		2
1	<u>APPEARANCES</u>	į
2	KING, KITRICK, JACKSON, McWEENEY & WELLS BY: MARK G. KITRICK, ESQ.,	
3	2329 NJ 34 Manasquan, NJ 08736	
4	Attorney for the Zoning Board.	
5	STONE & MANDIA, LLC BY: RICHARD B. STONE, ESQ.	
6	685 Neptune Blvd. Neptune, NJ 07753	
7	Attorney for the Applicant.	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15 16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

* *

CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Next case.

under consideration this evening, since we've carried the Irvington Manor case to October 15th would be ZB20/05 Beth and Harold Cotler, Block 78, Lot 14, 306 Monmouth Avenue. The applicants proposing to demolish an existing garage and construct a two-story accessory garage having a two-car garage on the first floor and a residential apartment above regarding variances for the height of the detached garage, minimum side yard setback for accessory structure, living accommodations on both floor and maximum impervious coverage. Applicants represented by Richard Stone.

MR. STONE: Mr. Kitrick is on. I take it that the board -- first let me enter my appearance again. Recall all of you that in the June meeting I indicated to the Board that I have the pleasure of representing the applicant Cotler in regard to this application. In the June meeting there was some dialogue from an objector, Mr. Coan. I must assume that Mr. Coan is on this meeting as well. One of the things that disturbed

me back then was that the objection that was raised with respect to the notice was a late call when it's hopeful that just as an applicant is required to provide information timely, it would have been best if the objector, any objector provided the board, applicant's counsel, applicant's experts with any issues that he might have.

In the June meeting there was an issue raised with regard to the notice. Frankly I believe that the notice was adequate but in order to make sure that that issue was not raised at some later date, we agreed to adjourn the hearing for two months giving an opportunity for my client to order a full-blown architect's plan, which we timely submitted. And that we crafted a far more detailed notice in order to adequately respond to the objector.

I want to re-enforce that at the time of the June meeting it was then and it remains now that that original notice was satisfactory.

But what I was hoping to avoid is that in the event that the application proceeded to its conclusion and without being presumptuous that it was approved, I didn't want there to be a

procedural attack on the application. So I agreed to carry the hearing until this date.

Either late last night or early this morning Ms. Dickert was kind enough to forward over to my office a rather detailed communication from in this case Thomas TJ Coan. This time Bradley Beach public citizen. I see there was a modification to his last characterization. But it was a rather detailed list of objections that Mr. Coan had and of course as always an objector had a right to make those objections. But again I point to the board's attention that the items contained in this myriad list were certainly well known to Mr. Coan before this morning or late last night. And I just want to make sure that the record is clear that I object to the late notice to the board, to the board professionals, to the applicant, to the applicant's attorney, all of which could have been done before. I should point out to you that --

FEMALE VOICE: That's the lawyer,
Richard Stone.

MR. STONE: I'm sorry. I didn't

24 hear that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

25

MS. DICKERT: It's somebody who keeps

unmuting. Go ahead, Mr. Stone. I'm sorry.

that the record clear that earlier this week and I don't remember if it was Monday or Tuesday I received an unsolicited call at my law office from Mr. Coan. I indicated to him then and assume that he would confirm now that I inquired as to whether or not he was represented by an attorney. He told me then that he was not but that he engaged a planner. And again I'm assuming that the planner is available tonight.

I've not received nor has any of us received I don't think any record or a report from his proposed planner. But he did go through some detail, Mr. Coan did, about items that he objected to and I would hope that the and I know Ms. Dickert must have, and again I'm assuming I hope without being presumptuous that the information provided by Mr. Coan was disseminated to all of the board members and that we might have those in front of us now including Mr. Kitrick. Because I do have some questions about these things because certainly before we can get this application under way, I believe that --

```
Sorry, Mr. Stone.
                 MS. DICKERT:
1
                 MR. KITRICK: Excuse me one second.
2
    Who is that individual?
 3
                              Whoever Karen is. I'm
                 MS. DICKERT:
 4
 5
    not sure.
               It just says Karen.
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. So they need to
 6
 7
    stay muted until they're going to speak. And if
    it keeps happening, we're going to have to take
 8
    other measures. Okay. Don't want to do that but
 9
10
    we have to proceed. So ...
                 MR. STONE: You know as a result of
11
    this new environment we're in I've only done a few
12
    of these. Ordinarily I quess if we were in the
13
    meeting in person just as we wouldn't permit --
14
15
                 MR. KITRICK: Correct.
                 MR. STONE: -- anybody from speaking
16
    out of turn. I guess we're doing the same thing
17
    here; am I correct, Mr. Kitrick?
18
                 MR. KITRICK: That's correct.
                                                 So
19
    let's keep rolling.
20
                 MR. STONE: Okay. So if all of us
21
    have Mr. Coan's communication dated Thursday,
22
    August 20, 2020 at 9:50 am. Well actually that's
23
    not correct.
24
```

MS. DICKERT: That was -- Mr. Stone

```
that was the prior objection. And actually the
1
    new objection since I got it late last night, it
 2
    was not distributed to the board members. It was
 3
    only distributed to Mr. Kitrick, yourself and it
 4
    was posted on the website.
 5
                 MR. STONE: Do the board members have
 6
 7
    this document now?
                 MS. DICKERT: They do not.
 8
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG:
 9
                 MR. STONE: Do they have the ability
10
    to access it so that when we review it, they will
11
12
    be able to see what's on it?
13
                 MS. DICKERT: I can -- can you hold
14
    on one second.
15
                 MR. STONE: Yes.
                 MS. DICKERT: I'll attempt to share
16
17
    my screen.
                 MR. STONE: I'm sorry about that, Ms.
18
19
    Dickert.
                 MS. DICKERT: No, that's okay.
20
21
                 MR. STONE: I just assumed that
    because --
22
                 MS. DICKERT: I was just rambling
23
    around. I don't work in Bradley Beach full time.
24
    So...
25
```

```
MR. STONE:
                            But I see here that Mr.
1
    Coan sent it, it appears to you.
2
                 MS. DICKERT: At ten to eight last
 3
 4
    night.
                 MR. STONE: Right. 7:49 last night.
 5
                 MS. DICKERT:
                               Yeah --
 6
                 MR. STONE: So certainly you wouldn't
 7
    have disseminated that last night. I don't
 8
    suppose at eight o'clock at night the night before
 9
    a meeting you would be on your computer working --
10
                              No, sorry. I was not.
                 MS. DICKERT:
11
                             So that none of us, Mr.
                 MR. STONE:
12
    Kitrick nor myself received this until this
13
14
    morning; am I right?
15
                 MS. DICKERT: Correct.
                 MR. STONE: And even as late as
16
    tonight at the outset of this meeting other than
17
    us discussing it now, none of the board members
18
    have seen it; am I right?
19
                 MS. DICKERT: The board members have
20
    not seen it unless they have viewed it on the
21
22
    website.
                 MR. STONE: Okav. So with that in
23
    mind might I ask Mr. Coan since the board members
24
    didn't have an opportunity to see this and I would
25
```

```
defer of course to Mr. Kitrick but it seems to me
1
    that this would fall under a general heading
2
    housekeeping. And because if there are any
3
    procedural issues that have to be raised I suspect
 4
 5
    I would respect --
                                This temporarily
                 FEMALE VOICE:
 6
 7
    unmuted but we --
                 MR. STONE: -- I would respectfully
8
    suggest that these items and others should be
 9
    discussed before the meeting gets started, before
10
    the application process gets started. And I would
11
    defer to Mr. Kitrick.
12
                 MR. KITRICK: I don't have any
13
    objection to that. And both sides will have the
14
    opportunity to address this, so...
15
                             So what I would ask is
                 MR. STONE:
16
    Mr. Coan now the ability to address these various
17
    issues and bring them up before the board?
18
           Is he attending the meeting, Ms. Dickert?
19
                 MR. COAN: Yes, I'm here. I'm here.
20
    I had my hand raised. Thomas Coan, 612 Third
21
             I'd be happy to address all these issues.
22
    Avenue.
    But first of all I really would like to address
23
    this issue that Mr. Stone keeps bringing up about
24
```

the timeliness. So in the ZOOM document of the

agenda tonight I'm going to read you what it says. 1 It says --2 MR. KITRICK: Before you start that, 3 I just want to make it a clear -- the reason we're 4 having this discussion now, at this point this 5 board has not accepted jurisdiction in this 6 matter. So we're having this discussion before 7 there's any ruling on that. Okay. 8 FEMALE VOICE: Yeah. 9 MALE VOICE: I mean we're not getting 10 11 anywhere. It plainly says in the MR. COAN: 12 Town's document for this ZOOM meeting if you have 13 information or exhibits you wish to be considered 14 and entered into the record, you will have to 15 email them to the board's secretary, Kristie 16 Dickert in advance of the meeting so they may be 17 marked into evidence. There is no time frame, Mr. 18 Kitrick, none. It's your own document created by 19 the Borough of Bradley Beach. My documents should 20 stand as they were submitted in plenty of time. 21 MR. STONE: Number one -- May I 22 respond to that, Mr. Kitrick? 23 MR. KITRICK: Of course. 24 MR. STONE: Okay. So number one the 25

communication in and of itself I would suggest is not evidential. There are items contained in the document clearly hearsay.

Mr. Coan has not been sworn in and I would like him to be sworn in. And I don't have any objection to him bringing up each one of the four, I believe that there are four line items contained in this document, which may very well lead to a further discussion generally about the jurisdiction of the board.

