

FREEHOLD BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 9, 2020

MONTHLY MEETING

The monthly meeting of the Freehold Borough Planning Board was held on Wednesday, December 9, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. remotely in accordance with the New Jersey State Emergency Declaration.

Chairman Barricelli stated that this meeting was provided in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act, by providing a copy of the agenda to the official newspaper and posting same on the official bulletin board of the Municipal Building.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT	Mr. William Barricelli
PRESENT	Mr. Paul Ceppi
PRESENT	Mr. Michael McCabe
PRESENT	Mr. Michael Wildermuth
PRESENT	Mr. Garry Jackson
PRESENT	Ms. Shealyn M.S. Crombie
PRESENT	Ms. Caridad Argote-Freyre
ABSENT	Councilwoman Margaret Rogers
PRESENT	Ms. Brianne Kozlowski

Mr. Barricelli read Item No. 3 on the Agenda as follows:

Approval of Minutes from Planning Board Meeting November 10, 2020

Mr. Wildermuth made a motion to approve the minutes, Ms Argote-Freyre seconded.

Yes	7	Barricelli, Ceppi, Wildermuth, Jackson, Crombie, Argot-Freyre and Kozlowski
No	0	
Abstain	1	McCabe
Absent	1	Councilwoman Rogers

Mr. Barricelli read Item No. 4 on the Agenda as follows:

Freehold Center Core Redevelopment Zone Resolution No. 155-20 adopted November 16, 2020 and Introduction of Ordinance #2020/18 Approving and Adopting the November 2, 2020 Amendment to the 2019 Center Core Rehabilitation Plan;

Mr. Cucchiaro – Mr. Chair, I would like to orient the newer Board members who many not have gone through this process; Borough has a redevelopment plan for the Freehold Center Core Redevelopment Area, the plan is adopted via ordinance; requirement of redevelopment and housing law, the redevelopment plans have to be referred to the Planning Board for review as to consistency with the Master Plan; after we do, it goes back to the Governing Body and they vote;

We have Mr. Melvin here tonight, who prepared the amendment, providing testimony explaining the amendment and the changes and why it is or not consistent with the Master Plan; you are not approving anything tonight you are voting to confirm if the changes are substantially consistent with the Master Plan; this is an amendment, discrete portion of redevelopment plan to be discussed and limited tonight to discuss only the amendment being proposed; not the overall redevelopment plan;

Swear in Mr. Robert Melvin, Pennoni - Professional Planner for the Borough, license in New Jersey and member of American Institute of Certified Planners;

Mr. Melvin – we prepared the original core redevelopment plan as Ron mentioned; there are minor changes in the amendment, 3 items; all hinge around a preexisting business Auto Pro in Market Yard; The plan originally acknowledged the preexisting condition and that it could expand over time; since the plan adopted, Auto Pro brought a plan to the Governing Body, slightly different to the conditions in the Core Redevelopment Plan; the amendment is to acknowledge the differences; Specifically, Auto Pro acquired a portion of lot 24 to make part of their overall expansion and proposes; the plan acknowledges the change of the lot line in the section of community, also acknowledges the split of zone line in the redevelopment plan; downtown zone, permits the auto shop where the business currently exists; lot 24 is in a neighborhood zone, so the backend of the lot, where the expansion will take place, the zone line has been modified to acknowledge that; also the plan allowed for the expansion of the preexisting business, up to about 20% expansion; the expansion put forth to the Governing Body is larger, 150%; the idea to clean up the site was found very attractive;

In terms of goals and objectives, it is consistent with the Master Plan; it is essentially it is the same planning concepts part of the original Core Redevelopment Plan; none of that has changed, none of the use locations have changed; very consistent with the Master Plan in that regard;

Ms. Freyre – I read something about knocking down a garage, can you speak to that;

Mr. Melvin – I think it is part of lot 24, in the rear in the expansion; if you are familiar with the site, there are parking issues, service issues where cars are parked; the intent is to clean that up, through this process;

Mr. Cucchiaro – to be clear, you are not approving an actual development; only saying if the proposed amendment to the redevelopment plan is substantially consistent with the Master Plan; a site plan application will be filed with this Board and go through the actual development;

