

MINUTES
MT. EPHRAIM LAND USE BOARD REORGANIZATION MEETING

Borough Hall Court Office
121 S Black Horse Pike, Mt. Ephraim, NJ 08031
Monday, June 13, 2022, 7:30pm

The meeting was called to order. The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag and stated the meeting was advertised and notices posted in accordance with the “Open Public Records Act.”

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, present. Steve Eggert, Robert Carter, Gary Prinski, Michael Marrone, Douglas Morgan, Jason Kerns, absent.

Swearing in of New Appointees: Commissioner George Gies (Class III), sworn in by Joe Nardi.

Reorganization Meeting:

Motion to elect Robert Carter as chairman, Mayor Tovinsky made motion, the motion was seconded by Thomas Maxwell.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to elect Steven Eggert as vice-chairman, Commissioner Gies made motion, the motion was seconded by Michael Schiavo.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to appoint Tara Weiss as secretary, Mayor Tovinsky made motion, the motion was seconded by Kimberly Beebe.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to re-adopt the rules and regulations, Commissioner Gies, the motion was seconded by Michael Schiavo.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to continue the meeting date & time for the second Monday at 7:30pm, Michael Schiavo, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Gies.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to establish legal notices in the Gloucester City News & Courier Post, Commissioner Gies, the motion was seconded by Mayor Tovinsky.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to appoint Key Engineers Inc. as the Land Use Board Engineer, Mayor Tovinsky, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Gies.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to appoint Brown and Connery as the Land Use Board Solicitor, Michael Schiavo, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Gies.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to adopt the Annual Report 2021-2022, Thomas Maxwell, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Gies.

Roll Call – Mayor Tovinsky, Kimberly Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

New Business

Announcement that the Giant Fitness Application has been postponed until the July 11th meeting, they will not need to re-notify the residents.

Hearing on Rudderow LLC Final Site Plan and Sub-Division application.

Don Cofsky – Attorney for applicant refreshes everyone with what was already approved in the past for this application. He states they were here about a year ago and got preliminary approval, there was a sub-division granted many years ago, I believe like 30 something lots and the borough put it on the tax map, exactly as approved but they never perfected it, so it was never officially named as a sub-division so when Mr. Nardi and I discussed this we both had the same opinion that if this was not perfected then it doesn't exist even though the tax map shows everything, they really aren't there because they were not perfected. So moving forward we had filed for a sub-division and the idea was it was going to be two parts, actually it would have been one sub-division but we would create 6 lots along Rudderow Avenue and then add an extension on Rudderow Avenue and possibly make that the 7th lot, but nothing is being proposed at this time for that additional lot, we are just in here for the 6 lots and actually from what I been told on the

history is that at least 2 of the 6 had previously old houses on them and when the sub-division was originally brought in those houses we knocked down, which explains why on Rudderow Avenue there is both a water main that goes down there in front of two of those properties and there is gas, and there is a pole for electric as well. In any event we were here, and we were granted a preliminary sub-division approval subject to certain conditions, mainly engineering conditions, but there were really 3 issues that arose, Marty Irving put together a plan with his engineer team for this application, we submitted a revision and then a follow-up letter from Mr. Fusco, which he acknowledged certain things that were satisfied and taken care of with the revised plans, other things he wanted more of and then he added some things that were not originally discussed that need to be addressed. We went over everything and there were like 28 items in Mr. Fusco's letter of those 28 items I believe over half of them were satisfied. The last 7 or 8 of them were again contingent on various approvals, County Planning Board, Soil Erosion all those things and of course that is standard and must be done. I looked at it at three major things, Wetlands, regarding the water making sure the 4-inch main will be adequate, and another thing that will be involved is because there will be a turn around at the end of the extension on Rudderow Ave, the end is with stone and how it will be maintained along with the basin how that will be maintained. Also, to bring everyone up to speed, since we were last here, we had test kits dug, we had Acer Associates which is environmental out there to do a complete and total wetlands delineation, the comments where why are you bothering you are so far from it, but none the less we did it. We have plans for how we will maintain these other areas, which will be the developer's responsibility, but we are forming a homeowner's association for the new lots, initially the only member of that will be the developer, primarily this will be handling the weed whacking by the basin and then the area by the turn around. As far as the 4inch main, we have New Jersey American Water saying that is fine and that the line will take care of these 6 houses, and that it can also take care of any fire related issues, we had them do their own flow test back in May. It is not easy finding a fire prevention expert, but we found one his name is John Stoppi, he is over in PA, he will be available via zoom to go over all questions and comments that everyone may have. He did submit a report on this issue, stating that we are fine with a 4-inch main going down there.