But I would like him to go through each one so that I can respond to it.

MR. KITRICK: You'd like him to go through each one in relation to whatever argument he wants to put forth; is that correct?

MR. STONE: Yes, Mr. Kitrick.

MR. KITRICK: All right. So moving forward there's not a discussion about, you know, the timeliness. Is that it?

MR. STONE: No, I anticipate that at some point the record of these proceedings are going to be reviewed. And when they are reviewed, if as in when they're reviewed, regardless of whether the application is approved or denied, when it's approved I want to make sure that the

reviewing court sees the progression of events in which at each separate occasion the objector drop shift his objection after anybody can prepare answers. And I would respectfully suggest he does so intentionally. He did it in June with regard to the notice. And he did it today in regard to addressing the issue of the various members of the board he has asked for recusal.

Now I'll --

MR. KITRICK: All right. So let me address the overall issue. So first of all we have an applicant's attorney and we have Mr. Coan who's a pro se objector. So the objector is extended the same courtesies as the applicant regarding scheduling matters. I think that's consistent with the Municipal Land Use Law. Also Mr. Coan had the opportunity to retain counsel and he is decided as many people do not to retain counsel. I think he's -- I understand he's got a planner but as legal advice he's representing himself and every right to do that. However he'll have to follow the same rules as someone who is an attorney.

So the reality is that whenever those documents came if we were to determine that it

wasn't timely, what really would occur was the matter would be carried. That's what would be carried. That's what would likely happen.

I don't disagree what Mr. Coan had said as to what is on the website and when it has to, you know, addressing where the documents go. So while I don't think what he's done is different than perhaps, contradicts I should say what's on the site. What I do not understand is, and I'd like to hear, one, why he did it? He did that the night before. And just as a professional courtesy as the Board Attorney I didn't get a copy.

Mr. Coan, do you want to address that?

MR. COAN: Mr. Kitrick, I'm following the instruction based on your own agenda document.

All files should go through Ms. Dickert and she should disperse them. I should not be dispersing, and quite frankly I did it improperly the first time and I sent submissions to Mr. Cannon in error. So I didn't want to make that mistake.

And I followed the rules as per your agenda.

MR. KITRICK: Well, Mr. Coan, I don't know why you would give the documents to the Borough Attorney. I mean you're before the Board of Adjustment.

MR. COAN: That was my error. So 1 that was not this meet -- this was before the 2 previous meeting. And Ms. Dickert was nice enough 3 to give me the proper direction and said that he 4 was not involved in that case. 5 MR. KITRICK: Right. So you 6 7 understand that when these documents are presented they have to be reviewed in a timely manner, 8 right. So I think out of, I'm going to call it a 9 courtesy that I think most attorneys would follow 10 that you would give people notice ahead of time. 11 You didn't do that. And we're not going to hold 12 up the proceeding on that but --13 MR. COAN: I don't expect you to, 14 15 sir. MR. KITRICK: But you need to give 16 people more notice. 17 MR. COAN: Well I would advise the 18 Borough to change the notice for the ZOOM then. If 19 people read this, I followed the rules. 20 I would like to MALE VOICE: 21 MR. KITRICK: No, no. Please. 22 don't know where we're going with this. But in 23 the future if you have some documentation I would 24 expect that you give it to your adversary and you 25

give it to the attorney of the board in a timely fashion. And not the day of and the night before.

Okay.

MR. COAN: Yes, sir. I understand that.

6 MR. KITRICK: All right.

MR. STONE: May I just comment

briefly on that, Mr. Kitrick?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KITRICK: Sure.

MR. STONE: Those of us who practice Municipal Land Use we're confronted on any given application, we could be the applicant's attorney or we could be the objector's attorney. you pointed out and the record should be clear any person has a right to be a pro se litigant. they're held to the same rules that you and I would be. And you used the word "professional courtesy" and I think that's a good term. think the record should reflect that if the course of conduct over the history that each time that there's a meeting on the eve, not even, the day of the meeting, the night before at eight o'clock he communicates it to the board secretary well knowing that she's not going to be able to disseminate it amongst the board members, who

certainly have a right particularly under some of the assertions made in this transmittal and that should be done so that if it's appealed at some later point the record should be clear that on each occasion in which I appear it was a late submission by Mr. Coan to somehow delay this process from taking place.

Now with that said let's move ahead. I would like him to raise each one of his items and to each one we can have a colloquy. I will respond to it. I can answer it. I will defer to the board attorney and then as we go through the process we can make decisions on each one, not me, but the board and the board attorney can make a decision on each issue that Mr. Coan raised.

But I'd like to hear from him not through written transmittal, what are his problems? What are his objections?

MR. KITRICK: All right. So I just want to make sure everybody can see the submission.

MR. CRITELLI: This is Dave Critelli.

I can't scroll down the submission at all.

MS. DICKERT: No because I'll do the scrolling. It's my screen.

```
MR. CRITELLI: Oh, okay.
 1
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. All right.
 2
                 MR. COAN: Mr. Kitrick, I just have
 3
    one aside there.
 4
                 MR. KITRICK:
 5
                               Sure.
                 MR. COAN: I've attended a lot of
 6
    meetings and I've been handed engineer's letters
 7
    the day of the meeting in the forum. So I don't
 8
    understand why now I'm held to this standard when
    other professionals have done that to me before.
10
                 MR. KITRICK: What do you mean done
11
    that to you? I don't know what --
12
                 MR. COAN: I've been handed an
13
    engineer's letter the day of the meeting, at the
14
    meeting.
15
                 MR. KITRICK: In what capacity?
16
                 MR. COAN: As an applicant. So I
17
    mean I don't know --
18
                 MR. KITRICK: I can't comment on your
19
    prior history. You have -- we're talking about
20
    this board.
21
                 MR. COAN: I totally understand, sir.
22
                 MR. KITRICK: And you have to have
23
    standards. Listen I accept that you looked at the
24
    website and you believed that you were following
25
```

