Locust Road, Block 75/Lot 38 at the last meeting that addressed the board, and asked if there was anyone else present this evening regarding the noticing of Block 75/Lot 37?

There was no comment from the audience.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval of Block 75/Lot 37, 528 Locust Rd., 5 bedroom house, this is an alteration with no expansion, from a map named Septic System Alteration Block 75/Lot 37, Readington Township, Hunterdon County, NJ dated 3/5/08, revision 4/17/08, prepared by CF Tiedeman, licensed professional engineer in NJ. The surveyor was Thomas A. Harris, NJ licensed public land surveyor. Hunterdon County Health Dept. report dated 5/22/08 is included. Correspondence from Mr. Tiedeman which was asked for at the July 2008 meeting is a letter dated 8/5/08 giving testimony as to the pre-cast concrete 1250 gallon existing septic tank, wetland expert qualifications, a tax assessment document showing it is a 5 bedroom house, and Form 3g, correcting the other two issues. This is a gravity dosing, mounded soil replacement, 20% oversized to deal with issues at hand regarding the basin flood. For the primary, done 1/24/08, soil log 4 @ 72", mottling @ 36"- 48" with no seepage, no ground water, soil log 5 @ 72", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water. Basin flood 1 @ 60", 1/24/08 – 1/26/08. This was considered officially failed because on the first flooding there was 2" of water remaining in the pit and on the final flooding there was 3" remaining in the pit. The regional water is determined by the logs, mottling in soil log 4 @ 36". Wetlands and soil investigation was done by Thomas Norkevich, classified as a wetlands assessment letter for the septic alteration stated that there were no wetlands within 250' of the proposed septic system.

A waiver is granted to this site because there was 2" and 3" remaining in the bottom of the basin flood pit. This board feels that this was the most opportune thing that could be achieved on this very constrained property, and the engineer has testified that it is an improvement and that it will function properly.

This motion was seconded by Ms. Albrecht. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Albrecht	Aye	Ms. Butula	Aye	Ms. Rohrbach	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye
Dr. Allen	Aye	Ms. Muir	Aye	Ms. Sheay	Aye		

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula to amend the previous motion to include the waiver for the deed restricted pump system

This motion was seconded by Ms. Albrecht. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Albrecht	Aye	Ms. Butula	Aye	Ms. Rohrbach	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye
Dr. Allen	Aye	Ms. Muir	Aye	Ms. Sheay	Aye		

2. Block 63/Lot 50– RBZ, Walker, Stanton Sta. Rd.

Escrow fees paid 7/8/08, Ck# 2514, \$750.

Previously heard 8/20/08.

Mr. Robert Zederbaum, NJ licensed professional engineer, with RBZ Enterprises and Jim Dougherty appeared before the board. Ms. Cynthia Neu, adjoining property owner, Block 63/Lot

49. Mr. Zederbaum stated since the last meeting, Ms. Neu had been contacted, noticed, and they had had a conversation regarding the situation.

Ms. Neu, 160 Stanton Road, addressed the board, with the following questions:

1) Was some of the soil from the prior system contaminated?

Ms. Vaccarella stated the letter may have implied that there is a potential contamination, the applicant is looking to rectify that problem. The contamination is coliform bacteria, or fecal coliform, it is not a spillage or other contaminant. The letter was an offer for an ultraviolet light to be put on the well, so that the potential of any contamination or entrance of surface water into the well would be eliminated. Because of the lack of casing in the well, even without the neighbors septic system functioning or not, it is highly unlikely that your well would become contaminated in the future with surface water. This UV light would protect what could go on on your own property, plus what potentially may come from the next door neighbors.

2) Does the ultraviolet light take care of everything?

Ms. Vaccarella stated the UV light has an alarm and is very easy to maintain. The light is rated for 375 days, which means that once a year should be changed out. The light bulbs are approximately \$75. If there were a problem with replacing it, the drinking water could be boiled before consuming.

3) Since some of the setbacks are being changed, is there anything that will be affected by that?

Mr. Zederbaum stated the distances to be most concerned with are between the system and the well. The toe of the mound waiver is actually allowing to move the system as far from you as possible. Considering the two properties, this is the best that you are going to have.

Chair Nugent stated the setback requirements that this township has in place is to prevent runoff as well as to protect the adjoining property. The setbacks not being met are towards the other side of the subject property.

4) Will there be any requirements to put in a new well ?