Joe Nardi swears in the applicants engineer Marty Irving. Joe also asks Marty to go over his transmittal letter stating what documents for were re-submitted for purposes of tonight's meeting. Marty goes over the letter and addresses everything that was re-submitted.

Marty Irving – nothing has changed since our previous application; we have addressed most of Mr. Fusco's original comments, we have 6 proposed homes we are now providing a k turn, turn around for emergency vehicles, we also have revised the cartway slightly, per Mr. Fusco's requirement. That is the project 6 single homes, and as Mr. Cofsky mentioned the remainder of the lot, the larger lot is for a potential future project that may or may not come. Marty shows on the plan the wetlands line to the members of the board. He shows that the wetlands line is considerably far from any type of development which is going on.

Don Cofsky - interjects, Marty if I may, the wetlands line, is that the one that Acer has...
Marty Irving - yes that is.

Don Cofsky – does this line differ from the one that was done in 2001. Marty Irving – it is practically identical. Don Cofsky – so then what you are showing is 150 feet from there would still leave a good amount of space for the house that is proposed and a back yard. Marty Irving – yes. Don Cofsky – like we said we are not clearing all those trees anyway. Marty Irving – what I said a moment ago, the end lot will be the one lot that could potentially be impacted the most because again of how the wetlands line is running on an angle.

They go back to the plan and show the members the tree line and then the wetlands line and the buffer line.

Don Cofsky – are we clearing the trees because that has been brought up in discussion. Marty Irving – we are clearing the necessary trees to grade the lots and that is it, so like I was saying the worst case scenario if in fact for some strange reason more of that property has become wetlands and a 150 foot buffer was imposed that would fall at the tree line, (Marty is showing the members on the picture where that buffer line would then be), but even with that it would still have no impact on the development itself. Don Cofsky – with the wetlands down there, that is primarily a creek, correct. Marty Irving – yes that is correct it's a creek which runs parallel to 295. Don Cofsky – you are showing something on the plan which will probably come up in the engineer letter, this doesn't have the turn around does it. Marty Irving – yes, he then points out the turn around on the plan to the members, this was also worked out with Mr. Fusco before we resubmitted everything. Don Cofsky – is there also a basin there? Marty Irving – yes, the retention basin lies in here, he again points to the drawing showing where the basin will be. We have designed a temporary retention basin to accommodate the roadway stormwater per the requirements that Mr. Fusco had made comments on, which the applicant and my office will revise and resubmit for final basin plan. Don Cofsky – well what else do you want to show us. Marty Irving – that is all I had, we can have Mr. Fusco go through his letter if you would like and then we can address any issues.

Greg Fusco – Mr. Nardi unless you object there are only 6 comments that have not been addressed that I would like to identify them by numbering and just go through them. Joe Nardi – that is fine.

Greg Fusco –

- page 2, item 2, as you all heard the applicant has indicated that the wetlands associated with the overall property has been delineated in our original report, we asked for that to be delineated and the line information sent to the DOT so that the line can be officially accepted and to the best of my knowledge that has not happened yet. We know that the NJDEP has placed a 50-foot-wide transition area to the wetlands line that was approved 10/12/2001, in my opinion its most likely that the NJDEP will continue to maintain the 50-foot buffer to the new wetland's

delineation line when they get the opportunity to receive an LOI request regarding this delineation. I just wanted to point out to the board if the DEP should determine the maximum transition area of 150 feet should be applied to the new delineation line there is only a small portion of the stone driveway that has been created for the turn around that would be affected, I believe it would be like a small corner of the driveway, so what I am saying is its most likely that a 50 foot buffer will be applied in the event that a 150 ft buffer is, it will really impacts the development proposal in a neglectable manner so the board could feel comfortable with the fact that the actual LOI has not been provided but yet the applicant still comes before the board for the final approval.