the procedure. 1 MR. COAN: Yes, sir. 2 MR. KITRICK: I accept that. 3 going forward there's got to be courtesy extended. 4 That's how we conduct it. 5 MR. COAN: Yes, sir. I understand. 6 MR. KITRICK: Because if you want to 7 be a cynic it looks like someone was trying to get 8 it late so people don't have the opportunity to 9 10 prepare. I accepted that that was not your 11 intention. I accept that. But, you know, a cynic 12 would think that that is what's going on. 13 accept that that's not what you're doing. Ι 14 totally accept your representation. But moving 15 forward, if we are moving forward, we need to 16 extend each other professional courtesy. Okay. 17 MR. COAN: Yes. 1.8 MR. STONE: Let the record reflect 19 that I'm the cynic in the group. 20 MR. KITRICK: Okay. All right so I'm 21 looking at this, Mr. Coan. 22 MR. COAN: Yes. 23 MR. KITRICK: So let's just start 24 with number one. 25

```
Sure well it became
                 MR. COAN:
1
    readily apparent after reviewing the video
2
    numerous time that this testimony and it is
3
    literally testimony was entered onto the record by
 4
    a board member leaving many, many facts that would
5
    not come in the meeting because there was no
 6
    testimony in the meeting. So how would she know
 7
    that it was a lighting and safety issue.
8
    states that she's familiar with the structure. You
 9
    know, how does she know it's a safety issue?
10
11
    mean --
                 MS. PHILLIPS: Can I object?
                                                Since
12
13
    vou're --
                 MR. KITRICK: No, just -- let him --
14
                 MS. PHILLIPS: Let him finish then
15
    I'll tell you my opinion.
16
                 MR. KITRICK: Well let's --
17
                 MS. PHILLIPS: My neighbors.
18
                            Mr. Kitrick --
                 MR. COAN:
19
                 MR. KITRICK: I appreciate that.
                                                    Mr.
20
    Coan, you proceed. Proceed, Mr. Coan.
21
                            What I'm interested in is
                 MR. COAN:
22
    Ms. Phillips' opinion after she hears the facts.
23
    So clearly she came to the proceeding schooled
24
    about this. Having intimate knowledge that she
25
```

```
received somewhere and --
 1
                 MS. PHILLIPS: Not true.
 2
                 MR. COAN: Please, Mr. Kitrick, can I
 3
    finish.
 4
                 MS. PHILLIPS: Not true.
 5
                 MR. KITRICK: Well let him -- Deidre,
 6
    just let Mr. Coan finish. Let Mr. Coan finish.
 7
                 MS. PHILLIPS: Go ahead.
 8
                 MR. COAN: Mr. Kitrick, Mr. Stone
 9
    offered no testimony and swore in nobody to give
10
    testimony. But a board member decides to give
11
    testimony and shouts it out to the other board
12
13
    members.
              It's highly improper. And the only
    answer is for her to recuse herself. That's a
14
15
    perception of a conflict and I perceive a conflict
16
    as many other people who viewed it. So a
    perception of a conflict, sir, is a conflict.
17
18
                 MS. PHILLIPS: You opened it.
19
                 MR. KITRICK: Ms. Phillips, let me
20
    respond first, okay.
21
                 MS. PHILLIPS:
                                Okay.
                 MR. KITRICK: All right. So I'm not
22
    sure that a perception of a conflict is a
23
    conflict. I'm not sure that that's accurate but
24
    let's talk about the specifics of this.
25
                                              In this
```

```
you're saying -- you're referring to this as
1
    testimony.
2
                 MR. COAN: Yes, sir.
3
                 MR. KITRICK:
                              So --
4
                 MS. PHILLIPS: You said that nobody
5
    had seen it. None of us -- that we are --
6
                 MR. KITRICK: Deidre, Deidre, let me
7
    just get through this, okay.
8
                 MS. PHILLIPS: He opened it up.
9
                 MR. KITRICK: Yeah, okay. So I think
10
    what you're saying is a statement. I mean
11
    testimony is stated under oath. So this isn't --
12
                            It's absolutely testimony,
                 MR. COAN:
13
          I'd be happy to read it right now for
14
    sir.
15
    everybody.
                 MR. STONE: I have to interrupt.
16
    I interrupt, Mr. Kitrick?
17
                 MR. KITRICK: No.
                                    No. I'd like
18
    people to stop interrupting actually. So I'm not
19
    saying you can't read it. What I'm saying is, and
20
    I saw what you had, that's not testimony.
                                                That
21
    may be a statement. I don't think you're
22
    characterizing it correctly.
23
                 MR. COAN: Well how would she know
24
    about what their daughter needs, sir?
25
```

```
MR. KITRICK: That's -- do you know
 1
 2
    what testimony is?
                 MR. COAN: Yeah, I know what
 3
 4
    testimony is. That was testimony in favor of the
    application before the board.
 5
                 MR. KITRICK: Tell me what it is.
 6
    Tell me what testimony is.
 7
                            Testimony is statements
                 MR. COAN:
 8
    entered into the record in a legal proceeding.
 9
                 MR. KITRICK:
                               Under oath.
10
                 MR. COAN: Okay, so she wasn't under
11
12
           It's still improper for a board member to
    enter this onto the record whether she's under
13
    oath or not. She has a preconceived notion of
14
    the way the application should go and she
15
    broadcast that notion to the other board members.
16
17
                 MR. KITRICK: So I'm not disputing
    what you're saying other than I was clarifying --
18
    I want the record to be clear. That's not
19
    testimony. Okay, so that's not what that is.
20
    That's not what that is. But I understand your
21
22
    point and we'll address your point.
23
           So you say -- so you have attached a
    transcript that you prepared, right. So is that
24
    transcript -- so my question is: Who prepared it
25
```

```
and was that from the meeting?
 1
                             I'm very clear to state,
                 MR. COAN:
 2
    sir, that I typed it based upon the video
 3
    recording, which is available to any board member
 4
    or any other jurisdiction beyond this one.
 5
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. So after the
 6
 7
    meeting you viewed it and typed it up.
                             Numerous times, sir.
 8
                 MR. COAN:
                 MR. KITRICK: I couldn't hear you.
 9
    I couldn't hear you.
10
                             Oh, numerous times.
                 MR. COAN:
11
                 MR. KITRICK:
                                Okay.
12
                 MR. COAN: I viewed it numerous
13
14
    times, sir.
                 MR. KITRICK: So it remains -- I'm
15
    just curious it remains on the website after the
16
    meeting is that --
17
                             Well I actually inquired
                 MR. COAN:
18
    to Ms. Dickert and she sent me the video recording
19
    link.
20
                 MR. KITRICK: Got it. Okay.
21
                 MR. COAN: So I could watch it.
22
                 MR. KITRICK: Just trying to
23
    understand how you got it. Okay.
24
                 MR. COAN: I -- inaudible --
25
```

```
something from that.
1
                 MR. KITRICK: All right.
2
                 MS. DICKERT: Mark, want to see the
3
    transcript that he prepared or --
4
                 MR. KITRICK:
5
                               Yes.
                 MS. DICKERT: Yes?
 6
                 MR. KITRICK: Please.
 7
                 MR. STONE: I object to that.
8
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. What's your
9
    objection?
10
                 MR. STONE: Okay, a couple of things.
11
    Number one, may I respectfully ask that since Mr.
12
    Coan has given this information to the board, that
1.3
    he be sworn in so that he makes these statements
14
15
    under oath.
                              Yes. Mr. Coan, since
                 MR. KITRICK:
16
    you're not a lawyer. You would need to be sworn
17
18
    in.
19
    THOMAS TJ
                COAN,
                        Sworn.
20
21
                 MR. KITRICK: Thank you.
22
                 MR. STONE: Mr. Kitrick, I'd like to
23
    direct a question to you to ask Mr. Coan. I don't
24
    want it to appear on the record that I'm
25
```

cross-examining Mr. Coan at this time. That may 1 happen later on but I think in the spirit of this 2 dialogue it would be better if the questions came 3 4 from the board attorney. I'd like to know whether or not the 5 transcript that he provided, to which I object, is 6 a verbatim record and is he certified as a court 7 reporter or otherwise to provide such information 8

MR. KITRICK: Okay. Mr. Coan, you heard that. 11

to the board?

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COAN: It is prepared to the best of my ability and the backup documentation is the video itself.

MR. STONE: Okay, so I object to That has no place in this record. And it's not testimony. It's not certified and he's not qualified to take a verbatim record.

I'd like to ask a second question. like to know whether or not during the course of the last meeting in June did he tape the meeting himself?

MR. COAN: No, I rely on the Borough's copy of the meeting and I made multiple requests as to why it wasn't posted on the Borough

website for the rest of the public to watch. 1 had to take an extra step, do an OPRA request to Ms. Dickert to get a copy of the link to watch it. 3 I would much prefer to be able to watch it at my 4 leisure attached to the website but apparently 5 that's not the way it works. 6

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. DICKERT: I don't believe by law we're required to post videos. You're entitled to an audio recording.

MR. COAN: Well I mean the planning board has no problem with it. The Council has no problem with it. So I don't know why it's a problem for the zoning board but, you know, I'm all about public information. Let's just put it out there.

MR. STONE: Let me make another comment, Mr. Kitrick. It's not unusual after an applicant provides a application to the board that the board in preparation, board members in preparation for the meeting review the application, attachments, reports, plans. that's the very essence of the Municipal Land Use That the board members have an statute. opportunity. So on the outset of a meeting it is not unusual for board members to have a dialogue

about it. But make no decision until all of the evidence in both for and against.

So the fact that, I don't know, this particular board member but the fact that she made a comment from what her review was, I don't find that objectionable. And it's certainly no reason for her to be -- to recuse herself.

In addition to that I would respectfully suggest that if there's such an issue, the next question that should be raised is whether she can be fair, unbias and form no preconceptions. And if the board attorney is satisfied with that, then that should end the issue there.

And if Mr. Coan has a problem after the application is completed, he can take that appeal up to the Superior Court Trial Division.

MR. KITRICK: So I think it's helpful at this time to hear from Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. And I think to reiterate that I'm absolutely fair, unbias. I don't pretend to be an attorney or a planner or an architect. I'll listen to the testimony and then I make my decisions in conjunction with the rest of the board.

Furthermore I was saying a question.

```
They're my neighbors. I've seen the structure and
 1
    I know that the daughter's a doctor. Like I know
 2
    other cases that have come before. They're
 3
    neighbors of mine. It doesn't mean that they're
 4
    going to like what I think, whether I vote for
 5
    them or against them. But I think I can
 6
    absolutely remain unbias, fair and come in with no
 7
    preconception about what my final vote will be.
 8
 9
                 MR. KITRICK: So I think -- so I
    appreciate that. And I saw what Mr. Coan had
10
    presented. And you made reference to, and I'm
11
12
    paraphrasing so please excuse me, but something
    about them needed two doors, something along those
13
    lines.
14
15
                 MS. PHILLIPS: Well in my mind again,
16
    do you need to have two doors for a two-car
17
    garage. You think you would. And I raised the
    question, I didn't know if you do because I only
18
    saw one door. But I've seen pictures with the two
19
    cars like we have all -- we all got pictures on
20
    the board.
21
                So. . .
22
                 MR. KITRICK: So have you prejudged
```

MS. PHILLIPS: No, I have not.

MR. KITRICK: All right. And do you

the application.

```
have a relationship with the applicant which would
1
2
                 MS. PHILLIPS: No, I really don't
3
4
    think so.
                 MR. KITRICK: -- impact your
5
    impartiality.
 6
                 MS. PHILLIPS: I would definitely say
 7
    I'm impartial. I say hello. I'm not in the house
8
    socializing. I see them when they're walking the
 9
    dogs and their kids and I say hello. That's the
10
    extent of my relationship with the Cotlers.
11
    They're very nice people. I supported him when he
12
    ran for Mayor. That was many years ago. Other
13
    than that no, you know, I really don't have, again
14
    I'm impartial. So whatever you think that's how I
15
    feel about it.
16
                 MR. KITRICK: Mr. Coan, do you have
17
    any comment?
18
                            Well sure, I'd like to
                 MR. COAN:
19
    know if she's ever been in the structure. So she
20
    says so I guess knowing this structure for myself
21
22
    they have to have two doors.
                 MS. PHILLIPS: I've never been in the
23
    structure.
24
```

MR. COAN: Has she ever been in the

building? 1 MS. PHILLIPS: No. 2 MR. COAN: And how would you know 3 about the applicant wanting lighting and safety 4 for their daughter if there was never any 5 6 testimony to that affect? MR. STONE: Mr. Kitrick, I don't 7 think it's appropriate. 8 MR. COAN: I asked a question --9 Inaudible. 10 MR. KITRICK: So this isn't -- you 11 don't get to cross -- it applies to Mr. Stone, 12 this is not a cross-examination of Ms. Phillips. 1.3 So the question, and I'll ask the question. So 14 you've already stated you're not in the building, 15 16 inside the building. MS. PHILLIPS: Yes. 17 MR. KITRICK: But would it be fair to 18 say with applications that we've had previously, 19 have nothing to do with this application, that you 20 and other board members will sometimes go to a 21 property, look at it prior to the meeting to get 22 an idea of what --23 MS. PHILLIPS: I do that all the 24 25 time.