Chair Nugent stated the only thing being entertained is that the applicant is proposing to protect your well by offering to install the filtration system on your well to prevent any possible contamination from their property.

Ms. Butula stated that Ms. Neu should be vigilante in having the well tested every year, since it is an old well.

Ms. Albrecht stated that the township offers a discounted well water testing program every fall, which the homeowner pays for.

5) During heavy rains, is there any chance that this would pool up to the surface?

Mr. Zederbaum stated that they are not asking for any waivers from the design of the system, there shouldn't be any ponding, it will be a mounded system similar to what is on your property.

Chair Nugent recapped for Ms. Neu that the Walkers were trying to repair their septic system similar to what the previous homeowner of Ms. Neu's property had done. During BOH review, the observance that the proximity of the proposed septic system would be too close to both wells. That prompted Ms. Neu being advised of the risks. There is not a problem perceived at the moment for either well, this is a preventative action that is suggested to the applicant.

The applicant will be involved in an application to the state for a GP25.

Mr. Zederbaum stated there are wetlands and wetland buffers in the entire area. Both areas have been designated as such, and because of that there is a specific general permit that has been established by the state to allow such construction when it is essentially due to a failing septic system. This permit is required before construction begins.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval for Block 63/Lot 50, map named Septic System Design and Plan View for Gloria Walker, Block 63/Lot 50, Readington Twp, Hunterdon County, NJ dated 5/15/08, revision 9/4/08, prepared by Robert Zederbaum, licensed engineer in the state of NJ, survey by Nicholas Lebo, licensed surveyor in the state of NJ. Hunterdon County Health Dept. reports dated 6/20/08, 7/24/08, 7/29/08, a certified letter sent to Ms. Cynthia Neu on 9/3/08 are included. Coliform tests done 5/19/08 from Nelson Analytical indicated passing results. This will be a select fill mounded pump, deed restricted septic system for a 3 bedroom

house. Soil log 1 @ 158", done 5/7/08, mottling 49 – 73", seepage 90" and below, flooding @ 133 1/2". Soil log 2 @ 158", mottling 32 – 66", seepage 100" flooding @ 105". Permeability is pitbail 1 @ 154", pitbail 2 at 136.5", done 5/8/08, results for #1 was 2.3"/hour, #2 was 0.47"/hour. Regional water is determined by soil log 2, mottling @32". The LOI is a report from Jeff Tariela dated 6/4/08, applying for a GP25. The septic field is located within the transition area or buffer of the existing freshwater wetlands, determined to exist throughout the rear and side yard and adjacent properties, containing hydrophilic vegetative species, hydric soils and positive wetland hydrology, buffer of 50'. Waivers include well distance for neighboring property, Lot 51, well casing is 8', tank is 85' from the well, disposal field is 75.9' from the well; well distance for this property, Lot 50, casing is 20', 65' from the tank, 75.9' from the disposal field, the 100' waiver is requested; toe of mound is 5' from boundary to Lot 48, the final installation of this should be inspected by the engineer; GP25 is being applied for; deed restricted pump. The installation of an ultraviolet treatment system is required on the well for Lot 50, the people owning this property must be made aware of the maintenance. For Lot 51, the current homeowner, if at the time that this system is being installed still desires to have the ultraviolet system put on her well, the homeowner of Lot 50 is required to do it. The applicant's engineer should notify the board in writing when this is completed. This system requires a deed restricted pump system, with all filing and maintenance requirements.

This motion was seconded by Ms. Albrecht. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Albrecht	Aye	Ms. Butula	Aye	Ms. Rohrbach	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye
Dr. Allen	Aye	Ms. Muir	Aye	Ms. Sheay	Aye		

Mr. Zederbaum thanked the board.

Ms. Neu also thanked the board.

Chair Nugent noted for the record that the engineering firm representing the Board of Health on the next application, Block 39/Lot 61.04, is Bayer-Risse Engineering, Mr. Bill Jupinka is present representing that firm.

3. Block 39/Lot 61.04 – Ombalski; Ferreira, Tannery

Escrow fees paid 4/2/08, Ck# 41292, \$750.

Escrow fees paid 4/21/08, Ck# 41613, \$1271.25.

Previously heard 10/15/03, 11/17/03.

Mr. Rich Pantel, Tectonic Engineering and licensed engineer in the state of NJ, represented this applicant. Mr. Mike Seaman also a licensed engineer in the state of NJ was in attendance. To review this application, back in 2006, Ferreira Construction built this building at 31 Tannery Road, at the time was constructed with 44,633 sq. feet of usable space. There was an unreachable portion of mezzanine accessible from the warehouse, was basically on top of the office.