Mr. Barricelli – As a retired teacher, I have one thing to point out, in 4, principles, not principals; when Council took the vote on what they adopted, it was a 4 to 2 vote; anyone know the reason, what was the argument of the 2 that voted against the resolution; hoping Councilwoman Rogers would be here to tell us;

Mr. Barricelli – anyone want to make a motion;

Ms. Crombie made a motion to approve; Mr. Ceppi seconded;

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, McCabe, Wildermuth, Jackson, Crombie, Argot-Freyre and Kozlowski
No	0	
Abstain	0	
Absent	1	Councilwoman Rogers

Mr. Barricelli read Item No. 5 on the Agenda as follows:

Application Number: PB-UV-2020-005
Applicant: Broadway Family Health Care / 13 Broadway Realty LLC
Location: 13 Broadway - Block 42 Lots 10 - Zone: B-1
Request: Use Variance & Preliminary and Final Site Plan
Carried from October 28, 2020

Vincent E. Halleran Jr., Esq – same witness; Ron do they remain under oath from the previous meeting;

Mr. Cucchiaro – all witnesses who previously sworn remain under oath;
Before you testify please identify yourself for the record;

Mr. Barricelli – offered the public, after each expert they will have a chance to ask questions; at the end the public may provide comments on the application; then the Board will deliberate and make a decision of the application;

Mr. Halleran – this application is carried from the October 28, 2020 meeting; we put on the case with regard to the positive criteria and was established this application is inherently beneficial use and what we should be focusing on is any negative effects on this; as a result of the previous meeting, we submitted additional documents and Mr. Wentzien, Borough Engineer has submitted a report addressing those items; expediting the matter, both Daniel and Mark Vaysberg are with us tonight to address their back ground and qualifications; Rob Sive, Engineer is here, he submitted site plan and will address any issues; Greg Clark, Architect will also address any concerns;

Mr. Halleran – Mark Vaysberg based on the concerns of the Board from the previous meeting please advise the Board of your background qualifications;

Mark Vaysberg – concerns of experience; in this business for twelve (12) years, prior I was with IT dept. at Goldman Sachs and Cantor Fitzgerald for seventeen (17) years; left professional career and started my own; we own 86 multifamily houses, most in Middlesex and Monmouth Counties, 40 are three (3) or more families; we have State inspections, we have once a month between all the houses; most 350 units, meaning we support 850 families, 12,000 people; also own management company which helps run these homes and employees 15 people and others working part time; many people working 24/7 taking care of any issues for the tenants; we have full scale real estate agency, my nephew is the broker, family business; I have experience and knowledge; this project here is not much different than what we are doing now; difference is the health part but we have qualified people; one has public health degree, one has licensed nurse;

We are a members of Freehold LaTip Chapter; every week at 7am, since December 2011 we go to American Hotel for meeting with approximately 100 other professionals who conduct business or live in Freehold Borough; 9 years, every week, currently remote, since 2011 we are in Freehold Borough every week; we have buildings in Freehold Borough; we are in the Borough often, we are not new and are part of the community; we have friends in the Borough and hope some will join the meeting tonight and support me with this application;

We added some things since last meeting; we met several neighbors and discussed the details of our project; met Anthony and Raymond, next door and seem happy with what we are trying to accomplish and issues resolved; made requested changes in the plans, traffic pattern parking spaces and professionals will explain; tree, we obtained a report from tree expert which advises us to remove and plant new; repair sidewalk that was damaged by tree;

We are investing 300,000 to the building inside and out; gateway to downtown and with upgrades it will look very nice and a benefit to the Borough; proposed business will not have many cars or trucks traveling through, no children playing or walking; it will be safe and peaceful to environment; most of live-ins will walk and not drive; 24/7 supervision, increasing safety of property; we agreed with all suggestions and advice of professionals and experts and think this project brings positivity to Freehold Borough; thank you

Mr. Jackson – supervision, can you go through again;

Mr. Vaysberg – 24/7 supervision, at least one supervisor at the property all the time;

Mr. Jackson – awake and alert or just living there;

Mr. Vaysberg – several shifts, even at night, always someone present;

Mr. Jackson – does that mean awake and asleep;