- page 3, item 8c, this is in regard to the dead end so to speak of Rudderow Avenue, the development of any type of subdivision in the State of NJ must comply with the residential site improvement standards that the state developers had worked hard for, its important to note that the town doesn't set the development of the roadways anymore, the residential site improvement standards do, so the standards need to be followed and its my job to make sure that they are followed, so in the case with the dead end there should be a cul-de-sac with a radius of 40 feet, there is another type of alternative, that alternative can be a k turn, so in this case the applicants engineer has come back with the k turn on the revised plans, the k turn area is 40 ft. deep and is capable of accommodating truck traffic, that truck traffic being most likely a trash truck and or any fire vehicles that would approach that particular end of Rudderow Avenue. It also provides access to the CCMUA'S metering station or pump station that is back there, and that needs to remain open on accordance with the CCMUA easement requirements. The only issue that I have that I need to bring to the attention of the board is the turn around area is proposed to be stone, it will not be paved the applicant continues to indicate that there is still a lot of ground back there that remains to be developed, there argument is that if we pave it we are going to rip it up when we come to do the rest of the development, my concern is if it is stone there will be maintenance, its going to be used and I just need to make sure that the planning board makes provisions if the accept the stone that someone will be responsible to maintain it.

Marty Irving – if I may answer that the developer has indicated that he will have a homeowner's association and for the for seeable future he and only he will be the single member so he will be responsible for maintaining that.

- Page 4, item 8d, the applicant has provided a typical road wat cross section detail and driveway detail regarding sidewalks and what not, again this is a standard detail that is required, the detail doesn't provide a grass median so that will need to be revised. The driveway apron detail needs to illustrate some additional information and there are also some revisions that are required, so that remains to be completed.

Marty Irving – and we agree to make those changes.

- Page 4, item 8f, the proposed extended roadway profile is going to be required to be adjusted so that we do not trap water on easy street, easy street is the undeveloped right of way associated with Rudderow Avenue near the subdivision. So, again this is something that I am going to have to go over and review with the applicants engineer and it still must be addressed.

Marty Irving – and we agree to repave that portion of the roadway and work with Mr. Fusco to alleviate his concern.

- Page 4, item 11, in reference to the stormwater requirements that are necessary for this project, I need to make sure members of the board understand that the state implements the stormwater requirements back in 2004 because of phase two of what we call the clean water act which came into effect back in the mid 1970's. So, the state has some very strict stormwater regulations that we all must adhere to, the applicant did get an approval preliminary in 2021, however in March of 2022 the state upgraded and revised some of the regulations and because they don't have final approval, they will have to revise their proposal for the stormwater management features. So, this item number 11 addresses the issues, which the issues range from stormwater quality design requirements for each individual home, the applicant has proposed.
- Page 5, (11) b1, the calculations have been performed utilizing exfiltration, the NJDEP does not allow to use the exfiltration calculations. When doing the math that will need to be revised?
- B2, the calculations for the stone k turn will need to be revised.
- B3, the calculations for the NJDEP Water Quality Design Storm need to be calculated and documented.
- B4, there is a spillway basin, and that needs to relieve the 100-year storm test, assuming the basin fills up with water. Those calculations still have not been provided and need to be.
- Page 5, D (1), the state requires that the developer create and record a stormwater maintenance manual and that manual must plan how on an annual basis all the stormwater techniques will be maintained, how records will be kept and how the structures will ensure, they will continue to function throughout their useful life. Prior to the project being completed and final COs are issued this maintenance plan needs to be prepared and recorded. This should be in the resolution, and this is extremely important. The stormwater techniques must be in a final As-Built survey which will need to be provided and recorded.

Marty Irving – just to address that in two parts, the stormwater calculations and design will be revised to accommodate and address Mr. Fusco's comments and as

well the stormwater maintenance plan will be updated and supplemented per his comment.