Recently, Ferreira Construction decided they would like to use that space, hence the 1800 sq. feet, bringing the total square footage of the building to 46,433 sq. ft. As part of this application, they had to verify that the existing septic system, capacity 1550 gal./day, was adequate for the use as proposed. The water records for the past year were reviewed, including time periods when the maximum employees were present, and working Saturdays, also, during a period when there was a lot of lawn watering. A more accurate estimate of use was desired, so the number of the people in the building was divided by the amount of water used, an additional 50% surcharge was added onto that and the proposed gallonage for the 1800 square feet was added, giving a total of 1389 gallons/day, which fit into the 1550 gallon system presently in use.

There was some discussion of the design, usage and capacity of the square footage of the building. Mr. Seaman stated that the actual square footage of the active building is only 39,000 square feet, it consists of a 32,900 square foot footprint, with a second story office space of 6,837 feet.

Mr. Jupinka stated that 39,000 square foot was built, but the intended use within that 39,000 sq. ft. changed, the intended use increased as it was constructed.

Mr. Pantel stated which means that there was more office space constructed than 10,000 sq. ft., which came out of the total warehouse space.

Mr. Jupinka stated it came out of the warehouse space, but then incurs a larger design flow.

There was some discussion of the square footage of the building in question.

Mr. Pantel stated there are 39,737 square feet in the existing subject building, it is the approved footprint of 32,900, and the first floor office of 8285, and the second floor office of 6,837.

Chair Nugent asked Mr. Jupinka if the state code provides design recommendations based on square footage, and if that building has people in it, does the existence of the people add to or are they encompassed in the design recommendations based on the square footage?

Mr. Jupinka stated they are encompassed within as long as their numbers fall below the numbers of the square footage as being calculated for waste water flow.

Chair Nugent stated if I have X number of people and multiplied times 30 gallons per day and it equals some value, as long as that value is less than what would be the equivalent calculation based on square footage, then the larger of the two numbers is used.

Mr. Jupinka stated that is correct, use the larger of the two numbers. The number is 30 gallons/day for the warehouse, the office is limited to 15 gallons/day.

Chair Nugent stated at the November 2003 approvals, this board approved, based on testimony that there would be 10 people in the building, that would have been times 30 gallons/day. They also approved a 10,000 sq. ft. office and 27,900 sq. ft. warehouse space.

Mr. Jupinka stated the warehouse approved with 10 employees added a total flow of 300 gallons for that warehouse.

Chair Nugent asked if the 1250 gallons/day was based on the office building, and would have exceeded the 10 people they proposed.

Mr. Jupinka stated it looks like the number of employees was not known, based on the square footage, it would be less than the design flow.

Chair Nugent stated using that same original design calculation, based on what was actually built, it would now be 2,190 gallons/day.

Mr. Jupinka stated the only difference now would be the 5 employees for that warehouse, it would be $5 \times 30 = 150$, added onto the 1890, equaling 2,040.

Mr. Pantel stated that is also based upon square footage as opposed to actual employee counts, if there were 45 office personnel and 5 warehouse people, that adds up to 825/day, in fact that is quite close to the measured value.

Mr. Jupinka stated mathematically the calculations add up to those numbers, it is just regulatory speaking, can you approve that.

Ms. Butula stated going back to the statement in the letter that the state was emphatic that they did not fall under the exception area.

Chair Nugent stated reviewing 7:9A 7.4C The volume of sanitary sewage from commercial or institutional establishments shall be based on the type and size of the facility and the maximum expected number of persons that may be served during any single day of operation.

Ms. Muir stated that is not an 'or', it is an 'and'.

Mr. Pantel stated it also says you are allowed to use empirical water data, provided that the value for design is at least 50% greater than the average daily flow volume, which is what the latest submission is based on.

Chair Nugent stated it also says it is conditional on the facility not being in their list, but the facility type is in their list.

Mr. Pantel stated yes.

Ms. Taormina stated the guidance document really is not applicable.

Ms. Muir asked that Mr. Pantel identify the guidance document by name and title.

Mr. Pantel stated it is NJAC 7:9A 7.4D.

Chair Nugent stated 7.4D actually says "in cases where the facility does not fall within any of the categories, the administrative authority may approve the use of other documented criteria."

However, testimony earlier is that what we have before us is either an office building or a factory industrial building.