Mr. Vaysberg – both; not sleeping in the attic space, it is a rest area; night shift is 5:00pm to 8:00am, during this time, they will not be constantly working, when residents are sleeping the supervisor can rest, take a nap; every room will be equipped with an alert button to wake up and get immediate attention;

Mr. Jackson – the minutes from the 10.28.2020 meeting, shows a conflict if someone was going to be a live in or staff shift changing; is staffing going to be living there;

Mr. Vaysberg – no, they are shift changing – Monday it will be 2 employees, 1 from 8am to 5pm, then 5pm 2nd person comes on;

Mr. Cucchiaro – to be clear, it is 2:30am, person responsible for supervision of the house will not be asleep in the restroom, they will be ready, awake and prepared to assist immediately if someone needs it; they will be sleeping at their own house on their own time; ready able and awake during their shift;

Mr. Vaysberg – correct;

Mr. Jackson – ok, that is your testimony, I accept that, thank you;

Mr. Wentzien – clarify, tree expert was referenced; the recommendation was to remove the tree and replace with 2 trees – it is 81-foot frontage; my recommendation also it 2 trees;

Mr. Barricelli – any other questions;
Any members from the public – hearing none;

Mr. Jackson made a motion to close public questions; Mr. Wildermuth seconded;

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, McCabe, Wildermuth, Jackson, Crombie, Argot-Freyre and Kozlowski
No	0	
Abstain	0	
Absent	1	Councilwoman Rogers

Daniel Vaysberg -

Administrators schedule;

Monday – Administrator 1 – 8am leave at 5pm

Administrator 2 – 5pm leave at 8am

They will be ready and able to provide immediate attention when needed; the upstairs area is for a quick rest to collect themselves;

Tuesday – Administrator 3 – Administrator 1 rotating shifts;

Wednesday – Administrator 2 and Administrator 3 rotating shifts;

Essentially there will be 3 Administrators throughout the week rotating shifts to ensure full coverage; we will also have 3 service staff rotating as well; 8am to 5pm – meal prep, laundry service, daily activities the residents might need; also on stand by for the Administrators and service staff, 1 additional for both Administrators and Staff; I will be on call 24/7 to help with any questions or help needed; this will ensure full coverage throughout the week; the stand by staff will help with coverage of days off, sick days or vacation days or whatever is needed;

Mr. Barricelli – this 2nd level of people, they will do home care, serve as sanitation staff;

Daniel Vaysberg – correct, home care and sanitation staff;

Ms. Freyre – number of staff change on Saturday & Sunday or remain consistent;

Daniel Vaysberg – remains consistent; always 2 staff members 8am to 5pm and 5pm to 8am 1 Administrator

Mr. Cucchiaro – 8am – 5pm, there are 2; and from 5pm to 8am how many;

Daniel Vaysberg – 1 Administrator on site;

Ms. Freyre – clarify, how residents will get to appointments;

Daniel Vaysberg – we will help them set up transportation;

Ms. Freyre – physically take them if needed;

Daniel Vaysberg – if it comes down to that yes; we would do that;

Mr. Cucchiaro – the specific question is, are employees using vehicles to transport the resident themselves or you are going to assist to have a third party transport them;

Daniel Vaysberg- the employees will not be transporting them personally; we will have a third party helping them;

Mr. Wildermuth – clarify; 5pm and 8am shift change for Administrators; what time does service staff rotate from shift 1 to shift 2;

Daniel Vaysberg – service staff is only there from when they need to prepare food, 8 am breakfast dinner 5pm that is there shift during that time they are providing laundry service, they do not need to be there any later because we will have Administrator on duty; Administrator will provide a snack around 7pm – main (3) three meals provided 8am to 5pm by service staff;

Mr. Barricelli – any other questions;

Any members from the public – hearing none;

Mr. Wildermuth made a motion to close public questions; Mr. McCabe seconded;

Yes 8 Barricelli, Ceppi, McCabe, Wildermuth, Jackson, Crombie, Argot-Freyre and Kozlowski

No 0

Abstain 0

Absent 1 Councilwoman Rogers

Mr. Halleran – my next witnesses are technical, previously Mr. Wentzien would go through his report or I can call them and have them go through what they have submitted; how should we proceed;