MR. KITRICK: Right.

MS. PHILLIPS: You know I do that with particularly one of my pet peeves as you know is the air conditioning unit placement.

MR. KITRICK: Right. Okay.

MS. PHILLIPS: Solely of that. I've been voted -- you know, I vote against it and been outnumbered but, hey, I feel strongly about certain things. De minimis factors of the solar panels on the top. We already know from literature that we got regarding this. But no, in terms of them wanting a safe structure that just goes without saying. I mean I had no conversations about it with anybody.

MR. KITRICK: All right. Okay. I have enough information.

Let's go to number two.

MR. COAN: Sure that would be a business relationship and I understand there are HIPAA laws so it's not anything that I can ask about but the board members should volunteer by recusing themselves. There's nothing more intimate than that relationship between a doctor and a patient. And you know, if you're going to be making a decision about your doctor, you're in

```
a very awkward position. And I believe the best
1
    thing for the public is any members as I request
2
    who are -- have that relationship should simply
3
    just recuse themselves. I'm not here to beat
 4
    anybody up, Mr. Kitrick. I'm just asking simple
5
    questions to get the smoothest application here
 6
    for Mr. Stone.
 7
                 MR. STONE:
                            Okay, can I --
8
                 MS. PHILLIPS: He's not my doctor by
 9
10
    the way.
                            Wait a minute. Can I
                 MR. STONE:
11
    enter? I have a question about that.
12
                 MR. KITRICK:
                               Sure.
13
                 MR. STONE: I wonder whether or not
14
    Mr. Coan has any information to suggest that any
15
    of the board members are in fact patients of Dr.
16
    Cotler.
17
                            No, sir. I have nothing
                 MR. COAN:
18
    that leads me to believe that. I'm just asking
19
20
```

MR. COAN: No, sir. I have nothing that leads me to believe that. I'm just asking the question and leaving it up to the conscience of the board members because there are HIPAA because there are HIPAA restrictions. So they can — that's why I ask in my letter for Mr. Kitrick to poll them privately. It's their information. But, you know, the public should get a fair and

21

22

23

24

honest hearing. That's all I want as a public citizen, sir.

MR. KITRICK: So, Mr. Stone, and without prejudging this, I mean I have no idea who's, like yourself I don't know, who's seeing which doctor. But let's assume for the purpose of this conversation, Mr. Stone, that there are —there's a member or there are members of the board who are patients of the applicant. What's your position on that?

MR. STONE: You know, all day today after receiving this transmittal and that paragraph dealing with patient information, it's very troublesome.

I'll give you an example. Supposed you take your board one by one just as if you were the judge in a trial out in Freehold and you wanted to voir dire each one of the various jurors and you wanted to do it in a private setting. Now we've tried cases in Freehold before juries. I know I have. And once in a while either you go to side bar everybody whispers, once in a while you go into chambers and the judge brings the lawyers in and in front of the attorneys the judge asks very very delicate questions. In this case I think you

fill that role. So but let's assume that you took your board out one by one to one of the meeting rooms and then they proceeded to come out to the -- back to the dais. And one of them leaves. That would allow the public, Mr. Coan, and all of the other people that are now visualizing this proceeding to know something very private that Mr. Coan would be getting indirectly that he's not allowed to get directly.

Now if he were to say are you a partner with Dr. Cotler, and it determined that one of the board members was a business partner, that's different then the very sensitive relationship that will be exposed to the world if Mr. Coan gets his way. And that issue is very sensitive. So he can't get a HIPAA form executed. He already indicated to his credit that there's HIPAA sensitivity. But he wants to know who Dr. Cotler treats. He's not entitled to know that. Nobody is entitled to know that.

So when we place members of a community onto a board we trust that if they feel as though they can't be honest and fair, then that is within their conscience. But if they're asked that question, can you be unbias? Will you be

prejudice in one favor or other? And their answer 1 is being negative, then we have to accept that. 2 Mr. Coan is not entitled to the answer as 3 to whether or not any of these board members are 4 patients of Dr. Cotler. And that's my position. 5 So I don't think he's entitled to that 7 information. MR. COAN: Mr. Kitrick, if I may this 8 could be done very simply. The board members can 9 just recuse themselves. There's no -- there's 10 nothing here but to have a business relationship 11 with someone that you're going to vote on their 12 application, I find that very troubling, sir. I 13 want --14 15

MR. KITRICK: I think you're both saying the same thing. By that I mean you and Mr. Stone are just saying it a little differently that a board member without having to announce what the issue is could recuse themselves knowing about this standard, if you will. So I think that would be the way to handle it.

MR. COAN: I don't disagree, sir.

23 | That's all I ask for.

MR. KITRICK: Right. Okay. Well

25 | let's --

16

17

18

19

20

MR. STONE: Let's not decided -- May
I suggest that we not decide --

MR. KITRICK: No, I'm not going to -- we're not making any final decisions on anything right now.

So number three.

MR. COAN: Sure, Mr. Kitrick. Number three I find is very important because Mr. Waterman writes the denial for the application. And in other forum I've been in they supply the Zoning Officer to answer questions as to why the denial is the way it is.

In this case there is a history of denials on this same structure before they were granted the approval to build it. I would like to know more about the history of that. I would like to know what those plans looked like. And I'd like to know why they were denied.

Mr. Waterman is the who wrote the denial and I feel that I should be able to cross-examine him as Mr. Stone. Mr. Stone may have questions about the ordinances intimately and he may want to ask Mr. Waterman.

So I mean I believe Mr. Waterman should be supplied for this hearing. I would hope he's on

1 | the call.

MR. STONE: I don't know if he is or not. May I provide --

MR. KITRICK: Go ahead.

MR. STONE: So what I think that Mr. Coan is alluding to is that he wants to bring in Mr. Waterman for all of the history leading to the approval.

I would respectfully submit that all that lead up to that approval would merge into the approval. And once it was approved if Mr.

Waterman is to testify as to what happened post-approval, I certainly have no objection to that. He certainly — but if Mr. Coan is going to go back into the history of this property for the last ten years, what lead to the approval, at the time that Mr. Waterman would be provided for his testimony I would raise that objection.

So whether or not Mr. Waterman comes or doesn't come to the meeting, that would be determined as the meeting was progressing.

MR. COAN: That being said I'd like to state that, you know, there was an approval granted to build a garage apartment and that didn't happen. And I'd like to ask -- talk to Mr.

Waterman about that application and as you say,
Mr. Stone, the subsequent application which was
denied. I have multiple questions on the denial.

MR. STONE: And you know what, I -Mr. Waterman, he's not my witness. I don't
suspect he's your witness. If the board found
that it would be appropriate for him to provide
information to the board, for him to assist them
in their decision, provided that we don't go back
into the history pre-approval.

Once it's approved, then if you want to talk about what happened after that, of course that is part of full consideration. In fact you know, Mr. Coan, that that's the reason we're here. Because if the structure was completed in the identical fashion to which it was approved, there would be no objections to this application.

MR. COAN: Oh, I don't disagree, sir. That's all I'm asking for.

MR. STONE: So I have no problem with Mr. Waterman but I would respectfully submit to Mr. Kitrick that the issue about the extent of his testimony and what it covers that would be dealt with just as it would with any witness in any trial setting or any board meeting. When he

testifies, there will be issues whether there will be evidential objections or otherwise. That's not -- that's not something that should be dealt with here.

MR. KITRICK: All right. Any other issues.

MR. STONE: Yes, I have an issue. So along with Mr. Coan package I was pleased to see that he found and submitted to the board -- I should tell -- for those board members that may not know. I was the zoning board attorney in Bradley Beach for what I believe was over two decades. And during that time I acted in the same capacity as Mr. Kitrick. And a few years ago I decided that the winter night meetings were too much for me. But here I am.

And he provided a copy of a resolution the application was for a Joseph and Jackalyne Jankowitz (phonetic) along with one of my bills to the Borough of Bradley Beach.

I'd like to know what his point is. What was his issue to provide that to the board?

MR. COAN: Oh, sure. That goes to the arbitrary and capricious nature of this

application, sir. And you will hear testimony

about that.

MR. STONE: I want an explanation of that. This would suggest that he culled out of all the records that I had over a two or decade period or more he decided to bring this bill before the board, which I think is irrelevant, immaterial and presumptuous. I'd like to know why he gave this bill to the board.

MR. COAN: As it relates to the legal review for that and in that case, 507 Fourth Avenue they requested a basement -- I'm sorry, a garage bathroom and I submitted the original plans when the garage bathroom was proposed. Through the hearing and in the resolution it indicates that the board did not approve that and there's a letter from Mr. Freda also which states that Mr. Jankowitz removed the bathroom from the plan as part of -- as condition number one of the resolution. And entered that into evidence because this applicant is asking for a garage bathroom. And it's -- I consider it to be an arbitrary and capricious standard if the board approves that.

So that's why I entered that into the record, sir. And it just so happened that you did

the legal review, which I just found interesting. If you'd like to strike that from the record, I would have no objection, sir.