- Page 6, item 12, the original plan indicated that a 2” diameter water main exists on Rudderow, there was some concern that it was on 2” diameter and the ability to service the street, the applicants did their homework and NJ American Water has indicated that they have a 4” diameter water main that exists on the roadway. So, this was revised and put on the plan.
- Page 6, item 17, Rudderow even though it will have a k turn it will also be a dead end, so we will need advanced warning signage and at the end of road showing that on the plan, end of road markers needs to be done. Other than that everything else was addressed in my review letter.

Don Cofsky – Mr. Fusco you mentioned about the 4” pipe, we do have Mr. Stoppi available to speak to him whenever you like and hear what he has to say.

Joe Nardi – can I just ask one question, regarding the wetland’s delineation the one property and I believe Mr. Fusco has noted only one property would potentially be affected if there was a 150 ft delineation setback.

Marty Irving – yes, this tail end of the k turn area would be impacted ever so slightly with the 150 ft delineation from the wetlands. None of the development with the homes will be impacted.

Greg Fusco – there is one thing I would like to clarify if I can, we keep using the term temporary stormwater basin, the stormwater management basin as proposed the way it will be constructed will meet the DEP requirements and handle the stormwater runoff for the extension of the roadway and three of the homes that are proposed, the reason why I refer to it as being temporary is the applicant has the ability to continue developments someday. The developer would have to come before the board with another plan and the board would have to review and approve and any engineer with the board would have to approve and review, at that time its most likely that the k turn, the stone k turn is going to disappear as we are proposing it and looking at it today as well as that basin, because the basin is better suited in someplace else for the future development, so this is why we have used the word temporary. The other thing I wanted to bring up is the HOA documents, as a board I guess we have to determine, or the HOA has to be formed by a certain time before all the homes are sold so that the stormwater is addressed properly when the documents are recorded, the president of the HOA and their information has to be actually included in the plan, and the as-built gets certified to that individual, there will need to be some type of mechanism that the HOA document goes into effect and that the HOA actually functions.

Don Cofsky – what I will be doing is, I must form an HOA corporation which I will form and that can be done rather quickly, then all the documents will go to Mr. Nardi I have done this a couple of times.

Greg Fusco – yes, it’s done all the time, I just want to make sure that it is in the resolution.

Don Cofsky – yes, I understand.

Joe Nardi – explains that everyone should have received the letter from the fire prevention expert and that Mr. Cofsky was trying to reach him via zoom for him to give testimony and if the board or anyone has questions for him.

Don Cofsky – gets John Stoppi on zoom and has him introduce himself.

Joe Nardi – swears in John Stoppi.

John Stoppi – So I am a consulting engineering firm, I also own a building code enforcement company, I do like the building code enforcement, I am based out of PA, I am a licensed engineer in 28 states. I also do fire protection and life safety, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing systems, a little bit of structural engineering, I have a master’s degree in fire protection engineering and a bachelor’s degree in mechanical engineering. I have been doing engineering for a little over 20 years now.

Don Cofsky - are you licensed in NJ?

John Stoppi – yes.

Don Cofsky – I think with his background I like to put that he is an expert in particularly being a fire protection engineering expert.

Joe Nardi – approved.

Don Cofsky - has John Stoppi look at the information that was submitted by NJ American Water and the comments from the Borough itself, about fire protection and some additional flow test done by NJ American Water this past May. Did you happen to review all that?

John Stoppi – yes, I did.

Don Cofsky – to get right to it, you are aware there is a 4” diameter pipe that goes that the street of Rudderow Ave?

John Stoppi – yes, I am aware of that.

Don Cofsky – we are proposing, 6 new building lots, and part of Rudderow Avenue right now I believe there are two of the lots from what you can see already has a 4” pipe in front of them now.

John Stoppi – that is correct.

Don Cofsky – so we would be extending down in front of the 4 additional lots, and that would be a total of 200 feet.

John Stoppi – yes that is what you had said before.

Don Cofsky – that shows on the plans, correct?

John Stoppi – the plans that I looked at were mostly zoning, and parcel maps, they didn't have utility lines and stuff like that on them, but what you are stating is what we discussed before.