Mr. Cucchiaro – Mr. Chair, I did correspond with Mr. Halleran with 2 other properties in the Borough, some members of the Board are interested in the architecture and façade of this building could look like the other buildings; Mr. Wentzien can't speak to that but Mr. Halleran if you can have the professional speak to that;

Mr. Halleran – Greg Clark will address those items;

Mr. Wentzien – I am prepared to go through; main thing on plans, adjustment made on parking layout along right side; increase number of parking by one space; proposing 14 parking spaces; there was clarification, while 8 bedrooms, actual bed count is 10; latest parking calculations indicate, in Borough code, 4 parking spaces are required, under residential site improvement standards, five parking spaces would be provided; the easement documents show the parking along the rear, are allocated to the lot to the left, #11, you are left with 9 available parking spaces for use on the site; clarification for how the 9 spaces will be utilized;

Mr. Sive – proposed 14, met with neighbor Mr. Cammallere and designated the 5 stalls along westerly portion of property for his use; increased 2 parking spaces to 10 feet to accommodate his vehicles; as part of, we re-located the proposed handicap parking stall closer to the ramp which generated the extra parking stall; of the 9 spaces, 2 to 3 are used by staff and 6 to 7 are available for residential and visitors;

Mr. Wentzien – your testimony is with the 9, you have adequate proposed parking; Also upon review of easement documents, very clear on the 5 spaces, the circulation agreed to between this lot and adjacent lot 10, all ingress on your lot and egress on adjacent lot 11; note report, easement documents silent on angle parking spaces, immediately to left upon entering the site; they are half on lot 10 and half on lot 11; need clear understanding of who can use and who maintains;

Mr. Sive – an understanding between tax lots 10 and 11, those 4 stalls are used by tax lot 11, adjoining lot; used by vehicles for employees and visitors they have; owner of tax lot 10, is honoring that understanding and joint maintenance of overall facility;

Mr. Wentzien – the use of angled spaces by lot 11 and the numbers are not in your parking numbers; maintenance is going to be joint;

Mr. Sive – I believe the maintenance falls under the easement agreement;

Mr. Wentzien – indicated you will replace the sidewalk across the lot frontage; need additional clarifying notations indicating that; tree, already referenced that removal of tree and replace with 2 trees; also, landscape section, along-side property lines near front yards, nice additional plantings, page 10 of my report; landscaping along front portion in form of medium size flowering plants to further buffer in nice way against adjacent lot; may be tight space against lot 11, having you given any consideration;

Mr. Sive – we can add additional landscaping;

Mr. Wentzien – I have other technical items in the report, assume you agree to provide; I have gone over the more technical items; also with those angle spaces, they are for passenger vehicles no construction size vehicles, nothing larger than a passenger vehicle would not be able to adequately circulate the spaces; understand why this is restricted to passenger vehicles only by adjacent lot 11;

Mr. Sive – correct on all points;

Mr. Wentzien – under historic; report issued by them, last open comment was you had to go back if doing anything with the windows; I know there will be further comments as Ron referenced;

Mr. Barricelli – Board questions

Mr. Jackson – page 8 of report dated October 12, 2020, parking circulation, #6, reviewed by Fire Official; has that been done; for future, should that be done prior to hearings;

Mr. Wentzien – not to my knowledge; it is an open recommendation; applicant has agreed to comply with all recommendations in my report; a recommended condition that take place;

Mr. Cucchiaro – it is not a requirement; as a conditional of approval the applicant would be proceeding at their own risk, if something were to change the plan they would have to come back; it would behoove the applicants to do prior but can opt to take the risk;

Mr. Wildermuth – looking for any signage installed for angled parking, limiting to passenger vehicles;

Mr. Sive – yes signage will be provided for the spaces and for use by the adjacent lot for this establishment;

Mr. Barricelli – milling and paving; left side of driveway, will you pave to the property line or past the property line to cover angle parking;

Mr. Sive – yes, milling will include angle parking stalls, not to have a break in the middle of them;

Mr. Barricelli – any other Board members
Any members from the public – hearing none;

Mr. Ceppi made a motion to close public questions; Ms. Crombie seconded;

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, McCabe, Wildermuth, Jackson, Crombie, Argot-Freyre and Kozlowski
No	0	
Abstain	0	
Absent	1	Councilwoman Rogers