MR. STONE: No, actually I'm very proud to have been the board attorney for the zoning board of Bradley Beach. So I have no interest in striking my --

MR. COAN: Okay. Great.

MR. STONE: Let me suggest this and I'll defer again to Mr. Kitrick. Regardless of whatever happened on any other application, under any other review standard, none of that is precedent in the application before the board.

Every case stands on its own four points. And in this application it will stand on what we're going to provide to the board, which includes the bathroom, the washer/dryer, the -- all of the comments the second engineer made, we are prepared to address.

But the issue as to whether or not the board should retain jurisdiction of this is an issue that I will raise after Mr. Coan completes his -- his discussion.

MR. COAN: Sure, my last one was -- yeah I made the recommendation on the first

meeting that we do a site inspection. And my recommendation was just kind of dismissed. It's a very unusual application here. Where the building has already been built.

So we're not just working off of -- of some plans. I mean we can actually go inside. See the operation. I think it's a very unique opportunity but I made that recommendation in the video and it was just pushed aside based upon the, I guess, the missed notice arguments. But I'd like to know why no one called me to schedule one.

MR. STONE: Well I have -- I will raise a point. A site inspection is unnecessary. There are as-built plans showing what the buildings exist today. The plan as proposed is pretty clear. And I think that frankly a site inspection in which we parade people onto the Cotler's property is inappropriate. It approaches harassment. It's unnecessary. The board will have plenty of information in order to make an informed decision as to what the conclusion of the application should be.

MR. COAN: Well --

MR. STONE: And this application is no

more unique than all of the many, many applications that have occurred over the many decades before the zoning board and the planning board of Bradley Beach.

They're very -- the board members are very capable in my opinion to review, analyze, listen to, evaluate and concluded an opinion based upon what has been presented both for and against the applicant.

MR. COAN: Mr. Kitrick, as Mr. Stone stated, you know, every application stands on its own. And this one is unique on its own because the building is already built and there should be no reason that the board members and the public can't have an organized site inspection. So again I'm going to stand on that. I think it's very unusual and there's a wonderful opportunity to really get -- get just site information for the board members so they know exactly what they're voting on.

MR. KITRICK: So without making any sort of decision on that, it would be highly unusual if we did that, highly unusual. And, you know, one of the considerations would have to be we're in a pandemic right now and the health and

```
the safety of all the individuals involved in the
 1
    application is paramount.
                               So...
 2
                 MR. CRITELLI: This is Dave Critelli.
 3
                 MR. KITRICK: Excuse me.
                                            Wait a
 4
    minute, Dave. You know especially the board
 5
    member.
                 MR. CRITELLI:
                                This is Dave Critelli.
 7
    I'm sitting here listening to all these
 8
    conversations and I'm just a little bit confused
 9
    as to why this is going on for the period of time
10
    that it's going where we have somebody who's
11
    trying to improve a community, improve the town,
12
    who has been a longstanding member of this town,
13
    and we're lambasting them for, I'm not sure for
14
15
    what reason.
                 MR. KITRICK: Dave, Dave, so right
16
    now we're going through some issues before where
17
    the board has taken jurisdiction. We have not
18
19
    taken jurisdiction. So to answer your question,
    we're working our way through issues before we get
20
    to the point where we accept jurisdiction.
21
    that's --
22
                 MR. CRITELLI: Can I ask a question.
23
    How long has Mr. Coan been in town?
24
                 MR. KITRICK:
                                I would -- I don't
25
```

```
think that's relevant right now, Dave. So if we
1
    could just conclude this and then --
2
                 MR. COAN: For the record I'd like to
3
    say that I have owned property here for 20 years
 4
    -- 25 years.
5
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. All right. So I
 6
    think we need to conclude resolving issues in the
7
    case before -- okay.
8
                 MS. HOSSIDY: Catherine Hossidy
9
    (phonetic). I just have one question. At the end
10
11
    of the meeting --
12
                 MR. KITRICK: We're not taking
    questions right now. We're working through these
13
14
    issues right now.
                 MS. HOSSIDY: Gotcha. Okay.
                                               Thank
15
16
    you.
                 MR. KITRICK: Mr. Stone, did you --
17
                 MR. STONE: I don't -- I think that
18
    -- I think we have to make some decisions but --
19
20
    Mr. Kitrick, what's your pleasure? What are your
21
    thoughts?
                 MR. KITRICK: Well do you have any --
22
    I thought you indicated you had an issue that you
23
24
    wanted to raise.
25
                 MR. STONE: I may not need to.
                                                 May
```

not need to. It depends upon what happens now considering Mr. Coan's positions.

You know, when I gave thought to these things early in the day, it was before I really heard from him to see what his problems were. I want to know can the board hear this and do it — can the board in its present configuration hear this application without being bias and allow the process to move forward?

I tell you, I will concede Mr. Kitrick these issues that are being raised are troublesome. And I know that you said early on that -- and Mr. Coan pointed out that apparently according to the website he was within his right to bring this issue up at the last minute.

You know I wanted to comment, you know, we lawyers who practice in this field, we very often even when we're against each other we extend courtesies to each other. And if Mr. Coan had these issues which were clearly available to him a month or more ago. If he were a lawyer, he would have either called me up and said, Richard, I got some problems. I'm going to give them to you.

And I would have -- I would have been prepared instead of having to run all day trying

to prepare for these questions. And that's why we're taking up the time of the board members.

1.5

We should be already moving through the application. I should also point out to you on now, on this video or this ZOOM meeting all my experts are available. My engineer, my architect, my planner, my clients, we're ready to go. But to put a taint of some impropriety on an application that should have moved forward in June, is unfair.

So I don't know. I really have to defer to you as I would to a judge as to know what you think we should do. And of course I will discuss it with my clients and I will do what you think is the right thing.

MR. KITRICK: Well I don't understand what you mean by what you think we should do.

MR. STONE: Well if the board members are not going to recuse themselves, let's get going. If some of the board members, I'm very uncomfortable about that. Because everybody know that's on this ZOOM, or will read the transcript, or watch the video as Mr. Coan did, they're going to know that anybody steps down is a patient of Dr. Cotler.

Now Mr. Kitrick, are you entitled to know 1 I don't think so. I don't think any of us 2 3 But we have to leave in the best judgment of the board member, that they will be fair and 4 unbias for whatever their reason. Maybe they 5 6 don't like the way Dr. Cotler practices medicine 7 or the way he keeps his garden. If they feel as though they can't be fair, then that's within the 8 conscience of each of the board members. 9 10 MR. KITRICK: So this is an extremely sensitive and important issue. And here's -- and 11 12 here is one of the problems with dealing with it 13 the day of. What is the legal guidance on this, 14 Mr. Coan or Mr. Stone? What's the legal guidance here? 15 16 MR. STONE: Okay. So I want -- I 17 want to put something --18 MR. KITRICK: Tell -- tell -- Can 19 either one of you, either one of you provide a 20 case to me in either direction as to how we would 21 make this determination? 22 MR. STONE: I would defer to Mr. Coan first since he raised the objection. 23 24 MR. COAN: I'm making a simple 25 observation and I made my case clear. There may

be case law. I don't have access to LexisNexis so I don't have it.

MR. KITRICK: Yeah, so it's not as simple observation. It's not a simply -- it's actually a pretty complex one, you know. And so -- which presents a problem when it's presented at the eleventh hour because everybody wants to be treated fairly. Both, you know, the applicant, the board members, the public, the objector and you've raised an extraordinarily sensitive issue. And I think it's relevant. But it's extraordinarily sensitive.

And, you know, to make a decision like this in the middle of a meeting with -- and I want everybody to appreciate you have our board secretary, who, this is not -- this case is not her only activity tonight. You know I'm your board attorney. I spend a lot of time doing the work on this board but I have other responsibilities during the day. And it's -- that's why people -- and you want to be able to do a good job and you want to be able to give a sound legal opinion and the fact that Mr. Coan you don't have access LexisNexis is, that doesn't cut it.

MR. COAN: Okay. 1 MR. KITRICK: You're representing 2 yourself and that's fine. But, you know, if 3 you're raising these issues and this one is 4 relevant what's -- so what's the legal support? 5 These common sense issues MR. COAN: 6 which should have been brought up to the board 7 members when the application came in. That could 8 have been done internally. I mean obviously 9 there's a potential for conflict. I mean there's 10 been previous cases of conflict in Bradley Beach. 11 MR. STONE: We're talking -- we're 12 here about this case. 13 I realize that, sir. 14 MR. COAN: conflict in a small community is an issue and 15 especially in this case. 16 MR. KITRICK: No kidding. 17 18 kidding. But that's not what we're talking about This is a HIPAA issue. 19 here. MR. COAN: Yes, it is, sir. 20 MR. KITRICK: That's very unique. 21 MR. COAN: Uh-huh. 22 MR. KITRICK: Very unique. This is 23

not just a simple conflict issue. Now the issue

you raised at the beginning, you know, the

24

```
transcript issue. Okay, that's not an unusual
 1
    type of conflict issue. But what you're
 2
    presenting here in this part of it, it is. Very
 3
    unique. And very -- very sensitive.
 4
 5
                 MR. COAN: Okay. Uh-huh, I agree,
 6
    sir.
                 MR. KITRICK: All right. So what --
 7
    so what's your legal argument? What -- are there
 8
    cases supporting your position?
 9
                 MR. COAN: My case is they have a
10
    business relationship -- if they have a business
11
12
    relationship --
13
                 MR. STONE: Who does?
14
                 MR. COAN: -- they recuse themselves
15
    that's all.
16
                 MR. STONE: Do you know who has a
17
    business relationship?
                 MR. COAN: No, I've stated that
18
19
    already. Under oath I've stated that already.
20
    do not know. I just raised the question, sir.
                 MR. KITRICK: Right. And I'm telling
21
    you it's a relevant. I agree it's a relevant but
22
23
    getting the answer to that presents complications
24
    that you don't see in other conflict issues.
25
    That's the inherent problem. And you've already
```

addressed the HIPAA aspects. So I'm certainly not
going to do something tonight, which is going to

violate anybody's privacy. And I don't think
anybody here wants that to happen.