Don Cofsky – did I also send you a copy of the Mt. Ephraim fire hydrants, shown where they were all located throughout the Borough.

John Stoppi – you sent me test data, you sent me zoning data for each parcel, I don't remember seeing the actual locations of all the hydrants in Mt. Ephraim.

Don Cofsky puts a paper of the hydrant locations in front of the computer for John to review. John states he is going through his folder to see if he has the paper.

John Stoppi – I found it, that was part of the packet, page two that was sent. The numbers 78 and 79 are highlighted on the map.

Don Cofsky – ok number 78 is the hydrant that is right there on Bell and Rudderow. That is where there is an 8-inch main, is that 78.

John Stoppi – yes, that is correct.

Don Cofsky – hydrant 79 goes down Rudderow Avenue and that comes to right before what we know as Easy Street, and that hydrant has a 4" main, correct.

John Stoppi – yes, that is correct.

Don Cofsky – I have been advised that it does not show on here that the piping that goes from the 4-inch main to that hydrant 79 is a 6-inch pipe, is that standard.

John Stoppi – 6-inch is the smallest pipe permitted, so yes that would typically be used.

Joe Nardi – excuse me, Mr. Cofsky what are you referring to, is this the Acer report your looking at?

Don Cofsky – no, this is Mr. Stoppi's report.

Joe Nardi – I have that report, where is the information that you are reading regarding the 78 and 79.

Anthony Stagliano – he is talking about the hydrants.

Greg Fusco – we don't have the map.

Marty Irving – I think I can make that easy for everyone, it just so happens that NJ American Water has designated the hydrant by our property, he then shows everyone and the board members on the map where these hydrants are located.

Don Cofsky – so the question was, John if I may, in extending the main down Rudderow with these additional 4 lots, the question was raised which size should that main be, continuing the 4" main and we now know with new major developments the state requires 8" mains, but we have a 4" going from a good 500 feet from where our properties start up until Bell Road. So, the question was first so if we continue the 4" main do you have an opinion to a reasonable degree of engineering certainty as to whether that could provide adequate water supply for these homes as well as water in the event of a fire.

John Stoppi - well I would have to run some calculations to be sure, I can tell you that I did calculations for a hydrant 78 which was the flow hydrant and we have a safety factor of about 45 PSI, but its not a linear relationship, so that pressure available would decrease as you run that line, so how many extra feet did you say it would run.

Don Cofsky – 200 feet.

John Stoppi – just give me a couple of minutes and I can calculate it.

Don Cofsky – you said something earlier, that there would be adequate water flow and water pressure in the event of fire from that hydrant.

John Stoppi – yes correct, from that hydrant.

Don Cofsky – that was the major question. So, then what was your conclusion afterwards.

John Stoppi – that there was enough water with a 45 PSI margin of safety. So, there is more than adequately enough water.

Don Cofsky – there was also a question as to what would be preferably, we can put in an 8" pipe for our 6 lots, even replacing the 4" that is in front of the two lots of ours, is there a preference is one better than the other.

John Stoppi – well the bigger the pipe is the more pressure flow that you will have, the advantage is really on the distance that you are running the line. If you start running a 4" line a few hundred feet, the pressure will drop.

Don Cofsky – let me ask you this, if an 8” line is put there at the end of an existing 4” pipe will that cause any problems.

John Stoppi – if no hydrants are any T’s, are with in that reducing flange, or nozzle, or whatever fuser that the transition piping, that wouldn’t cause any issue, I would recommend a fuser instead of the flange because its more gradual, so it wouldn’t cause any trouble, but I wouldn’t tap anything close to that transition piece because when that transition happens there could be a lot of local turbulence.

Don Cofsky – with the hydrant map, from what we have seen, the hydrant taps in the 4” main and there is a fair distance from where that would tap in and where the fuser would start at an 8”, that is the kind of lay out that you would approve.

John Stoppi – yes, you would have to, we have a marginable safety factor, but like I said I have a spreadsheet for this, I would like to find it quick and let you know how much of a drop we would have.