Mr. Barricelli – take a 5-minute break, our attorney, Ron Cucchiaro has lost connection come back at 8:03pm

Mr. Halleran – calling Greg Clark – we left off with several questions of the building being able to accommodate the use, specifically with ADA compliance; we have revised our plans and the first floor will be ADA complaint; from the handicap ramp, A-1 plans, entry to the rear of the building, main entrance, widen the corridors, eliminate a bathroom and make existing bathroom larger; still under code to accommodate the three bedrooms on first level; over the course of design, these are technical items that are building department related; due to questions we wanted to make the changes for you to see; second level, residential area, R-4 zone, residential care facility, not an apartment house; if it was apartments, we would need to make second level ADA complaint; we have bedrooms and bathrooms on first level with ADA compliance, not required for second and third levels;

Staff is going to rest in a space made in the attic, adjacent to a bathroom; drawing A-2; we added the bedroom, separated out the staff area, office area, have storage and now have a dedicated space for staff to rest;

There was a fire safety concern, asking if we need to sprinkler the house; after research, we do need to provide sprinklers and will be done at the time of design of the building; there were esthetical questions raised recently regarding decorative elements; could we add to the exterior elevations to the building; they are good suggestions, decorative shingles in the gables, will add a nice look and be in line with properties in the Borough; this will be implemented in the gables themselves, at the triangle roof, it will be filled with what is called ‘fish scale’, different shingle with rounded bottom; other questions was windows, could we do two over two, these are center mullion’s, bars that go down vertical in middle of window; this is another

historic look, again keeping the look of other properties in the Borough; also shutters and trusses, this is a ginger bread look up in gables and quatrefoils; also in line with other properties in the Borough;

Mr. Cucchiaro – the specific design elements your speaking of, were also discussed in the context of making them look similar to the properties of 62 Broad Street and 111 West Main; incorporating the look, will it look similar to these 2 properties;

Mr. Clark – yes;

Mr. Barricelli – Board members any questions;

Mr. Barricelli – based on your testimony in October, you said you would do a code analysis for the need for an elevator; will upper level bathroom be ADA compliant;

Mr. Clark – we did, but only need to make first level ADA compliant; so we will not need an elevator for access to upper floors; upper levels do not need to be ADA compliant, so we will not make the bathroom ADA compliant; code advises we need to make on first level; also based on clientele planned this is adequate;

Ms. Kozlowski – with making historic recommendations here, does this need to go back to the HPC;

Mr. Cucchiaro – these are not recommendations, they have said they will do, so it will become a condition of approval; they will be required; it does not go back to HPC, it becomes part of the approval of this Board;

Ms. Freyre – Bill report, sanitary and concerns with increased water usage and water flow; it was not discussed today, is this an issue, how does this tie in;

Mr. Wentzien – it is noted because of the change of use and intensity, I provided the calculations, more to benefit the building department than for here; the flows are more nominal size, not anticipate a capacity issue; it is referred then, to building department and what they need; wanted them to have the technical information for help; I do not foresee an issue;

Mr. Barricelli – any other Board members
Any members from the public – hearing none;

Mr. Jackson made a motion to close public questions; Ms. Freyre seconded;

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, McCabe, Wildermuth, Jackson, Crombie, Argot-Freyre and Kozlowski
No	0	
Abstain	0	
Absent	1	Councilwoman Rogers

Mr. Halleran – that is all, nothing further;

Mr. Barricelli – any members of the public want to make a comment regarding testimony tonight or previous;

Mr. Cucchiaro – sworn in Carlo Castronovo, 104 Broad Street, Freehold; Borough resident 15 years, business in Old Bridge, I know Mark very well, had business next door; they are good people, good business people, abide by all rules and laws; a good thing for the town and for people in general;

Mr. Cucchiaro – sworn in Anthony Cammallere, 99 Broad, Freehold; I am adjoining property, 11 Broadway; met with Mark and all worked out with parking and feel this is a good concept bringing into the town; this is a better concept than more office space and more people and more parking; having an adult community will be better for the town;

Mr. Cucchiaro – sworn in Nicholas Mastriana, West George Street, Freehold; work and live in Freehold; working with Mark for about few years; they have taken down and built up other buildings and they do good work; I have helped with electrical portion; great person to work for, always around and available; seems to always do the right thing with his jobs;