We all in agreement about that?

MR. COAN: Yes.

MR. KITRICK: Okay, so I get back to,

I can tell you there are responses but the response "common sense" that's an evasive response. Do you have -- it appears that you, Mr. Coan, you don't have any law supporting direction one way or the other on this.

MR. COAN: No, that's true, sir. I don't.

MR. KITRICK: Okay.

MR. COAN: I leave that up to your

17 | legal mind.

MR. KITRICK: Yeah, I know. I appreciate that but my expectation, you know, I have to call balls and strikes, right. Somebody's got to call balls and strikes. And it's not good enough for you to raise the issue and say, okay let somebody make the decision. You have to have a legal argument. You're not making — and once again I'm saying you don't have any cases

supporting or giving guidance one way or the other.

Now imagine a scenario where this issue was raised ten days ago. And the parties would have the opportunity maybe to do some research on it, review it. But that didn't happen here. And that's the problem with providing something like this the night before. That's the inherent problem.

But, you know, we're dealing with it. So we will deal with it.

Mr. Stone, do you have any --

MR. STONE: So I'm going to throw another fly in the ointment and I see I don't know exactly how this works but I see that people are typing in.

MR. KITRICK: Yeah, I know.

MR. STONE: Does that usually happen?

I don't know how that happened. I saw somebody

typed in if you're not a lawyer so you don't have

to hire a lawyer. And --

MR. KITRICK: So I don't know what we can do about the chat but it's also distracting.

MR. STONE: Okay. I just want the public to understand that it is true that we are

trained as lawyers and of course the skill of a lawyer is being with the research. But anybody has a right to represent themselves.

And Mr. Coan certainly -- and I've never had any dealings with him before, I don't think, but he seems to me to be a formidable adversary. He's prepared, articulate. I'm not just complimenting him. But that doesn't make him correct. And if I were on his side and I made the issue -- I raised the issues that he raised, I would have to support it. That's what a lawyer's job is and if you choose to represent yourself, then you still have to do that.

However if this issue doesn't complicate the case enough, the issue of the undercurrent of politics is even worse. You know when this application was first filed, and again I'm making it for the record, because I anticipate this record is going to be reviewed. When the application was first filed Dr. Cotler was a sitting councilman in Bradley Beach. Clearly as a sitting council member the board of adjustment or the planning board or the Mayor and Council couldn't hear those cases because there was a very clear conflict. And that could work both

ways.

If it were heard by the zoning board, and the members of the zoning board favored the other side of the political line, that would be one conflict. And similarly if there were those who favored his side of the politics, that would be inappropriate as well.

So that existed. That conflict existed.

As a result of which the case was transferred to the contiguous municipality Avon. And at that time I believe I forget if I communicated with the board secretary there or I was anticipating that as the application was progressing that it would be heard there.

So I see there's other chats here. People are --

MR. KITRICK: Yeah.

MR. STONE: -- already chatting. But that conflict while he was a sitting council person has not disappeared. If this application were to continue before this body, I think that the conflict that existing before he lost the election could very well exist after he lost the election.

So I'm as interested as Mr. Coan is that

Mr. -- that Dr. Cotler receive a fair hearing. And the board member also have to reflect upon their own conscience to make sure that whatever line of politics their own either now or in the future that they'll give him a fair shake.

So as we approach these very sensitive issues I don't -- I'd like to get over the first issue first. That's the one of the disclosure of what would otherwise be confidential under HIPAA.

And then revisit the issue later as to the second part of it. Because it appears to me that this is going to take some time. Am I wrong about that, Mr. Kitrick?

MR. KITRICK: Well I didn't understand. What do you mean revisit what?

MR. STONE: Well at the time that the board members make their decision as to whether or not they're going to be intact as a board then we'll take a look at the issue as to whether or not the board as a body can be unbias. And if they can, then there's no reason to remove this case from Bradley Beach. But if some of them feel as though because of political motivations they can't be, then for those reasons they may be —need to be removed.

MR. COAN: If I may, Mr. Kitrick. 1 MR. KITRICK: Go ahead. 2 It has nothing to do with MR. COAN: 3 politics, sir. He's putting his own testimony on 4 This is a Municipal Land Use Law issue. there. 5 This is not political issue at all. And you know what I would MR. STONE: 7 say to that. What I would say to that is that 8 when the board is intact and ready to proceed I 9 too may want to question them through the board 10 attorney as to their prejudice or lack thereof. 11 MR. CRITELLI: If this is a Municipal 12 Land Use Law, why are we ever having a 13 conversation about HIPAA? 14 MR. STONE: Well that's because Mr. 15 Coan brought up something that would violate -- he 16 17 brought up the HIPAA. MR. CRITELLI: Isn't HIPAA a Federal 18 Law? Not a Borough law? And why are we having 19 this conversation? 20 MR. KITRICK: Well, okay, so Dave, 21 the reason this is coming up is because there's a 22 question of whether a board member has a 23 doctor/patient relationship with the applicant. 24 And whether in fact that relationship results in a 25

```
conflict. And the sensitivity of determining
 1
    whether such a relationship exists is governed by
 2
    HIPAA and I -- so that's the conundrum.
 3
                 MR. AFFUSO: Mr. Kitrick, can I
 4
 5
    make a suggestion?
                 MR. KITRICK: Just one thing, Federal
 6
    Law would preempt. Go ahead.
 7
                                  Yes.
                 MR. AFFUSO: You have two
 8
    situations where there can be bias. Bias under
 9
    the doctor/patient question or bias based upon the
10
11
    political question.
12
                 MR. KITRICK: Right.
                 MR. AFFUSO: If we present to the
13
    board a chance to recuse based upon either one,
14
    you should possibly be able to give the fig leaf
15
    to cover the HIPAA. I would suggest that you
16
    don't bifurcate it and you do it all at once. And
17
18
    that's just merely a suggestion from myself.
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. That's a good
19
20
    suggestion.
           So if I could just elaborate on an argument
21
    that Mr. Stone made. So here's my understanding
22
    before this application got here.
23
           While the applicant was an elected
24
```

official, there was a need for some level of

inspection regarding the project. I don't know all the details but when that was occurring the inspections were handled by the Borough of Avon by the Sea. That's my understanding. And that's not unusual. Because there's a -- whoever would serve the role of inspector would be an employee of the Borough. So it went to Avon.

But it's not clear to me that that meant that once that was done and once whatever decisions were made regarding those inspections that the application would have been heard by Avon. That's not clear to me.

So there are cases that say and one is a Superior Court case, <u>Wyzykowski versus Rizas</u>, and I'm going to just summarize that. That's a situation in which the elected official wanted their matter to be heard, wanted their matter to be heard before a Municipal Land Use board. And there was push back regarding that. And the ruling is that procedures have to be put in place but the mere fact that you're an elected official does not prohibit you from having an application be heard by that Municipal Land Use board.

Now I'm giving a very general observation here and are always restrictions and guidelines

in doing that. So that's a different situation. And I'm not trying to put words in Mr. Stone's mouth at all. But, you know, this potentially would be an issue -- would be a situation where perhaps, perhaps the applicant would be saying I don't want to be -- I don't wish to be heard by the Land Use board in this municipality or this X municipal official.

That's a little bit different spin on that.

Okay. So I'm not -- and I'm not -- a cursory
review is I haven't seen any cases where it's
taken out of the municipality. It doesn't mean
they don't exist. If there are conflicts within
one particular land use board that people can't
hear, often times members from another board in
town, in this instance the planning board could
enter into a situation so that there be enough for
a quorum.

Of course in this situation you may dealing with the same conflict issues. So any way.

So, Mr. Stone, I agree with Mr. Affuso that we should deal with all of that at one time. I think that makes perfect sense.

MR. STONE: I don't object -- you know what I don't object to that. I mean look we

have to cover the record. We have to make sure that we get support to make -- for you to make decision. I have no objection to that.

MR. KITRICK: So I don't want to -since we're having discussions about conflicts, I
want to -- I'm trying to as we're discussing these
I want to get everything on the table. All right.
So here's something that is occurring to me as
we're discussing this and I'd like Mr. Coan and
Mr. Stone to address this because I don't want
to address it later.

You're before the Borough of Bradley Beach Board of Adjustment. The members of the Bradley Beach Board of Adjustment are appointed. It's a Mayor's appointment. Typically the Mayor's appointment is done, not always, but done at a reorganization meeting whereby it's part of a consent agenda that the Council would vote on. So arguably the members of this board were appointed in that manner while the applicant was an elected official.

Anybody have any position on that?

BOARD MEMBER: I was not.

MR. KITRICK: Okay.