Don Cofsky – if the 4” main we to be continued, would that still provide adequate water supply to the homes?

John Stoppi – how much are we talking about.

Don Cofsky – the four additional lots, that are 50ft wide and there are two lots that already have a 4” pipe in front of them already.

Marty Irving - we would need about 120 linear feet of water main.

John Stoppi – at the size of 4”?

Don Cofsky – well yes if it is 4”.

John Stoppi – if it was 4” pipe you would be ok.

Don Cofsky – ok.

Marty Irving – that is what we needed to hear.

Don Cofsky – I guess one of the important things to know, would be really between the Borough and NJ American Water if at some point in time they are proposing to change or replace that entire main from Rudderow to Bell Road. As of now though from what they supplied us it does not appear that they intend to do so at this point, but that certainly can be a discussion for them in the future. John, would you make a recommendation as to what should be put for the additional 120 feet, whether that should be 4” or 8”.

John Stoppi – well it would be safe to put in the 8” but I still think that you would be ok with the 4”, based on the testing from the hydrant that I looked at, there is considerable safety factor and the way I calculated how much flow is required for each lot, it is only 750 GPMs for each lot at 20 PSI out of a hydrant. A good compromise that if you didn’t feel like running the 8” you could just do the 6”, if you wanted to upgrade the pipe.

Don Cofsky – would the board have any questions, or the engineer or attorney?

Anthony Stagliano – about your report and the information that NJ American Water provided you, and it is kind of hard to decipher between the 2 reports, the static pressure is reported at 73 PSI and residual pressure 48 PSI, and in the calculations was anything taken into consideration for pressure drop due to standard residential use of all the people on Rudderow Avenue using that 4” main.

John Stoppi – no I just used the direct test data, and I didn’t make any corrections for time of day, or domestic water usage. I don’t recall if they dated when they did the test.

Anthony Stagliano – I believe they did date the test they did in their email.

John Stoppi – yes, they did, they did it at 9:30 in the morning.

Anthony Stagliano – yes, and one of the reasons why I ask this question, an incident would occur where approximately 7am and or 8-9pm when people may be taking showers and using facilities, we will have a pressure drop. The other concern would be if that 4”, if that hydrant at the end of Rudderow Avenue is in use a secondary line is going to be taken from the hydrant on Bell Road, soon as that hydrant on Bell Road is opened all that pressure in that 4” line will drop.

John Stoppi – right.

Anthony Stagliano – so, that is some of the concerns that we face, is the fact that if we have residential use at the same time that the hydrant is in use we are going to see a pressure drop there and it may not be significant but it may be problematic, also again if that secondary line comes in from Bell Road as soon as that 8” main is opened up that pressure on that 4” main will drop out to almost 0 to a vacuum state for the apparatus that is connected to it. So there is a concern of that 4” main, so if we are using a straight nozzle verse a fog nozzle, or master stream, we will probably have some trust construction so we will have a significant fire load in the attic areas, so the concern is expressed with the regard to the event to safely extinguish a fire and not jeopardizing the lives of those residents and to those who are trying to extinguish the fire.

John Stoppi – right, what did you mean when you said if another hydrant was opened.

Anthony Stagliano – typically any type of structure fire you want to bring in a secondary water supply in case something happens to the primary water supply, so the rule of thumb for the department if available is to drop a second line down Rudderow Ave to Bell Road

as a secondary line. Once that hydrant on Bell Road is opened and charging that supply line, that takes away the water pressure that is charging the 4" main. So, the engine that initially is connected to the 4" main now loses pressure not just at the engine but on the attack lines.

John Stoppi – right, I see what you are saying.

Don Cofsky – let me ask something John, if a fire today occurred at the last house on Rudderow Avenue and they used the procedure they just explained, shouldn't that be a concern now if a fire happened and then shouldn't the whole main be replaced, regardless of what we do with our 6 lots.

John Stoppi – well if they do those secondary attack measures on different lines regardless of what size they have, from two lines they will have less pressure flow from both hydrants. So, if that is their tactic you will get less pressure regardless of what size the main is.