Mr. Pantel stated it is a combination.

Chair Nugent stated that his interpretation would be that the facility in question does fall within the categories within the list of types of establishments and as such that the code does not allow this board to approve using anything but these design levels, yet that is what is being requested of this board. Where within the code does the applicant believe this board has the authority to grant that?

Mr. Pantel stated that is why they are asking for an exception, based on realistic numbers which comport with what had been stated per capita daily flows.

Chair Nugent asked where within the code is that? The only allowance is if the facility doesn't fall within the list of establishments, and if it can be shown where in the code that latitude is given, it can be entertained, but it has to be identified where it is in the code.

Mr. Pantel stated they would ask the board's permission to investigate that particular question and find out where in the code they would be allowed to come back in and ask for this variation from the standard.

Chair Nugent asked if any board members had any other questions for this applicant.

Ms. Muir stated everything else seems to hinge on that.

Ms. Albrecht stated if there are any other corrections on the map, the square footage of the second floor office space should be indicated.

Mr. Pantel stated that they would.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any other questions.

There were none.

Mr. Pantel thanked the board for their time.

Chair Nugent stated for the record, he did not believe that the County made any error on this application.

Ms. Butula stated for the record, Mr. Jupinka's letters were great, the research and the notations were fantastic.

4. Block 66/Lot 33 – Bayer-Risse; McPherson, Militia Rd.

Escrow fees paid 7/22/08, Ck# 874, \$750.

Mr. Bill Jupinka, Bayer-Risse Engineering and licensed engineer in the state of NJ, represented this applicant before the board. This is for an existing 3 bedroom dwelling with a malfunctioning seepage pit. Several tests were done on the property outside the perimeter of the well circle. Nothing passed with the exception of the northern rear area of the lot. Successful tests were at 48" below ground surface, mottling was at 24" in one of the holes, which they are counting as the regional water table. This will be a mounded system, pump tank, requiring a deed restriction, reusing the existing septic tank which was installed 2 – 3 years back on a repair permit, is in tact and functional. The only site feature is on the eastern side, the well circle does encroach upon the property. There are no septic, wetlands or wetlands areas within that area. The seepage pit is about 50 years old, and the reason for failure is no capacity, a lot of sludge within the area. The house is currently vacant.

Chair Nugent confirmed that the only waiver is the deed restricted pump system, and that the homeowner is fully aware of the filing and maintenance requirements.

Mr. Jupinka stated yes they are.

Chair Nugent stated they have a map from Harbor Consultants, Inc., the topographic survey.

A MOTION was made by Ms. Butula for approval of Block 66/Lot 33, a 3 bedroom home at 105 Hillcrest Road, Readington Twp., from a map named Septic System Alteration and Design for Bonnie McPherson, Block 66/Lot 33, dated 7/15/08, no revisions, prepared by Stephen M. Risse, licensed engineer in the state of NJ, surveyor was Victor Venegra, done 6/26/08, also a licensed land surveyor and engineer in the state of NJ. Mr. Bill Jupinka is here testifying. A report from the HCHD dated 6/28/08, this is an alteration with no expansion. Testimony was given by the

engineer and his notes on the presentation of the 10 pages. No wetlands, transition areas within 100', or disposal systems within 50' of the proposed system. This is a pressure dosed, mounded soil replacement installation with a pump. Primary, soil log 617-5, done 6/17/08, no mottling, no hydraulically restricted horizons, no seepage. Soil log 617-6, done 6/17/08, mottling @ 24", no hydraulically restricted horizons, seepage @ 78". Basin flood 617-2, in soil log soil log 617-5 @ 48", done 6/17/08, passing. Regional water is determined by the log 617-6 with mottling @ 24". A waiver is given for the use of a pump, the homeowners are aware of the deed restriction filing and maintenance requirements.

This motion was seconded by Ms. Muir. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Butula	Aye	Ms. Sheay	Aye
Ms. Muir	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye

The following application for Block 47/Lot 13 was not heard, and will be listed first on the October 15, 2008 agenda:

5. Block 47/Lot 13 – Mantz; Kramer, 42nd St.

Escrow fees paid 5/8/07, Ck# 16539, \$750.

Previously heard 6/2007.

G. ADJOURNMENT

A *MOTION* was made by Ms. Muir to adjourn at 10:40 pm, seconded by Ms. Butula with a vote of Ayes all, Nays, none recorded.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger
Board of Health Secretary