MR. STONE: Well I ask --

```
MR. KITRICK: Well there are members
1
    that fall in that position perhaps not all but I
2
    know there are so.
 3
           Mr. Coan, do you have any position that?
 4
                             I mean I like what Mr.
                 MR. COAN:
5
    Affuso said. I mean it made sense to give people
 6
    the opportunity and --
 7
                 MR. KITRICK: No, that's a different
 8
            I agreed what he said made sense.
 9
10
    this is a different issue.
                            I mean that's up to the
11
                 MR. COAN:
    board members. I mean I don't --
12
                 MR. KITRICK: No, no, no, no, no, no.
13
14
    No.
                            I'm not objecting to
                 MR. COAN:
15
    anything that has to do with politics at all, sir.
16
    That's not at all what --
17
                 MR. KITRICK: And I'm not talking
18
    about politics. I'm not talking about politics.
19
    What I'm saying is that there are members of this
20
    board, and I'm telling you, I think you're
21
    somewhat familiar with the format, that members of
22
    the board are appointed the political entity in
23
24
    town; correct?
                             They're -- those are
                 MR. COAN:
25
```

1 Mayoral appointments. MR. KITRICK: That's what I said. 2 That's what I said before. 3 MR. COAN: With Council approval. 4 I'm not objecting to any of that. 5 MR. KITRICK: So my question is do 6 you have an opinion as to whether that presents a 7 conflict? 8 MR. COAN: Oh, I don't view that as a 9 conflict at all. That takes place in every single 10 But if they don't feel comfortable voting 11 on it, that's up to them. People have donated \$50 12 to a Mayoral campaign in the past and recused 13 themselves because they didn't feel comfortable. 14 That's up to them. I don't have any bearing on 15 that. I'll leave that up to their conscience, 16 17 sir. Okay. 18 MR. KITRICK: So --MR. STONE: I think --19 MR. KITRICK: Listen, Mr. Coan, you 20 representing a position. So, you know, the 21

MR. KITRICK: Listen, Mr. Coan, you representing a position. So, you know, the response can't always be you'll leave it up to them. We'll certainly inquire more. I'm asking you, you're representing yourself do you have a position as to whether you're arguing that that's

22

23

24

a conflict? 1 MR. COAN: I'm not arguing that 2 politics is a conflict, sir. I made my point 3 about the medical issues. 4 MR. KITRICK: All right. I'm going 5 to -- see you're not answering my question. 6 MR. COAN: 7 Okay. MR. KITRICK: And I'm going to --8 MR. COAN: Okay. Try it again. 9 10 Let's do it again. MR. KITRICK: Because this has 11 nothing to do with -- this is -- the question is 12 do you take a position that there would be a 13 conflict if a board member was appointed to the 14 board as a Mayor's appointment during the tenure 15 of the applicant serving as a member of Council 16 and that appointment by the Mayor was ratified at 17 a meeting under a Consent Agenda by the Council? 18 My position is is that 19 MR. COAN: this happens in 565 municipalities. The Mayor 20 makes the appointments. I have no issue with it 21 at all, sir. 22 So... MR. KITRICK: So your position is 23 it's not a conflict. 24

MR. COAN: I do not believe it's a

conflict.

MR. KITRICK: Okay.

MR. COAN: If they feel it's a conflict because they made a political donation, that's up to them. But I didn't raise this issue and I have no problem with this issue.

MR. KITRICK: All right. So you -- on its face you don't view that as a conflict.

MR. COAN: No, sir. There would be conflicts everyday all of the state if that was the standard.

MR. KITRICK: I don't agree with that but you don't feel it's a conflict. So, Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: Well let's repeat the history. This matter had been sent to Avon. It was sent to Avon because Dr. Cotler was a sitting member of the Council. After he loses the election I don't believe that the conflict disappears.

I think for the very same reason that it was sent to Avon and that Avon's inspector did the inspection it continues. It doesn't evaporate because he lost the election. So in the hypothetical had he won the election it would

have stayed in Avon. And that's where the proceeding would have been held. I might point out to you that the likelihood that if it was before Avon today the very issues we're talking about now would not exist.

And had Mr. Coan not introduced this this morning I think that over the last, you know, even if he gave it to me ten days ago or a week ago, we would have been able to do a fair and complete review as to a response.

And I also took a look at that case. It seems like it's the same case in reverse. I lost you. Are you still there?

MR. KITRICK: Yeah.

MR. STONE: I'm sorry. But I think it's the same case in reverse. But you know as lawyers we would have to research further. We'd have to draw some analogies from it. And all I want is for my client to get a fair shake. If Bradley Beach feels as though this board can give him a fair and unbias decision, I'm ready to go.

MR. KITRICK: Yeah but I'm asking you the same question because we're going to get all this out now because we don't want to be addressing this later on. So, one, Mr. Stone, I

don't necessarily agree that it would have gone to Avon in the scenario that you're stating. I don't necessarily --

MR. COAN: If I may, sir. The reason that it went to the building department in Avon is because the Council has direct control over the budget.

that. I already established that. Okay. So once the inspection issue was resolved, you know, I'm — it's not clear to me it would have stayed in Avon. That's not clear to me. And I'm not aware of any cases where it gets in a situation like that, it gets transferred to another municipality.

MR. STONE: So let me ask you, if he had won the election, you think that Bradley Beach would have still heard the case.

MR. KITRICK: I think based on the cases that I've reviewed if that was he desire, yes. Now there would have been restrictions in that and, you know, I'm not saying it would have been an easy road and there may have been conflicts that would have had to be addressed. You may have had to get perhaps take members from the planning board to ultimately flush out the

board. But once again, and that's a distinction I 1 made before, the case that I cited before it's a 2 situation where the elected official wanted to be 3 heard. We're talking about a situation where the 4 what is now the former elected official perhaps 5 would be asking not to be heard. That's a 6 different -- those are different facts. 7 Then I have a solution. MR. STONE: 8 Let me put on my case. I'm ready to go. If the 9 board is ready to hear the case, they feel as 10 11

though they can give me an unbias decision, my client and my experts are ready to go.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KITRICK: So you don't view -you don't believe this is a conflict based on the scenario that I -- you're not arguing -- you're not arguing a conflict based on the fact that the -- regarding the appointment issue.

MR. STONE: I didn't raise that issue.

MR. COAN: I didn't raise it either.

MR. STONE: Mr. Coan believes that there are members that should not sit in this hearing.

MR. KITRICK: Yes, okay. I'm not asking anybody if they raised it. We're getting all this out of the way. So you concur with Mr. Coan that's not an issue; correct?

MR. STONE: That is not an issue provided that we proceed now. If we proceed now, I want to reserve my right to bring that up. If the board decides now that we're not going to proceed tonight for whatever reason, then I reserve my right to raise any other issues that might have to come up.

But right now I am here tonight to present my case. And if it wasn't for Mr. Coan providing this to us this morning, or -- in fact the board members didn't even get this until tonight. We wouldn't even be wasting two hours. I would have put in two hours of testimony already.

MR. KITRICK: Right.

MR. STONE: Now I'm being put into a position being asked a question that I would have had been asked. Mr. Kitrick, if you and I didn't get this today, would we be even talking about this today?

MR. KITRICK: But we are. This is where we are. So, you know, a lot of things that happened today I wish could change but having nothing to do with this. So this is where we are.

So this is a very difficult format to be discussing these issues.

MR. STONE: And I agree with that. I would rather be in that room having this discussion where from time to time we could speak together. But it's very difficult in a case particular in a difficult case. In a straightforward case it's not that bad. But in a difficult case it becomes more difficult.

MR. KITRICK: Yeah.

MR. STONE: But given that I really have nothing else to add. If the board wants me to present my case tonight, I'm prepared to do it. If the board wants to reserve and make a decision, I'll accept that. And my client will have to understand that he's waited this long, going to have to wait a little longer.

MR. KITRICK: So I'm going to ask that Mr. Coan and Mr. Stone provide legal research on these issues.

MR. STONE: Let's make sure that we're narrowing the issue. One board member recusal.

MR. KITRICK: Kristie, could you show that list again.

FEMALE VOICE: Kristie actually got 1 kicked off the meeting and is trying to get back 2 It's still --3 It's a rough crowd. MR. KITRICK: 4 All right. So I don't know if you could do that 5 Kristie just so we don't miss anything. That's 6 7 why it's --You know what I'm going MR. STONE: 8 to do, Mr. Kitrick. Tomorrow or Monday I'm going 9 to order a transcript of this proceeding. 10 Okav. MR. KITRICK: 11 MR. STONE: And unlike Mr. Coan I 12 will be happy to share it with him. 13 Thank you, sir. MR. COAN: 14 MR. STONE: Yeah, ordinarily I 15 suggest that we share the cost of that. Are you 16 okay with sharing the cost of a transcript? 17 MR. COAN: Could you give me an over, 18 under on this? 19 It's only about two and MR. STONE: 20 a half hours so it'll be -- but in fairness I 21 think that we should get a transcript. And what 22 I'll do Mr. Kitrick I'll be happy to supply it to 23 you at no charge. 24 MR. COAN: Wait I'll go a third, if