Don Cofsky – so again my question is if this is a legitimate concern, shouldn't the residents on Rudderow Avenue be concerned as to why they only have a 4" main.

John Stoppi – the requirements on the statutes and in the codes only require a single hydrant that addresses a fire there, it doesn't take into a contingency of the fire fighter tactics on how they would put a fire out and the procedures that they use. So, it would still meet the fire code itself and it would be compliant, regardless of the main size if it can adequately flow and have pressure as tested, its acceptable.

Don Cofsky – so go back to what I asked you before, you don't see any problem with extending the line by 120 feet.

John Stoppi – I felt that based on the testing of what I seen and the calculations I did, that the hydrant number 78 would still have adequate flow and pressure after the additional 120 feet of water main.

Don Cofsky – thank you.

John Stoppi – I still feel that even after it is installed it should be tested and all, but again I said I could do some calculations here and probably could tell you what it would test at based on the data I have here, but 120 feet is not too much extra, especially if you are going to upgrade to like a 6" line or even an 8" line because you're not going to get much pressure drop.

Don Cofsky – thank you.

Joe Nardi – I just want to follow up on that last point, so you are saying that the 6" pipe would be preferable in this situation?

John Stoppi – yes, you would have less friction going through that new section of pipe, verses if you continued with the 4” pipe.

Joe Nardi – earlier you have said that from hydrant 78 you mentioned a safety factor of 45 PSI.

John Stoppi – yes.

Joe Nardi – what is the range between for the PSI, like what is the optimum and what is unacceptable.

John Stoppi – what is unacceptable?

Joe Nardi – yes what is the lowest you can go.

John Stoppi – unacceptable is anything below 150 GPMs at 20 PSI. That is the minimum requirement.

Joe Nardi – what is the optimum.

John Stoppi – the optimum would be having 200 PSI and 4000 GPMs. You don’t need that much water to fight these houses in 1800 square foot and they have a height around 26 feet.

Joe Nardi – anyone have any more comments or concerns from the board.

Anthony Stagliano – are we still going with basements or crawl spaces?

Marty Irving – they will have basements.

Mayor Tovinsky – what is going on with the stone path for a k turn.

Joe Nardi – well that is what is being submitted.

Mayor Tovinsky – I mean we have grief from residents because the church has stone in their parking lot. I mean how long will the stone be good for. Who will repair it and the construction I am sure the trucks will be driving all up and down that with all this debris?

Anthony Stagliano – well that should be on the construction crew to maintain that and clean it.

Mayor Tovinsky – well what we had on Northmont.

Anthony Stagliano – I know I was just meaning it should be on them to maintain and take care of all of that.

Joe Nardi – right now the application is that there would be stone.

Mayor Tovinsky – how deep is the stone going to be?

Marty Irving – I believe the detail for the stone shows that it will be 8 inches deep, and for what its worth its temporary, granted that temporary time is undetermined now.

Mayor Tovinsky – I am just saying we got grief from a guy about a parking lot.

Marty Irving – it really is just for emergency use, hopefully no one ever uses the darn thing.

Thomas Maxwell – you said its only for emergency and trash trucks, well now that will be used at least twice a week by the trash truck. Hopefully the HOA will maintain this.

Marty Irving – yes, the HOA will maintain it.

Greg Fusco – to answer your question Mayor, the stone will be 5 inches thick.

Don Cofsky – where does the stone start?

Marty Irving – in front of all the houses will be paved, after the last house then it will be stone.

Joe Nardi – do we have any comments from the board, do we have any from the public, hearing none, do we have a motion.

George Gies made a motion to approve final site plan and sub-division subject to all the conditions being met which were identified on the record and per the Borough Engineers report, the motion was seconded by Mayor Tovinsky.

Roll Call: Mayor Tovinsky, Kim Beebe, Commissioner Gies, Michael Schiavo, Thomas Maxwell, Anthony Stagliano, all voting yes.

Motion to approve minutes: March 14, 2022 – April 11, 2022 – May 9, 2022

George Gies made a motion to approve the minutes, the motion was seconded by Michael Schiavo.

Roll Call: All members voting in favor.

Motion to adjourn.
All voting in favor.