Mr. Jackson made a motion to close public comments; Ms. Freyre seconded;

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, McCabe, Wildermuth, Jackson, Crombie, Argot-Freyre and Kozlowski
No	0	
Abstain	0	
Absent	1	Councilwoman Rogers

Mr. Barricelli – Board deliberations

Mr. Cucchiaro – if I could provide a few comments; special type of application; normally with Use Variance, the Board as you stated, normally find the applicant provided positive and negative criteria; the positive criteria the Board would find the property is particularly suitable for proposed use; the exception are class of uses the Courts and MLUL identify as inherently beneficial; proposed use here, Group Home, falls in that exception; inherently beneficial use, the law presumptively determines the site, is particular suitable for use; as matter of law, the applicant has satisfied the positive criteria; the Board is focused on tonight, to find there is no substantial detriment to the zone plan, zone ordinance or public welfare; beyond that, if you find there is a substantial detriment, the Supreme Court case law holds, you have to engage in a balancing test to determine if the applicant can do something to overcome the substantial detriment; tonight you should focus on substantial determined, the applicant has revised the plan since the meeting in October, addressed the open ended issues and have taken comments from the Board as well as HPC regarding design, façade and architectural concepts to use making in line with homes in the area; also is good information, background and history of applicants, MLUL does not allow us to look at qualifications of applicant or if business plan will succeed, you can't consider that; doesn't go to design or use;

Mr. Wildermuth – I make a motion to approve;

Mr. Cucchiaro – make clear, motion to grant use variance relief, with site plan approval subject to all conditions placed on the record;

Mr. Jackson – before there is a second - can you please give us the conditions;

Mr. Cucchiaro – take down existing tree, replace with 2 trees subject to review and approval of Mr. Wentzien; subject to all conditions and recommendations in Mr. Wentzien report and plantings discussed tonight; the angle parking restricted to passenger vehicles only; treatment discussed gables, decorative mill work, shutters, two on two windows and look like buildings on two properties discussed tonight; staffing; method of ingress and egress; sidewalk replacement; ADA compliant on first level; all approvals are subject to all outside agency approvals, to the extent any certifications, licenses from the State, must provide; also any County approvals; also any construction department code requirements including sprinklers; all items placed on the record tonight;

Ms. Crombie – thinking about trees, important to choose the least expansive in width, considering it is main road in and out of town; thinking of storms as trees age, wires and sidewalk; I am not an arborist, seems Japanese Alcoba is least expansive;

Mr. Wentzien – keep more generic, keep more columnar, less branch out in nature allows more flexibility between us and the applicant;

Ms. Freyre – clarify, extensive testimony regarding staffing; they indicated someone there at all times, is that requirement of approval or just part of testimony;

Mr. Cucchiaro – it was placed on the record, how this will operate and that is integral to testimony for approval, become condition;

Mr. Barricelli – can we get a second to the motion to approval given by Michael Wildermuth;

Ms. Argote-Freyre seconds the motion to approve;

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, McCabe, Wildermuth, Jackson, Crombie, Argot-Freyre and Kozlowski
No	0	
Abstain	0	
Absent	1	Councilwoman Rogers

Mr. Barricelli – thank you, Mr. Halleran and applicants;

Mr. Barricelli – on Tuesday, Dominica, myself and the Administrator participated in a zoom conference with Executive Director of OPA, chairing a session of several State and County entities going over what they can do to assist the municipalities, including the Borough; many requirements and mandates and when asked by myself, what type of assistance could they provide; they spoke about maps, personnel but said no money; too bad, I was looking for money; interesting meeting;

Mr. Barricelli – Brianne, anything with HPC we should know about;

Ms. Kozlowski – no, we had a sign approval; nothing to comment;

Mr. Barricelli – Dominica anything;

Ms. Napolitano – nothing; there is an application but see you January 13, 2021 reorganization meeting;

Mr. Barricelli – any board members have comments or motion to adjourn;

Mr. Wildermuth made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Ceppi;

All in favor; Aye (all) – Nay (none)

Mr. Barricelli – thank you all for coming tonight, happy holidays take care;

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Dominica R. Napolitano