he goes a third. 1 MR. STONE: We can't negotiate that. 2 We have to provide it to Mr. Kitrick. 3 MR. KITRICK: Yeah. Right. 4 I want to make sure that MR. STONE: 5 we narrowed the issues. As I see it there's two The HIPAA sensitivity, that should be an 7 interesting one for us to research. And whether 8 or not once the matter is transferred to another 9 municipality is it supposed to stay there given 10 the very unusual facts of the case. 11 MR. COAN: I agree, sir. 12 And I also want you to MR. KITRICK: 13 address the -- Ms. Phillips conflict issue. 14 MR. STONE: Oh. 15 MR. COAN: Sure. Was that me or Mr. 16 17 Stone? MR. KITRICK: Both of you. 18 Sounds great. MR. COAN: 19 MR. STONE: Could I give you my 20 schedule, Mr. Kitrick? 21 MR. KITRICK: Well it would be better 22 if you gave it to Kristie. 23 MR. STONE: Let me just explain to 24 you my issues. As a result of the COVID-19 all of 25

```
my pre-planned vacations for the first seven
1
    months of the year were cancelled. Much to my
 2
    wife's chagrin. I anticipate being away for about
 3
    two weeks from Labor Day through the following
 4
           I know that my client is not going to be
    week.
 5
    happy about it but I'd like to put it on the
    October meeting. Can you tell me --
 7
                 MR. KITRICK: That's why I need
 8
    Kristie.
              I --
 9
                 MR. STONE: May I make a suggestion.
10
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG:
                                      I think it can
11
    be -- I'm going to butt in. From what I see our
12
    October 15th meeting is okay.
13
                 MR. KITRICK: So, Mr. Chairman, just
14
    so they're aware that Irvington Manor is going to
15
    be on the 15th.
16
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG:
                                       They were
17
    supposed to be on tonight as well.
18
                 FEMALE VOICE: Mark, I have Kristie.
19
    I have Kristie on the phone and she said there's
20
    no one on the October meeting right now.
21
                 FEMALE VOICE #2: Except for
22
    Irvington Manor that we just carried tonight.
23
                 FEMALE VOICE: Except for Irvington
24
    Manor which we just carried. She can't get back.
25
```

```
CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG:
                                      If they
1
    renotice. They have to renotice, so ...
2
                 MR. KITRICK: It's your call, Mr.
3
    Chairman.
 4
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: I would say we
5
    put him up first on October 15th at this point.
 6
    Carried without notification.
 7
                 MR. KITRICK: This matter.
 8
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: This matter
 9
    only.
10
                 MR. KITRICK:
                              Okay.
11
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: The Cotler
12
    matter continued.
13
                 MR. KITRICK: All right.
                                            So --
14
                 MR. STONE: Can I supply you with a
15
    brief by the 30th of September? That will give
16
    you a full two weeks to digest my brilliant and
17
    articulate argument?
18
                  CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Kitrick, is
19
    that okay with you.
20
                  MR. KITRICK: Yeah, I'm --
21
                  CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: It gives you 15
22
    days.
23
                  MR. KITRICK: I'm thinking about my
24
    schedule too. Okay. Both parties by September
25
```

30th. 1 MR. COAN: Yes, sir. 2 MR. KITRICK: All right. 3 You understand CHATRMAN ROSENBERG: 4 that, Mr. Coan. You have to give a brief. 5 MR. COAN: Yes, sir. 6 So the transcript will MR. KITRICK: 7 come obviously sooner than that and then here's 8 what I would ask just provide when you do that 9 contact numbers in case prior to the 15th that 10 there's a discussion among -- there needs to be a 11 discussion among Mr. Stone, Mr. Coan and myself on 12 the legal issues. Not the facts of the case. 13 MR. COAN: Yes, sir. Just the legal 14 issues on those items. 15 MR. KITRICK: Yeah, if necessary 16 so... Okay? 17 MR. COAN: Okay. 18 MR. STONE: You know ordinarily -- I 19 guess that's not so. I was going to say ordinarily 20 we would have a discussion of the attorneys 21 leading to the 15th. But under these 22 circumstances given that Mr. Coan is a pro se 23 litigant that's inappropriate. I think. But I 24 think everything has got to be on the record. Ι 25

don't think anything should be off the record. 1 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: I actually agree 2 with Mr. Stone. We should have every conversation 3 on the record here. 4 MR. STONE: I don't want there to be 5 any confusion or misunderstanding. I think it's 6 7 MR. KITRICK: Well, listen I'm going 8 to -- I'm not saying we're going to have that 9 conference. I want your contact information and 10 it's possible that we'll need something. 11 MR. STONE: Okay. That's okay. 12 But I'm hopeful that MR. KITRICK: 13 both briefs are going to be so lucid and so 14 informative that I'll have no questions. And I'll 15 just be seeing you on the 15th. 16 MR. COAN: Mr. Kitrick, I'll forward 17 my information to Ms. Dickert and she can be the 18 conduit for everyone's information. 19 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: No you forward 20 it to Mr. Stone and Mr. Kitrick direct. 21 Oh, okay. MR. COAN: 22 MR. KITRICK: Directly to me. 23 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: With a copy to 24 25 Ms. Dickert.

1	MR. COAN: Yes.		
2	MR. KITRICK: Yeah.		
3	MR. COAN: Yes, sir.		
4	MR. KITRICK: Okay. Same for you, Mr.		
5	Stone.		
6	MR. STONE: Of course. Of course.		
7	So that's all I have.		
8	MR. KITRICK: So, Mr. Chairman, I		
9	think there's without further notice this matter		
10	will be carried to the October 15th meeting with		
11	the briefing schedule as outlined and		
12	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: And the		
13	communication system as discussed.		
14	MR. KITRICK: Yeah, and at this point		
15	we still have not accepted jurisdiction in the		
16	matter.		
17	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Correct. That		
18	okay, Mr. Stone.		
19	MR. STONE: I'm ready to go. I going		
20	to go hit the books tonight.		
21	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Kitrick and		
22	Mr. Coan.		
23	MR. COAN: Yes, sir.		
24	MR. KITRICK: And no issues with the		
25	time line, Mr. Stone, as far as the application		

being accepted and --1 MR. STONE: Consider this the 2 acknowledgement that we can delay it until the 3 October meeting. 4 MR. KITRICK: Okay. Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Do we have to 6 make a motion or that was done. Mr. Kitrick, do 7 we have to make a motion? 8 MR. KITRICK: You can make the motion 9 based on what I just stated. 10 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: I make a motion 11 that we the discussion and continuation and the 12 correspondence to be forwarded accordingly. 13 there a second? 14 MR. KITRICK: And the hearing to be 15 October 15th. 16 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: And the hearing 17 to be October 15th. 18 MR. CRITELLI: Second. 19 MR. KITRICK: I have one question. 20 May I ask a question? 21 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Hold the second. 22 Go ahead. 23 MR. CRITELLI: I'll second. 24 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: No, no, hold the 25

```
second. Mr. Stone, wants one more thing.
1
                 MR. STONE: I have a question.
2
    of the concerns of my client is that we want to
3
    sure up the building for safety and to make sure
4
    that there's no damage to the building. I'm not
5
    sue that the zoning board can give that approval
    but my intention is to communicate with the
7
    building inspector to see if he'll allow us to
 8
    cover up the building.
 9
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: That's fine with
10
11
    us.
                 MR. KITRICK: That's not --
12
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: That's not a
13
    zoning issue.
14
                 MR. KITRICK: That's not the board of
15
    adjustment. I can't give you any guidance on
16
17
    that.
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: An inspector's
18
19
    issue.
                 MR. STONE: We'll take care of that
20
    with the inspector.
21
                  CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Okay.
                                              Now you
22
    can second whoever second it.
23
                  MR. CRITELLI: I'll second it, Dave
24
    Critelli.
25
```

```
CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Is Kristie back
1
    on or no? Mr. Affuso?
2
                 MR. AFFUSO: Yes.
3
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Wade?
                                                 Mr.
 4
 5
    Wade, yes or no?
                 FEMALE VOICE: Kristie's listening.
 6
 7
    She's on the phone.
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: You're on mute,
 8
    Mr. Wade. Mr. Wade yes or no?
 9
                 FEMALE VOICE: Here.
10
           Mayor Rosenberg? I'm sorry. Chair
11
    Rosenberg?
12
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Yes.
13
                 FEMALE VOICE: Kristie is on the
14
    phone she's going to call the names and have me
15
    just write them.
16
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: That's what I
17
    was doing. Okay.
18
                 MS. DICKERT: I can hear their
19
    responses. I'm just going to call the roll.
20
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Go ahead.
21
                 MS. DICKERT: Okay. Call Teresa
22
23
    Rosenberg.
                 BOARD MEMBER: Teresa Rosenberg?
24
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Yes or no.
25
```

			82
1	You're on mut	e.	
2		MS. ROSENBERG: I'm sorry. Yes.	
3		FEMALE VOICE: Okay.	!
4		MS. DICKERT: Ms. Bruynell.	
5		FEMALE VOICE: Ms. Bruynell?	
6		MS. BRUYNELL: Yes.	
7		CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Yes.	
8		BOARD MEMBER: Okay, who's next,	
9	Kristie?		
10		MS. DICKERT: Mr. Affuso.	
11		FEMALE VOICE: Mr. Affuso?	
12		MR. AFFUSO: Yes.	
13		FEMALE VOICE: Okay.	
14		MS. DICKERT: Ms. Phillips?	
15		MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.	
16		MS. DICKERT: Mr. Wade?	
17		MR. WADE: Yes.	
18		MS. DICKERT: And Mr. Mayor had	
19	recused himse	elf in the beginning. So Chair	
20	Rosenberg?		
21		CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Yes.	
22		MS. DICKERT: Okay. All right.	
23	October 15th	with no further notice.	
24		CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: I make a motion	
25	to adjourn.	And the next meeting is September	
	1		